



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**

Distr.: General  
Draft of 4 March 2005

English only

---

**Conference of the Parties of the Stockholm  
Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants  
First meeting**

Punta del Este, Uruguay, 2–6 May 2005  
Item 6 of the provisional agenda\*

**Matters for consideration or action by the Conference of the Parties**

**Global Environment Facility work in support of the  
implementation of the Stockholm Convention: opportunities for  
advancing global sound management of chemicals**

**Note by the Secretariat**

The annex to the present note contains information provided by the Global Environment Facility. The annex has not been formally edited.

---

\* UNEP/POPS/COP.1/1.

**Annex**



**Global Environment Facility**

September 23, 2004

---

**GEF'S WORK IN SUPPORT TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE  
STOCKHOLM CONVENTION:**

**OPPORTUNITIES FOR ADVANCING  
GLOBAL SOUND MANAGEMENT OF CHEMICALS**

**INFORMATION PAPER FOR SUBMISSION TO THE 2<sup>ND</sup> PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR THE  
DEVELOPMENT OF A STRATEGIC APPROACH TO INTERNATIONAL CHEMICALS MANAGEMENT  
OCTOBER 4-8, 2004; NAIROBI, KENYA**

**SUBMITTED FOR INFORMATION TO THE FIRST MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE STOCKHOLM CONVENTION ON PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS**

## Table of Contents

<b>I. Introduction.....</b>	<b>4</b>
Purpose.....	4
The GEF’s Participation in the SAICM Process.....	4
Structure of this Paper.....	5
<b>2. How the GEF works.....</b>	<b>5</b>
Largest Single Source of Funding for the Global Environmental Agenda.....	5
The Three Types of GEF Programming.....	5
The GEF Functions Through Collaboration and Partnerships.....	6
Capacity Building at the GEF.....	7
<b>3. GEF’s Chemicals Related Activities.....</b>	<b>8</b>
POPs Focal Area.....	8
International Waters Focal Area.....	10
Ozone Layer Depletion Focal Area.....	11
<b>4. The NIPs Program.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>5. Opportunities for Advancing “Foundational” Capacities for SMC.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>6. Conclusion.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Appendix A: List of Countries Engaged in NIP Development with GEF Funding.....</b>	<b>15</b>

**Acronyms**

CEIT	Countries with economies in transition
COP	Conference of the Parties
EA	Executing Agency (of the GEF)
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IA	Implementing Agency (of the GEF)
IOMC	Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals
IW	International Waters (focal area)
LDC	Least Developed Countries
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreement
NIP	National Implementation Plan (for the Stockholm Convention)
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
OP	Operational Program (of the GEF)
POPs	Persistent Organic Pollutants
SAICM	Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
SMC	Sound Management of Chemicals
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
WB	World Bank

## I. INTRODUCTION

### Purpose

1. This information document is submitted to the second meeting of the Preparatory Committee (PrepCom2) of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) process as a means of informing the SAICM of the activities of the GEF related to global sound management of chemicals (SMC).

2. This paper addresses two main questions:

- (i) What set of activities and programs is the GEF supporting as the financial mechanism for the Stockholm Convention?<sup>1</sup>
- (ii) When can the GEF help to advance broader sound management of chemicals objectives in the context of fulfilling its core function as a financial mechanism for the Stockholm Convention and through its other focal areas, in particular International Waters and Ozone Layer Depletion?

3. This paper is developed consistent with the overarching mandate and operating principles of the GEF, the POPs focal area established by the GEF in 2002, and the focal area's related Operational Programme (OP) for POPs #14. Other relevant focal areas are also discussed.

4. Additionally, this paper is consistent with the *Strategic Approach to Enhance Capacity Building* previously considered by the GEF Council, in particular with respect to how its principles and modalities apply to POPs, including targeted capacity building, strengthening capacity building elements, and critical needs of Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDs).

### The GEF's Participation in the SAICM Process

5. The GEF Secretariat is a member of the SAICM Steering Committee. The GEF participated at PrepCom 1. The GEF representative took note of comments by PrepCom 1 participants that the GEF be involved in the SAICM process, and that the GEF SAICM Preparatory Committee be kept apprised of developments with respect to the GEF, in particular with respect to work by the GEF Council to develop a strategic approach for the enhancement of capacity-building.

6. The GEF representative at PrepCom 1 commented that the GEF's mandate as interim financial mechanism for the Stockholm Convention and the GEF operational programme on persistent organic pollutants reinforced the GEF's strong interest in the SAICM process. GEF-sponsored enabling activities covering chemicals are supportive of capacity building programmes and activities in many developing countries and countries with economies in transition that could usefully address concrete measures identified by a SAICM. While the GEF mandate does not allow funding of meetings, the GEF looks forward

---

<sup>1</sup> Art. 14 of the Stockholm Convention states that "The institutional structure of the Global Environment Facility, operated in accordance with the Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility, shall, on an interim basis, be the principal entity entrusted with the operations of the financial mechanism referred to in article 13, for the period between the date of entry into force of this Convention and the first meeting of the Conference of the Parties, or until such time as the Conference of the Parties decides which institutional structure will be designated in accordance with article 13."

to further discussions with GEF Implementing Agencies (IAs) and Executing Agencies (EAs) and countries on ways for GEF to support SAICM.

### **Structure of this Paper**

7. This paper has four substantive sections:
- (i) *Section 2* provides a brief overview of the GEF's mandate, core principles, and structure;
  - (ii) *Section 3* describes the various focal areas of the GEF that bear the greatest relevance to SMC issues;
  - (iii) *Section 4* describes the GEF's programme related to National Implementation Plans required by the Stockholm Convention, and
  - (iv) *Section 5* discusses how, in building capacity to implement the Stockholm Convention, the GEF can assist countries in building broader capacities for SMC and further the goals of a SAICM.

## **II. HOW THE GEF WORKS**

### **Largest Single Source of Funding of the Global Environmental Agenda**

8. The GEF is the largest dedicated source of funding for global environmental initiatives. Its overarching objective, as enunciated in the *Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured GEF*, is to provide new and additional grant and concessional funding to meet incremental costs of measures to achieve agreed global environmental benefits (GEF Instrument, 2004).<sup>2</sup> At present, the GEF has 176 members.

9. The GEF's operates in six focal areas: Biodiversity, Climate Change, International Waters, Land Degradation, Ozone Layer Depletion, and Persistent Organic Pollutants.

10. The GEF Instrument stipulates that in the execution of its mandate, "the GEF shall ensure the cost-effectiveness of its activities in addressing the targeted global environmental issues, shall fund programs and projects that are country-driven and based on national priorities designed to support sustainable development and shall maintain sufficient flexibility to respond to changing circumstances in order to achieve its purposes" (GEF Instrument, 2004). In addition, the 1995 GEF Operational Strategy<sup>3</sup> notes that global and interregional projects may be funded for eligible recipient countries or for other activities promoting the purposes of the Facility and that GEF activities will be designed so as to be consistent, where appropriate, with regional initiatives.

11. In seeking to maximize global environmental benefits, the GEF emphasizes its catalytic role, including by: leveraging additional financial resources from the public and private sectors; and catalyzing results by innovation, demonstration and replication. Sustainability and replication of interventions are cornerstones of the GEF's operations.

---

<sup>2</sup> Efforts to secure global environmental benefits may impose additional costs (i.e., *incremental costs*) on countries beyond the costs of achieving national development goals. The principle that GEF funds will be additional to the funds required for national sustainable development helps to ensure that scarce resources are not diverted from development financing and to maximize global impact of GEF resources.

<sup>3</sup> The Operational Strategy, adopted by Council in 1996, is a "road map" or framework for programmatic cohesiveness and integration among the entities that participate in the GEF.

### **The Three Types of GEF Programming**

12. There are three interrelated types of GEF programming: operational programmes, enabling activities, and short-term response measures.

13. An Operational Programme (OP) is “a conceptual and planning framework for the design, implementation, and coordination of a set of projects to achieve a global environmental objective in a particular focal area. It organizes the development of country-driven projects and ensures systematic coordination between the Implementing Agencies and other actors”.

14. Enabling activities, as defined in the GEF Operational Strategy, represent a basic building block of GEF assistance to countries. They either are a means of fulfilling essential communication requirements to a Convention, provide a basic and essential level of information to enable policy and strategic decisions to be made, or assist planning that identifies priority activities within a country. Countries thus enabled will have the ability to formulate and direct sectoral and economy-wide programs to address global environmental problems through a cost-effective approach within the context of national sustainable development efforts. Country-driven enabling activities normally qualify for full agreed costs funding when they are directly related to global environmental benefits and/or consistent with the guidance of a Convention.

15. Short-term response measures are project opportunities that while not strictly related to an operational programme or enabling activities, are sufficiently important and timely to achieve short-term benefits applicable to a focal area at a limited cost. Criteria for short-term response measures are typically developed for each focal area.

### **The GEF Functions Through Collaboration and Partnerships**

16. The GEF operates on the basis of collaboration and partnership among its Implementing Agencies (IAs): the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and the World Bank (WB). These agencies are themselves accountable to the GEF Council for their GEF-financed activities, including preparation and cost-effectiveness of GEF projects, and implementation of operational policies, strategies and decisions of the GEF Council within their respective competencies.<sup>4</sup> The World Bank also acts as the Trustee to the GEF Trust Fund and provides administrative support to the Secretariat.

17. The GEF Secretariat and its IAs, under guidance of the GEF Council, seek to coordinate their activities and pursue synergies, and cooperate with other international organizations to promote achievement of the purposes of the GEF, consistent with national priorities.

---

<sup>4</sup> As noted in paragraph 11 of Annex D of the GEF instrument, the World Bank plays the primary role of ensuring development and management of investment projects and promotes investment opportunities to mobilize private sector resources consistent with GEF objectives and national sustainable development strategies. UNEP plays a primary role in catalyzing the development of scientific and technical analysis and in advancing environmental management in GEF-financed activities. UNDP has the primary role of ensuring the development and management of capacity building programs and technical assistance projects, while also contributing to regional and global projects within the GEF work program in cooperation with the other IAs.

18. The GEF Council, in 1999, expanded opportunities for seven organizations to contribute to the implementation of GEF projects, relative to their specific technical competencies. In 2002, the Council underscored the importance of the inclusion of FAO and UNIDO as Executing Agencies, given their specific expertise in the new emerging area of POPs management.

19. In supporting and administering GEF projects, the IAs and EAs consider potential effects among all of the GEF focal areas. Efforts are made to design projects that are consistent with operational strategies of the various focal areas and to avoid negative impacts in focal areas outside the focus of a project (Operational Strategy, 1995). For instance, the International Waters focal area formally seeks to coordinate with other focal areas in recognition that "GEF projects integrating several focal areas have the potential to multiply global benefits" (Operational Strategy, 1995).

20. GEF projects are expected to be co-financed by project partners. These are resources committed in various forms that are essential for the objectives of the project funded by the GEF. Co-financing can be generated from recipient governments and other stakeholders, such as other multilateral agencies (including the IAs and EAs), bilateral donor agencies, NGOs and beneficiaries as project circumstances warrant or allow.<sup>5</sup>

### **Capacity Building at the GEF**

21. Capacity building is a key aspect of the GEF's work. Capacity building elements appear as strategic priorities for most focal areas, and are crosscutting to all GEF focal areas. The Conventions of the Parties of the MEAs typically place considerable emphasis on capacity building. Additionally, the GEF Council has emphasized the need to build capacity to help countries to develop policies and strategies to deal with global environmental challenges and not just capacity to meet the requirements of the conventions (Joint Summary of the Chairs, May, 2001).

22. The GEF Assembly noted in the Beijing Declaration that capacity building needs of recipient countries should be identified and addressed in a systematic way. Medium-sized projects should play an important capacity building role, particularly in LDCs and SIDS. The GEF, in addressing capacity building, should foster synergies among global environmental conventions, and capacity building activities that achieve effectiveness, efficiency, and better mainstreaming of global environmental issues within the sustainable development agenda (e.g. sustainable development strategies, country assistance strategies, and poverty reductions strategies).

23. In November 2003 the GEF Council considered a *Strategic Approach to Enhancing Capacity Building* (GEF/C.22/8). This approach attempts to underscore the importance of GEF facilitation of and support for nationally determined and prioritized capacity building needs so as to facilitate implementation of country commitments as Parties to specific MEAs that the GEF supports. The Council has requested that the GEF Secretariat, in collaboration with the IAs and the monitoring and evaluation unit, undertake further work to make the strategy operational.

---

<sup>5</sup> Some countries have less opportunity than others to raise cofinancing, because their economic development, absorptive capacity, and familiarity with GEF and global environmental issues makes this difficult. Likewise, not all agencies have the same ability to commit or mobilize cofinancing. This reflects the fact that agencies tend to specialize in the type of projects in which they have a comparative advantage. For example, the World Bank and the Regional Development Banks implement the larger investment projects and these typically have higher cofinancing.

24. The strategic approach outlines four pathways for enhanced GEF capacity building support:

- (i) A self-assessment of capacity needs;
- (ii) Strengthening capacity building elements in GEF projects;
- (iii) Targeted capacity building projects; and
- (iv) Country specific programs for addressing critical capacity building needs in LDCs and SIDS.

25. Two types of *targeted capacity building modalities* are proposed, within and across focal areas.

26. The first modality would finance focal area specific *free-standing* capacity building projects that address national priorities and are responsive to the guidance and decisions of the relevant Conventions but which cannot be included in other projects that address focal area strategic priorities. Projects undertaken under this modality would seek to build capacity as an end product, which in turn is expected to simulate a broad based impact on global environmental management.

27. The second *targeted capacity building* modality entails an approach for systematic or institutional level activities that are cross-cutting to all focal areas and which will assist countries to manage global environmental issues in a more general manner, e.g., via:

- (i) Institutional strengthening;
- (ii) Assistance for enhanced legislation, regulations or administrative measures;
- (iii) Capacity building for public awareness; and
- (iv) Development of training material.

### III. GEF'S CHEMICALS RELATED ACTIVITIES

28. The scope of the GEF's mandate to support the sound management of chemicals is defined primarily by:

- (i) The *POPs* focal area, established in 2002 by a GEF Assembly amendment to the GEF Instrument in support of the GEF's role as the financial mechanism for the Stockholm Convention;
- (ii) The *International Waters* focal area, which is one of the GEF's original focal areas; and
- (iii) The *Ozone Layer Depletion* focal area, which was established to take into account the particular situation of the countries with economies in transition not eligible for funding under the Multilateral Fund for the implementation of the Montreal Protocol.

29. In addition, paragraph 3 of the amended GEF Instrument provides that "the agreed incremental costs of activities to achieve global environmental benefits concerning chemicals management as they relate to the above focal areas [the six focal areas of the GEF] shall be eligible for funding".

## POPs Focal Area

30. The objective of the draft<sup>6</sup> GEF Operational Programme on Persistent Organic Pollutants (OP#14) is to provide assistance, on the basis of incremental costs, to developing countries and countries with economies in transition to reduce and eliminate releases of POPs into the environment. This objective is consistent with that of the Stockholm Convention, which is aimed at protecting human health and the environment from POPs. The primary focus of the GEF's mandate on POPs applies to the Convention's 12 listed chemicals: aldrin, chlordane, DDT, dieldrin, endrin, heptachlor, hexachlorobenzene, mirex, toxaphene, PCBs, and dioxins and furans.

31. GEF's initial support for implementation of the Stockholm Convention is focussing on enabling activities, assisting countries with preparation of National Implementation Plans (NIPs) required under Article 7 of the Stockholm Convention. NIPs 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 on POPs. Therefore, NIPs are the national instrument that the GEF is using as the primary framework for its support, insofar as they identify "priority policy and regulatory reforms, capacity building and investment needs" relative to POPs and chemicals management pertaining to the GEF focal area.

32. OP #14 provides for three types of activities that will be eligible for GEF funding on the basis of agreed incremental costs: (1) capacity building (2) on-the-ground interventions and (3) targeted research. The OP notes that assistance for these activities will be focused primarily on the national level and, to a lesser extent, on regional and global activities.

33. Other guiding principles that the GEF will use for development and implementation of projects in this focal area include:

- (i) An appropriate enabling environment (policies, regulations, etc.) for effective and sustainable actions to address POPs;
- (ii) Mainstreaming of environmentally sound POPs management practices into national sustainable development programs, strategies, and frameworks for assistance;
- (iii) Broad stakeholder consultation at all stages of project and program development and implementation;
- (iv) All information related to the health and safety of humans and the environment will be made public;
- (v) POPs projects and programs will support the objectives of the Stockholm Convention and seek synergies with the other GEF focal areas – biological diversity, international waters, land degradation, climate change and ozone layer depletion, emphasizing integrated and cross-sectoral approaches;
- (vi) GEF-funded interventions to support the implementation of the Stockholm Convention will seek synergies and coordination with the activities of other global and regional chemicals-related conventions or agreements<sup>7</sup>; and

<sup>6</sup> The operational program on POPs will be finalised in light of the guidance that will be received from the COP once it meets.

<sup>7</sup> For example the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent (PIC) Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade, the Bahia Declaration on Chemical Safety and the World Summit on Sustainable Development, as well as the Bamako Convention on the Ban of the Import into Africa and the Control of Transboundary Movement and Management of Hazardous Wastes Within Africa, and the Waigani Convention to Ban the Importation into Forum Island Countries of

- (vii) Partnerships are crucial for the successful development and implementation of projects and programs on POPs. The GEF will catalyze partnerships for the delivery of financial and technical assistance with the countries eligible for GEF financing, bilateral and multilateral development agencies, intergovernmental organizations and their coordinating bodies, the private sector, foundations, NGOs, and other organizations.

34. The Stockholm Convention is also cognizant of synergies with the Rio Declaration and Agenda 21, and the Rotterdam Convention (via reference in the preamble), and the Basel Convention, via Article 6.2 and Article 5 of Appendix 1.<sup>8</sup> Hence, there are opportunities for other chemical MEAs to advance aspects of implementation of the strategic priorities of OP #14 when consistent with guidance of Stockholm Convention, and GEF programme objectives. This acknowledges that other Conventions, such as the Basel and Rotterdam Conventions, are key pillars of the global sound management of chemicals regime, and are stakeholders of the GEF's activities consistent with its core mandate.

35. Expected outcomes of GEF-supported interventions on POPs noted in OP#14 include the following:

- (i) The institutional and human resource capacity for the management of POPs is strengthened;
- (ii) The policy and regulatory framework is strengthened to facilitate environmentally sound management of POPs and other chemicals;
- (iii) There is significant improvement in the reduction of the use of POPs for disease vector control, termite control and agricultural production;
- (iv) Safe and cost-effective alternatives to POPs are available to developing countries and countries with economies in transition; and
- (v) Stockpiles of POPs are managed, and wastes that contain POPs are managed and contained or disposed of, in an environmentally safe manner.

### **International Waters Focal Area**

36. GEF's Operational Strategy defines the term "international waters" as including "the oceans, large marine ecosystems, enclosed or semi-enclosed seas and estuaries as well as rivers, lakes, groundwater systems, and wetlands with transboundary drainage basins or common borders". The goal for this focal area is to assist countries to utilize the full range of technical, economic, financial, regulatory, and institutional measures needed to develop and implement operational sustainable development strategies for international waters and to address priority transboundary water-related environmental concerns.

---

Hazardous and Radioactive Wastes and to Control the Transboundary Movement and Management of Hazardous Wastes Within the South Pacific Region.

<sup>8</sup> Article 6.2 of the Stockholm Convention states that "the Stockholm Conference of the Parties shall cooperate closely with the appropriate bodies of the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal to, *inter alia*:

(a) Establish levels of destruction and irreversible transformation necessary to ensure that the characteristics of persistent organic pollutants as specified in paragraph 1 of Annex D are not exhibited; (b) Determine what they consider to be the methods that constitute environmentally sound disposal referred to above; and (c) Work to establish, as appropriate, the concentration levels of the chemicals listed in Annexes A, B and C in order to define the low persistent organic pollutant content referred to in paragraph 1 (d)(ii).

Article 5, similarly invites the bodies of the Basel Convention to cooperate closely on the items referred to in paragraph 1 (d) of article 6 of the Stockholm, and in particular to prepare appropriate technical guidelines for the environmentally sound management of persistent organic pollutant wastes.

37. Of particular relevance is the Contaminant-based Operational Program (OP #10) of the International Waters focal area. Four components characterize the range of projects possible under this OP:

- (i) Land-based activities demonstration component;
- (ii) Global contaminants component;
- (iii) Ship-related contaminants component; and
- (iv) Regional/Global technical support component.

38. The *global contaminants component* makes special mention of persistent toxic substances (PTS), toxic pollutants that are persistent and accumulate in living organisms and can pose human or ecosystem health risks, and for which some releases are associated with industrial processes across the world. This component identifies heavy metals (e.g. mercury), persistent organic pollutants (e.g. dioxins, PCBs) and some pesticides that can disrupt human endocrine systems or pose human health threats as possible categories of global contaminants that could be targeted through specific projects. Hence, the *global contaminants component* was designed to be consistent with initiatives underway as part of the Global Program of Action (anticipating the Stockholm Convention).

39. The IW focal area has clear links with the 12 listed POPs within the Stockholm Convention, while it may also be used to address national priorities on chemical contaminants beyond those listed in the Stockholm Convention (e.g., pesticides such as lindane and endosulfan, metals, and other toxic and hazardous substances). Action on toxic and hazardous pollutants, while not restricted regarding the pollutants addressed, is predicated upon the linkage between land-based activities and potential for existing releases to/presence in groundwater, streams, rivers, etc., as these may contaminate international waters. Additionally, because of the international nature of the file, collaboration among nations is a key aspect of this focal area. Hence, there is an inherent regional or sub-regional collaborative aspect to it. Although historically funding for this component has been relatively limited, the GEF was able to support a number of POPs projects in the late 90s, thereby building experience and setting the stage for the POPs focal area. In addition to POPs projects strictly speaking (before the adoption of the POPs focal area), the GEF has also supported a limited number of projects to reduce the use of agrochemicals and a multi-country project to reduce the use of mercury for artisanal gold mining.

40. In addition to projects that address specific classes of contaminants, there are at least two other areas of intervention in the IW focal area which are related to chemicals in some ways and are of relevance here : these are projects that aim at reducing eutrophication of waterbodies through nutrient reduction, and demonstration projects that promote cleaner technologies to reduce the pollution load of seriously threatened waterbodies.

### **Ozone Layer Depletion Focal Area**

41. The Ozone focal area was added to the GEF mandate to assist GEF eligible countries not receiving assistance from the Multilateral Fund for the implementation of the Montreal Protocol. Although the GEF is not linked formally to the Montreal Protocol, the GEF Operational Strategy in ozone depletion is a response to the Montreal Protocol, its control measures, list of controlled substances, amendments and adjustments.

42. Following successful completion of phase-out of CFCs and halons in our partner countries, the thrust of on-going GEF efforts is the phase-out of the use and production of methyl bromide. At present all GEF eligible countries are in compliance with the phase-out schedule for HCFC. The GEF is considering optimal ways to assist eligible countries to meeting further HCFC reduction schedules.

43. The lessons learned in the process of implementing the Montreal Protocol, and the capacities that have been built all have potential to contribute to the broader chemicals agenda and to further the goals of a SAICM.

#### **IV. THE NIPs PROGRAM**

44. The parties to the Stockholm Convention are required to develop and endeavour to implement a National Implementation Plan (NIP) that describes how that country will meet its obligations under the Convention. The NIP must be transmitted to the COP within two years of entry into force of the Convention for a given party, and must be kept under review and up to date. As stated above, the NIP will set national priorities for initiating future activities to protect human health and the environment from POPs and will provide a framework for a country to develop and implement, in a systematic and participatory way, priority policy and regulatory reform, capacity building, and investment programs.

45. In May 2001, the GEF Council adopted the "Initial Guidelines for Enabling Activities for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants." As of September 15, 2004, 118 GEF eligible countries already had proposals for funding approved by the GEF (see list in appendix A). The guidelines, which focus on the preparation of National Implementation Plans were developed in cooperation with the GEF inter-Agency POPs Task Force, and include expedited procedures for their processing.<sup>9</sup> The GEF Guidelines have been complemented by a number of guidance documents including in particular the UNEP/WB "interim guidance for developing a national implementation plan for the Stockholm Convention". The GEF's initial assistance also includes a *Capacity Building Support for Enabling Activities* component to provide support to strengthen the ability of countries to implement a systematic and participatory process for the preparation of the NIPs.

46. In developing their NIPs, countries can follow, and amend as appropriate to national circumstances, the following step-wise process suggested for NIP development:

- (i) Determination of coordinating mechanisms and organization of process;
- (ii) Establishment of POPs inventory and assessment of national infrastructure and capacity;
- (iii) Setting of priorities and determination of objectives;
- (iv) Formulation of a National Implementation Plan, and specific Action Plans on POPs;
- (v) Endorsement of NIP by stakeholders.

47. These five steps typically include the following activities:

---

<sup>9</sup> All developing countries and countries with economies in transition signatory or party to the Convention are eligible for GEF "Enabling Activities" funding. Eligibility was later expanded following recommendation of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee to developing countries and countries with economies in transition in the process of becoming a party to the Convention.

- (i) Undertake preliminary inventories of sources and emissions of POPs listed in Annexes A and B to the Convention;
- (ii) Prepare an Action Plan for the reduction of releases of unintentional by-products;
- (iii) Prepare an Action Plan to control the use of DDT for disease vector control, where appropriate;
- (iv) Build capacity to report every five years on progress in phasing out PCBs as described in Annex I part II of the Convention;
- (v) Prepare a preliminary assessment of stockpiles of POPs and of waste products contaminated with POPs, and identify management options, including opportunities for disposal;
- (vi) Build capacity to report to the COP on total production, import and export, as per Article 15 of the Convention;
- (vii) Build capacity to assess the need of continuation of specific exemptions and preparation of their reporting/extension;
- (viii) Build capacity to identify sites contaminated by POPs; and
- (ix) Support communication, information exchange, and awareness raising through multi-stakeholder participatory processes, as described in Article 9 and 10 of the Stockholm Convention.

48. Recognising that POPs management must be grounded in a foundation for chemicals management, and that there is not much more - if at all - effort involved in assessing the national infrastructure for management of chemicals or for management of POPs, the GEF guidelines recommend that countries develop or update a National Profile for chemicals management with an additional POPs-specific focus as an early activity<sup>10</sup>. Similarly, the guidelines recommend that a country establish and maintain a register - Pollutant and Release and Transfer Register (PRTR) or equivalent – to support the management of the POPs inventory, which clearly can be used to track other chemicals as appropriate.

## V. OPPORTUNITIES FOR ADVANCING “FOUNDATIONAL” CAPACITIES FOR SMC

49. It has been noted that elements of a SMC regime are promoted within the GEF NIPs program, in particular through the recommendations to develop a National Profile and establish a PRTR or equivalent. When implementing the NIPs, it will be necessary at the very least to frame the proposed intervention within the overall regime for chemicals management in the country. This will be particularly true for the capacity-building components of NIP implementation. There will be cases where addressing broader aspects of the management of chemicals might only require relatively modest additional efforts that the country and development partners will be willing to assume. There will also be cases where not taking into account broader chemicals management issues would lead to misinformed decisions leading to the wrong intervention.

50. Therefore activities developed for the POPs focal area should be designed to build capacity that can be cross-cutting to or have synergies with management of other toxic and hazardous chemicals, including development of policy and legislative frameworks; inventory development; development of models for managing POPs or other contaminants; environmentally sound management of wastes; and creating infrastructure for chemicals management.

<sup>10</sup> In response, a complement guidance document to the original UNITAR/IOMC National Profile Guidance Document was developed by UNITAR/UNEP/IOMC.

51. For example, a large number of developing countries do not have adequate legislation for industrial chemicals: the foundation on which the incremental GEF funded OP #14 intervention should be based does not exist. It would obviously be counter-productive to develop legislation solely for PCBs and HCB. Therefore it is expected that a project aimed at developing legislation consistent with the Stockholm Convention and the POPs focal area OP #14 would be designed to also address other toxic and hazardous chemicals in a comprehensive legislative framework. Similarly, an analysis of options for management and disposal of PCBs, for example, would necessarily have to take into account the broader hazardous waste management needs of the country. Furthermore, obsolete pesticides wastes most often include POPs and non-POPs pesticides wastes together in the same warehouse. These can only be addressed together as is the case with the African Stockpile Program, which the GEF is co-financing.

## **VI. CONCLUSION**

52. The GEF welcomes and supports the SAICM process, which promises to strengthen the capacity of our partner countries to mainstream chemicals management activities into national sustainable development strategies and assistance frameworks.

53. The Stockholm Convention was not developed in isolation and cannot be implemented in isolation from the broader regimes for chemicals management – at the national, regional and global levels. Countries building their capacity to implement the Stockholm Convention should and inevitably will be building capacity that can be utilised to address broader aspects of chemicals management and further the objectives of a SAICM.

54. The experience of the GEF over the past decade points to the desirability of increased integration amongst domains of interventions in addressing multi-faceted environmental degradation. The GEF through its capacity to address complex issues across a number of focal areas and with a variety of partners in a coordinated fashion, is well positioned to work with partner countries on the development and implementation of a SAICM. The GEF, acting within its mandate, will continue to look for opportunities through its operations to advance the sound management of chemicals, particularly related capacity-building initiatives.

---

## **References**

- GEF. 1995. Operational Strategy of the Global Environment Facility. Washington, D.C.
- GEF. 1996. Operational Program Number 10. Contaminant-Based Operational Program.
- GEF. 2001. Initial Guidelines for Enabling Activities for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants. GEF/C.17/4.
- GEF. 2003. Strategic Approach to Enhance Capacity Building. GEF/C.22/8.
- GEF. 2003. Draft Operational Program on Persistent Organic Pollutants (OP #14). GEF.C.22/Inf.4.

GEF. 2004. Instrument for the Establishment of the Restructured Global Environment Facility.

### Appendix A: List of Countries Engaged in NIP Development with GEF Funding

Country	Agency	Country	Agency	Country	Agency
Albania	UNDP	Haiti	UNEP	Palau	UNEP
Algeria	UNIDO	Honduras	UNDP	Papau New Guin.	UNEP
Antigua and Barb.	UNEP	Hungary	UNIDO	Paraguay	UNEP
Argentina	UNEP	India	UNIDO	Peru	UNEP
Armenia	UNIDO	Indonesia	UNIDO	Philippines	UNDP
Azerbaijan	UNIDO	Iran	UNDP	Poland	UNIDO
Bangladesh	UNDP	Jamaica	UNDP	Romania	UNIDO
Barbados	UNEP	Jordan	UNEP	Russian Fed.	UNEP
Belarus	World Bank	Kazakhstan	UNDP	Rwanda	UNIDO
Benin	UNEP	Kenya	UNEP	Samoa	UNDP
Bolivia	UNIDO	Kiribati	UNEP	Sao Tome and Pr.	UNIDO
Botswana	UNIDO	Korea DPR	UNDP	Senegal	UNEP
Bulgaria	UNEP	Kyrgyzstan	UNEP	Serbia and Mont.	UNEP
Brazil	UNEP	Lao PDR	UNIDO	Seychelles	UNIDO
Burkina Faso	UNDP	Latvia	UNDP	Slovak Republic	UNDP
Burundi	UNIDO	Lebanon	UNEP	Slovenia	UNEP
Cambodia	UNEP	Lesotho	UNIDO	South Africa	UNEP
Cameroon	UNEP	Liberia	UNIDO	Sri Lanka	UNEP
Central Afric. Rep.	UNIDO	Lithuania	UNDP	St. Lucia	UNEP
Chad	UNIDO	Macedonia	UNIDO	Sudan	UNDP
Chile	UNEP	Madagascar	UNEP	Syria	UNEP
China	UNIDO	Malaysia	UNEP	Tajikistan	UNEP
Colombia	World Bank	Malawi	UNIDO	Tanzania	UNIDO
Comoros	UNDP	Mali	UNEP	Thailand	UNEP
Congo	UNIDO	Marshall Islands	UNEP	Togo	UNIDO
Cote d'Ivoire	UNEP	Mauritania	UNEP	Tonga	UNEP
Croatia	UNIDO	Mauritius	UNDP	Tunisia	UNEP/UNIDO
Cuba	UNEP	Mexico	World Bank	Turkey	UNIDO
Czech Republic	UNIDO	Micronesia	UNEP	Ukraine	UNEP
Djibouti	UNIDO	Moldova	World Bank	Uruguay	UNEP
Ecuador	UNEP	Mongolia	UNIDO	Vanuatu	UNEP
Egypt	UNIDO	Morocco	UNDP	Venezuela	UNIDO
Etiopía	UNIDO	Mozambique	UNEP	Vietnam	UNDP
Fiji	UNEP	Nauru	UNEP	Yemen	UNEP
Gabon	UNIDO	Nepal	UNIDO	Zambia	UNEP
Gambia	UNEP	Nicaragua	UNDP	Zimbabwe	UNEP
Georgia	UNDP	Niger	UNIDO		
Ghana	UNIDO	Nigeria	UNIDO		
Guatemala	UNIDO	Niue	UNDP		
Guinea	UNEP	Oman	UNEP		
Guinea-Bissau	UNEP	Pakistan	UNDP		