



PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF)

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

THE GEF TRUST FUND

Submission Date: 09/15/2009

PART I: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

GEF PROJECT ID¹: 4066 PROJECT DURATION: 60 months

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:

COUNTRY(IES): Cook Islands, FSM, Marshall Islands, PNG, Samoa, Tuvalu, Palau, Tonga, Kiribati, Niue, Nauru, Vanuatu, Fiji²

PROJECT TITLE: Pacific POPs release reduction through Improved Management of Solid and Hazardous wastes

GEF AGENCY(IES): UNEP, (select), (select)

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): UNEP (DTIE; IETC), AFD, FAO, SPREP (assisting with coordination)

GEF FOCAL AREA (S)³: Persistent Organic Pollutants

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): SP-1, SP-2, SP-3 (see preparation guidelines section on exactly what to write)

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT (if applicable): G-PAS

INDICATIVE CALENDAR*	
Milestones	Expected Dates mm/dd/yyyy
Work Program (for FSP)	11/01/2009
CEO Endorsement/Approval	02/01/2010
Agency Approval Date	06/01/2010
Implementation Start	08/01/2010
Mid-term Evaluation (if planned)	01/01/2013
Project Closing Date	08/01/2015

* See guidelines for definition of milestones.

A. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To reduce POPs releases in the Pacific Island states through the introduction of integrated whole-system approaches to the environmentally sound management of solid and hazardous wastes								
Project Components	Indicate whether Investment, TA, or STA ^b	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Indicative GEF Financing ^a		Indicative Co-Financing ^a		Total (\$) c =a + b
				(\$) a	%	(\$) b	%	
UNEP Component								
1. Development of national and regional uPOPs prevention and management strategy.	TA	Strategic minimizing of unintentionally generated POPs (uPOPs) emissions through avoidance of incineration, and/or through application of cleaner production techniques, where incineration.	a) Identification of key players in the waste stream to be targeted for outreach and incorporation of sustainable approaches in waste management (general public, municipal and industrial waste generators and management) b) National solid waste strategic guidance developed on organic waste management. c) Required elements for attendant regulation and legislation identified for independent uptake by respective governments.	290,000	49.95	290,530	50.05	580,530
2. Training and awareness raising in solid and hazardous waste management best practices	TA	Increased capacities and uptake of best practices by stakeholders to minimize uPOPs creation in the course of solid	a) Centralized national awareness raising workshops for decision makers; b) Training of stakeholders (public and private sector), using train-the-trainer method in: waste management techniques that	525,000	54.64	435,850	45.36	960,850

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Note that Palau and Tonga are only Signatories to Stockholm Convention, and will be supported by AFD funding only, unless they ratify by the end of the project development phase. All countries must have advanced or completed NIP drafts at the end of the project development phase in order to receive GEF funding support along with AFD support. UNEP will follow-up with relevant countries (Palau, Tonga, Cook Islands, Kiribati, Nauru, PNG, Vanuatu) during PPG.

³ Select only those focal areas from which GEF financing is requested.

		and hazardous wastes management.	<p>will reduce the use of open and incomplete burning as a tool of organic waste disposal; landfill management, using demonstration site (already built) in Suva; and hazardous waste management.</p> <p>b) Development of technical training manuals.</p> <p>c) Cadre of certified trained PIC professionals undertaking national training in each PIC, with the support of a consultant on the first round, leading to ongoing project sustainability.</p> <p>d) Pilots in selected PICs to promote composting/mulching of organic waste, possible incorporation into other useful products, and application of Cleaner Production where incineration remains necessary</p> <p>e) Broader awareness campaigns for the public and SMEs on best practices in waste separation, composting etc. Lessons learned and mentoring promoted..</p>					
3. Enhanced, post-NIP Inventory, stockpile management and safe disposal strategy for unwanted pesticides (including POPs) and school laboratory chemicals	TA	PIC Environment departments capable of: developing and maintaining inventories; managing school chemicals and ordering chemicals that can be safely disposed of in-country; managing and safe-guarding disused chemicals (including POPs); and therefore improving the sound chemicals management.	<p>a) Enhanced inventory exercise for select countries mature in the NIPs process, to include new POPs, waste school laboratory chemicals, and similar laboratory chemicals in hospital and veterinary laboratories in preparation of disposal exercises.</p> <p>b) Training of environment staff in inventory development and chemicals database management;</p> <p>c) Training of Customs, agriculture and environment staff (as appropriate) in the safe storage and management of chemicals in select countries with significant chemical imports, or which act as transshipment points for other countries in the region (minimum of 4 countries).*;</p> <p>d) Training of environment staff, laboratory technicians and school science teachers in safe storage, and disposal of laboratory chemicals, and local disposal of phosphides (minimum of 4 countries envisioned)</p>	800,000	55.03	653,720	44.97	1,453,720

			<p>e) Generation of awareness and technical guidance tool kits for Customs areas, laboratories (schools, hospitals, veterinary) and other chemical storage sites for day to day safe management of chemicals*.</p> <p>f) Pilot assessment of contaminated soils in one PIC, using in situ management and risk reduction measures*.</p> <p>g) Development of a cost-effective, self-sustaining, subregional strategy for the repackaging, collection, shipping and disposal of POPs (and container management) and other unwanted chemicals from the various categories of stockpiles, involving taxes/levys and take-back relationships with chemical suppliers.</p> <p>*c), e), f): to be aligned where possible with FAO-led activities where there may be stakeholder overlap (see Section 6 below)</p>					
4. Waste oil export and reuse in Polynesia and Melanesia	TA	Production of unintentionally produced POPs, through burning of waste oil prevented. Waste oil collection, storage, and export systems established, and used oil from the Pacific region reused in Fiji.	<p>a) Development of a strategy on the implementation of extended producer responsibility (EPR) systems for waste oil produced and distributed;</p> <p>b) Waste oil collection, storage and export system developed for eligible PICs⁴ ;</p> <p>c) A product stewardship and collection system developed with PNG, Fiji, Samoa, including a voluntary or legislative product stewardship agreement with the lubricant importers;</p> <p>d) Drafting instructions for extended producer responsibility legislation developed for PICs;</p> <p>e) Public education program on waste oil and its collection implemented in nine PICs;</p> <p>f) Environmental audit undertaken of the collection and reuse facility.</p>	500,000	65.66	261,510	34.34	761,510
5. National technical assistance for	TA	a) Level basic supportive technical	a) Technical assistant supported by AFD for day to day execution support of the	0	0	691,490	100	691,490

⁴ Note this activity is only implementable if Fiji ratifies Waigani, and/or if Tonga, Niue, Tuvalu, SI and Van ratify Basel. Efforts to encourage ratification will be undertaken during the project preparation process

country-specific post-NIP activities		capacities amongst countries in the region as PICs complete post-NIP activities, not suitable for regional interventions. b) Improved management of chemicals and reduced uPOPs generation	overall AFD programme. b) Differentiated assistance given to countries at various levels of NIP completion and with various levels of national expertise, to better ensure timely coordinated national level activity execution, and overall timeliness of the umbrella programme, and GEF interventions.					
FAO Component								
6. Legislation enforcement and promotion of low risk alternatives in agriculture and wood treatment, in PICs with significant reliance on pesticides.	TA	a) Improved management of pesticides at national level through linkages between Agriculture, Environment, Health and Customs; b) Strengthened enforcement of regulations across the Region through harmonisation; c) Obtain data on pesticide poisoning and/or residual toxin accumulation through improved reporting using community based health monitoring; d) Reduced levels of harmful pesticide residues in key export and subsistence crops .	a) Review of existing draft legislation and adoption across all partners through advocacy with SPC; b) Regional registration process for pesticides developed and accessible to all partners; c) Uptake of new legislation and associated regulations through development of national and regional pesticide management committees; d) Training of customs, agriculture and environment inspectors on pesticide risks and enforcement of regulations; e) Roll-out of the FAO Pesticide Stocks Management System (PSMS) to better control pesticide registrations and movements; f) Working with civil society generate a system for collection of pesticide poisoning data and link this to reporting requirements from the pesticide regulator; g) Development of risk management and awareness materials on pesticide use; h) Promotion of low input intensification of production to reduce risk of pesticide residues.	500,000	35.55	906,480	64.45	1,406,480
Monitoring, Evaluation, Lessons Learned (UNEP)								
7. Impact monitoring and evaluation, lessons learned, knowledge management, project planning and administration, and future project identification.		a) Verification of baselines to validate impact of project activities b) Countries equipped with appropriate technical tools and information documents to assist them in	a) Regional database of chemicals and waste releases before and after project intervention, inclusive of import/export patterns, primary consumers, and other stakeholders who will be a part of the long term, self-sustaining national/(sub)regional chemicals and waste management strategy.	365,000	55.69	290,420	44.31	655,420

		national efforts to improve their chemicals and waste management systems c) Countries assisted and play a fuller role in follow-on project identification	b) Generation of case studies, independent evaluation of strategies and technical options implemented, to be utilized post-project to inform future technical interventions c) Use of aforementioned outputs to work with countries for GEF Project Identification, taking advantage of future AFD project funding cycles and priorities, as well of those of governments and other partners met in the course of the current project. d) Training for PICs in project planning and administration. e) Independent evaluation at mid point and end of project.					
8. Project management				295,000	100		0	295,000
Total project costs				A3,275,000		B3,530,000		6,805,000

^a List the \$ by project components. The percentage is the share of GEF and Co-financing respectively of the total amount for the component.

^b TA = Technical Assistance; STA = Scientific & Technical Analysis.

B. INDICATIVE CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE and by NAME (in parenthesis) if available, (\$)

Sources of Co-financing	Type of Co-financing	Project
Project Government Contribution	Unknown at this stage	
GEF Agency(ies) (FAO)	Grant	1,000,000
Bilateral Aid Agency(ies) (AFD)	Grant	1,430,000
TBD (AusAid, JICA, EC and New Zealand have all expressed strong support for a PPG during which time they could align co-finance)	Grant	1,100,000
Private Sector	Unknown at this stage	
NGO	(select)	
Others	(select)	
Total Co-financing		B3,530,000

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

	Previous Project Preparation Amount (a) ⁵	Project (b)	Total c = a + b	Agency Fee
GEF financing		A3,275,000	3,275,000	327,500
Co-financing		B3,530,000	3,530,000	
Total		6,805,000	6,805,000	327,500

D. GEF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY (IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY(IES)¹

GEF Agency	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
			Project (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
UNEP	Persistent Organism	Regional	2,775,000	277,500	3,052,500

⁵ Include project preparation funds that were previously approved but exclude PPGs that are awaiting for approval.

FAO	Persistent Organics	Regional	500,000	50,000	550,000
Total GEF Resources			3,275,000	327,500	3,602,500

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

² 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.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

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

Due to small sizes, limited land availability, limited water resources, fragile ecosystems, increasing population pressures, and limited buffering capacities, Pacific Island Countries (PICs) are among the most vulnerable states. The Pacific Islands Environmental Outlook Report (2004) acknowledged that “while climate change is (well established as) the most important environmental issue for the Pacific Islands, waste and pollution undoubtedly represent the largest taxing issue.” Solid and hazardous waste, including POPs, and persistent toxic substances (PTS) are now widely recognized as one of the major threats to sustainable development in the PICs that have direct influence over peoples’ lives.

There has been a significant increase in investments to deal with waste management across the Pacific islands in the past decade, including environmental infrastructure investments, projects that have developed policies and institutional reforms to improve the efficiency with which waste management services are delivered. In addition the ‘POPs in PICs’ project funded by AusAID, and implemented in cooperation with SPREP and PICs, collected and repackaged hazardous chemicals in the region.

During 2008 and 2009, AFD funded feasibility studies for solid and hazardous waste management in PICs. These studies resulted in the design of activities involving training, waste oil reuse, school chemicals and POPs inventorying and management, and a programme to support national level activities to implement post-NIP activities, not suitable to regional interventions. AFD is planning on implementing the training and national level activities, as well as providing some support to the other activities. AFD will also be funding a Secretariat of the Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) based Technical Assistant, to manage the implementation of the activities. GEF could add incremental value to the training, waste oil reuse, and school chemicals and POPs inventories.

In line with the programmatic approach taken under GEF-PAS this project identifies synergies, complementarities, and value-added opportunities to existing initiatives. In line with GEF-4’s strategic programs this activity focuses on technical assistance and capacity building for NIP implementation, partnering in investments for NIP implementation and in the demonstration of feasible, innovative technologies for POPs reduction. Looking forward to GEF-5, the project also aims to improve the use of chemicals in an environmentally sound manner, reduce releases of POPs and other PTS to the environment, and prevent, manage, dispose of waste chemicals and manage contaminated sites.

The proposed AFD activity has three components. These components correspond to sections in the PIF table. Sections 1 and 2 correspond to AFD Component 1 (Regional support to SPREP and its members for implementation of the Pacific Solid Waste Strategy and Action Plan); sections 3 and 4 correspond to AFD Component 2 (Subregional Activities for Hazardous Waste Collection); and section 5 corresponds to AFD Component 3 (Funding for Country-specific Waste Management Projects). Section 6 corresponds to work initiated by FAO to be executed in partnership with the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC). Within this GEF project, UNEP will lead work in Sections 1 through 5, and be in charge of monitoring aspects (Section 7), while FAO will be in charge of Section 6.

A general lack of in-country project management, planning and administrative skills in PIC governments hampers implementation success, and reduces the impact of development activities, throughout the Pacific. This has come through clearly in the course of preparation of this PIF, and this project will be sensitive to this, building in assistance to reduce the risk of failure of interventions, and to help build long-term capacity to oversee projects, technical activities, reducing reliance on the agencies, as was previously envisioned by the GEF PAS.

Sections 1 and 2: Poor waste management is ubiquitous in the Pacific region; and with limited land area, improvement of waste management is vital for improving the health and livelihoods. Incomplete combustion processes through open and uncontrolled burning are common to all PICs. Tuvalu, Samoa, Niue and Fiji, highlighted in their NIPs, and PNG and Kiribati in their draft NIPs, that the major releases of uPOPs are from waste incineration (with fly ash being released into

the air) and uncontrolled combustion (through open and uncontrolled burning). Niue's action plan to reduce uPOPs emissions includes training on incinerator use and on alternatives to open burning, such as composting.

The Regional Solid Waste Strategy Action Plan clarifies the immediate priorities of PICs on a biennial basis. The Action Plan includes the region's highest priorities, in their order of priority. For 2008-10 the top two priorities are landfills and financing waste. JICA has funded several successful landfills in the region and therefore suitable demonstration sites exist to undertake regional practical training in landfill management.

In light of the above, Section 1 of this GEF project includes national level work identifying key players, developing national strategic guidance for solid waste management, focusing on organic waste management and incineration, and identifying elements for incorporation into national regulation and policy, for independent uptake by governments.

Section 2 focuses on centralized national awareness raising workshops for decision makers, a region-wide train-the-trainer program, certifying staff from each PIC as trainers, broader awareness for the public and SMEs on best practices for waste management. The training will include, inter alia, waste management techniques that will reduce the use of open and incomplete burning as a tool of organic waste disposal; practical landfill management, using demonstration site (already built) in Lautoka (Fiji); and hazardous waste management. Certified staff will then have the responsibility to conduct trainings in their own PICs, with the assistance of a consultant. Several PICs will then be selected for pilot organic waste and incineration projects. Lessons learned will be published and PIC to PIC mentoring encouraged and facilitated.

At the moment it is envisioned that execution will be led by UNEP DTIE's IETC Office, Japan.

Sections 3 and 4: There are no hazardous waste management or disposal facilities in the Pacific region. As such PICs face the ongoing challenge of stockpiling hazardous waste and seeking options for export. Integrated approaches are crucial to improving cost-effectiveness and efficiency of delivering environmentally sound waste management in Pacific, especially in achieving economies of scale in terms of human resource and institutional capacity. Without integrated approaches, the damages from pollutants on biodiversity of global value within the Pacific, both terrestrial and marine, will continue.

The AFD feasibility study (Component 2) surveyed PICs on their priority areas for assistance in hazardous waste management. The results of this survey indicated that seven PICs prioritized assistance for waste oil management and disposal, six PICs prioritized assistance for pesticides (including POPs) disposal, and six PICs prioritized assistance for school chemicals disposal.

Due to the potential for synergies in approaches the AFD feasibility study proposed to address school chemicals and pesticides in an integrated initiative. Section 3 outlines an activity that will work with PICs that have completed their NIPs to update inventories to include the nine new POPs (pentabromodiphenyl ether, chlordecone, hexabromobiphenyl, alpha-hexachlorocyclohexane, beta-hexachlorocyclohexane, lindane, commercial octabromodiphenyl ether, pentachlorobenzene and perfluorooctane sulfonate) added to the Stockholm Convention in May 2009. Although the POPs in PICs Project collected over 100 tonnes of POPs from the region from 2003 to 2005, minor POPs are thought to remain. These were POPs identified during detailed inventorying undertaken as part of PIC NIP development. To reduce the risk these POPs pose to health and the environment, a strategy will be developed to collect and destroy these chemicals. The POPs in PICs Project did not include PNG and it is envisaged a separate activity will be required to develop a detailed inventory of POPs in PNG. Looking forward to building supportive capacities for GEF V, the activity will also train environment and education staff in the sound management of school chemicals, replicating an activity undertaken in Kiribati successfully in July 2008, which trained teachers and environment staff in the stabilization and neutralization of chemicals. It will also develop a guidance document on chemicals that can be safely neutralized and stabilized on island, to be used by the education and environment ministries to guide the evolution of the science curriculum, to prevent future build up of waste chemicals.

Section 4 focuses on reuse waste oil at a steel kiln located in Fiji. Historically bulk fuel facilities in the Pacific were owned by private sector multinational oil companies such as BP and Exxon Mobil. Under these companies waste oil was exported to Australia for recycling. In recent years these corporations have implemented region-wide divestment strategies, divesting assets to Pacific Island governments. Under government ownership PICs are faced with the challenge of making arrangements for oil reuse or recycling. As seven PICs requested assistance with waste oil under the AFD

feasibility study, an activity was designed involving Fletchers Steel, located in Fiji, a transport hub for regional shipping. Fletchers has agreed to reuse waste oil in its processes, free of charge.

In order to ensure the long-term sustainability of the activity, extended producer responsibility legislation drafting instructions and guidelines will be developed to assist PICs in financing administration and transport costs.

At this time it is envisioned that the Section 3 best-practices training and NIP update can be a rapid activity, engaging government expertise and national and international consultants, as was done for the initial NIP process. UNEP DTIE Sustainable Consumption and Production Branch (Paris) has offered their expertise in executing Section 4.

Section 5: Acknowledging the differing post-NIP, national-level priorities among PICs, and the regional nature of the GEF-PAS, Section 5 is focused on the providing opportunities for PICs to undertake national-level activities as prioritized in their NIPs, which are not appropriate for regional interventions. Such activities include: testing of potentially PCB-contaminated transformers on the outer islands of Tuvalu; implementing public awareness strategies for potentially contaminated sites in Samoa; and further assessment of potentially contaminated sites in Niue. These activities are identified as priorities under NIPs, but due to their country-specific nature, do not slot easily into regional interventions, and can therefore be addressed more cost effectively through national level activities. The financing of such activities will also serve to level the playing field among PICs. These activities will be approved and managed by the AFD Technical Assistant. By leveling the playing field among PICs in terms of technical capacity, the effectiveness of regional-level interventions under GEF-PAS will be further enhanced.

Section 6: FAO, under the EC funded project on capacity building related to implementation of MEAs in ACP countries, will be working in the region to improve pesticide lifecycle management. This will include a series of demonstration projects in key areas which have been identified as main concerns across the region through consultation with partners. In addition to projects on container management and contaminated site assessment FAO (linked to Sections 3 and 4 above) will be working with the SPC to improve the harmonisation and enforcement of pesticide legislation; work with regional NGO groups to initiate community based health monitoring and reporting linked to pesticide poisoning; and through a coordinated communications campaign with civil society look to raise awareness on the risks related to pesticide use and so increase the promotion of alternatives. These components will all be included in a “life-cycle” management approach which will assist countries in the regulation, inspection, distribution, storage and use of pesticides based on the principles of the International Code of Conduct for the Distribution and Use of Pesticides (2002). FAO will provide access to data base tools and technical guidelines and training programmes to assist countries in managing the risk from pesticides. In order to maximise the impact in each of these subject areas from the limited resources available it is proposed that FAO will work in a limited number of countries which are known to be significant importers and users of chemical pesticides. From consultation amongst partners it has been decided to concentrate efforts in the island states of Fiji (pesticide management and legislation), Samoa (container management), Solomon Islands (contaminated site assessment), Tonga (promotion of lower risk alternatives) and Vanuatu (communications and awareness for risk reduction). FAO will then work with regional partners including SPC and SPREP to provide guidance in each area based on lessons learnt which can be applied across the other island states as necessary. As such the FAO MEA project can be considered as a series of demonstration and capacity building projects aimed at developing expertise in a number of key areas for use within the region.

A PPG is also being proposed to further fine-tune activities to national circumstances and priorities, as well as to permit co-finance discussions with Australia and New Zealand, who can only enter into such discussions from September/October 2009.

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

At the political level, in response to the many development challenges facing the Pacific region, the Pacific Island Forum Leaders adopted the Pacific Plan to, amongst other objectives, to promote economic growth, sustainable development, good governance and security. Under the priority area of sustainable development, the “development and implementation of policies and plans for waste management” was identified as a priority requiring immediate attention for implementation. GEF support to this project will build on ongoing policies, programs and political commitments.

All countries participating in the project are party to the Stockholm Convention, have expressed interest in the project, and are eligible for GEF funding in the POPs focal area.

All participating countries have been engaged in GEF-supported enabling activities to develop NIPs, and over half have transmitted their plans to the COP. Priorities set out in the transmitted NIPs, draft NIPs, and elaborated by PICs during consultations undertaken by the AFD feasibility studies form the basis of this proposal.

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

The project is consistent with strategic priorities SP1, SP2 and SP3 of the POPs Focal area and with guidance provided to the GEF by the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention.

D. JUSTIFY THE TYPE OF FINANCING SUPPORT PROVIDED WITH THE GEF RESOURCES:

This project was identified as a priority during the regional consultations for the Global Environment Facility Pacific Alliance for Sustainability programme (GEF PAS) in the Pacific. UNEP has stepped in to research the related work in the region, to collaborate with those agencies involved with work on POPs and Waste Management, so that the GEF-Intervention was truly incremental. GEF finance will permit uPOPs mitigation and POPs chemicals management on top of the broader solid waste and chemicals management work being executed by AFD and FAO.

E. OUTLINE THE COORDINATION WITH OTHER RELATED INITIATIVES:

The 1994 Barbados Programme of Action

Small Island Developing States (SIDS) identified, at an early stage, toxic chemicals and hazardous wastes as a threat for sustainable development of their countries. States, participating in the Global Conference on the Sustainable Development of SIDS in Bridgetown, Barbados, 25 April – 6 May 1994, stated in the Declaration of Barbados that “... the increasing amounts of waste and hazardous substances, and limited facilities for waste disposal combine to make pollution prevention, waste management and the transboundary movement of hazardous materials critical issues for small island developing States”. In the adopted “Programme of action for the sustainable development of small island developing states”, Chapter III on “Management of Wastes”, it is recognized that the poorly disposal of toxic chemicals is a significant contributor to marine pollution and coastal degradation, since small island developing States are highly vulnerable to contamination by toxic and hazardous wastes and chemicals.

The programme of action (cp. chapter B Regional Action) identifies regional programmes and projects as a promising approach to face the threat of toxic chemicals and wastes for the environment and human health in the small island states. It states that regional pollution prevention programmes shall be used to conduct demonstration projects. It also stressed that regional programmes and projects should be used to remove and dispose of existing hazardous wastes, such as polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs).

Mauritius Strategy

The Mauritius Strategy for the Further Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (SIDS) was agreed in January 2005. In the Mauritius Strategy countries commit at the national level to, inter alia: develop and implement regulatory measures for the safe and efficient management of toxic, hazardous and solid wastes; and ratify and implement the Basel and London Conventions.

Regionally, countries committed to actions, including to: develop economic incentives to further pollution prevention and waste management; develop waste management and prevention trust fund; remove and dispose of existing hazardous wastes, such as polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), with the technical assistance of developed countries; and to establish, where appropriate, regional centres for the training and transfer to cleaner production and the management of hazardous wastes generated at the national level.

Pacific Waste Management Strategy

The guiding policy document for solid waste management in the Pacific is the Solid Waste Management Strategy and Regional Solid Waste Management Strategy Action Plan (SPREP, 2005). The Waste Management Strategy sets out the situation of waste management in the Pacific including challenges and opportunities. The Strategy emphasizes the need

for the development of strong partnerships between governments, the community and the private sector efficient waste minimisation and recycling. The disconnect between the constant calls for assistance to address solid waste problems, and the lack of consequent concrete action by member countries, is identified as a significant and complex challenge relating to budgets, capacity, and institutional arrangements (for example waste is usually managed at local government level and donor liaison occurs at the national level).

The Strategy sets out the immediate concerns of PICs as: increasing quantities of solid waste; the limited land areas in small atoll islands; population density, especially the atolls; limited available appropriate infrastructure; the lack of controls on chemicals imported into the region; and the limited capacity to manage the range of pollutants.

The Regional Solid Waste Strategy Action Plan clarifies the immediate priorities of PICTs on a biennial basis. The Action Plan includes the region's highest priorities, in their order of priority. In the regional meeting in late 2007, the PICT delegates decided the priorities for 2008-10 are: landfills; financing waste; ensuring political and public support; bulky wastes; national strategies; training and capacity building; regional integration; electronic waste; waste oil; recycling; legislation and enforcement; and organics and composting.

AFD, UNEP and FAO in the Pacific

The project is linked with the regional initiative that was launched by AFD and UNEP to support the implementation of the Pacific Regional Strategy Action Plan by SPREP and its member countries. It was envisaged from the outset that this AFD funded initiative would be coordinated with existing or future projects in the Pacific region.

The proposed AFD activity has three components. These components correspond to sections in the PIF table. Sections 1, 2 and 7 correspond to AFD Component 1 (Regional support to SPREP and its members for implementation of the Pacific Solid Waste Strategy and Action Plan); sections 3 and 4 correspond to AFD Component 2 (Subregional Activities for Hazardous Waste Collection); and section 5 corresponds to AFD Component 3 (Funding for Country-specific Waste Management Projects).

The UNFAO is also planning a Pacific regional activity. In order to avoid duplication, to build on the synergies and complementarity between the activities, and to ensure maximum benefit to PICs, through increased cost effectiveness, the FAO activities have also been included in this PIF. Section 6 corresponds to work initiated by UNFAO to be executed in partnership with the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC).

This GEF project is designed to again add complementarities to the AFD and FAO initiatives.

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

Participating PICs lack the financial capacity to meet the disproportionately high costs of implementing the chemicals and wastes conventions to which they are Party. Thus, without external financial assistance, the international agreement will not be fully implemented and participating countries will not be able to make reductions in their use and release of proscribed chemicals. In consequence, the contribution of these countries to the global burden of POPs will continue unabated.

The alternative presented here is to provide GEF support for actions that reduce or eliminate POPs releases and thus reduce the regions contributions to global POPs fluxes, and to build capacity for ongoing and sustainable sound chemicals management. Co-financing support to these actions will focus on schemes providing local environmental benefits in terms of improved management of agricultural and industrial processes, enhanced waste management and improved understanding by stakeholders and the public. Through these efforts the project seeks to accrue important co-benefits to other local environmental initiatives and thus to secure key economic sectors such as agriculture and tourism that are based on environmental services. Reducing releases of POPs pesticides, PCBs and uPOPs will benefit the global environment.

G. INDICATE RISKS, INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS, THAT MIGHT PREVENT THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) FROM BEING ACHIEVED, AND IF POSSIBLE INCLUDING RISK MITIGATION MEASURES THAT WILL BE TAKEN:

Potential risks and the mitigation measures to be taken into account for this project are described as follows:

1) Failing to achieve effective and efficient cooperation between concerned agencies at all levels of government for the implementation of the project:

This risk is addressed by involving all stakeholders through the project preparation process. Training will be provided to increase awareness of the need for cross-sectoral cooperation and the improved mechanisms required to achieve it. This issue will be addressed in the PPG phase. As the project evolves, mechanisms for coordination will be explored. The rate of this risk is medium.

2) Difficulties in obtaining information from different sources of public administration and private enterprises:

Institutional capacities for data collection, processing and reporting, established during NIP development, will be enhanced and supported by administrative and technical capability strengthening programs. Engagement of the private sector and NGOs will be essential in these efforts and the project will seek to involve these groups in developing appropriate regulatory, administrative and management schemes and through public awareness campaigns.

The AFD Component 2 and 3 feasibility studies involved extensive consultation with stakeholders, the establishment of networks, and relationships with private sector partners for activities under Section 3 and 4. The risk rate is low.

3) Inability to generate cost-effective approaches to management and disposal at national levels

The project is founded on the principle that while national markets may not provide sustainable or viable opportunities for service providers, a regionally-harmonized approach may provide such opportunities and prove significantly more cost-effective than individual efforts. The project, therefore, is designed to take up the interest of participating countries to act together as a distinctive group with regard to POPs and other hazardous chemicals and wastes.

In the participating countries, the project can build on the information obtained during the NIP development processes and the AFD feasibility studies. The rate of this risk is low.

4) The limited absorptive capacity of some participating countries could hinder project implementation. To address limited absorptive capacity of some national executing agencies, the activities will ensure the involvement of stakeholder groups in implementation, including local NGOs, regional organizations where appropriate, agricultural, health and finance ministries, and local government representatives. The rate of this risk is low.

H. DESCRIBE, IF POSSIBLE, THE EXPECTED COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROJECT:

Overall, in building on recent studies, priority-setting exercises and the like, much of the initial work required to set up such a project has been cut down, such that the PPG can focus on gathering directly relevant baseline data, as opposed to starting at broad identification of issues etc. The proposed project seeks to cut national transaction costs in implementing the Stockholm Convention and other chemicals and wastes agreements by promoting regionally-harmonised approaches that are likely to be cost-effective at a number of levels:

- 1) Training packages in awareness raising for solid and hazardous waste management will be shared and disseminated regionally;
- 2) Awareness campaign for public and SMEs on best practice and waste separation will be shared and disseminated regionally;
- 3) Training and capacity building can be undertaken on a regional basis with governments and key stakeholders;
- 4) Cost-effective, self-sustaining strategy for the repackaging, collection, shipping and disposal of POPs and other unwanted chemicals, involving take-back relationships with suppliers will be developed regionally;
- 5) National good practices and lessons can be shared to 'short-cut' capacity development within the region;
- 6) Waste oil reuse activity can be developed regionally to take advantage of joint shipping between PICs;
- 7) Drafting instructions for extended producer responsibility legislation can be shared regionally, together with lessons learned from pilot country;
- 8) Awareness materials can be developed regionally and shared and disseminated; and

- 9) Regional database of chemicals and waste releases before and after intervention can be developed.

This project approach takes into account possible economies of scale and the synergetic effects for individual countries for a coordinated implementation at the regional level.

I. JUSTIFY THE COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE OF GEF AGENCY:

In implementing this project, UNEP is working within its comparative advantage (GEF/C.31/5 rev.1, June 18, 2007). The project focuses on foundational capacity building for which UNEP has been a leading agency since the start of GEF support for the international negotiations towards an agreement to eliminate, reduce and control POPs releases. The project also exploits UNEP's comparative advantage in the determination of scientifically and technically valid, environmentally sound, socially acceptable, and cost-effective systems for the management and destruction of POPs and other hazardous chemicals and wastes.

This project complements the UNEP PoW 2010-2011 Sub-programme 5 (Hazardous Substances and Hazardous Waste). Five specific comparative competences and functional capacities of UNEP will be the focus of the subprogramme in the biennium: 1) sound science for decision-makers: early warning, monitoring and assessment, emphasizing strategic needs for adaptive legal, institutional and market frameworks; 2) awareness-raising, outreach and communications to promote environmental actions and innovations; 3) capacity-building and technology support, contributing to the implementation of the Bali Strategic Plan to better meet the needs of Governments and partners in relation to sound management of chemicals and hazardous waste; 4) cooperation, coordination and partnerships to engage United Nations entities, international institutions, multilateral environmental agreements, bilateral aid agencies, civil society and the private sector; and, 5) support for and facilitation of further development of existing and, as required, development of new international policy and operational frameworks.

FAO's comparative advantage in the context of the Stockholm Convention on POPs is recognized in GEF Council Document GEF/C.28/15 of 9 May 2006. This document relates to the phase-out and replacement of POPs pesticide use and the elimination of POP pesticide stockpiles.

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 [country endorsement letter\(s\)](#) or [regional endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this template).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (Month, day, year)
Trinison Tari	Acting Director, Vanuatu Environment Unit	ENVIRONMENT UNIT, REPUBLIC OF VANUATU	09/01/2009
Dr. Wari Amo	GEF Operational Focal Point	DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CONSERVATION, PAPUA NEW GUINEA	08/14/2009
Ms. Ngedikes Olai U. Polloi	National Environment Planner	OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSE AND COORDINATION, PALAU	08/28/2009
Mr. Sauni Tongatule	GEF Operational Focal Point, Niue	DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT, NIUE.	08/21/2009
Russ J Kun	Permanent Secretary for Commerce, Industry & Environment	Department of Commerce, Industry & Environment, Nauru	08/20/2009

Tu'u'u Dr. Ieti Taule'alo	Chief Executive Officer and GEF Operational Focal Point, Samoa	Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment, Samoa	08/26/2009
Ms. Yumi Crisostomo. Desmond,	Director OEPPC, GEF Operational Focal Point, Republic of the Marshall Islands	OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING AND POLICY COORDINATION (OEPPC) OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, Republic of the Marshall Islands	08/20/2009
Andrew Yatilman	Director, Office of Environment and Emergency Management, GEF Operational Focal Point, Federated States of Micronesia	Office of Environment and Emergency Management, Federated States of Micronesia	09/03/2008
Tererei Abete-Reema,	Director, Environment and Conservation Division, Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agricultural Development, Kiribati	Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agricultural Development, Kiribati	08/24/2009
Epeli Nasome	Director of Environment, GEF Operational Focal Point	DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT, Fiji	09/04/2009

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for project identification and preparation.

Agency Coordinator, Agency name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Maryam Niamir-Fuller, Director, UNEP-DGEF		08/18/2009	Christine Wellington-Moore	+1 (202) 974-1303	Christine.wellington-moore@unep.org

