REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

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: Elimination of Obsolete Pesticide Stockpiles and Addressing POPs Contaminated Sites within a Sound Chemicals Management Framework			
Country(ies):	Armenia	GEF Project ID:[1]	4737
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	4905
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Nature Protection of Armenia	Submission Date:	09/24/2014
GEF Focal Area (s):	Persistent Organic Pollutants	Project Duration(Months)	48
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): ➢ For SFM/REDD+ ☐ ➢ For SGP ☐ ➢ For PPP ☐		Project Agency Fee ($):	470,000

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK[2]

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount ($)	Cofinancing ($)
Chem 1	Outcome 1.4 POPs waste prevented, managed, and disposed of, and POPs contaminated sites managed in an environmentally sound manner. Indicator 1.4.2 Amount of obsolete pesticides, including POPs, disposed of in an environmentally sound manner; measured in tons	Output 1.4.2 Countries receiving GEF support for environmentally sound management of obsolete pesticides, including POPs. Indicator 1.4.2.1 Number of countries receiving GEF support for environmentally sound management of obsolete pesticides, including POPs.	GEF TF	4,135,000	12,728,200
Chem 1	Outcome 1.5 Country capacity built to effectively phase out and reduce releases of POPs. Indicator 1.5.1 Progress in developing and implementing a legislative and regulatory framework for environmentally sound management of POPs, and for the sound management of chemicals in general, as recorded in	Output 1.5.1 Countries receiving GEF support to build capacity for the implementation of the Stockholm Convention. Indicator 1.5.1.1 Number of countries receiving GEF support to build capacity for the implementation of the Stockholm Convention	GEF TF	240,000	5,386,184

[1] Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.
[2] Refer to the Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework when completing Table A.

	the POPs tracking tool.				
	M&E component		(select)	100,000	130,000
	Project Management		(select)	225,000	1,040,000
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
		Total project costs		4,700,000	19,284,384

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: Protection of health and environment through elimination of obsolete pesticide stockpiles and addressing contaminated sites within a sound chemicals management strategy						
Project Component	**Grant Type**	**Expected Outcomes**	**Expected Outputs**	**Trust Fund**	**Grant Amount ($)**	**Confirmed Co-financing ($)**
Component 1: Capture and Containment of Obsolete Pesticide Stockpiles and Wastes	Inv	Outcome 1.1 Removal of priority POPs pesticide waste from the Nubarashen burial site, secure containment of residual contamination on-site, site stabilization and restoration, with the site secured under appropriate institutional arrangements providing effective access limitations, monitoring and future land use control, all endorsed by an informed public.	1.1.1Design documentation, tender specification, implementation procedures to undertake the required works. 1.1.2 EHS procedures documented and promulgated in support of the works required. 1.1.3 EIA and Environmental Expertise approval to proceed with the works 1.1.4 Removal to secure storage of 900 t of pure pesticides and high concentration POPs wastes from the Nubarashen burial site 1.1.5 Removal to secure storage of 7,000 t of POPs pesticide waste in the form of highly contaminated soil from the Nubarashen burial site completed 1.1.6 Onsite secure containment of 12,000 t of low and moderately contaminated soil in an engineered landfill within the Nubarshen site in place. 1.1.7 Restoration and access control provisions for the Nubarashen burial site are in place and civil works to stabilize the surrounding land and drainage are completed. 1.1.8 Training delivered to 20 national technical and regulatory staff in support of Nubarashen operations.	GEF TF	745,000	7,128,200

			1.1.9 5 public consultation events held and 10 public documents/web/media products delivered.			
		Outcome 1.2: Development of the Kotayk national hazardous waste management site equipped with secure storage and basic infrastructure to allow introduction of HW treatment soil remediation technologies constructed and operated for the secure storage of POPs pesticide waste and OP stockpiles, and the treatment of POPs pesticide contaminated soil.	1.2.1Design documentation, tender specification, implementation procedures to undertake the Kotyk HW facility site development. 1.2.2 Applicable EHS procedures documented and promulgated in support of the works required. 1.2.3 EIA and Environmental Expertise approval to proceed with the Kotyk HW facility site development 1.2.4 Kotyk national HW management site developed and operated according to international standards. 1.2.5 Operation of the facility for the storage of 1050 t of POPs pesticide waste and OP stockpiles pending export for environmentally sound destruction. 1.2.6 Operation of the facility to host remediation technology treating 7,100 t of soil highly contaminated with POPs pesticide in an environmentally sound manner. 1.2.7 20 HW facility operational staff trained and equipped with respect to HW management, safeguards and EHS practices. 1.2.8 5 public consultation events held and 10 public documents/web/media products delivered.			
		Outcome 1.3:				

		Remaining significant historical OP storehouses have OP stocks packaged, removed for destruction,and residual site contamination cleaned up.	1.3.1 Screening assessments completed/documented on 24 identified historical OP stockpile sites and 150 t of OP stockpiles and clean up residuals packaged and removed to the Kotayk HW facility. 1.3.2 Detailed contaminated site and risk assessments and remediation/clean up designs on 6 identified priority sites completed/documented 1.3.3 Excavation/removal, remediation and/or containment on 6 identified priority sites completed 1.3.4 6 public consultation events held at 6 priority sites and 10 public documents/web/media products delivered.			
Component 2: Obsolete Pesticide Stockpile and Waste Elimination	Inv	Outcome 2.1: Removal from Armenia of all substantially high priority POPs pesticides, associated very high concentration wastes and OP stockpiles. Outcome 2.2: Environmentally sound remediation of heavily POPs pesticide contaminated soil inclusive of destruction of extracted POPs pesticides demonstrated.	2.1.1 Export of 900 t of Category 1 POPs pesticides, priority POPs pesticide wastes, and OPs from the Kotayk facility for destruction in a qualified international facility 2.2.1 7,100 t of heavily contaminated POPs contaminated soil (POPs pesticide waste) remediated to levels below the low POPs content returned and contained on the Nubarashen site 2.2.2 Commercially viability of in-country remediation of POPs contaminated soil demonstrated 2.2.3 Operational training of 20 national technical personal on a modern	GEF TF	3,390,000	5,600,000

			contaminated soil technology			
Component 3: Institutional and Regulatory Capacity Strengthening for Sound Chemicals Management and Contaminated Site	(select)	Outcome 3.1: Legal/regulatory and technical guidance tools for management of chemical wastes, including POPs, and, contaminated sites management within a national sound chemicals management framework strengthened	3.1.1:Policies, legislation and regulatory measures respecting hazardous chemical wastes and contaminated sites management reviewed, updated and appropraite revisions implemented 3.1.2. Adopted technical guidelines on operational safety procedures for hazardous chemicals waste handling, transport, storage and disposal, developed in accordance with international practice and 50 relevant national personal trained 3.1.3 Guidance documentation on environmental and health risk assessment methodologies and practices applicable to hazardous waste stockpiles and contaminated sites developed in accoradnce with international practice introduced and adopted, and 50 professional trained.	GEF TF	240,000	5,386,184
		Outcome 3.2: Technical/environmental performance evaluation and upgrading requirements for existing national destruction capability	3.2.1 Qualification test burns undertaken based on international standards on the EcoProject incineration facility to determine appropriate HW streams for its application. 3.2.2 Technical assessment produced defining upgrading and investment requirements for expanded application			
		Outcome 3.3: Basic national capacity for effective hazardous	3.3.1 Adopted national strategy for rationalization and upgrading national laboratory capability to serve a sound chemicals			

		chemicals sampling and analysis for multi-environmental media and contaminated sites in place, operational and certified to international standards	management framework including hazardous waste and contaminated sites management. 3.3.2 3 national laboratories, including one each in the regulatory, academic and private sector upgraded with suitable capability for hazardous chemical waste and contaminated site sampling and analysis 3.3.3 30 laboratory and associated personel training upgraded 3.3.4 3 laboratories with international certification and international methods and practice in place			
Component 4: Project Monitoring and Evaluation	TA	Outcome 4.1 Project monitoring and evaluation implemented	4.1.1 M&E and adaptive management are applied to provide feedback to the project coordination process to capitalize on the project needs; and 4.1.2 Lessons learned and best practices are accumulated, summarized and replicated at the country level.	GEF TF	100,000	130,000
			Subtotal		4,475,000	18,244,384
			Project management Cost (PMC)[3]	GEF TF	225,000	1,040,000
			Total project costs		4,700,000	19,284,384

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME ($)

Please include letters confirming co-financing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount ($)
National Government	Government of Armenia	Cash	7,915,000
National Government	Government of Armenia	In-Kind	8,105,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Cash	200,000
GEF Agency	UNDP Czech Government Trust Fund	Cash	60,000
Other Multi-lateral	OSCE	Cash	350,000
Other Multi-lateral	OSCE	In-Kind	14,384
Private Sector	EcoProject	Investment	2,640,000
Total Co-financing			19,284,384

[3] PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY[1]

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in $)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b)[2]	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	Persistent Organic Pollutants	Republic of Armenia	4,700,000	470,000	5,170,000
Total Grant Resources				4,700,000	470,000	5,170,000

[1] In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.
[2] Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount ($)	Cofinancing ($)	Project Total ($)
International Consultants	111,500	200,000	311,500
National/Local Consultants	147,800	550,000	697,800

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT? No

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

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF[4]

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

As described in the PIF and further elaborated in Sections I and IV of the UNDP project document.

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

As described in the PIF and further elaborated in Section V of the accompanying UNDP project document.

The overall project design and associated framework remains consistent in the final project with that in the PIF in that the design is based on three functional components, namely Component 1 that addresses the capture and containment of OP stockpiles and waste on a prioritized basis, Component 2 that provides for a similarly prioritized elimination of these stockpiles and wastes but with a better differentiation and allocation of resources to ensure actual GEB is maximized as well as providing for sustaining national capability, and Component 3 that address institutional and technical capacity strengthening. The PPG phase provided three major areas of new and more detailed information that allowed the improved structuring and optimization of detailed outcomes and output and activities within this framework for better implementation efficiency. The first was the availability of bi-lateral resources (OSCE and Czech) to undertake a much more complete level of site assessment and clean-up design than that which the PPG resources alone would otherwise have allowed. In particular, the Outcomes and Outputs could be tailored to the actual operational sequence of excavation, packaging and removal as well as allowing incorporation of better quantification and differentiation of POPs and other priority OP contamination levels. It also allowed a more accurate categorization POPs and its management to optimize capture and management options in Component 2 with the result that GEB can be maximized. Additionally the availability of incremental preparation resources for site assessment from bilateral sources freed up GEF PPG resources to use for the better definition of other aspects related to the OP stockpile issue. This included

[4] For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter "NA" after the respective question.

undertaking preliminary design work on the Kotayk facility and also undertaking a more comprehensive inventory and preliminary assessment of the other secondary small OP storage sites to provide a solid baseline for assessing the value of this aspect. The latter work informed the decision making respecting the prioritization of addressing the Nubarashen site as offering the largest GEB rather than the relatively minor issues associated with these small sites. The second and complementary development was the appearance of and subsequent evolution of the EU/FAO intervention that expressly wished to target these small residual storage sites and which after some changes throughout the PPG period appears now to have resources and capacities to deal with them. The GEF project's role now would essentially be to backstop this work through provision of interim storage capacity at Kotayk and containment disposal of low contamination level residuals as required. The third PPG stage development affecting the project design and framework at the Output and Outcome level was obtaining better and more detailed national inputs in technical capacity initiatives and priorities, specifically in relation to development of analytical capability and private sector hazardous waste management facility development.

As a consequence of this substantially increased knowledge base as well the inputs from the very extensive stakeholder discussions on project design and structure held, the Outcome and Activity structure has been modified and streamlined, although practically it contains the same scope as that defined in the PIF. In Component 1, the main change is to simplify the Outcomes such that Outcome 1.1 focuses on Nubarashen related field work, Outcome 1,2, deals with the development of the Kotayk site and Outcome 3 separates out the originally integrated aspects dealing with the old small secondary storage sites now being addressed by the EU/FAO initiative.

Another modification at detailed level in the final project relative to the PIF on note relates to the allocation of funding between Focal Area Outcome Chem. 1.4 and Chem. 1.5. In both cases the allocation of funding has been based on the principle that Components 1 and 2 are applicable FA Outcome 1.4 and Component 3 applies to FA Outcome 1.5. As a result of detailed preparation work, the allocation of GEF funds between the two remains similar. However, in the case of FA Outcome 1.4, the significant amount of site assessment and clean-up design undertaken on the Nubarashen site and availability of more accurate market pricing for disposal has allowed optimization of the costs and reduced the requirement for co-financing from public sources. Similarly, available co-financing both from the private and public sector available for Component 3 was determined to be substantially greater that originally estimated, largely from the inclusion of national investment in laboratory facilities and private sector investment in supporting hazardous waste infrastructure to be subject to assessment/qualification as part the GEF TA in Component 3.

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:

UNDP has been identified by the government as the GEF IA for having a strong country office with long lasting positive record of operations and relations with the government and extensive experience in providing assistance to Armenia in development and introduction of national policies and tools, and in building capacities for improving environmental administration system for last seventeen years. UNDP has been a pioneer in supporting country with implementation of obligations under various Multilateral Environmental Agreements. The agency offers strong, country based, expertise in GEF funded project management in Armenia where it operates a major sustainable development/environmental program. UNDP has also been instrumental in mobilizing co-financing for those projects and encouraging host country for baseline investments.

Globally, UNDP has implemented several NIPs and post NIP projects, including PCB and obsolete POPs pesticides handling and disposal. Additionally, UNDP has been very active in promoting sound management of chemicals in general. To date, GEF funding has been approved for UNDP-supported PCB management activities in Argentina, Brazil, Ghana, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Jordan, Latvia, Mexico, Morocco and Uruguay. Large POPs pesticide disposal programs are technically supported and implemented by UNDP in Honduras, Nicaragua, Vietnam, Georgia, Mauritius, and China. Such programs focus on capacity building to eliminate obsolete POPs pesticides stockpiles and on improvement of management and release containment of POPs. UNDP actively works on the formulation of other obsolete POPs pesticides disposal projects in other countries of the region and globally, including methyl bromide projects funded by the Multilateral Fund, programmes in integrated pest management (IPM) and many more.

Finally, the proposed project will benefit from UNDP's experience in integrated policy development, capacity building and institutional strengthening, as well as in wide involvement of non-governmental organizations and community. This

setup will be further supported by specialized technical expertise available at UNDP-MPU/Chemicals through UNDP Regional Office for Europe/CIS and UNDP-HQ.

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

The overall baseline and problem is as described in the PIF (Part B, Section B.1.) and in Section I of the accompanying UNDP project document, specifically under the headings relating to the historical and current situation respecting POPs pesticides and other obsolete pesticides and situation respecting POPs pesticides and other obsolete pesticides. Elaborating on that provided in the PIF, the baseline project scenario defined as what would be anticipated in terms of what would be realized in the absence of GEF funding including associated portion of the co-financing is provided in Section V of the project document under the heading Non-GEF Baseline Project.

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

The basis for the incremental reasoning supporting the project and GEF funding is provided in the description of the Project Baseline in Section V of the UNDP project document with particular reference to the summary provided in Table 11. Global environmental benefits are described and quantified in Section VI of the accompanying project document as summarized below.

Activity in relation to the primary focus of the project and where the large majority of both global environmental benefits (GEB) and national development benefits are is addressing the Nubarashen burial site. The baseline project in relation to the Nubarashen site would be limited primarily to securing all the POPs waste in place with effective surface containment civil works as well as undertaking some of the basic geotechnical and hydrological works upstream of the site to ensure its stability in the contained configuration. It is also assumed that the site would be placed under adequate care and custody including monitoring, with appropriate land use and access restriction. These measures, at least in the near and medium term, could provide a basic level of management for risks that the site and contained POPs waste presents to health and environment. However, in the absence of the GEF project, these risks are not eliminated and no progress is made in their elimination and, from GEB perspective, the POPs and other OPs that it contains remain in the national and global inventory with the inevitability of ultimate release. Provision for environmentally sound destruction of the Category 1 (please refer to the UNDP project document for description of waste categories adopted for project purposes) POPs wastes which contain 90% of the actual POPs pesticides in the country is entirely dependent on GEF funding and would not otherwise occur unless an alternative source of international funding exists. Likewise the core funding for the remediation of the Category 2 POPs waste largely in the form of contaminated soil would involve GEF funding with other co-financing being practically tied to the GEF funding that supports the front end development of technology options and introduction of international practice.

The secondary benefit of at least packaging and securely storing the relatively minor OP stockpiles in storehouses is assumed to be achieved in the baseline project based on the expectation of the EU/FAO funding through the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) being directed to this and that there is sufficient national budget commitment to make up for the shortfall in originally anticipated EU/FAO funding as well as either continue with the development of a national HW storage facility through Ministry of Emergency Situations (MES) or to make alternative temporary arrangement for such storage. The baseline project assumes the latter would be the case.

With respect to the institutional, regulatory and technical capacity building supported by the project, some portion of these activities will continue in the baseline project through Ministry of Nature Protection (MNP) budget and in-kind activities but likely a slower pace and without critical international support and inputs. The country in effect will more or less continue as it has done noting that the critical impact of the GEF project and its funding is effectively to focus and accelerate public policy and priorities on the issue of HW and contaminated sites management.

A.6. Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

A descriptive Risk section has been elaborated in the accompanying UNDP project document as added in Annex C of the project document.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives:

A special Section IV on coordination with donor-funded and GEF-financed initiatives has been provided in the UNDP project document. The project specifically links to the EU CIS obsolete pesticide project being undertaken by FAO and has, during PPG stage, provided inputs to both this project and the GEF financed NIP update being undertaken by UNIDO.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

The project has a wide range of national stakeholders as defined along with potential interests and roles in the following. Initial stakeholder analysis and follow up consultation on the project was undertaken during the preparation of the PIF as reported therein and has continued after that time under the auspices of MNP and a major national NGO (Armenian Women for Health and a Healthy Environment – AWHHE). During the PPG stage this analysis was updated and further elaborated in directed studies undertaken by national consultants addressing both institutional stakeholders in the context of their statutory involvement in the project, and more broadly for non-government stakeholders including affected publics. Three major workshops were also held during the PPG, namely: i) Inception Workshop (December 2012), ii) PPG Technical Planning Workshop (March 2013), and iii) Draft Project Document Stakeholders Consultation Workshop (January 2014). Additionally, a formal stakeholder analysis was undertaken uner the OSCE project by AWHHE and documented as part of that project. For further detailed information please refer to the UNDP project document Section III – Stakeholder analysis.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

The national development benefits essentially relate to the elimination of a major national priority environmental problem, development of national institutional and technical capability related to hazardous wastes, contaminated sites and perhaps most significantly the use of the project to stimulate the development of a national hazardous waste (HW) management facility site and potentially a qualified, modestly scaled chemicals destruction facility. The latter gives Armenia a basis to develop modern HW infrastructure and commercial service capability characteristic of a modern developed country as well as providing a key supporting element for a well-integrated overall waste management system which is an overall national priority.

The gender dimension is incorporated on the overall level of minimizing future spread of POPs to the global environment, thus, limiting the global population of men, women and children from their chronic impacts. The local restrictions to the land use on Nubarashen will also limit access of local population (all gender, including women) to avoid any residual impact on health.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

The project document's design has been based on assumption of the local works (and locally driven prices) to co-fund the essential elements of excavating the POPs and mixed waste materials for further disposal and treatment of contaminated soil in a locally established platform/storage facility that would accept on a temporary basis a qualified soil decontamination facility. The facility's costs will have two pillars: its rental for an identified duration of time where the costs part will be determined through an international bidding, and its local support, operation and maintenance costs which also will solely be based on local price estimates.

With respect to the export of pure waste for high-temperature (HTI) disposal in EU, it is believed that the acceptable cost estimates will be determined on the basis of tendering such services in a highly competitive market, and this will result in a well justified cost-effectiveness. Cost estimates used are based on recently market tested tenders in other completed projects coupled with direct research undertaken with major suppliers and operators of relevant remediation technology.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M &E PLAN:

Detailed and budgeted M&E plan has been elaborated in the UNDP project document and presented as such for guidance during the project implementation. The M&E Section can be found in Section IX of the accompanying UNDP project document.

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

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):): (Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter(s) with this form. For SGP, use this OFP endorsement letter).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE *(MM/dd/yyyy)*
Aram Harutyunyan	Minister, GEF Operation Focal Point	Ministry of Nature Protection	09/20/2011

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date *(Month, day, year)*	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, UNDP – GEF Executive Coordinator and Director a.i		09/24/2014	Mr. Jacques Van Engel Officer-in-Charge UNDP MPU/Chemicals	212-906-6687	jacques.van.engel@undp.org

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).

Please refer to the UNDP project document Section XI, Annex A – Project Result 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).

GEF Secretariat Review: Based on the final GEF Secretariat Review sheet provided with the GEF PIF approval of Feb. 12, 2012, all substantive PIF review comments and issues were cleared and the project as presented remains consistent with these. The two residual points that were noted are addressed as follows:

1. *Rotating fund co-financing mechanism:* At that time, the investigation of a rotating fund mechanism for support by periodic bilateral contributions was to be investigated as a method of backstopping contracted environmentally sound destruction funded by potential bi-lateral donors who had expressed interest. These donor arrangements have not been realized, and the project co-financing structure is based on committed national co-financing. However, the Government continues to investigate such sources of funding to reduce its state budget commitments as well as is engaged in discussions with an IFI for similar cash financing.
2. High level of in-kind co-financing. GEF noted that less than half the proposed is cash. Confirmed co-financing as now documented is 72%.

GEF STAP Review: No comments or direction was provided in the GEF STAP review beyond "The Panel commends the developers of this project for a comprehensive approach, utilising NGOs and other knowledgeable national partners to enhance effectiveness of the interventions".

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS[5]

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: **US$140,000**			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	***GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount ($)***		
	Budgeted Amount	***Amount Spent Todate***	***Amount Committed***
National experts	45,000	46,338.20	
International experts	42,000	39,160.52	
Contractual services (sub-contracts)	0	16,417.09	
Travel	13,000	22,927.37	
Laboratory services (sub-contracts)	30,000	0	
Workshops	0	13,613.67	
Miscellaneous	10,000	744.84	798.31
Total	140,000	139,201.69	798.31

[5] If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue 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.

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

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

N/A