



**GEF**

## **REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL**

**PROJECT TYPE:** Full-sized Project

**THE GEF TRUST FUND**

**Submission Date: 14 January 2011**

### **PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION**

**GEFSEC PROJECT ID:** 3968

**GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:** 521

**COUNTRY(IES):** Regional (Burundi, Djibouti, D.R. Congo, Ethiopia, Rwanda, Sudan, Uganda)

**PROJECT TITLE:** Capacity Strengthening and Technical Assistance for the Implementation of Stockholm Convention National Implementation Plans (NIPs) in African Least Developed Countries (LCDs) of the COMESA Sub region

**GEF AGENCY(IES):** UNEP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S):** WWF

**GEF FOCAL AREA(s):** Persistent Organic Pollutants

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(s):**

**NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT:**

<b>Expected Calendar (mm/dd/yy)</b>	
<b>Milestones</b>	<b>Dates</b>
Work Program (for FSPs only)	June 2009
Agency Approval date	March 2011
Implementation Start	April 2011
Mid-term Evaluation (if planned)	Oct 2013
Project Closing Date	March 2016

**A. PROJECT FRAMEWORK** (Expand table as necessary)

**Project Objective:** The Objective of the project is to strengthen and build the capacity required in LDCs and SIDS in the COMESA sub region to implement their Stockholm Convention NIPs in a sustainable, effective and comprehensive manner, while building upon and contributing to strengthening a country's foundational capacities for the sound management of chemicals.

Project Components	Indicate whether Investment, TA, or STA**	Expected outcomes	Expected Outputs	Indicative GEF Financing*		Indicative Co-financing*		Total (\$)
				(\$)	%	(\$)	%	
<b>1. Legislative and regulatory framework development</b>	STA and TA	1.1 Comprehensive chemical regulatory system available for use and adaptation to specific national requirements.	1.1 Model comprehensive chemicals regulatory system, as well as national plans for regulatory system implemented.	750,000	63	433,000	37	1,183,000
		1.2 Participating countries have the skills to review and revise Pesticides Acts against new FAO guidelines.	1.2 Pesticide Act revised in at least two countries.					
<b>2. Sustainable enforcement and administrative capacity</b>	TA	2.1 Skilled trainers in each participating country on the obligations of the Stockholm Convention and relationship to chemicals and wastes conventions.	2.1 10 provincial level staff trained in each participating country. Two "trainers" trained in each participating country.	1,000,000	43	1,350,000	57	2,350,000
	TA	2.2 Guidelines developed and trainers trained on inspection/monitoring of illegal traffic.	2.2 5 Quarantine and Customs staff trained in each participating country. Two "trainers" trained in each participating country.					
	TA	2.3 Toolkit developed and members of the judiciary from each country trained on the Stockholm Convention and related chemicals and waste conventions.	2.3. Three judges and 2 MOF staff trained per participating country and training materials made available..					
	STA and TA	2.4 Network and database of sub regional laboratories instituted.	2.4. Comprehensive, accurate and accessible database and network on laboratories exists and is used by countries to identify options for sample analysis.					
<b>3. Coordinated information dissemination and awareness raising</b>	TA	3.1 Revitalize the Chemical Information Exchange Network (CIEN) as a knowledge management system.	3.1 Platform reactivated as an appreciated knowledge management system and actively utilized by participating countries.	300,000	40	452,500	60	752,500
	TA	3.2 Development of POPs education materials (including on 9 new POPs), and pilot community training, working with local NGOs and focusing on vulnerable communities.	3.2 Two pilot communities trained in each participating country.					
	TA	3.3 Bring high-level representatives to COMESA forum, to increase high level awareness on the Stockholm Convention.	3.3 COMESA countries make a declaration committing to be able implement the Stockholm Convention, and that if required resources will be made available.					
<b>4. Project management</b>				250,000	26	727,829	74	977,829
<b>5. Monitoring and evaluation</b>				200,000	100%	0	0	200,000
<b>Total project costs</b>				<b>2,500,000</b>		<b>2,963,329</b>		<b>5,463,329</b>

<sup>1</sup> List the \$ by project components. The percentage is the share of GEF and Co-financing respectively of the total amount for the component.

<sup>2</sup> TA = Technical Assistance; STA = Scientific & Technical Analysis.

**B. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT** (expand the table line items as necessary)

<i>Name of Co-financier ( source)</i>	<i>Classification</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Amount \$</i>	<i>%*</i>
African Union Commission ACP-MEAs	Multilateral Agency	In-Kind	33,000	1.1
UNEP Regional Office for Africa	Multilateral Agency	In-Kind	500,000	16.87
WWF	NGO	In-kind and cash	22,500	0.75
Countries	National Governments	In-kind and cash	450,000	15.13
Stockholm Convention Secretariat	Multilateral Agency	In-Kind	300,000	10.12
UNEP Chemicals/Kemi	Multilateral Agency	In-Kind	457,829	16
SAICM Secretariat	Multilateral Agency	In-Kind	1,200,000	40.49
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>2,963,329</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*

Percentage of each co-financier's contribution at CEO endorsement to total co-financing.

\*\* Amount not yet secured at CEO endorsement

**C. FINANCING PLAN SUMMARY FOR THE PROJECT (\$)**

	<i>Project Preparation a</i>	<i>Project b</i>	<i>Total c = a + b</i>	<i>Agency Fee 10%</i>	<i>For comparison: GEF and Co- financing at PIF</i>
GEF financing	70,000*	2,500,000	2,570,000	250,000	2,827,000
Co-financing	70,000	2,963,329	2,963,329		2,612,500
<b>Total</b>	140,000	5,463,329	5,533,329	250,000	5,439,500

\*PART OF APPROVED \$200,000 PPG FOR PFD.

**D. GEF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY(IES)<sup>1</sup>**

<i>GEF Agency</i>	<i>Focal Area</i>	<i>Country Name/ Global</i>	<i>(in \$)</i>		
			<i>Project (a)</i>	<i>Agency Fee ( b)<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>Total c=a+b</i>
UNEP	Persistent Organic Pollutants	Regional	2,500,000	250,000	2,750,000
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>			2,500,000	250,000	2,750,000

<sup>1</sup> No need to provide information for this table if it is a single focal area, single country and single GEF Agency project.

<sup>2</sup> Relates to the project and any previous project preparation funding that have been provided and for which no Agency fee has been requested from Trustee.

**E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:**

<i>Component</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks</i>	<i>GEF amount(\$)</i>	<i>Co-financing (\$) cash &amp; kind</i>	<i>Project total (\$)</i>
Local consultants*	139.7	130,000	83,000	213,000
International consultants*	131.7	342,500	50,000	392,500
<b>Total</b>	271.4	472,500	133,000	605,500

\* Details to be provided in Annex C.

## F. PROJECT MANAGEMENT BUDGET/COST

<i>Cost Items</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks</i>	<i>GEF amount (\$)</i>	<i>Co-financing (\$)</i>	<i>Project total (\$)</i>
Local consultants*	114.2	40,000	0	40,000
International consultants*	56.9	130,000	500,000	630,000
Office facilities, equipment, vehicles and communications*		20,000	77,829	97,829
Travel*		60,000	150,000	210,000
Others**		0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>171.1</b>	<b>250,000</b>	<b>727,829</b>	<b>977,829</b>

\* Details to be provided in Annex C. \*\* Maintenance of computers and office equipment, reporting costs included in office facilities

## G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? yes ☐ no ☒

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex E an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your agency and to the GEF Trust Fund).

## H. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

The project will follow UNEP standard monitoring, reporting and evaluation processes and procedures. Substantive and financial project reporting requirements are summarized in Appendix 7. Reporting requirements and templates are an integral part of the UNEP legal instrument to be signed by the executing agency and UNEP.

The project M&E plan is consistent with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy. The Project Results Framework presented in Appendix 4 includes SMART indicators for each expected outcome as well as mid-term and end-of-project targets. These indicators along with the key deliverables and benchmarks included in Appendix 6 will be the main tools for assessing project implementation progress and whether project results are being achieved. Other M&E related costs are also presented in the Costed M&E Plan (Appendix 7) and are fully integrated in the overall project budget.

The M&E plan will be reviewed and revised as necessary during the project inception workshop to ensure project stakeholders understand their roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis project monitoring and evaluation. Indicators and their means of verification may also be fine-tuned at the inception workshop. Day-to-day project monitoring is the responsibility of the project management team but other project partners will have responsibilities to collect specific information to track the indicators. It is the responsibility of the Project Coordinator to inform UNEP of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that the appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely fashion.

The Project Steering Committee will receive periodic reports on progress and will make recommendations to UNEP concerning the need to revise any aspects of the Results Framework or the M&E plan. Project oversight to ensure that the project meets UNEP and GEF policies and procedures is the responsibility to the Task Manager in UNEP-GEF. The Task Manager will also review the quality of draft project outputs, provide feedback to the project partners, and establish peer review procedures to ensure adequate quality of scientific and technical outputs and publications.

The Basel Convention Regional Coordinating Centre for Africa (BCRCC) which is based in Ibadan Nigeria will be responsible for project monitoring and evaluation. The BCRCC coordinates the three Basel centres in Africa. The BCRCC will develop a project supervision plan at the inception of the project which will be communicated to the project partners during the inception workshop. The emphasis of the BCRCC supervision will be on outcome monitoring but without neglecting project financial management and implementation monitoring.

Progress vis-à-vis delivering the agreed project global environmental benefits will be assessed with the Steering Committee at agreed intervals. Project risks and assumptions will be regularly monitored both by project partners and UNEP. Risk assessment and rating is an integral part of the annual Project Implementation Review (PIR), mandatory for all larger GEF projects. The quality of project monitoring and evaluation will also be reviewed and rated as part of the PIR. Key financial parameters will be monitored quarterly to ensure cost-effective use of financial resources.

A mid-term management review or evaluation will take place on the 30<sup>th</sup> month of the project work plan as indicated in the project milestones. The review will include all parameters recommended by the GEF Evaluation Office for terminal evaluations and will verify information gathered through the GEF tracking tools (once available), as relevant. The review will be carried out using a participatory approach whereby parties that may benefit or be affected by the project will be consulted. Such parties were identified during the stakeholder analysis (see section 2.5 of the project document). The project Project Steering Committee will participate in the mid-term review and develop a management response to the evaluation recommendations along with an implementation plan. It is the responsibility of the UNEP Task Manager to monitor whether the agreed recommendations are being implemented.

An independent Terminal Evaluation will take place at the end of project implementation. The Evaluation and Oversight Unit (EOU) of UNEP will manage the terminal evaluation process. A review of the quality of the evaluation report will be done by EOU and submitted along with the report to the GEF Evaluation Office not later than 6 months after the completion of the evaluation. The standard terms of reference for the Terminal Evaluation are included in Appendix 9. These will be adjusted to the special needs of the project.

The GEF tracking tools for POPs are not yet available. Once they become available, they will be updated at mid-term and at the end of the project and will be made available to the GEF Secretariat along with the project PIR report. As mentioned above the Mid-Term Review and Terminal Evaluation will verify the information of the tracking tool.

## **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION:**

### **A. STATE THE ISSUE, HOW THE PROJECT SEEKS TO ADDRESS IT, AND THE EXPECTED GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS TO BE DELIVERED:**

The evidence from on-going dialogue with countries in the region is that countries are facing difficulties and barriers in shifting from NIP development to preparing and financing projects and programs in support Stockholm Convention implementation. This Post-NIP program is a GEF/UNIDO/UNEP initiative is designed to enhance and sustain the implementation of the Stockholm Convention in the COMESA LDCs and SIDS. The sub regional consultations undertaken during the project design process pointed to the need for a concerted effort to increase capacity to manage POPs and chemicals soundly at all levels of government - national and provincial, and in the wider community. Country representatives also highlighted their wish to work together on a sub regional basis in order to learn from each other, work together and share experiences. As such project activities have been designed to encompass the sub regional political sphere, national government, provincial government and community levels.

The project will strengthen and build the capacity required in LDCs and SIDS in the COMESA sub region to implement their Stockholm Convention NIPs in a sustainable, effective and comprehensive manner, while building upon and contributing to strengthening a country's foundational capacities for the sound management of chemicals.

The Goal of the project is to improve the management of chemicals in participating countries. This aligns to the GEF goal in chemicals management which is *“to promote the sound management of chemicals throughout their life-cycle in ways that lead to the minimization of significant adverse effects on human health and the global environment.”*

The Objective of the project is to strengthen and build the capacity required in LDCs and SIDS in the COMESA sub region to implement their Stockholm Convention NIPs in a sustainable, effective and comprehensive manner, while building upon and contributing to strengthening a country's foundational capacities for the sound management of chemicals.

The specific objectives are to:

- Improve legal and regulatory frameworks;
- Improve sustainable enforcement and administrative capacity; and
- Institute a coordinated dissemination and awareness raising system on a national and regional level that is linked to global scale lessons learned dissemination channels.

The key outputs given in the project document for these stated objectives are:

- Model comprehensive chemicals regulatory system, including legislation, regulation, guidelines for implementation, sectoral guidelines and standard setting developed.
- Train-the-trainer for national level environment staff and provincial level environmental level inspectors on the Stockholm Convention conducted.
- Guidelines developed and training (train the trainer) for Environment, Customs and Quarantine staff, on inspection/monitoring and illegal traffic undertaken.
- Tool kit developed, and training of judiciary and Ministry of Finance staff on the Stockholm and other chemicals conventions conducted.
- Network and database of sub regional laboratories, including information on equipment, staff capability, and analytical capability, developed.
- Revitalized the Chemical Information Exchange Network (CIEN) as a knowledge management system
- Development of POPs education materials (including on 9 new POPs), and pilot community training, working with local NGOs and focusing on vulnerable communities.
- High-level representatives brought together in COMESA forum, to increase high level awareness on the Stockholm

**B. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH NATIONAL AND/OR REGIONAL PRIORITIES/PLANS:**

The project was developed through a very consultative process. Meetings and workshops bringing together participating countries from the sub region as well as meetings and discussions with sub regional organisations, civil society organisations, professional and academic institutions and industry were conducted to determine the priority needs and that should be addressed within the project. An assessment of countries' needs with regard to capacity building was undertaken.

Through the consultations, it was found that each of the participating countries has ratified the Stockholm Convention and completed its National Implementation Plan. Countries are at various stages of policy development, but are all facing constraints and requesting assistance. The following is a summary of the current situation in the selected countries with regard to NIP development and implementation of obligations under the Stockholm Convention.

*Summary of NIP Priorities and Implementation Status in Participating Countries*

- In its NIP Burundi prioritized the update and completion of regulatory texts, and assistance with the enforcement of legal texts. Training sessions for environment officers on POPs issues were also prioritized, as well as information exchange network on POPs.
- In its NIP, Djibouti prioritized working with the national sub-committee for the integrated management of POPs, to establish the legal framework for the development of guidelines for different categories of POPs and chemical products. Djibouti also prioritized training on sampling techniques and acquisition of key equipment. Regarding information dissemination and awareness the NIP prioritized the organisation of national workshops for primary and secondary school teachers, and for national NGOs.
- The D.R. Congo recently finalized its NIP. The NIP notes that no specific regulations exist on chemicals or POPs and prioritized the need to institute such regulations. DRC also prioritized training of environment staff on POPs and sensitization of the wider community on POPs issues.
- Ethiopia prioritized assistance related to legislation, enforcement and information exchange in its NIP. Regarding legislation, Ethiopia requested assistance revising existing legislation and issuing new ones. It also prioritized assistance identifying areas that require standards and guidelines for effective implementation of POPs legislation. Regarding enforcement, Ethiopia prioritized conducting trainings for relevant staff on contents of POPs legislations, standards and guidelines. Organize periodic forums for experience sharing and coordination among relevant staff of implementing agencies. On information exchange and sharing of experiences, Ethiopia prioritized public awareness and sensitization of POPs and requested assistance with the preparation of materials including brochures, posters, newsletters, articles, training manuals on POPs.
-

- In its NIP, Rwanda prioritized the completion of legal texts and regulations relating to POPs. Rwanda also requested assistance to sensitize various levels of government and the community on legal texts and regulations relating to POPs. Relating to dissemination of information Rwanda prioritized assistance with formal training on POPs.
- Sudan prioritized the review and amendment of existing laws, which were issued prior to negotiation of the Stockholm Convention, as well as revising the pesticide regulations to adhere to the new FAO issue of the International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides and incorporating them into environmental policy. The NIP also prioritized the training of personnel involved in the management of pesticides, contaminated containers and contaminated soils. Sudan also prioritized upgrading laboratory capacities in the relevant institutions and training of laboratory staff in POP pesticide related analysis techniques, methods and instrument use, procurement of laboratory equipment. Related to dissemination and sharing of experiences the NIP prioritized the preparation of training materials on POPs for the general community and implementing a media campaign using TV, radio and print media. Training of pesticide users and agricultural areas was also prioritized.
- In its NIP Uganda prioritized the: development of a legal and enforcement framework for POPs in Uganda; capacity building for stakeholders implementing, managing and regulating POPs; strengthening coordination mechanism of the regulatory agencies engaged in POPs management; increasing public education and awareness on POPs and instituting a national awareness program.

As indicated above, LDCs in the COMESA region are at various stages in the development of effective legal frameworks and enforcement mechanisms for POPs. All require assistance in the development of new regulations, or the revision of existing instruments. In addition, those countries with some form of regulatory framework are requesting assistance with increasing enforcement capacity. Those countries without existing regulation require assistance with sensitization to the issue of POPs. Countries also acknowledge the important role of provincial level governments in managing POPs and therefore the need to increase the capacity of these personnel through training. The project activities are designed to address the priorities and needs identified in implementation of NIPs in the participating countries as identified by country representatives.

**C. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH [GEF STRATEGIES](#) AND STRATEGIC PROGRAMS:**

The GEF Operational Programme 14 on POPs provides for three types of activities that are eligible for GEF funding on the basis of incremental costs, noting that assistance for these activities focus primarily on the national level, and also, on a lesser extent, on regional and global activities. The present project would fit fully under one of the activities eligible for GEF funding, namely, capacity building.

The project will develop and/or strengthen the capacity of LDCs and SIDS in COMESA to improve management of POPs at the national level, while providing the opportunity for countries to share experiences and learn from each other on a regional level. The project will:

- Provide a comprehensive model chemicals regulatory framework as well as assistance to countries to improve regulatory frameworks at the national level;
- Improve sustainable enforcement and administrative capacity of participating countries by providing train-the-trainer courses in the Stockholm Convention for national and provincial level environment staff, as well as specialized training for the judiciary; and
- Institute a coordinated dissemination and awareness raising system on a national and regional level is in place and linked to global scale lessons learned dissemination channels.



These actions are consistent with Strategic Programme 1 of the POPs focal area.

**D. JUSTIFY THE TYPE OF FINANCING SUPPORT PROVIDED THROUGH THE GEF RESOURCES.**

Countries are facing difficulties and barriers in shifting from NIP development to preparing and financing projects and programs in support Stockholm Convention implementation. This project aims to enhance and sustain the implementation of the Stockholm Convention in participating countries from the SDAC sub region. The sub regional consultations undertaken during the project design process pointed to the need for a concerted effort to increase capacity to manage POPs and chemicals soundly at all levels of government - national and provincial, and in the wider community. Country representatives also highlighted their wish to work together on a sub regional basis in order to learn from each other, work together and share experiences. Little financing is currently available for these activities within the countries. GEF funding will help remove bottlenecks that have been identified, paving the way for smoother implementation of the Stockholm Convention in participating countries after the project period.

Without this GEF-assisted project, countries are likely to continue their “business as usual” which means few activities to improve legislation and regulation, and enforcement capacity. The alternative approach presented by this project seeks to build capacity and harmonize national efforts at a regional level, while bringing together relevant stakeholders to ensure coordinated and cohesive implementation of activities.

The project provides for local benefits in terms of reduced risks to human and ecosystem health through education and awareness activities with vulnerable communities and for global benefits in terms of improving regulatory frameworks and subsequent enforcement capacity to ensure POPs are managed in a way that reduces the global POPs burden.

**E. OUTLINE THE COORDINATION WITH OTHER RELATED INITIATIVES:**

During the project design phase, UNEP explored existing projects (GEF and non GEF interventions) in participating LDCs and SIDS of the COMESA sub region in order to learn from their experiences and not duplicate efforts. During the project design phase, key actors were consulted including POPs Focal Points, the COMESA Secretariat, UNEP staff implementing related projects, the Basel Convention Regional Coordinating Centre in Nigeria, and NGOs. The following paragraphs describe linkages with relevant regional, sub regional and national activities.

The Africa Stockpiles Programme (ASP) is addressing the issue of disposal of obsolete stockpiles in African countries. The present project activities dealing with stocks will be fully coordinated with the work of the ASP, which is implemented by the World Bank ,FAO, CLI, PAN and WWF. The ASP aims to: clean up obsolete pesticides; prevent pesticide accumulation; and build capacity for pesticide management. Of the countries included in the UNEP –UNIDO POPs project, only Ethiopia has participated in the ASP. According to the ASP approximately 2300 tons of stocks were removed from Ethiopia and safely destroyed through a disposal project led by FAO prior to the launch of ASP-Ethiopia. As of August 2009, the remaining 400 tons of stocks had been collected and packed for transport, and were stored in Addis Ababa awaiting CropLife International (CLI) funding for their safe disposal. A further 215 of the estimated 250 tons of uncollected stocks from other locations in the country have been inventorized under ASP-Ethiopia, revealing publicly-held obsolete pesticides and un-quantified amount of contaminated containers and soil. The ASP also assisted in the drafting of a pesticides proclamation and a pesticides regulation for submission to Parliament.

UNEP Chemicals Branch has been working on guidance on legal and institutional infrastructure for sound management of chemicals, and on economic instruments for financing sound management of chemicals since March 2009. The UNEP-KemI Project on “Development of Legal and Institutional Infrastructures for the Sound Management of Chemicals in Developing Countries and Countries with Economy in Transition” introduced the main elements to be considered for developing comprehensive and efficient legal frameworks for managing the introduction of chemicals into the market for use, along with possible institutional arrangements for effective implementation and enforcement. With the support of the Norwegian Government, UNEP has also generated a draft guidance document for policymakers on the use of these economic policy measures for achieving Sound Management of Chemicals, with a focus on cost recovery options for financing legal and institutional infrastructure for SMC. UNEP Chemicals is in the process of merging these two projects into an integrated guidance document that will comprise of three sections: managing the introduction of chemicals into the market for use; managing

chemicals at other steps of their life-cycle; and innovative approaches to chemicals management. It is envisaged that the integrated guidance produced by UNEP Chemicals will form a significant component of the comprehensive legislative framework model requested by COMESA countries. To avoid duplication the project will collaborate with UNEP Chemicals and use this guidance document as the basis of the project's approach.

The UNDP-UNEP Partnership Initiative for the Integration of Sound Management of Chemicals into Development Planning Processes, builds on previous mainstreaming experience to establish the links between the sound management of chemicals and development priorities of the country. The process is characterized by a multi-stakeholder dialogue – particularly appropriate for chemicals management given its cross-sectoral dimensions – the need to reduce the fragmentation of information, to develop integrated solutions, and to improve implementation of chemicals management policies. Uganda received funding under the SAICM Quick Start Programme (QSP) and has been involved in the activity since late 2007. As a result the need for sound chemicals management was included in the Uganda's revised Poverty Eradication Action Plan. It is proposed that this COMESA LDCs and SIDS project will provide an opportunity for Uganda to share their experience and to potentially replicate the results of the UNDP-UNEP Partnership.

In accordance with Paragraph 28 of the SAICM Overarching Policy Strategy which mandates the provision of “information clearing-house services such as the provision of advice to countries on implementation of the Strategic Approach, referral of requests for information and expertise in support of specific national actions” and, supported by the Government of Germany, the SAICM Information Clearinghouse was launched in May 2010. The SAICM clearinghouse website has incorporated the data archive and much of the functionality of the Information Exchange Network on Capacity-building for the Sound Management of Chemicals (INFOCAP). Under this project the SAICM Information Clearinghouse will provide links to the CIEN. Also, if the CIEN cannot be revitalized it is possible the Information Clearinghouse could house, or link to the knowledge management component of this project, and associated programme.

The African Caribbean Pacific - Multilateral Environment Agreements (ACP-MEAs) Programme is being implemented by UNEP in cooperation with the European Commission (EC) and several other partners to enhance the capacity of African, Caribbean, and Pacific (ACP) countries to implement MEAs. The African Hub is hosted by the African Union Commission (AUC) in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, and provides technical assistance, training and policy and advisory support services. The comprehensive four-year project has a total budget of 21 million Euros. Due to the potential duplication of efforts of the two programmes, consultations were undertaken with the AUC on the ACP-MEAs planned activities. It is understood that AUC plans to undertake training of the judiciary in Anglophone and Francophone countries, as well as training of MEA focal points on effective dissemination of information on MEAs and MEA implementation strategies. Both activities fit with the planned activities of this project and therefore activities under the ACP-MEAs activities and this project will be harmonized to avoid duplication and to make the most of limited available funds. As such activities will be undertaken in a coordinated manner and will be executed in collaboration by the two programmes. Other areas of possible collaboration such as in the area of development of legislative frameworks have been discussed and will be refined at the inception of the project.

A concept for a regional Pesticide Lifecycle Development in Africa project is currently being developed by FAO, UNEP and WHO. The project may include activities on pesticide legislation, regulation and registration. This project is likely to include some of the COMESA LDCs and SIDS, as well as non-LDCs from COMESA and other regions. The FAO, UNEP and WHO project may provide the opportunity to share lessons learned from this project and to scale up and replicate outcomes. In addition proponents are considering activities related to laboratory capacity. As such the FAO, UNEP and WHO activity is likely to make use of the laboratory network and equipment database produced under this activity.

The e-waste Africa project, is being implemented in the framework the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, and is a comprehensive programme of activities aiming at enhancing environmental governance of e-wastes and at creating favorable social and economic conditions for partnerships and small businesses in the recycling sector in Africa. The primary objective of the project is to build local capacity to address the flow of e-wastes and electrical and electronic products destined for reuse in selected African countries; and augment the sustainable management of resources through the recovery of materials in e-wastes. While there is no direct relationship between the e-waste activity and the activities planned under this project, they are complimentary in that both build much needed capacity in areas of hazardous materials.

WWF has developed a training program on the development of pesticide and obsolete pesticide management communication strategies and it is planned that this will be extended to all POPs. WWF has also developed informational products on proper pesticide handling management including booklets and short videos. These will be redeveloped and made available to the project. WWF has been working with private sector, agricultural produce associations and academia on pesticide management issues. Synergies will be made with these ongoing initiatives. In addition WWF is planning work with regional economic commissions in Africa including COMESA, on environmental policy. There are potential duplications with this work and as such WWF has agreed to work together with this project to execute activities with COMESA.

In a relevant national level activity, Burundi and Rwanda received funds from the SAICM QSP to increase institutional capacity for implementing the Stockholm Convention on POPs and awareness raising issues. Activities under this project are expected to commence in July 2010 and continue through to December 2011. As these activities will be implemented concurrently with activities under the sub regional project, links will be forged during implementation, to ensure duplication is avoided. Further resources developed for the activities in Burundi and Rwanda will be shared with the other COMESA LDCs and SIDS and utilized where relevant.

PELUM Association works in eastern, southern and central Africa to improve the livelihoods of small-scale farmers and rural communities, including Rwanda. PELUM Association facilitates learning and networking, participatory research, capacity building information sifting and dissemination as well as lobbying and advocacy. The programme will collaborate with PELUM and/or other similar networks that work closely with small holder farmers in the region.

**F. DISCUSS THE VALUE-ADDED OF GEF INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROJECT DEMONSTRATED THROUGH INCREMENTAL REASONING :**

While countries of the Region are committed and strive to attain sustainable development, and have completed their NIPs, implementing NIPs and meeting the provisions of the convention remain a challenge. This is mainly due to insufficient legislative and regulatory frameworks, and associated enforcement capacity, across all levels of government. The broad developmental objective of the project is to strengthen and build the capacity required in LDCs and SIDS of the COMESA Africa sub region to implement their Stockholm Convention NIPs in a sustainable, effective and comprehensive manner, while contributing to strengthening countries' foundational capacities for sound chemicals management. This will be achieved through assistance with developing comprehensive legislative and regulatory frameworks for chemicals management, providing training to all levels of government on the Stockholm Convention, its provisions and methods of enforcement, and by putting in place a knowledge management system to allow countries to exchange information and knowledge.

The overriding concern of participating countries is to execute the action plans elaborated in their individual NIPs. Although most participating countries have completed their NIPs, implementation is yet to be initiated in several countries. Under baseline conditions, activities relating to Stockholm Convention implementation are extremely limited. As such assistance from GEF is required to re-initiate momentum generated during NIPs and build sustainable capacity among NFPs to continue activities beyond the life of the project.

In the long run the activities contained in the present GEF project brief will benefit the global community by increasing the knowledge, skills and experiences in participating countries on managing POPs. This trained cadre of individuals will therefore decrease the releases of POPs to the receiving environment and reduce illegal POPs traffic. The current project will be implemented on a sub regional basis thereby providing the opportunity for peer to peer learning and south-south cooperation. The sub regional approach is expected to result in a network of trained professionals across the sub region, capable of working together to manage POPs. Outcomes of the pilot activities being undertaken in this project will also provide sufficient evidence for replicability in other regions. The potential for replication is enhanced by the knowledge management system which is expected to enhance dissemination of information on project activities and lessons learned.

Clearly, capacity building for the management of POPs and the implementation of NIPs has features of incrementality in providing global benefits while at the same time giving rise to significant domestic benefits (including reduced risk for local vulnerable populations, and enhanced skills of environment staff at national and provincial level). It is therefore appropriate for government co-financing to be targeted on these aspects of capacity building as proposed under this project.

The global and local benefit of the project and incremental cost is described in Table 2 matrix. Baseline expenditures were estimated at US\$45,000 while the alternative has been US\$5,463,329. The incremental<sub>11</sub>

cost of the project US\$5,418,329 is required to achieve the project's global environmental benefit of which the amount US\$2,500,000 is requested from GEF. This amounts to 46% of the total incremental cost. The remaining amount US\$2,963,329 or 54% of the total project costs will be provided by co-financing by the participating countries, and other partners, including the Stockholm and SAICM Secretariat's, UNEP Chemicals, and the UNEP Regional Office for Africa.

**G. INDICATE RISKS, INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS, THAT MIGHT PREVENT THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) FROM BEING ACHIEVED AND OUTLINE RISK MANAGEMENT MEASURES:**

Under Component 1 which deals with legislative frameworks and regulations, due to the strong political element to the sanctioning of new regulations in countries, there is a risk that participating countries lack the appetite for establishing a comprehensive regulatory framework. On the more practical level, legislative drafting takes time and participating countries have very few legal drafters on staff. Therefore the project aims to provide assistance to participating countries by providing a model comprehensive framework, and in drafting amended and new regulations in line with this model. Such an approach negates the need for drafting legislation from scratch and instead allows participating countries to adapt the models available, to their own legislative situation. In addition, provision has been made in the project for development of national level chemical legislative plans to allow countries to consider and prioritize their legislative needs. Risks associated with this Component 1 activity will also be mitigated by high level awareness raising activities being undertaken in Component 3, in partnership with COMESA, to increase high level understanding and political support for the implementation of the Stockholm Convention in the sub region.

Under Component 2 which relates to development of enforcement and administrative capacity, there is an assumption that provincial level staff, who currently have a low awareness of the Convention, understand the need to increase their awareness on chemicals management. To ensure this is the case, sensitization will need to be undertaken by POPs National Focal Points (NFPs). Sensitization activities will be undertaken in the first assistance through the National Coordinating Committees (NCCs), convened by NFPs. These Committees are envisaged as an extension of the work of NIP NCCs and will include members from various ministries, industry, and other stakeholders. Information and consultation on project activities will occur through this group. The risk that appropriate trainers cannot be identified, will be mitigated by focusing on POPs NFPs, all of whom have participated in numerous workshops convened by the Stockholm Convention Secretariat and possess a strong knowledge base. Additional trainers will be sought from relevant ministries including health and agriculture, to ensure further reach of trainers conducting training at the provincial level. Nominated "trainers" from agricultural and health ministries, will ensure provincial agricultural and health staff will also benefit from training opportunities.

In Component 3 which focuses on information dissemination and awareness raising, risks associated with the CIEN revitalization have been discussed with UNEP Chemicals, and discussions indicate it is possible to revitalize CIEN and that UNEP Chemicals are already working on such revitalization for the Latin American and Caribbean region. In addition several other projects are planning on rebuilding and revitalizing CIEN, meaning there is an agency-wide effort to reinvigorate this tool. To ensure the CIEN is taken up on the national as well subregional level, provision has been made for training of both national webmasters and NFPs in the development of national websites for information exchange. The project will work closely with UNEP CIEN staff to execute this activity, and use experienced UNEP CIEN regionally-based consultants to undertake the training. Regarding the need to accurately identify vulnerable communities in participating countries, discussions with country representatives indicate most countries have identified potentially vulnerable communities. In addition several have strong links with civil society organizations that may be receptive to community training. To ensure vulnerable communities are reached, this activity will be executed in consultation with the International POPs Elimination Network, which has identified vulnerable communities in several of the participating countries. Regarding the political commitment of high-level representatives, this has been agreed in principle by POPs national focal points on behalf of governments and consultations were also held with COMESA. COMESA has agreed to facilitate these activities. An MOU will be agreed with COMESA at project inception. COMESA has an environment department, but is fairly new to dealing with chemicals issues. As such, COMESA will benefit from programmatic links with ECOWAS who are more experienced in consulting their constituencies on chemicals. In addition, to ensure the project is not constrained by lack of capacity at COMESA, UNEP ROA will provide extensive support to COMESA staff to ensure COMESA's capacity to act as an efficient forum for raising the political commitment of high-level representatives.

There is also a general risk that this activity will be treated by participating countries as a discrete project, as opposed to an opportunity to build capacity in managing POPs and mainstreaming the obligations of the Stockholm Convention into national activities. This occurred with the NIP enabling activities. In order to mitigate this risk activities have been built into the project to empower POPs NFPs to continue POPs related activities once the project has completed. In this project NFPs will have certain responsibilities related to coordinating project activities, as well as opportunities to improve technical skills. Through subregional activities NFPs will also have the opportunity to network with each other. This includes train the trainer activities, where POPs NFPs will become certified trainers and have an obligation to train a cadre of provincial level staff annually. This approach will enhance the technical capability of NFPs, and is designed to improve the confidence of NFPs.

In the case that it is not technically, or politically possible to revitalize the CIEN, an alternative knowledge management system will be created for the programme.

#### **H. CONSISTENCY WITH NATIONAL PRIORITIES OR PLANS**

Consistency of this project with national priorities and plans are already discussed in section B.

#### **I. EXPLAIN HOW COST-EFFECTIVENESS IS REFLECTED IN THE PROJECT DESIGN:**

This project is sub regional in nature to ensure cost-effectiveness in capacity-building and training activities. While activities are planned at the national level, where possible regional level activities and workshops are planned to ensure cost-effectiveness and to allow for peer-to-peer learning.

This project forms one third of a regional programme. The two other projects are located in southern Africa (SADC) and western Africa (ECOWAS). To increase cost-effectiveness, activities that are common to each of the programmatic sub regions will share materials developed. Therefore international consultant costs have been kept to a minimum.

### **PART III: INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT**

#### **A. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT:**

UNEP will be the GEF Implementing Agency. WWF - Eastern and Southern Africa Programme Office (ESARPO) will be the executing agency.

#### **B. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENT:**

This project, focusing on LDCs in the COMESA sub region is part of a larger programme being jointly implemented by UNEP and UNIDO. The program will have eight main elements the implementation of which will be shared between UNEP and UNIDO as follows:

- Legislative and regulatory framework (UNEP Lead);
- Administrative and enforcement capacity (UNEP);
- BAT and BEP strategies (UNIDO);
- Integrated waste management (UNIDO);
- Reduced exposure to POPs (UNIDO);
- Site Identification Strategy (UNIDO);
- Dissemination and sharing of experiences (UNEP); and,
- Programme coordination and management (UNEP/UNIDO).

The project will be implemented on a sub regional basis with separate though similar projects being implemented in three sub regions namely: SADC, COMESA and ECOWAS. This approach will make use of existing networks and allow south-south cooperation. The following paragraphs describe the institutional framework for the overall program, followed by specific implementation arrangements for this project.

The programmatic structure includes a program coordination body (PCB), comprising representatives from UNEP, UNIDO, executing agencies, regional economic commissions and the Basel Convention Regional Coordinating Centre (BCRCC). The PCB will meet twice per year for the first two years, and has the role of overseeing program implementation. The PCB may invite any number of specialist and experts to contribute to its tasks or attend meetings, as agreed by members.

Sub regional steering committees are responsible for project execution. Steering Committees include representatives from UNEP, UNIDO, executing agency staff, pops NFPs, the BCRCC and topical organizations relating to project execution. Sub regional steering committees approve annual workplans, agree terms of reference for external consultants and oversee project activities. The steering committee provides guidance to the executing agency and will meet once every six months for the first 18 months, and annually thereafter. Key responsibilities of the steering committee include: ensuring the project's outputs meet the programme objectives; monitoring and review of the project; ensuring that scope aligns with the agreed portfolio requirements; foster positive communication outside of the focal points regarding the project's progress and outcomes; advocate for programme objectives and approaches; advocate for exchanges of good practices between countries; and report on project progress. An inception meeting will be convened for each sub regional steering committee at the beginning of the project. At this meeting the project logframes and work plans will be reviewed and finalized.


National project teams, coordinated by the POPs NFPs will be responsible for executing activities at the national level. National project teams are likely to include members of the NIP national coordinating committee and other relevant stakeholders. National project teams will meet once every three months to plan upcoming project activities and evaluate recently completed of ongoing activities.

WWF will be responsible for project execution. The BCRCC Nigeria is responsible for programme monitoring and evaluation. The monitoring and evaluation plan is outlined in section 6.

#### **PART IV: EXPLAIN THE ALIGNMENT OF PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF:**

The project design is in-line with the original PIF.

#### **PART V: AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

Agency Coordinator, Agency name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Maryam Niamir-Fuller, Director, UNEP Division of GEF Coordination (DGEF)		27/09/2010	Jan Betlem, Task manager, UNEP-GEF	+254- 762-4607	Jan.betlem@unep.org

## ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

### Project Logical Framework and Objectively Verifiable Impact Indicators

<b>Project Objective</b> <b>Strengthen and/or build the capacity required in LDCs in COMESA Africa subregion</b> to implement their Stockholm Convention NIPs in a sustainable, effective and comprehensive manner, <b>while</b> building upon and contributing to strengthening country's foundational capacities for sound management of chemicals.					
Outcome	Baseline	Target	Objectively Verifiable Impact Indicators	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Component 1</b> Legislative and regulatory framework in place					
1. Model comprehensive chemicals regulatory system, including legislation, regulation, guidelines for implementation, sectoral guidelines and standard setting developed.  2. Pesticide Act reviewed against FAO Code of Conduct and amendments made to comply with the FAO code of conduct	1. No country in the COMESA subregion has comprehensive regulatory system in place. (Several countries have sectoral regulations requiring revision to take account of the requirements of the Stockholm Convention. Framework legislation is also required).	1. 1 5 countries have work plans for comprehensive regulatory framework developed.  1. 2. 4 countries have developed and drafted chemicals regulation.  1.3 3 countries have adopted sectoral guidelines.  2. 1 country has revised Pesticides Act (incorporating new FAO guidelines).	- Work plans - Model framework legislation and guidelines  - Number and type of chemical regulations  - A reviewed Pesticides Act.	1. Review of work plans.  2. Review of documents making up model regulatory system.  3. Review of draft regulations  4. Review of sectoral guidelines  1. Review of revised pesticide acts	Stakeholders understand the need for developing comprehensive regulatory system.
<b>Component 2</b> Sustainable enforcement and administrative capacity established, and enforcement of Stockholm Convention provisions undertaken.					
1. Train-the-trainer for national level environment staff and provincial level environmental level inspectors on the Stockholm	1. No provincial level staff have been trained on the requirements of the Stockholm Convention in COMESA subregion.	1. 10 provincial level staff trained in each participating country. Two "trainers" trained in each participating country.	- Number of trained staff. - Number of trainer of trainers. - Training records.	1. Training records	Provincial staff understand the need to be trained on Convention

<p>Convention builds capacity of provincial staff and staff from other sectors to effectively enforce the convention</p> <p>2. Development of guidelines, and (train the trainer) training for Environment, Customs and Quarantine staff, on inspection/monitoring and illegal traffic.</p> <p>3. Development of tool kit, and training of judiciary and Ministry of Finance staff on the Stockholm and other chemicals conventions.</p> <p>4. Comprehensive, accurate and accessible database and network on laboratories exists and is used by countries to identify options for sample analysis.</p>	<p>2. No training has been conducted for Least Developed Countries in the COMESA subregion in inspection and monitoring.</p> <p>3. No Stockholm Convention training materials, specifically targeting the judiciary, or Ministry of Finance, currently available.</p> <p>4. No comprehensive, accurate and accessible database exists on laboratories in the subregion.</p>	<p>2. 5 Quarantine and Customs staff trained in each participating country. Two “trainers” trained in each participating country.</p> <p>3. Three judges and 2 MOF staff trained per participating country and training materials made available.</p> <p>4. Network and database of subregional laboratories, including information on equipment, staff capability, and analytical capability, developed.</p>	<p>-Number of officials and trainers trained.</p> <p>- Inspection, guidance and monitoring documents.</p> <p>-Number and types and training toolkits developed.</p> <p>- Number of officials trained.</p> <p>- Training records.</p> <p>-Laboratory database.</p> <p>- Availability/accessibility of the database.</p> <p>- A list of equipments and staff capability.</p>	<p>2. Training records, and inspection/monitoring, guidance documents.</p> <p>3. Training records and tool-kit.</p> <p>4. Subregional laboratory network available online (on Chemical Information Exchange Network-CIEN).</p>	<p>issues</p> <p>Suitable trainers can be identified.</p>
<p><b>Component 3</b> Experiences and good practices disseminated and shared.</p>					
<p>1. Platform reactivated as an appreciated knowledge management system and actively utilized by participating countries.</p> <p>2. Two pilot communities trained in each participating country and enabled to address POPs issues in their localities</p>	<p>1. CIEN platform exists but is inactive.</p> <p>2. Little systematic targeting has been conducted for POPs-vulnerable communities in this region.</p>	<p>1. Revitalize the Chemical Information Exchange Network (CIEN) as a knowledge management system.</p> <p>2. Development of POPs education materials (including on 9 new POPs), and pilot community training, working with local NGOs and focusing on vulnerable communities.</p>	<p>-An active CIEN platform</p> <p>- Number of trained people.</p> <p>- Materials developed.</p> <p>- Number of NGOs partnered with.</p>	<p>1. Platform reactivated, number of hits per week.</p> <p>2. Training records.</p>	<p>The existing CIEN can technically be revitalized.</p> <p>Vulnerable communities can be identified. Local NGOs available and interested in</p>



3. COMESA countries make a declaration committing to be able implement the Stockholm Convention, and that if required resources will be made available.	3. Absence of high-level support for implementation of the Stockholm Convention in the COMESA forum	3. Bring high-level representatives to COMESA forum, to increase high level awareness on the Stockholm Convention.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Record of the number of participants in the COMESA forum.</li> <li>- Meetings and the forum's reports.</li> <li>- COMESA declaration.</li> </ul>	3. COMESA declaration. 4. COMESA meeting reports	<p>working on this activity.</p> <p>Sufficient political will to make a declaration.</p>
---	---	--	---	---	--

## **ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS**

Comments have not yet been received from GEF-SEC.

# ANNEX C: CONSULTANTS TO BE HIRED FOR THE PROJECT USING GEF RESOURCES

Position Titles	\$/ Person Week	Estimate d (max.) PWs	Tasks to be performed
<b>For Project Management</b>			
<b>Local</b>			
Legal/project management	350	114.2	Administration and coordination of project.
<b>International</b>			
Project Officer (part-time)	1300	56.9	Management of the project
Project Manager (part-time)	1300	43	Management of the project
<b>For Technical Assistance</b>			
<b>Local</b>			
Legal drafting/planning consultant	700	74	Assistance with development of national-level planning for adaptation of existing laws and institution of new laws to achieve a comprehensive framework for chemicals management. Lead role in legal drafting and implementation of national plan.
Regional consultant for development of national plans for legislative framework	1190	33	Consultation with participating countries and assistance with the development of national-level planning for adaptation of existing laws and institution of new laws to achieve a comprehensive framework for chemicals management.
Regional consultants for Stockholm Convention train-the-trainer	1190	21	Development and execution of Stockholm Convention train-the-trainer for NFPs and identified trainers.
Regional consultant laboratory assessment	1190	8	Country visits and laboratory assessment to formulate sub regional database on laboratories, equipment and analytical capability.
Regional ESTIS/CIEN consultant	1190	3.7	Execution of sub regional ESTIS training.
<b>International</b>			
Legal drafting consultant	2,600	46	Development of comprehensive legal framework for chemicals management, and consultation with participating countries.
Pesticide Act consultant	2,600	4	Working with pilot country, review of Pesticide Act, and redrafting to bring Act into line with FAO guidelines. Development of case study on the process.

Stockholm Convention train-the-trainer course consultant	2,600	1.5	Development and execution of Stockholm Convention training course for NFPs.
Illegal traffic/inspection training consultant	2,600	3.8	Development and execution of training programme on illegal traffic and inspection for Customs and Quarantine workers.
Training advisor	2,600	47	Execution of all training activities, to ensure continuity, review of participants, design of feedback systems. Also in charge of reporting on lessons learned and ensuring continuous improvement.
Technical review consultant (legal aspects)	2,600	19	Review of legal framework, coordination with other subregional activities in the programme.
Judiciary training expert	2,600	1.5	Development and execution of training for the judiciary on international environmental law and the Stockholm Convention and other chemical conventions.
Laboratory consultant	2,600	4.2	Design of laboratory survey, direction of sub regional consultant, collation of laboratory survey data, development of laboratory database.
ESTIS/CIEN trainer	2,600	4.7	Development of ESTIS/CIEN training package, execution of training.
Justification for travel, if any: Travel expenses are fully justified given that this is a regional project run in 8 countries. Capacity building activities will be undertaken at the sub regional level, to achieve cost effectiveness and local level activities are also necessary to ensure the project reaches vulnerable communities. A total of 219,000 US \$ has been budgeted for travel expenses including DSA of the local and international technical experts / consultants.			

\* Provide dollar rate per person week.

\*\* Total person weeks needed to carry out the tasks.

## **ANNEX D: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS**

### **A. EXPLAIN IF THE PPG OBJECTIVE HAS BEEN ACHIEVED THROUGH THE PPG ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN.**

The objectives of PPG have been achieved. A consultation with participating countries was convened from 3-5 February in Nairobi, Kenya. A further consultation was convened with representatives of the regional economic commissions in Gaborone, Botswana. Two representatives from COMESA attended.

The consultant hired for this preparatory phase has been able to gather all available information National Implementation Plans, National Chemicals Profiles and through the face to face consultation.

The information gathered was sufficient to allow the drafting of the different components of the project. The PPG activities also helped to establish create strong linkages with the major stakeholders including the BCRCC (Nigeria), WWF, IPEN and other stakeholders. This will directly contribute to management quality during the FSP.

### **B. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:**

The PPG revealed no findings that affect the project design or any concerns on project implementation

**C. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:**

Project Preparation Activities Approved	Implementation Status	GEF Amount (\$)				Co-financing (\$)
		Amount Approved	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed	Uncommitted Amount	
1. Needs assessment and design of project interventions with regards to Legislative and regulatory framework in participating countries	Completed	20,000	20,000			
2. Needs assessment and design of project interventions with regards to strengthening the Enforcement and administrative capacity in participating countries	Completed	27,000	27,000			
3. Needs assessment for identification and formulation of support to existing regionally coordinated mechanisms for effective dissemination and sharing of the specific project/country experiences	Completed	12,000	12,000			
4. Development of a comprehensive project M&E system and	Completed	6,000	6,000			

definition of concrete project impact indicators						
5. Development of project design (including regional harmonisation workshop for all components) aimed at the involvement of key stakeholders in the project with regards to co-financing, in-country project preparation and design, project coordination, assessment of incremental costs, financial management and development of technical documents needed for the successful project development and implementation (shared by UNEP & UNIDO)	Completed					
		5,000	5,000			
Total PPG expenditure		70,000	70,000			
<b>Total PDF budget/cost</b>						

\* Any uncommitted amounts should be returned to the GEF Trust Fund. This is not a physical transfer of money, but achieved through reporting and netting out from disbursement request to Trustee. Please indicate expected date of refund transaction to Trustee.

#### ANNEX E: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS

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

N.A.



## **Acronyms and Abbreviations**

ANCAP	African Network for the Chemical Analysis of Pesticides
ACP	Africa Caribbean and Pacific
ASP	Africa Stockpiles Programme
AUC	African Union Commission
BAT/BEP	Best Available Techniques/Best Environmental Practices
BCRCC	Basel Convention Regional Coordinating Centre
CIEN	Chemical Information Exchange Network
CLI	CropLife International
COMESA	Common Market for East and Southern Africa
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
GEF	Global Environment Facility
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
NCC	National Coordinating Committee
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NFP	National Focal Point
NIP	National Implementation Plan
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PCB	Programme Coordination Body
POPs	Persistent Organic Pollutants
QSP	Quick Start Programme
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SAICM	Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management
SETAC	Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organisation
WHO	World Health Organization