

GEF Council Meeting
November 16 – 18, 2010
Washington, D.C.

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWING AND UPDATING THE NIP UNDER THE STOCKHOLM CONVENTION ON POPs

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| OVERVIEW OF PROGRESS UNDER THE NIP PROGRAM | 3 |
| Context of the NIP process | 3 |
| Lessons learned and challenges | 4 |
| COUNTRY ELIGIBILITY FOR NIP UPDATE | 4 |
| ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED FOR REVIEWING AND UPDATING THE NIPs | 5 |
| Coordination mechanism | 5 |
| Inventories of new POPs and assessment of national capacities | 5 |
| Priority setting..... | 6 |
| Development of specific Action Plans for the new POPs..... | 7 |
| Endorsement of the NIP and transmission of the NIP to the COP | 7 |
| PROCEDURES FOR PROCESSING PROPOSALS FOR GEF ASSISTANCE ON THE PROCESS OF UPDATING THE NIP | 7 |
| Annex 1: Characteristics of the new POPs (based on POPRC's evaluation) | 8 |
| Annex 2: Status of POPs National Plans | 14 |
| Annex 3: Request for Enabling Activities (Agencies)..... | 23 |
| Annex 4: Request for Enabling Activities (Direct Access)..... | 29 |

INTRODUCTION

1. The Global Environment Facility (GEF), as the principal entity entrusted with operations of the financial mechanism of the Stockholm Convention, provides financing to country driven projects consistent with guidance approved by the Conference of the Parties on policy, strategy, program priorities and eligibility. The assistance of the GEF for the development and strengthening of capacity building aims at enabling the recipient country to fulfill its obligations under the Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) Convention. In that respect, the preparation of the National Implementation Plans (NIPs) and the reviewing and updating of the NIPs are undertaken in accordance with the provisions of article 7 of the Convention which stipulates that:

Each Party shall:

- (a) Develop and endeavor to implement a plan for the implementation of its obligations under this Convention;
- (b) Transmit its implementation plan to the Conference of the Parties within two years of the date on which this Convention enters into force for it; and
- (c) Review and update, as appropriate, its implementation plans on a periodic basis and in a manner to be specified by a decision of the Conference of the Parties.

2. The 4th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP) of the Stockholm Convention met from April 24 to 29, 2009 in Geneva, Switzerland and made decisions to amend the Convention by adding nine new POPs in Annexes A, B and C of the Convention. These new POPs include three (3) pesticides, five (5) industrial chemicals and two (2) by-products (See Annex 1: Characteristics of the nine new POPs).

3. Following the amendments of the Stockholm Convention to list nine additional chemicals as persistent organic pollutants, countries will have to review and update their national implementation plan and transmit the NIPs two years following the entry into force of the amendments to the COP (August 2012). The updated NIP should provide a framework for a country to develop and implement, in a systematic and participatory way, priority policy and regulatory reforms, capacity building, and investment programs.

4. The process of updating the NIPs will enable countries to establish inventories of products/articles containing new POPs and industrial processes using new POPs and will also provide useful information on the concentration levels and distribution of new POPs across the different regions of the world.

5. Taking the above into consideration, the GEF has included in the chemicals strategy for GEF-5 a provision for updating and reviewing the NIPs. The main focus of the GEF's assistance regarding this process is the identification of the nine new POPs with the view to assessing their

socio-economic, environmental and health implications at national levels and developing action plans for reduction and phase out activities.

6. This paper provides an overview of progress under the NIP program; country eligibility criteria and reasoning; a description of activities relative to the NIP update process and sequencing; and the expedited procedures for processing proposals for GEF assistance.

7. The annexes attached to the present document contain useful information about the rationale of the GEF intervention and could help facilitate the work related to the NIP update process.

Annex 1: Characteristics of the nine new POPs

Annex 2: Status of GEF approval and submission of NIPs to the Stockholm Convention Secretariat

Annex 3: Request for Enabling Activities (Agencies)

Annex 4: Request for Enabling Activities (Direct Access)

OVERVIEW OF PROGRESS UNDER THE NIP PROGRAM

Context of the NIP process

1. During the period preceding the entry into force of the Convention, developing countries and countries with economies in transition signatory to the Convention or in the process of ratification, were eligible for funding for enabling activities (EA), mainly for the preparation of the national implementation plans. These plans have been prepared following the May 2001 GEF Council approved document “Initial guidelines for Enabling Activities for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants.”
2. With the exception of China, India and Brazil, which have applied for Full Size Projects (FSPs) to prepare their NIPs, eligible countries, have received up to \$500,000 under expedited approval procedure for the preparation of the NIPs.
3. As of September 2010 the GEF has funded the preparation of the initial NIP for the Stockholm Convention in 138 countries providing total grant funding of US\$ 68 million to signatories of the Convention. As shown in Annex 2: Status of GEF approval and Submission of NIPs, 96 countries - representing 70% of the GEF funded countries - have officially submitted their NIPs to the Convention Secretariat.
4. A large number of countries submitted their NIP between 2005 and 2007 and most of these countries are now implementing post NIPs projects at national, regional and global levels.
5. Thirty-one (31) countries, including 24 Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and 3 Countries with Economies in Transition (CEITs) have not yet submitted a NIP. However the majority of these countries have a NIP or draft NIP ready, pending government approval and submission to the Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention. This group of countries also includes 2 emerging countries in which the NIP process was somewhat longer due to the magnitude of POPs issues. In both cases Agencies reported that an advanced draft is already available. The GEF Secretariat together with Agencies and the Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention, through awareness workshops is encouraging these countries to finalize and submit their NIPs.
6. Only 7 countries, including 2 LDCs, 3 SIDS and two middle income countries have not ratified the Convention and therefore are not formally required to submit a NIP.
7. The GEF’s approach to assist signatory countries on the preparation of their NIPs has proven to be a relatively productive as a means for promoting the ratification of the Convention. Indeed, 95% of the countries that received support for NIPs are parties to the Convention and are implementing or are in the process of implementing its related provisions.

Lessons learned and challenges

8. In some countries, the NIP process has taken a long time to finalize due to insufficient human resources, changes in government structure systems, inefficient bureaucratic procedures, and long approval procedures in Governments.

9. In many countries, inter-ministerial coordination was something new, leading to a NIP approach managed by a single entity in the country, which resulted in a NIP document that was not fully accepted or even considered in the national plan.

10. However, it should be recognized that this first round of Enabling Activities/NIP projects provided a very valuable platform for bringing together the relevant ministries, national agencies and other stakeholders for enhancing understanding of the POPs question and its global context, the Stockholm Convention and the need for action at country level.

11. Challenges encountered during the NIP development process include: weak technical capacities; insufficient human resource capacities and infrastructure for chemicals management in least developing countries; and the absence of regulatory and policy frameworks for management of POPs. In large populated countries with decentralized government systems the main challenges are: absence of information on historically contaminated sites; difficulty of conducting inventories due to fragmented responsibilities; and weak consultation/slow agreement on approaches and plans. In large countries with centralized government systems the main challenges are: weak communication; lack of engagement of the far regions; and heavy bureaucratic procedures.

12. The above lessons learned and challenges encountered in the preparation of the NIPs will constitute an important starting point for the process of reviewing and updating the NIPs. Countries are encouraged to use existing frameworks (e.g., National Coordinating Committees) and take stock in implementation experiences (e.g., national coordination, comparative advantages of Agencies, use of trained personnel during the NIP process).

COUNTRY ELIGIBILITY FOR NIP UPDATE

13. Developing countries and countries with economies in transition that have completed and submitted NIPs - and that are parties to the Convention and to its amendments - will be eligible for funding for the NIP update process. The update process will also assist countries with on-going NIP activities to include issues related to new POPs for timely submittal of an updated NIP to the Stockholm Convention that addresses the new obligations under the amendments. Countries that have not prepared an initial NIP will have to include the assessment of all POPs in their request for NIP preparation.

ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED FOR REVIEWING AND UPDATING THE NIPS

14. The GEF will provide up to \$ US 250,000 per country, under expedited approval procedures using the templates as illustrated in Annexes 3 and 4. This level of funding is based on the assumption that countries have already established important steps (e.g., National Coordinating Committees, assessment of national infrastructure, etc...) that do not need to be repeated. Update work will principally focus on inventorying new POPs and identifying priorities actions related to reduction and phase out activities. Considering the above, the NIP update process should be deployed and implemented within a 12-month period and therefore allow countries to engage with the implementation of priorities that would be identified during the process.

15. The process will broadly follow the step-wise process as set out in the GEF's "Initial Guidelines for Enabling Activities for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants" (GEF/C.17/04, April 6, 2001) and "Guidance for Developing a National Implementation Plan for the Stockholm Convention" (UNEP/POPS/COP.2/INF/7, May 2005) as adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention. Furthermore, it is expected that countries will make the best use of the general and technical guidance documents recently developed by the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee (POPRC) including:

- The 9 new POPs;
- Feasible flame-retardant alternatives to commercial pentabromodiphenyl ether;
- considerations related to alternatives and substitutes for listed persistent organic pollutants and candidate chemicals; and
- The 9 New POPs Risk management evaluations (2005 – 2008) POPRC1 – POPRC4

The guidance documents of the POPRC are available at the following web-site:

<http://chm.pops.int/Convention/Media/Publications/tabid/506/language/en-US/Default.aspx>

Coordination mechanism

16. For the process of updating the NIPs, National Coordinating Committees (NCC) established during the development of NIPs should be maintained or reconstituted and should include a wide range of stakeholders from government departments (e.g., Environment, Industry, Health, Agriculture, Trade, Planning, Labor and Social Affairs, etc...) academic and research institutions, private sector and Non-Governmental Organizations.

Inventories of new POPs and assessment of national capacities

17. The inventory of products/articles containing new POPs and industrial processes using new POPs will include:

- The POPs pesticides (Alpha-hexachlorobenzene, Beta-hexachlorobenzene, chlordecone, lindane, pentachlorobenzene);

- The industrial chemicals (Hexabromodipheny, Hexabromodiphenyl ether and heptabromodipheny ether; Tetrabromodipheny ether and Pentabromodipheny ether, Pentachlorobenzene, Perfluorooctane sulfonic acid (PFOS), its salts and perfluorooctane sulfonyl fluoride (FPOS-F)
- Unintentional production (Alpha and Beta hexachlorohexane, Pentachlorobenzene, pentachlorobenzene); and
- Products contaminated with the new POPs and contaminated sites.

18. The characteristics of the nine new POPs as outlined in Annex 1 could provide a basis for a country to streamline the inventory process and the development of phase out and reduction/disposal action plans.

19. The assessment of national capacities to manage the new POPs should include:

- Reviewing the regulatory framework pertaining to POPs management;
- Assessing monitoring, analytical and enforcement capacities for the new POPs; and
- Assessing socio-economic implications of new POPs use and reduction and phase out.

20. Through a GEF funded project, a comprehensive set of guidelines for establishing inventories of products/articles containing new POPs and industrial processes using new POPs as well as on regulatory frameworks, labeling of products/articles and Best Available Techniques/Best Environmental Practices for industrial chemicals will be developed. The project, titled “Development of the guidelines for updating of National Implementation Plans (NIPs) under the Stockholm Convention taking into account the new POPs added to the Convention” will be implemented by UNIDO partnering with the Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention and other Agencies as relevant. It is expected that these guidelines will be ready before COP 5 (24 – 29 April 2011) and made available to countries for the process of the NIP update.

21. Countries can start the process for NIP updates as early as desired following securing funds from the GEF. In order to prepare a comprehensive work product, however, countries are encouraged to use the guidelines described above once they become available. The GEF Secretariat will make sure that the two processes (initiation of the NIP update process and the finalization of the guidelines) will be well coordinated to keep the NIP update process within a reasonable deadline.

Priority setting

22. The prioritization of actions related to the management of the new POPs should take into account health, environmental, and socio-economic impact and the availability of alternative solutions; and the determination of national objectives in relation to priority POPs issues.

Development of specific Action Plans for the new POPs

23. Actions plans for the implementation of the updated NIP will include:

- Identification of management options, including phasing out and risk reduction options;
- Determination of the need for the introduction of technologies, including technology transfer and possibilities for developing alternatives;
- Assessment of the costs and benefits of management options; and
- Development of a national strategy for information exchange, education, communication and awareness raising, taking into account the risk perception of POPs by the public;

Endorsement of the NIP and transmission of the NIP to the COP

24. The revised and updated NIP update should be validated through a national consultation and endorsed by the appropriate government body and submitted through the Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention to the Conference of Parties.

PROCEDURES FOR PROCESSING PROPOSALS FOR GEF ASSISTANCE ON THE PROCESS OF UPDATING THE NIP

25. The GEF Council at its 2010 June meeting approved the proposal for eligible national entities in recipient countries to receive resources from the GEF Trust Fund directly for national reporting including the preparation of NIP and the reviewing and updating of the NIP.

26. Recipient countries will be able to choose whether to apply for grants to support the development of Convention Reports through one of the ten GEF Agencies or directly with the GEF Secretariat.

27. The GEF will fund 100% of the agreed cost of EAs. EA funding proposals should be consistent with the GEF's operational principles including the following:

- Country centered approach: A proposal must include a letter of endorsement from the Country's GEF Operational Focal Point;
- Proposals should build on existing knowledge and activities, in particular on the initial NIP;
- GEF resources should be used efficiently; and
- Local and regional expertise should be used wherever possible.

Characteristics of the new POPs *

| The new POPs | Annexes of the Convention | Use and production | POPs characteristics | Replacement possibilities |
|---|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| <p>Chlordecone</p> <p>Chemically related to Mirex, a pesticide listed in Annex A of the Convention</p> | Annex A without specific exemption | Synthetic chlorinated organic compound mainly used as an agricultural pesticide. Currently, no use or production of the chemical is reported. | Highly persistent in the environment, has a high potential for bioaccumulation and biomagnification and based on physico-chemical properties and modeling data, chlordecone can be transported for long distances. It is classified as a possible human carcinogen and is very toxic to aquatic organisms. | Alternatives to chlordecone exist and can be implemented inexpensively. Many countries have already banned its sale and use. The main objective to phase out chlordecone would be to identify and manage obsolete stockpiles and wastes. |
| <p>Hexabromobiphenyl</p> <p>Group of polybrominated biphenyls, which are brominated hydrocarbons formed by substituting hydrogen with bromine in</p> | Annex A without specific exemption | Industrial chemical that has been used as a flame retardant, mainly in the 1970s. No longer produced or used in most countries (Stocks?) | The chemical is highly persistent in the environment, highly bioaccumulative and has a strong possibility for long-range environmental transport. As hexabromobiphenyl is classified as a possible | Alternatives are available for all uses of hexabromobiphenyl, so prohibiting its use and production is feasible and inexpensive. This chemical is already subject to several national and international regulations, restricting its use and production |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| biphenyl. | | | human carcinogen and has other chronic toxic effects, the Committee recommended its listing as a POP. | |
| Hexabromodiphenyl ether and heptabromodiphenyl ether Hexabromodiphenyl ether and heptabromodiphenyl ether are the main components of commercial octabromodiphenyl ether . | Annex A with a specific exemption for use as articles containing these chemicals for recycling in accordance with the provision in part IV of Annex A (decision SC-4/14) | Flame retardants | Commercial mixture of octaBDE is highly persistent, has a high potential for bioaccumulation and food-web biomagnification, as well as for long-range transport. The only degradation pathway is through debromination and producing other bromodiphenyl ethers. | Alternatives generally exist and there is no information about any current production. However, it is reported that many articles in use still contain these chemicals. |
| Alpha hexachlorocyclohexane (alpha-HCH) | Annex A without specific exemption | Although the intentional use of alpha-HCH as an insecticide was phased out years ago, this chemical is still produced as unintentional by-product of lindane. For each ton of lindane produced, around 6-10 tons of the | Alpha-HCH is highly persistent in water in colder regions and may bioaccumulate and biomagnify in biota and arctic food webs. This chemical is subject to long-range transport, is classified as potentially carcinogenic to humans | Today, alpha-HCH is only produced unintentionally during the production of lindane. Releases also occur from stockpiles and contaminated sites. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | other isomers including alpha- and beta-HCH are created. Large stockpiles of alpha- and beta-HCH are therefore present in the environment. | and adversely affects wildlife and human health in contaminated regions. | |
| Beta hexachlorocyclohexane | Annex A without specific exemption | Although the intentional use of beta-HCH as an insecticide was phased out years ago, this chemical is still produced as unintentional by-product of lindane. For each ton of lindane produced, around 6-10 tons of the other isomers including alpha- and beta-HCH are created. Large stockpiles of alpha- and beta-HCH are therefore present in the environment. | Beta-HCH is highly persistent in water in colder regions and may bioaccumulate and biomagnify in biota and arctic food webs. This chemical is subject to long-range transport, is classified as potentially carcinogenic to humans and adversely affects wildlife and human health in contaminated regions. | Today, beta-HCH is only produced unintentionally during the production of lindane. Releases also occur from stockpiles and contaminated sites. |
| Lindane Common name for the gamma isomer of hexachlorocyclohexane (HCH). Technical HCH is an isomeric mixture | Annex A with a specific exemption for use as a human health pharmaceutical for control of head lice | Lindane has been used as a broad-spectrum insecticide for seed and soil treatment, foliar applications, tree and wood treatment and | Lindane is persistent, bioaccumulates easily in the food chain and bioconcentrates rapidly. There is evidence for long-range transport and | Alternatives for lindane are generally available, except for use as a human health pharmaceutical to control head lice and scabies. Regulations on the production, use and |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| that contains mainly five forms, namely alpha-, beta-, gamma-, delta- and epsilon-HCH. | and scabies as second line treatment | against ectoparasites in both veterinary and human applications. The production of lindane has decreased rapidly in the last few years and only few countries are still known to produce lindane | toxic effects (immunotoxic, reproductive and developmental effects) in laboratory animals and aquatic organisms. | monitoring of lindane already exist in several countries. |
| Pentachlorobenzene (PeCB) Group of chlorobenzenes that are characterized by a benzene ring in which the hydrogen atoms are substituted by one or more chlorines. | Annex A without specific exemption and under C | PeCB was used in PCB products, in dyestuff carriers, as a fungicide, a flame retardant and as a chemical intermediate e.g. previously for the production of quintozone (or pentachloronitobenzene used as fungicide). PeCB might still be used as an intermediate. PeCB is also produced unintentionally during combustion, thermal and industrial processes. It also present as impurities in products such as solvents or pesticides. | PeCB is persistent in the environment, highly bioaccumulative and has a potential for long-range environmental transport. It is moderately toxic to humans and very toxic to aquatic organisms. | The production of PeCB ceased some decades ago in the main producer countries, as efficient and cost-effective alternatives are available. Applying Best Available Techniques and Best Environmental Practices would significantly reduce the unintentional production of PeCB. |
| Perfluorooctane | Annex B with | PFOS is both | PFOS is extremely | While alternatives to PFOS are |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <p>sulfonic acid (PFOS), its salts and perfluorooctane sulfonyl fluoride (PFOS-F)</p> <p>PFOS fully fluorinated anion, which is commonly used as a salt or incorporated into larger polymers. PFOS and its closely related compounds, which may contain PFOS impurities or substances that can result in PFOS, are members of the large family of perfluoroalkyl sulfonate substances.</p> | <p>acceptable purposes and specific exemptions</p> | <p>intentionally produced and an unintended degradation product of related anthropogenic chemicals. The current intentional use of PFOS is widespread and includes: electric and electronic parts, fire fighting foam, photo imaging, hydraulic fluids and textiles. PFOS is still produced in several countries.</p> <p>Page 3</p> | <p>persistent and has substantial bioaccumulating and biomagnifying properties, although it does not follow the classic pattern of other POPs by partitioning into fatty tissues but instead binds to proteins in the blood and the liver. It has a capacity to undergo long-range transport and also fulfills the toxicity criteria of the Stockholm Convention.</p> | <p>available for some applications, this is not always the case in developing countries where existing alternatives may need to be phased in. For some applications like photo imaging, semi-conductor or aviation hydraulic fluids, technically feasible alternatives to PFOS are not available to date.</p> |
| <p>Tetrabromodiphenyl ether and pentabromodiphenyl ether</p> <p>Main components of commercial pentabromodiphenyl ether.</p> | <p>Annex A with a specific exemption for use as articles containing these chemicals for recycling in accordance with the provision in part IV of Annex A (decision SC-4/18)</p> | <p>Used as additive flame retardants</p> | <p>Commercial mixture of pentaBDE is highly persistent in the environment, bioaccumulative and has a high potential for long-range environmental transport. These chemicals have been detected in humans in all regions. There is evidence</p> | <p>Alternatives are available and used to replace these substances in many countries, although they might also have adverse effects on human health and the environment. Alternatives might not be available for use in military airplanes. The identification and also handling of equipment and wastes containing brominated</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | | of its potential for toxic effects in wildlife, including mammals | diphenyl ethers is considered a challenge. |
|--|--|--|---|---|

*Based on POPRC's evaluation

Status of POPs National Plans
for the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention:
Status of GEF Approval and Submission to the SCS

| Country | Date of GEF | Date of ratification | Agencies | Date of NIP submission Or status of NIP preparation |
|---------------------|-------------|----------------------|------------|--|
| Albania | 25-Sep-03 | 04-Oct-04 | UNDP | 12-Feb-07 |
| Algeria | 14-Nov-01 | 22-Sep-06 | UNIDO | 06-Oct-07 |
| Angola | 27-Mar-08 | 23-Oct-06 | UNIDO | Inventories completed |
| Antigua And Barbuda | 03-Mar-03 | 10-Sep-03 | UNEP | 26-Nov-08 |
| Argentina | 10-Feb-03 | 25-Jan-05 | UNEP | 25-Apr-07 |
| Armenia | 14-Nov-01 | 26-Nov-03 | UNIDO | 29-Apr-06 |
| Azerbaijan | 25-Aug-04 | 13-Jan-04 | UNIDO | 15-Jan-10 |
| Bahamas | 27-Oct-05 | 03-Oct-05 | UNEP | Not submitted Project still ongoing |
| Bangladesh | 27-Mar-02 | 12-Mar-07 | UNDP | 08-May-09 |
| Barbados | 29-Apr-02 | 07-Jun-04 | | 10-Dec-07 |
| Belarus | 28-May-04 | 03-Feb-04 | World Bank | 17-Jan-07 |
| Belize | 17-Feb-05 | 25-Jan-10 | UNDP | Submission expected end of 2010 |
| Benin | 22-Nov-02 | 05-Jan-04 | UNEP | 27-Oct-08 |
| Bolivia | 22-Feb-02 | 03-Jun-03 | UNIDO | 19-Sep-05 |
| Botswana | 01-Jul-03 | 28-Oct-02 | UNIDO | NIP completed and pending Government submission |
| Brazil | 28-Aug-06 | 16-Jun-04 | UNEP | Inventory development Submission expected December 2011 |
| Bulgaria | 29-Apr-02 | 20-Dec-04 | UNEP | 27-Sep-06 |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|---|
| Burkina Faso | 10-Apr-03 | 31-Dec-04 | UNDP | 02-Apr-07 |
| Burundi | 20-Nov-02 | 02-Aug-05 | UNIDO | 28-Mar-06 |
| Cambodia | 24-Mar-03 | 25-Aug-06 | | 03-May-07 |
| Cameroon | 10-Apr-03 | 19-May-09 | UNEP | Not submitted, currently on phase 2 of NIP dev |
| Cape Verde | 18-Oct-05 | 01-Mar-06 | UNEP | Not submitted NIP ready but not endorsed |
| Central African Republic | 22-May-02 | 12-Feb-08 | UNIDO | 08-Oct-08 |
| Chad | 13-Jun-02 | 10-Mar-06 | UNIDO | 28-Apr-06 |
| Chile | 29-Apr-02 | 20-Jan-05 | UNEP | 30-May-06 |
| China | 09-Sep-04 | 12-Aug-04 | UNIDO | 18-Apr-07 |
| Colombia | 10-Jun-02 | 22-Oct-08 | World Bank | 11-Aug-10 |
| Comoros | 31-Jul-03 | 23-Feb-07 | UNDP | 29-Jan-08 |
| Congo, Rep of | 19-Apr-02 | 12-Feb-07 | UNDP | 27-Feb-07 |
| Cook Islands | 03-Mar-08 | 29-Jun-04 | UNDP | Not submitted Submitted expected 2011 |
| Costa Rica | 10-Dec-04 | 06-Feb-07 | | 04-May-09 |
| Cote d'Ivoire | 09-Oct-01 | 20-Jan-04 | UNEP | 24-May-06 |
| Croatia | 14-Nov-01 | 30-Jan-07 | | 12-Mar-09 |
| Cuba | 08-Jul-03 | 21-Dec-07 | UNEP | NIP finalized but not submitted yet. |
| Czech Republic | 31-Jul-01 | 06-Aug-02 | UNIDO | 08-May-06 |
| Congo, Dem. Rep. of | 14-Feb-07 | 23-Mar-05 | UNDP | 07-Jun-10 |
| Djibouti | 22-Nov-02 | 11-Mar-04 | UNIDO | 01-Jun-07 |
| Dominica | 03-Mar-05 | 08-Aug-03 | UNEP | Not submitted. Draft NIP available |
| Dominican Republic | 30-Mar-06 | 04-May-07 | UNDP | 07-May-09 |
| Ecuador | 29-Apr-02 | 07-Jun-04 | UNEP | 06-Sep-06 |
| Egypt | 03-Sep-02 | 02-May-03 | UNIDO | 16-Mar-06 |
| El Salvador | 13-Mar-06 | 27-May-08 | UNDP | Not submitted Draft NIP available |
| Eritrea | 13-Feb-07 | 10-Mar-05 | UNIDO | Inventories |

| | | | | |
|---------------|-----------|----------------|-------|--|
| | | | | completed and validation workshop held |
| Ethiopia | 29-Jul-02 | 09-Jan-03 | UNIDO | 09-Mar-07 |
| Fiji | 20-Dec-01 | 20-Jun-01 | UNEP | 21-Jun-06 |
| Gabon | 20-Nov-02 | 07-May-07 | UNIDO | 08-May-08 |
| Gambia | 22-May-02 | 28-Apr-06 | UNEP | 21-May-09 |
| Georgia | 10-Feb-03 | 04-Oct-06 | UNIDO | Not submitted Submission expected November 2010 |
| Ghana | 29-Oct-01 | 30-May-03 | UNIDO | 21-Jan-08 |
| Guatemala | 19-Apr-02 | 30-Jul-08 | UNEP | Not submitted NIP in Government hands for SC Sec submission soon. |
| Guinea | 29-Apr-02 | 11-Dec-07 | UNEP | 22-Apr-10 |
| Guinea-Bissau | 07-Jul-04 | 06-Aug-08 | UNEP | Not submitted NIP pending UNEP audit |
| Guyana | 26-Jan-10 | Not ratified* | UNEP | Not submitted. Project was only approved January 2010. Country has begun stakeholder consultations and is putting together consultancies to conduct their NIP. |
| Haiti | 03-Sep-02 | Not ratified * | UNEP | Not submitted Pending UNEP audit |
| Honduras | 22-Mar-04 | 23-May-05 | UNDP | 13-Jan-10 |

| | | | | |
|------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|---|
| Hungary | 01-Aug-01 | 14-Mar-08 | UNEP | 21-Jun-10 |
| India | 14-Jun-07 | 13-Jan-06 | UNIDO | NIP drafting started and will be submitted March 2011 |
| Indonesia | 14-Nov-01 | 28-Sep-09 | UNIDO | 15-Apr-10 |
| Iran | 13-Feb-02 | 06-Feb-06 | UNDP | 02-Aug-08 |
| Jamaica | 22-Nov-02 | 01-Jun-07 | UNEP | Not submitted Submission expected End of 2010 |
| Jordan | 13-Jun-02 | 08-Nov-04 | UNEP | 26-Dec-06 |
| Kazakhstan | 21-Dec-01 | 09-Nov-07 | UNEP | 25-Feb-10 |
| Kenya | 09-Oct-01 | 24-Sep-04 | UNEP | 14-Apr-07 |
| Kiribati | 22-Nov-02 | 07-Sep-04 | UNEP | Not submitted Draft NIP available, submission pending Government approval process |
| Korea DPR | 08-Dec-03 | 26-Aug-02 | UNDP | 25-Nov-08 |
| Kyrgyzstan | 05-Aug-03 | 12-Dec-06 | UNEP | 02-Apr-09 |
| Lao PDR | 19-Apr-02 | 28-Jun-06 | UNIDO | 11-Aug-10 |
| Latvia | 30-Jul-02 | 28-Oct-04 | UNDP | 07-Jun-05 |
| Lebanon | 29-Apr-02 | 03-Jan-03 | UNEP | 17-May-06 |
| Lesotho | 19-Apr-02 | 23-Jan-02 | UNIDO | 26-Feb-09 |
| Liberia | 27-Jan-03 | 23-May-02 | UNIDO | 20-Mar-08 |
| Lithuania | 10-Mar-03 | 05-Dec-06 | UNDP | 6-Apr-07 |
| Macedonia | 14-Nov-01 | 27-May-04 | UNIDO | 02-Sep-05 |
| Madagascar | 24-Mar-03 | 18-Nov-05 | UNEP | 25-Sep-08 |
| Malaysia | 29-Apr-02 | Not ratified * | UNEP | Not submitted NIP completed but lacks endorsement. Malaysia is not a Party to the SC. |
| Malawi | 03-Sep-02 | 27-Feb-09 | UNIDO | 15-Feb-10 |
| Mali | 29-Apr-02 | 05-Sep-03 | UNEP | 09-Aug-06 |
| Marshall Islands | 10-Apr-03 | 27-Jan-03 | UNEP | 11-Aug-09 |
| Mauritania | 20-Dec-01 | 22-Jul-05 | UNEP | 19-Mar-10 |
| Mauritius | 03-Sep-02 | 13-Jul-04 | UNDP | 11-Oct-06 |
| Mexico | 03-Jun-04 | 10-Feb-03 | World | 02-Feb-08 |

| | | | Bank | |
|------------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|---|
| Micronesia | 29-Apr-02 | 15-Jul-05 | UNEP | Not submitted Draft NIP completed, submission pending Government approval |
| Moldova | 25-Apr-02 | 07-Apr-04 | World Bank | 25-Aug-05 |
| Mongolia | 30-Jul-02 | 30-Apr-04 | UNIDO | 08-Jan-08 |
| Montenegro | 15-Dec-08 | | UNEP | Not submitted Under implementation |
| Morocco | 19-Apr-02 | 15-Jun-04 | UNDP | 02-May-06 |
| Mozambique | 22-May-02 | 31-Oct-05 | UNEP | 12-Aug-08 |
| Nauru | 03-Jul-03 | 09-May-02 | UNEP | Not submitted NIP drafting (phase 3) |
| Nepal | 22-May-02 | 06-Mar-07 | UNIDO | 25-Sep-07 |
| Nicaragua | 13-Aug-03 | 01-Dec-05 | UNDP | 29-Apr-06 |
| Niger | 06-May-02 | 12-Apr-06 | UNIDO | NIP has been completed and pending Government submission |
| Nigeria | 14-Nov-01 | 24-May-04 | UNIDO | 29-Apr-09 |
| Niue | 28-Aug-02 | 02-Sep-05 | UNDP | 25-Jan-05 |
| Oman | 31-Jul-03 | 19-Jan-05 | UNEP | 03-Feb-09 |
| Pakistan | 28-Aug-02 | 17-Apr-08 | UNDP | 15-Dec-09 |
| Palau | 06-May-03 | Not ratified * | UNEP | Not submitted NIP drafting ongoing |
| Panama | 21-Apr-05 | 05-Mar-03 | UNEP | 10-Feb-09 |
| Papua New Guinea | 29-Apr-02 | 07-Oct-03 | UNEP | Not submitted submission pending Government approval |
| Paraguay | 12-Nov-03 | 01-Apr-04 | UNEP | 21-Jun-10 |
| Peru | 19-Dec-03 | 14-Sep-05 | UNEP | 19-Dec-07 |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|--|
| Philippines | 22-Oct-01 | 27-Feb-04 | UNDP | 19-Jun-06 |
| Poland | 01-Aug-01 | 23-Oct-08 | UNIDO | NIP completed and pending Government submission |
| Romania | 04-Oct-01 | 28-Oct-04 | UNIDO | 12-Apr-06 |
| Russian Federation | 16-Sep-09 | Not ratified * | UNEP | Not submitted execution, phase 2 |
| Rwanda | 08-Jan-03 | 05-Jun-02 | UNIDO | 30-May-07 |
| Samoa | 18-Sep-01 | 04-Feb-02 | UNDP | 21-Jun-07 |
| Sao Tome and Principe | 20-Nov-02 | 12-Apr-06 | UNIDO | 12-Apr-07 |
| Senegal | 24-Mar-03 | 08-Oct-03 | UNEP | 26-Apr-07 |
| Serbia | 10-Apr-03 | 31-July-09 | UNEP | 29-Jun-10 |
| Seychelles | 20-Nov-02 | 03-Jun-08 | UNIDO | NIP completed and pending Government submission |
| Sierra Leone | 07-Feb-06 | 26-Sep-03 | UNIDO | 11-Mar-09 |
| Slovak Republic | 04-Oct-01 | 05-Aug-02 | UNDP | 12-Dec-06 |
| Slovenia | 29-Apr-02 | 04-May-04 | UNEP | 02-Feb-10 |
| South Africa | 03-Sep-02 | 04-Sep-02 | UNEP | Not submitted Draft NIP to be completed by March 2010. |
| Sri Lanka | 13-Jun-02 | 22-Dec-05 | UNEP | 28-Sep-07 |
| St. Lucia | 08-Jul-03 | 04-Oct-02 | UNEP | 10-Jul-07 |
| Sudan | 08-Jan-03 | 29-Aug-06 | UNDP | 04-Sep-07 |
| Suriname | 07-Feb-06 | Not ratified * | UNDP | Not submitted Final stage Submission expected Early 2011 |
| Swaziland | 25-Mar-08 | 13-Jan-06 | UNIDO | Not submitted Draft NIP completed |
| Syria | 03-Sep-02 | 05-Aug-05 | UNEP | 23-Mar-09 |
| Tajikistan | 13-Aug-03 | 08-Feb-07 | UNEP | 14-Nov-07 |
| Tanzania | 14-Nov-01 | 30-Apr-04 | UNIDO | 12-Jun-06 |
| Thailand | 06-May-03 | 31-Jan-05 | UNEP | 07-Aug-08 |
| Togo | 14-Nov-01 | 22-Jul-04 | UNIDO | 13-Oct-06 |
| Tonga | 22-Nov-02 | 23-Oct-09 | UNEP | Not submitted Draft NIP |

| | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|--|
| | | | | completed, submission pending government approval |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 07-Feb-06 | 13-Dec-02 | UNDP | Not submitted Initial stage – Submission expected end of 2011 |
| Tunisia | 14-Nov-01 | 17-Jun-04 | UNEP | 30-Jan-07 |
| Turkey | 17-Dec-02 | 14-Oct-09 | UNIDO | NIP completed and submitted <i>Not seen in the SCS website</i> |
| Tuvalu | 17-Feb-05 | 19-Jan-04 | UNEP | 05-Mar-09 |
| Uganda | 09-Mar-05 | 20-Jul-04 | UNEP | 13-Jan-09 |
| Ukraine | 06-May-03 | 25-Sep-07 | UNEP | Not submitted NIP completed awaiting approval from the parliament |
| Uruguay | 13-Jun-02 | 09-Sep-04 | UNEP | 01-Jun-06 |
| Vanuatu | 24-Mar-03 | 16-Sep-05 | UNEP | Not submitted NIP plans drafting. |
| Venezuela | 20-Nov-02 | 19-Apr-05 | UNIDO | 12-Aug-09 |
| Vietnam | 18-Sep-01 | 22-Jul-02 | UNDP | 11-Sep-07 |
| Yemen | 22-May-02 | 09-Jan-04 | UNEP | Not submitted draft NIP probably available |
| Zambia | 29-Apr-02 | 07-Jul-06 | UNEP | 11-May-09 |
| Zimbabwe | 22-Nov-02 | Not ratified * | UNEP | Not submitted country has as per June 2010 started again to prepare for NIP formulation. expected completion date: June 2012 |

*If 'Not ratified,' country is not yet a Party and therefore not formally required to submit its NIP. However, these countries are eligible for GEF funding.



**REQUEST FOR (select) ENABLING ACTIVITY
PROPOSAL FOR FUNDING UNDER THE GEF TRUST FUND**

PART I: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

| | | | |
|--|----------|------------------------------|--|
| Project Title: | | | |
| Country(ies): SIDS <input type="checkbox"/> LDC <input type="checkbox"/> | | GEF Project ID: ¹ | |
| GEF Agency: | (select) | GEF Agency Project ID: | |
| Other Executing Partner(s): | | Submission Date: | |
| GEF Focal Area (s): | (select) | Project Duration(Months) | |
| | | Agency Fee (\$): | |

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²:

| Focal Area Objectives | 1.2 Expected FA Outcomes | Expected FA Outputs | GEF Grant (\$) | Indicative Cofinancing (\$) |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|
| (select) (select) | | | | |
| (select) (select) | | | | |
| (select) (select) | | | | |
| (select) (select) | | | | |
| (select) (select) | | | | |
| (select) (select) | Others | | | |
| Project management cost ³ | | | | |
| Total Enabling Activity Cost | | | 0 | 0 |

B. ENABLING ACTIVITY FRAMEWORK

| 1.1.4 EA Objective: | | | | | |
|---------------------|------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------|------------------|
| EA Component | Grant Type | Expected Outcomes | 1.8 Expected Outputs | GEF Grant (\$) | Cofinancing (\$) |
| | (select) | | | | |
| | (select) | | | | |
| | (select) | | | | |
| | (select) | | | | |
| | (select) | | | | |

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the reference attached on the Focal Area Results Framework when filling up the table in item A.

³ GEF will finance management cost that is solely linked to GEF financing of the project.

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--|--|---|---|
| | (select) | | | | |
| | (select) | | | | |
| | (select) | | | | |
| | (select) | | | | |
| | (select) | | | | |
| EA management Cost ⁴ | | | | | |
| Total Enabling Activity Cost | | | | 0 | 0 |

⁴ Same as footnote #3.

C. CO-FINANCING FOR THE EA BY SOURCE AND BY NAME, IF AVAILABLE (\$)

| Sources of Co-financing for baseline project, if any | Name of Co-financier | Type of Cofinancing | Amount (\$) |
|--|----------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| (select) | | (select) | |
| (select) | | (select) | |
| (select) | | (select) | |
| (select) | | (select) | |
| (select) | | (select) | |
| (select) | | (select) | |
| (select) | | (select) | |
| (select) | | (select) | |
| (select) | | (select) | |
| (select) | | (select) | |
| Total Cofinancing | | | 0 |

D. EA MANAGEMENT BUDGET

| <i>Cost Items</i> | <i>Total Estimated person weeks</i> | <i>GEF (\$)</i> | <i>Other source (\$)</i> | <i>EA total (\$)</i> |
|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| <i>1.1.9 Local consultants*</i> | | | | |
| <i>1.1.10 International consultants*</i> | | | | |
| <i>1.1.11 Office facilities, equipment, and communications**</i> | | | | |
| <i>Travel**</i> | | | | |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

* Provide detailed information regarding the consultants in Annex A.

** Provide detailed information and justification for these line items.

PART II: ENABLING ACTIVITY JUSTIFICATION

- A. **ENABLING ACTIVITY BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT** (Provide brief information about projects implemented since a country became party to the convention and results achieved):
- B. **ENABLING ACTIVITY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES** (The proposal should briefly justify the need for the project. If this is an add-on activity, the gap to be filled through this additional funding should be described).
- C. **DESCRIBE THE ENABLING ACTIVITY AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR EA IMPLEMENTATION** (discuss the work intended to be undertaken and the output expected from each activity as outlined in Table B above).
- D. **DESCRIBE, IF POSSIBLE, THE EXPECTED [COST-EFFECTIVENESS](#) OF THE EA:**
- E. **DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M&E PLAN:**
- F. **EXPLANATION FOR DEVIATIONS FROM TYPICAL COST RANGES (WHERE APPLICABLE):**

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

- B. **RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT (S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT:** (Please attach the [country endorsement letter](#) with this template).

| NAME | POSITION | MINISTRY | DATE (<i>Month, day, year</i>) |
|------|----------|----------|----------------------------------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the standards of the GEF Project Review Criteria for (select) Enabling Activity approval. | | | | | |
| Agency Coordinator, Agency name | Signature | Date (<i>Month, day, year</i>) | Project Contact Person | Telephone | Email Address |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

CONSULTANTS TO BE HIRED FOR THE EA

| <i>Position Titles</i> | <i>\$/ person week</i> | <i>Estimated person weeks</i> | <i>Tasks to be performed</i> |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| For Project Management | | | |
| Local | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| International | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| For Technical Assistance | | | |
| Local | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| International | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

OPERATIONAL GUIDANCE TO FOCAL AREA ENABLING ACTIVITIES

Biodiversity

- [Revised Operational Criteria for Enabling Activities \(June 30, 1997\)](#)
- [Revised Guidelines for Additional Funding of Biodiversity Enabling Activities \(Expedited Procedures\) \(October 2000\)](#)
- [GEF/C.14/11 An Interim Assessment of Biodiversity Enabling Activities](#)
- [Guidelines for Additional Funding for Biodiversity Enabling Activities \(Expedited Procedures\) \(February 2000\)](#)

Climate Change

- [Operational Guidelines for Expedited Financing of Initial Communications from Non-Annex 1 Parties \(February 1997\)](#)
- Operational Guidelines for Expedited Financing of Climate Change Enabling Activities – Part II
- [Expedited Financing for \(Interim\) Measures for Capacity Building in Priority Areas \(October 1999\)](#)
- [Information Note on the Financing of Second National Communications to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change \(April 2000\)](#)
- [Operational Procedures for the Expedited Financing of National Communications from Non-Annex 1 Parties \(November 2003\); Annex A; Annexes B and C](#)
- [Up-dated Operational Procedures for the Expedited Financing of National Communications from Non-Annex I Parties \(November 2007\)](#)

Persistent Organic Pollutants

- [GEF/C.17/4 Initial Guidelines for Enabling Activities for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants \(April 2001\)](#)

Land Degradation

- [ICCD/CRIC \(5\)/Inf.3 National Reporting Process of Affected Country Parties: Explanatory Note and Help Guide, December 2005](#)



**POPS ENABLING ACTIVITY
PROPOSAL FOR NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
DEVELOPMENT/ UPDATE
Country Request for Direct Access to GEF Trust Fund**

PART I: ENABLINGACTIVITY IDENTIFICATION

| | | | |
|----------------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| Country: | | Executing Agency(ies): | |
| Project Title: | | | |
| GEF-5 Strategic Objective | | | |
| Total Project Costs: | | GEF Grant Amount: | |
| Submission Date: | | Project Duration: | |
| Implementation Start Date: | | Closing Date: | |

E. ENABLING ACTIVITY FRAMEWORK FOR NIP DEVELOPMENT UPDATE(Expand table as necessary)

| EA Components | Expected Outputs | GEF Financing | Co-Financing |
|-------------------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|
| | | | |
| 1. | | | |
| 2. | | | |
| 3. | | | |
| 4. | | | |
| 5. | | | |
| 6. | | | |
| 7. EA Management Budget | | | |
| Total EA costs | | | |

B. EA MANAGEMENT BUDGET

| Cost Items | Total Estimated staff weeks | GEF (\$) | Co-financing (\$) | EA total (\$) |
|---|-----------------------------|----------|-------------------|---------------|
| 1.1.12 Personnel | | | | |
| 1.1.13 Local consultants* | | | | |
| 1.1.14 International consultants* | | | | |
| 1.1.15 Office facilities, equipment, and communications** | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--------------|---|---|---|---|
| Travel** | | | | |
| Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

* Provide detailed information regarding the consultants in Annex A.

** Provide detailed information and justification for these line items.

PART II: PROPOSED ENABLING ACTIVITY**G. DESCRIBE ACTIVITIES, OUTPUTS AND INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.****H. PROVIDE LIST OF DELIVERABLES:****I. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M&E PLAN:****J. INFORMATION ON THE ORGANIZATION IN THE COUNTRY SUBMITTING THE PROPOSAL:****K. INFORMATION ON THE PROPOSED EXECUTING ORGANIZATION (if different from above).****PART III: STATUS OF EARLIER ASSISTANCE RECEIVED UNDER ENABLING ACTIVITIES:**

| National Implementation Plan submitted to Stockholm Convention | Date of Submission |
|---|---------------------------|
| Initial NIP | |

PART IV: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT**A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT:**(Please attach the [country endorsement letter](#) with this template).

| NAME | POSITION | MINISTRY | DATE |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|
| | | | |

B. COUNTRY CERTIFICATION

| This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the standards of the GEF Project Review Criteria for POPs Enabling Activity approval. | | | | | |
|---|------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Operational Focal Point | Signature | Date | Project Contact Person | Telephone | Email Address |
| | | | | | |

CONSULTANTS* TO BE HIRED FOR THE PROJECT

| Type of Consultant <i>(Local/International)</i> | Position Title | \$/week | Estimated Staff Time | Tasks to be Performed |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| | <i>For Project Management</i> | | | |
| (select) | | | | |
| (select) | | | | |
| (select) | | | | |
| (select) | | | | |
| (select) | | | | |
| | <i>For Technical Assistance</i> | | | |
| (select) | | | | |
| (select) | | | | |
| (select) | | | | |
| (select) | | | | |
| (select) | | | | |

*Attach Terms of Reference of consultants to be hired

OPERATIONAL GUIDANCE TO POPS FOCAL AREA ENABLING ACTIVITIES

Persistent Organic Pollutants

- [GEF/C.17/4 Initial Guidelines for Enabling Activities for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants \(April 2001\)](#)
- [Guidance Material on New POPs](#)