



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9079		
Country/Region:	Honduras		
Project Title:	Environmentally Sound Management of Products and Wastes Containing POPs and Risks Associated with their Final Disposal		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5615 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Chemicals and Waste
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CW-2 Program 3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$110,000	Project Grant:	\$3,460,000
Co-financing:	\$26,600,325	Total Project Cost:	\$30,170,325
PIF Approval:	April 28, 2015	Council Approval/Expected:	June 04, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Anil Sookdeo	Agency Contact Person:	Jacques Van Engel, Director, MPU/Chemicals

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	MO, March 23, 2015. Yes.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MO, March 23, 2015. Yes.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental	MO, March 23, 2015. Yes. Co-processing is an innovative	

<sup>1</sup> For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	approach in Honduras. The project will strengthen the National Management Committee (NMC) on Sustainable Management of Chemicals, the central coordination mechanism of important stakeholders including private sectors. Together with the implementation of Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR), this project will address sustainability, market transformation and scaling.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MO, March 23, 2015. Yes.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>MO, March 23, 2015.</p> <p>Component 3 The paragraph 24 for the Component 2 discussed the possibility of PCB disposal in cement kiln, but the component 3 is not clear enough whether the guideline and manual will be produced for PCB disposal. Please propose appropriate activities to implement environmentally sustainable disposal of PCB in cement kiln.</p> <p>Component 4 The Outcome 4.4 and output 4.3 -4.4 are not discussed in paragraph 40-47. Please revise the section B and/or related paragraphs. Regarding awareness raising, the Component 4 relatively focuses</p>	<p>Clarification on the proposed Guideline/Manual was included in paragraph 37, as follows:</p> <p>"37. While the holistic model of co-processing for POPs-containing stream, once established, will be commercially viable and self-sustaining, project support will be required to make it operational and to ensure adequate environmental performance. The project will work with private sector actors in the development and publication of technical manuals for co-processing of all waste streams, based on Basel Convention Guidelines, stipulating for example allowable types of wastes as well as the required operational temperatures and residency time durations necessary to ensure complete combustion since there is a national trend to expand the co-processing of many waste streams.</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>activities in academic sectors, however the barrier 2 discusses lack of awareness in the policy-makers and private sectors, and the paragraph 55 discusses that awareness raising in the Government institution will support increase of budget allocation. Please explain how the identified barriers and sustainability of resource allocation will be addressed through the proposed activities, and revise the activities accordingly.</p> <p><b>M&amp;E</b> Please include one component for monitoring and evaluation to implement mid-term and terminal evaluation, and documentation.</p> <p><b>PMC</b> There was no amount for PMC from co-financing. Please provide.</p> <p><b>Co-financing</b> Please explain why the all co-financings are in-kind. The project should expect investment. Also please include co-financing from UNDP.</p> <p><b>2. Stakeholders</b> Please include Ministry of Education and educational sectors (schools, universities), and describe their roles and responsibilities.</p>	<p>More specifically, it will be given special attention to PCBs and PCBs-contaminated materials in a form of a specific chapter of the Manual(s), that will further generate Guidelines that can be easily detached and used as reference for the cement industry in order to avoid U-POPs emissions, in compliance with Government-approved standards, and a proper indepth assesment of the test burns and the emissions monitoring."</p> <p>Activities to implement environmentally sustainable disposal of PCB in cement kiln were included in the paragraph 39, as follows:</p> <p>"39. The activities to be promoted under this componente will involve the limination of open burning and the implementation of co-process of waste tyres and other hazardous wastes in cement kilns; the Implementation of a pilot programme of non-incineration alternatives for Health Care Waste (HCW) in two Hospitals that will be assessed and selected during the PPG phase of the project; and to develop a community-level management model of domestic waste in order to minimize backyard open burning and promote environmentally sound disposal of those wastes in the municipalities of Comayagua, Sigatepeque, Potrerillos,</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>4. Risks According to the Project Implementation Review of the GEF/UNDP project #3806, risks were identified related to National Commission of Sound Environmental Management of Chemicals and the change within the government. Please describe the relevant risks and mitigation activities based on the experiences of previous and current projects.</p> <p>MO March 26, 2015 On the paragraph 38, the number of activities are different from those in the Table B. (3.1.4 and 3.1.5 do not exist in the Table B). Please revise.</p> <p>In the Table B, there are still outcome 4.3 and output 4.3.1. If they are already incorporated in Component 3, please delete from the Table B.</p> <p>In the Table B, the outcome 4.4 and output 4.4.1 duplicate outcome 4.2 and output 4.2.1. Please revise to avoid duplication.</p> <p>The awareness raising activities of output 4.1.3, described in the paragraph 47, are rather fragmented.</p>	<p>Colosuca and MDC (Those will demand the strenght of the National Authority, and its management information systems, on the Integrated Management System for Solid Waste to reach the municipal level) and implement a pilot project to promote technical guidelines on the cement kiln being ready to co-process hazardous waste following ESM of waste (including bringing international expertise on cement kiln co-processing to evaluate current scenario; develop test burns at cooperating companies in order to verify and adjust performance and update environmental licensing; oversight all adaptatations required to the kiln for the co-processing of PCBs; Establish targets and schedules for the destruction of 60 mt of PCBs under a PPP; and sistematize and share experiences and lessons learnt).</p> <p>We apologize for the error in the numbering of the Component 4 in the Section B. Please note that Outputs 4.3.3 and 4.3.4. are, indeed, incorporated in the Component 3 already. In this sense, they were deleted from the Component 4. Futhermore, consider the numbering corrections:</p> <p>Outcome 4.4 is corrected to "4.3" Output 4.4.1 is corrected to "4.3.1"</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Please develop these activities with more concrete purpose, coordination with important stakeholders, and integrated manner within the government's policy and strategy before endorsement.</p> <p>MO March 27, 2015 Please describe Project Objective in the Table B.</p> <p>MO March 27, 2015 Comments cleared.</p>	<p>Under the SAICM activities (2013), Honduras has undertaken a study related the unsound management of chemical products in terms of its social and economic impacts. This study need to be shared with decision makers and with public and private sectors and proper activities to built upon those experiences will be required to generate inputs for the Component 1 of the project. In this sense, awareness raising activities shall involve entities and employees of the entities responsible for the environmental management and surveillance of many areas, such as agriculture and industries, and knowledge must be managed and shared among them and the end-users of such substances.</p> <p>In this sense, these areas within Government Institution will need to allocate proper resources to address those issues, and the project is expected to facilitate the identification of those needs and help entities to proper allocate resources for the ESM of chemicals in each area of their responsibility.</p> <p>The Paragraph 55 was reviewed in order to incorporated the explanations required by the Secretariat as follows:</p> <p>"55. With all of the POPs issues to be addressed by the project, a central focus</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>will be the development of sustained capacities in the institutions concerned to carry out their respective roles. Particular attention will be placed in this regard on further developing analytical capacities in MiAmbiente/CESCCO, with a focus on financial sustainability through a combination of cost recovery and increased budget allocation from central Government. The SAICM Study (2013) has identified social impacts and economic costs of unsound management of chemicals in many areas that are regulated and surveilled by different institutions. In this sense, project is expected to facilitate the identification of such needs and help entities to properly allocate their own resources for the ESM of chemicals in each area of their responsibility. It is expected that, through this, the sustainability of resource allocations (budget and commitment) from involved Government institutions will be encouraged through and awareness-raising activities proposed under Component 4 will play a key role in which will focusing on the magnitude and nature of the environmental, health and economic implications when no action is taken to address POPs."</p> <p>M&amp;E Please note that M&amp;E activities are part of the Component 4. To further clarigy, the</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>Outcome 4.4 - and related output(s) - were included to address specifically the mid-term and terminal evaluation / documentation issues.</p> <p>PMC Information included in Section B.</p> <p>Co-financing Proper investment/cash contributions were corrected in Section C.</p> <p>2. Stakeholders Information included in Page 19.</p> <p>(d) Ministry of Education (Secretaria de Educación): has approved in 2013 the "Methodological Guide on the Rational Management of Chemical Products" and is the institution responsible to develop contents and mainstream educational subjects within school and university curricula at national level.</p> <p>4. Risks The mentioned risks is considered to be "low". Today, the CNG is operating through the Presidential Decree PCM 035-2013, meaning that it is incorporated in the State structure, with minimal or null political influence of the Government in power.</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>The risk might rest in the issue that governmental changes in the ministries that are part of the CNG can slow the work its work with representative staff is changed.</p> <p>To mitigate this risk, the General Assemblies of the CNG held in 2014 and 2015 already stablished work programs at technical level that is not subject to influence due to political changes.</p> <p>The risk log on page 20 of the PIF was amended accordingly.</p> <p>Numbering format revised as request:            Output 3.1.4 corrected to Output 3.2.1 (to match Table B)            Output 3.1.5 corrected to Output 3.2.2 (to match Table B)</p> <p>Outputs deleted and numbering adjusted as requested.</p> <p>Outcomes/outputs reviewed and adjusted as requested.</p> <p>Outcome            4.2. Project results monitored and sustained, adaptative feedback and evaluation undertaken and results replicated.</p> <p>Outputs:            4.2.1 M&amp;E and adaptive management</p>



## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>applied in response to needs, mid-term and final evaluation findings with lessons learned extracted.</p> <p>4.2.2 Results and best practices captured in knowledge management products and disseminated at national and international level.</p> <p>Please find the clarification in paragraph 47, as highlighted below:</p> <p>"47. In this sense, the project shall pursue the implementation of activities related to the improvement of private and public sector stakeholders understanding on emissions, exposure limits and control tools for the newly listed POPs through awareness activities and materials designed to each recipient; it will build capacities in key public and private sector stakeholders involved in the waste management area, cement industries and car dealers on Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) for POPs management and disposal using guidelines and other explanation materials on how PPPs work and how to engage in such agreements; the project will look into manners to disseminate Environmentally Sound Management (ESM) principles of Chemical Products in the educational curricula of schools and universities - as well as training plans of national stakeholders that handle and dispose such products; the project also</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>will create an Awareness Programmes driven to private sector that will approach the issue of risks associated to the new POPs. Finally, the project will provide training to teachers in public and private schools on ESM of chemicals to strenght the revision of scholar curricula"</p> <p>Objective included as follows: "To minimize impacts on health and the global environment though sound chemicals management and reduce of POPs releases through wastes management operations in Honduras"</p>
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MO, March 23, 2015. Yes. Women will play important role in community-based activities for appropriate solid waste management.	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	NA	
	• The focal area allocation?	Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• Focal area set-aside?	NA	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	MO, March 23, 2015. Not at this time. Please address the comments on the Component 2, 4, M&E, PMC, co-financing, stakeholders, and risks.	

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
		MO March 26, 2015 Not at this time. Some errors should be corrected.  MO March 27, 2015 Yes, PIF can be recommended.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	March 23, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	MO December 19, 2016  Yes. There is minor restructuring in the project framework, and justification provided.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	MO December 19, 2016  (1) Output B1 and B4 Please explain if this project will support analytical and monitoring	1) The project aims at strengthening the capacities of the Center for Studies and Pollution Control (CESCCO), and the Laboratory of Atmospheric Pollution through the sampling and monitoring of PCCD/F of

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>capacity on PCDD/F emission from co-processing.</p> <p>(2) Output C2 and E4 Please explain how these guidelines are coordinated and aligned. Also please explain how these guidelines are used.</p> <p>(3) Output B2 and C1 Please explain why both outputs will develop detail inventories.</p> <p>(4) Output D2 Environmental performance and due diligence/safeguards are only discussed in this output. Please explain if the other pilots will implement similar activities.</p> <p>(5) Output E Please clarify what is the additional value of output E1. It has same indicators with outcome D, and it duplicates activities with outcome D.</p> <p>(6) Project Result Framework Figure 2 project objective states that the project will implement PPP, enforce regulations, introduce institutional models etc. However, the indicators on project objectives are not aligned with these objective statement. Please revise Table 4 indicators on page 23.</p> <p>MO July 4, 2017 Comments cleared.</p>	<p>POPs coprocessing of in cement kilns. These activities will be achieved through a combination of local and regional capacities, with additional analysis support of laboratories in US, Canada and/or Europe. Through the pilots with the cement companies, the project will provide a platform for the sharing of pioneering experiences for the development of test burn protocols. Moreover, to guarantee safety as well as reliability of the results of the analysis, services from accredited/certified laboratories will be performed. For PCCD/F, Honduras reports monitoring and analysis experiences with US laboratories with the cement industry.</p> <p>2) The Guidelines will be based on the Basel Convention's procedures and will be coordinated through the National Commission for Environmentally Sound Management of Chemicals (CNG), which is also to be strengthened by this project. Although the proposed guidelines are based on multiple legal frameworks (current, proposed or to be developed), there is an agreed roadmap between the authorities regarding the filling of these technical gaps. All technical guidelines will be managed through MIAMBIENTE, which guides the chemical sector through the Executive Secretariat and its policy committee. Moreover, the project aims to 1) create the Hazardous Waste Regulation that will meet the guidelines for the PBDEs and PFOS, 2) develop a Law for Integral Waste Management that will strengthen the application of the</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>current regulation that safeguards solid waste management at the local level. On the other hand, the technical guidelines for coprocessing will be nested under the current Regulation for the Control of Atmospheric Emissions from Fixed Sources, which will also integrate the provisions on test protocols, monitoring and analysis methods for PCCD/F. Regarding the guidelines for pesticides (POPs included) and hazardous waste of the health care sector, these will be coordinated through the CNG which holds its legal framework through the Phytozoan Sanitary Law and the Regulation for the Management of Solid Waste generated In Health Establishments, respectively.</p> <p>3) New POPs inventories appear in B2 and C1; however, they will only be developed in C1; They were only mentioned in B2 because the Inventory will reinforce the regulatory amendments' development (it is not budgeted in B2 but only in C1), see Table 8, in notes B and I).</p> <p>4) The project will provide comprehensive support for the development of technical specifications and safeguards for the environmentally sound disposal of POPs that are intended to be managed in cement kilns, namely Pesticides POPs, PCBs and PBDEs, as well as disused tires. Also, the other pilots will also implement safeguards.</p> <p>5) The main difference between both outputs and its activities is that Output E is focused on reducing unintentional releases of POPs, specifically through the establishment of a</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>disused tire sustainable management model with one of the cement companies that 1) contributes to Reduce PCCD/F releases from burning practices, 2) the application under an Extended Producer Responsibility pilot for the sustainability of the management model and 3) the application of an alternative approach to the treatment of wastes from non- incineration. Technical assistance of international experts is intended to guide the process of adapting the facilities of one of the cement companies, designing ancillary facilities for disused oil feeds, including PCBs and Design of the intentional POP burning protocols. Additionally, the main added value from Output E1 is to standardize operation of a cement kiln as a permanent means for POPs and UPOPs generating waste, testing it with PCBs, HCW and tires; see differentiating annex Table for D and E Outputs</p> <p>6) Revised. An indicator for the measurement of the strengthening of PPPs has been added. (marked with yellow in UNDP ProDoc).</p>
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	<p>MO December 19, 2016 Yes. The amount of co-financing has been increased and improve cots-effectiveness.</p> <p>MO September 11, 2017 PMC is above 5% of the subtotal. Please revise.</p>	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of	<p>MO December 19, 2016 Please include risk of climate change. Please also see box 11.</p>	<p>The project aims to contribute to the results of the Country Programme (CPD) signed between the Government of Honduras and UNDP</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	MO July 4 2017 Comments cleared.	(2017-2021), specifically with result 3 related to responsible consumption. These particular results are: - Climate change with particular emphasis on mitigation and natural resource management, as the project will directly reduce GHG emissions and its reduction from current burning practices, particularly from disused tires. - Reduction of hazardous waste in health facilities and the establishment of sound waste management models at the local levels. In addition, impacts on natural resource management will evolve from a sound management of intentional POPs. This will be achieved through cost-recovery approaches, extended responsibility mechanisms and diversification of income sources within the services sector.
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	MO December 19, 2016 Yes.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	MO December 19, 2016 Yes.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	MO December 19, 2016 Yes.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	MO December 19, 2016 Yes.	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	MO December 19, 2016 Yes.	
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEFSEC</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP</li> </ul>	MO December 19, 2016 Yes. Risks are revisited during project preparation.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEF Council</li> </ul>	MO December 19, 2016  Response to Germany's comments (1) Please elaborate the particular Honduras situation to which the guideline will be adapted and developed in this project. (2) Please clarify if the project has taken into account lessons learned from similar projects and initiative that have already been carried out. Also please elaborate in more detail which synergies could be created through good coordination and/or joint activities with the GEF/UNIDO project on WEEE. (3) Please clarify if the project will engage important stakeholders including CSO. Especially please explain how the civil society will participate in the project not only for municipal waste but also for other	1) The Guidelines will be based on the Basel Convention's procedures and will be coordinated through the National Commission for Environmentally Sound Management of Chemicals (CNG), which is also to be strengthened by this project. Although the proposed guidelines are based on multiple legal frameworks (current, proposed or to be developed), there is an agreed roadmap between the authorities regarding the filling these technical gaps. All technical guidelines will be managed through MIAMBIENTE, which guides the chemical sector through the Executive Secretariat and its policy committee. Moreover, the project aims to 1) create the Hazardous Waste Regulation that will meet the guidelines for the PBDEs and PFOS, 2) develop a Law for Integral Waste Management that will strengthen the application of the current regulation that safeguards solid waste management at the local level. On the other hand, the technical guidelines for coprocessing

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.



## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>components.            (4) Please include information on the institutional allocation of and responsibility for the PRTR system.</p> <p>Responses to US' comment            (5) Please consider risk associated with the project, especially with disposal of hazardous materials.</p> <p>MO July 4 2017            (1), (3)-(5) Comments cleared.            (1) Please elaborate in more detail which synergies could be created, especially with the GEF/UNIDO project.            (2) Please also provide responses to the following comments</p> <p>Germany</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the disposal option on cement kiln the SC BAT/BEP guidelines considerations should be taken into account.</li> <li>• A socio-economic or livelihood analysis to identify vulnerable groups should be performed.</li> <li>• All components are marked as technical assistance components while GEF is looking for investments components. Please consider which component can become investment component.</li> </ul> <p>Canada            - Concerning project component 3</p>	<p>will be nested under the current Regulation for the Control of Atmospheric Emissions from Fixed Sources, which will also integrate the provisions on test protocols, monitoring and analysis methods for PCCD/F. Regarding the guidelines for pesticides (POPs included) and hazardous waste of the health care sector, these will be coordinated through the CNG which holds its legal framework through the Phytozoan Sanitary Law and the Regulation for the Management of Solid Waste generated In Health Establishments, respectively.</p> <p>2) The GEF / UNIDO Project on WEEE was CEO endorsed recently. All activities will be closely coordinated between the two projects, and synergies will be sought, whenever possible.</p> <p>3) The project will use the CNG – the official coordination mechanism established by the State. Within the commission there is a central representation of Civil Society. For interventions in the field of municipal waste management, health facilities and coprocessing, the project will refer to NGOs such as the Ecological Committees of Rural areas or community patronage - water boards. For the handling and coprocessing of intentional POP waste, the Latin America Pesticide Action Network (RAP AL) is the representative in Honduras of the Pesticides Action Network (PAN) and for IPEN.</p> <p>4) MIAMBIENTE approved the Pollutant Release and Transfer Register Regulation in 2014. 2016 marked the first year of</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>(page 4), Reduce UPOPs releases from priority sources: A series of technical manuals and guidelines are proposed as outputs of this project; however, it is unclear whether, and to what extent, existing guidance documents developed and adopted by the international community will be or have been consulted. For example, the Basel Convention has developed a number of relevant technical guidelines for the environmentally sound management of specific wastes (e.g., biomedical and healthcare wastes, used and waste tyres, unintentionally produced POPs wastes). Technical guidelines have also been adopted on environmentally sound co-processing of hazardous wastes in cement kilns. Please elaborate on this component.</p> <p>- We note that while the proposal provides information on plans to share experiences from the project with relevant stakeholders (page 20), it does not take into account lessons learned from similar projects and initiatives that have already been carried out. These should be carefully examined to increase chances of the project's success. In addition, it should be made clear how the proposed project will draw from and build on all the work that has already</p>	<p>compulsory reporting by the relevant sectors. CESSCO is the lead authority of the PRTR, which together with the National Environmental Information System (SINIA) and the Environmental Assessment and Control (DECA) validates estimates derived from the registry. However, project resources are required for additional strengthening of regulations to incorporate emissions from non-point sources and the interagency mechanism to advise and assist reporting sectors to streamline registration to the automated system administered by MIAMBIENTE.</p> <p><b>Additional Responses</b></p> <p>(1) The project will coordinate closely all the activities with the regional GEF/UNIDO project that will be implemented out of Vienna and Argentina. The UNDP-GEF project in Honduras will be implemented under the National Implementation Modality with CESSCO in the Ministry of Environment in Honduras, and a full National Project team will be set up for the implementation of the project. The team is like the team that implemented previous UNDP GEF CW projects in Honduras. The project team will take contact with the UNIDO GEF project team at the outset of the project implementation to assure a close coordination of activities and to generate synergies between the two projects.</p> <p>(2)</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>been done in Honduras to fulfill its obligations under the Stockholm Convention (page 8).</p> <p>- In terms of stakeholder engagement, the related section notes how civil societies and indigenous people will be involved; however, the document provides limited specificity with respect to organizational name and engagement approaches. Given the importance of stakeholder engagement, this section should be expanded in the subsequent document to ensure full and meaningful inclusion of relevant stakeholders, including CSOs and indigenous people.</p> <p>MO September 11, 2017, Please include all comments and responses in the endorsement request document.</p>	<p>Germany:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the disposal option on cement kiln the SC BAT/BEP guidelines considerations should be taken into account.</li> </ul> <p>UNDP response: UNDP confirms that SC BAT/BEP guidance will be taken into account during the project implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A socio-economic or livelihood analysis to identify vulnerable groups should be performed.</li> </ul> <p>UNDP response: UNDP confirms that a socio-economic analysis to identify vulnerable groups potentially to be affected by the project will be performed during the implementation of the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All components are marked as technical assistance components while GEF is looking for investments components. Please consider which component can become investment component.</li> </ul> <p>UNDP response: In the request for CEO endorsement document, component 2 and component 3 have been marked as investment components, as the majority of the activities in these two components are investments.</p> <p>Canada</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concerning project component 3 (page 4), Reduce UPOPs releases from priority sources: A series of technical manuals and guidelines are proposed as outputs of this project; however, it is unclear whether, and to what</li> </ul>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>extent, existing guidance documents developed and adopted by the international community will be or have been consulted. For example, the Basel Convention has developed a number of relevant technical guidelines for the environmentally sound management of specific wastes (e.g., biomedical and healthcare wastes, used and waste tires, unintentionally produced POPs wastes). Technical guidelines have also been adopted on environmentally sound co-processing of hazardous wastes in cement kilns. Please elaborate on this component.</p> <p>UNDP response: UNDP and the Government of Honduras would like to confirm that all technical manuals and guidelines proposed as outputs will build on the work already done at the international level and will be adapted for the local circumstances. Both under the Basel and Stockholm convention, importance technical manuals and guidance have been developed and will be fully utilized in the context con the project. The focus is to adapt existing guidance documents that have already been adopted by the international community to the reality of Honduras.</p> <p>- We note that while the proposal provides information on plans to share experiences from the project with relevant stakeholders (page 20), it does not take into account lessons learned from similar projects and initiatives that have already been carried out. These should be carefully examined to increase</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>chances of the project's success. In addition, it should be made clear how the proposed project will draw from and build on all the work that has already been done in Honduras to fulfill its obligations under the Stockholm Convention (page 8).</p> <p>UNDP response: UNDP and the Government of Honduras can confirm that all the work listed in this project will build on the existing work done in Honduras. UNDP was the implementing agency for the NIP development, the development and implementation of the Full Size Project "Strengthening National Management Capacities and reducing releases of POPs in Honduras" That was completed last year. The projects have been executed via the National Implementation Modality (NIM) in Honduras, where CESSCO in the Ministry of Environment has been the responsible institution for the implementation. It is the same institution and project staff that will be in charge of the implementation of the current proposal, which should assure a smooth transition and continuation of activities in Honduras, and should lead to a successful implementation of the Stockholm Convention in the country.</p> <p>- In terms of stakeholder engagement, the related section notes how civil societies and indigenous people will be involved; however, the document provides limited specificity with respect to organizational name and engagement approaches. Given the importance of</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>stakeholder engagement, this section should be expanded in the subsequent document to ensure full and meaningful inclusion of relevant stakeholders, including CSOs and indigenous people.</p> <p>UNDP response: UNDP and the Government of Honduras will develop a more detailed stakeholder engagement strategy at the outset of the project implementation. We fully agree on the importance of engaging with CSOs, as it is essential to have full participation to generate public trust in the proposed actions. Every pilot project has foreseen to have a very detailed engagement strategy with CSOs.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat</li> </ul>	NA	
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>MO December 19, 2016 Not at this time. Please address comments in box 2, 4 and 11.</p> <p>MO July 4 2017 Not at this time. Please address comments in box 11.</p> <p>MO September 11, 2017 Not at this time. Please address comments in box 3 and .</p> <p>AS October 24, 2017 - All comments have been addressed. The project is being recommend for CEO endorsement</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	December 19, 2016	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	Additional Review (as necessary)	July 04, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 31, 2017	