PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS FOCAL AREA STRATEGY AND STRATEGIC PROGRAMMING FOR GEF-4

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This brochure presents the Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) focal area strategy and strategic programming for GEF-4 (2007 – 2010), approved by the GEF Council in September 2007.

2. At the replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund in 2006, the GEF Council requested the GEF Secretariat to review and revise as necessary the strategies for the six focal areas of the GEF, taking into account issues such as sustainable forest management and sound chemicals management.[1]

3. In December 2006, the CEO presented to the Council a plan to increase the efficiency and impact of the GEF. A central element of this reform package is to move away from the previous single project interventions towards a more programmatic focus for the GEF. The purpose is two-fold: a) to focus the limited funding resources of GEF-4 on a set of priority issues of global environmental concern; and b) to link projects together to achieve stronger impacts.

4. The strategy for POPs presented here is the result of a consultative process involving external advisory groups and contributions from the GEF Council Members, Convention secretariats, GEF agencies, the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) and other GEF partners[2].

5. The strategy builds on previous GEF achievements and experience with Persistent Organic Pollutants. The GEF's goal in the POPs focal area is to protect human health and the environment by assisting countries to reduce and eliminate production, use, and releases of POPs, and consequently contribute generally to capacity development for the sound management of chemicals.

6. For the period of GEF-4, this goal will be met through:

(a) Strengthening capacities for National Implementation Plans (NIPs)implementation, including assisting those countries that lag farthest behind to establish basic, foundational capacities for sound management of chemicals

(b) Partnering in investments needed for NIP implementation to achieve impacts in POPs reduction and elimination

(c) Partnering in the demonstration of feasible, innovative technologies and best practices for POPs reduction and substitution

---

[1] GEF/R.4/32, Policy recommendations for the Fourth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund.

[2] Working documents and comments received from GEF partners are accessible at the GEF website www.thegef.org under GEF policies.

7. As a step towards a more programmatic approach, strategic programs have been developed in support of the long term objectives. These strategic programs define the GEF's focus during GEF-4. The strategic programs have been selected and defined in view of their importance, urgency and cost-effectiveness from a global environment perspective. Priorities identified by countries, as well as overall guidance from the multilateral environmental agreements and conventions have also been taken into consideration. The strategic programs provide an intermediate link between the project level and the long term objectives of the GEF within the focal areas.

8. The long term objectives and strategic programs that are redefined for every replenishment period replace the previous structure of operational programs and strategic priorities. The new structure, summarized for the POPs Focal Area in the table below, balances continuity and flexibility and supports the emphasis on results.

Table 1: Long term objectives and strategic programs for the POPs Focal Area in GEF-4

Long-term Objectives	**Strategic Programs for GEF-4**
1: To reduce and eliminate production, use and releases of POPs	1. Strengthening capacity for NIP (National Implementation Plan) development and implementation 2. Partnering in investments for NIP implementation 3. Partnering in the demonstration of feasible, innovative technologies and best practices for POPs reduction

9. The focal area strategy is aligned with the Results Based Management (RBM) Framework for the GEF, in order to direct the strategies towards tangible global environmental benefits and to enable adequate reporting on the implementation of the strategies. Long-term expected *impacts* on the global environment are assigned to each of the objectives, and intermediate expected *outcomes* are assigned to each of the strategic programs. The projects are thus expected to support the achievement of the impacts and outcomes identified at the programmatic level.

10. Provisional indicators have been identified for each expected impact and for each expected outcome. These indicators will allow a systematic monitoring of the actual achievement of the expected impacts and outcomes. The indicators will be further developed in connection with the Results Based Management for the GEF.

11. The strategy for POPs presented here seeks to guide project proponents in countries and in GEF agencies and other GEF partners in preparing and reviewing project proposals for GEF-4. The GEF Secretariat will initiate the development of long term objectives and strategic programs for GEF-5 in 2008 with a view to presenting proposed strategic programming for GEF-5 to the GEF Council at its first meeting in 2009.

II. BACKGROUND

Environmental and Human Health Consequences of Exposure to POPs

1. Mounting evidence of damage to human health and the environment has focused the attention of the international community on POPs. POPs are pesticides, industrial chemicals, or unwanted by-products of industrial processes or combustion. They are characterized by: a) *persistence* – the ability to resist degradation in various media (air, water, sediments, and organisms); b) *bio-accumulation* – the ability to accumulate in living tissues at levels higher than those in the surrounding environment; and c) potential for *long range transport* – the capacity to travel great distances from the source of release through various media (air, water, and migratory species).

2. Because of these properties, POPs are found throughout the world, including in areas far from their original source. The harm these chemical substances can cause to humans and animals includes disruption of the endocrine system, suppression of the immune system, causing reproductive dysfunction, and fostering developmental abnormalities.

3. Most intentionally-produced POPs have been banned and are being phased out in OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) countries. However, the situation in developing countries, and particularly in Least Developed Countries, is characterized in many instances by inadequate legislative and regulatory frameworks, coupled with the near absence of capacity for enforcement, and the lack of awareness of the hazards associated with POPs exposure. As a result, the limited local capacity can lead to regional and, ultimately, global contamination of the environment by POPs, with damage to the health and well-being of human populations, particularly the poor that are at greatest risk[3].

Convention Guidance

4. The Stockholm Convention on POPs – that was adopted in May 2001 and entered into force in May 2004 – designates the GEF as the principal entity entrusted with the operations of the financial mechanism of the Convention, *ad interim*. The first meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP) adopted guidance[4] for the financial mechanism that emphasises capacity building and establishes the NIP as the main driver for implementation activities. Specifically, the COP recommended that resources should be

[3] See *Toxics and poverty: the impact of toxic substances on the poor in developing countries*. Goldman L. and Tra N. The World Bank, 2002.

[4] Decision SC-1/9 can be found in the annex to the meeting report from COP-1 (document UNEP/POPS/COP.1/31) http://www.pops.int/documents/meetings/cop_1/meetingdocs/report/default.htm.

allocated to activities "that are in conformity with, and supportive of, the priorities identified in [Parties'] respective national implementation plans."

5. The COP at its second meeting in May 2006 adopted additional guidance[5] for the GEF, including inviting the GEF and its agencies to facilitate the leveraging of other sources of financing for the implementation of the Convention.

6. The COP at its third meeting in May 2007 reaffirmed its previous guidance and adopted further guidance[6] for the GEF, including regarding: alternative products, methods, and strategies to replace DDT pesticide for disease vector control; best available techniques and best environmental practices; and capacity building for the implementation of the global monitoring plan for effectiveness evaluation. The COP also requested the GEF to give special consideration to those activities relevant to the sound management of chemicals identified as priorities in the NIPs.

Knowledge Management

7. In pursuing the following strategic programs, the GEF will support the generation and dissemination of good practices and the development of practical guidelines, so that lessons learned from GEF projects and good practices in general are incorporated into the design of new GEF projects. Specific themes that could be analyzed include: PCB (polychlorinated biphenyls) management; NIP development; alternatives to DDT use in disease vector control or to POPs used as termiticides; or the application of the guidelines for best available techniques and best environmental practices. Themes that cut across sectors or groups of projects could also be considered: for example, good practices in stakeholder involvement or private sector participation.

Measuring Results

8. A number of indicators for each strategic program are described herein. Taken together, these constitute the POPs focal area tracking tool that is the basis for tracking progress in the implementation of the POPs focal area strategy, and will allow reporting on results and impacts for the focal area overall.

9. These indicators do not purport to be the only ones that could be used to describe achievements under a particular strategic program. The intent in selecting these indicators was to choose a limited number of indicators that could be measured and added up to provide a meaningful overview of portfolio achievement. Each individual POPs project will include, at the minimum, one of these indicators in their results matrix. It is expected, of course, that individual projects would also include other indicators to track

[5] Decision SC-2/11 can be found in the annex to the meeting report from COP-2 (document UNEP/POPS/COP.2/30) http://www.pops.int/documents/meetings/cop_2/report/default.htm.
[6] Decision SC-3/16 can be found in the annex to the meeting report from COP-3 (document UNEP/POPS/COP.3/30) http://www.pops.int/documents/meetings/cop_3/meetingdocs/report/default.htm.

all dimensions of expected project results, but these could differ between projects and may not contribute to the broad overall assessment of focal area-wide achievements.

10. The indicators encompass enabling environment indicators (e.g., regulatory frameworks in place or increased capacity for enforcement) and stress reduction indicators (e.g., number and unit cost of tons of PCB destroyed in an environmentally sound manner, or amount and unit cost of avoided emissions of by-products). Environmental impacts will be assessed in the framework of the overall evaluation of the effectiveness of the Convention.

11. *Targets:* There is insufficient experience with the implementation of the Stockholm Convention to define targets upfront for all the indicators that are defined here. The tracking tool, however, will permit an accurate reporting of expected results at the end of the replenishment period and this will, in turn, facilitate the development of targets in the future.

Cost-effectiveness

12. Cost-effectiveness is one of the core principles of the GEF Operational Strategy. A cost-effective POPs project is one that achieves the requisite outcomes generating global benefits at the least cost, promotes replication, and is sustainable. Cost-effectiveness is one of the tools that are used during project development to support the analysis of and, ultimately, the choice between different project approaches. Cost-effectiveness can also be a useful tool for setting priorities in the context of limited resources and implementation capacity, primarily to support a country in its prioritising of issues for the most urgent attention.

13. A rudimentary proxy of cost-effectiveness is the measure of the unit-cost of POPs phased-out from use or production, destroyed in an environmentally sound manner, or not released into the environment. Although this proxy cannot by itself be used to judge the merit of an intervention, it is a tool that will be recorded and reported to facilitate benchmarking.

III. STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE

14. The GEF's goal in the POPs focal area is to protect human health and the environment by assisting countries to reduce and eliminate production, use, and releases of POPs, and consequently contribute generally to capacity development for the sound management of chemicals.

15. The long term impact of GEF interventions is a reduction in the exposure to POPs of humans and wildlife. The indicator for this reduction of exposure is a decrease in the observed concentration of specific POPs chemicals in the environment. This global level indicator is to be assessed within the framework of the efforts of the COP to evaluate the effectiveness of the Convention, as required by Article 16 of the Convention.

16. The strategic objective of the GEF under the POPs focal area, in the mid-term and spanning a number of replenishments, is to assist eligible partner countries to implement their obligations under the Stockholm Convention and to achieve the purposes of the Convention, including to reduce and eliminate production, use, and releases of POPs. Table 1 presents the expected impacts of GEF interventions in the POPs focal area under GEF-4.

Table 1: GEF Strategic Objective in the POPs Focal Area

Strategic Objective	**Expected impacts**	**Main Indicators**
To reduce and eliminate production, use and releases of POPs	GEF-supported countries have strengthened capacity for POPs management and consequently strengthened capacity for the general sound management of chemicals	Regulatory and enforcement capacity in place
	Dangerous obsolete pesticides that pose a threat to human health and to the environment are disposed of in an environmentally sound manner	Obsolete pesticides disposed of
	PCBs, some of the most widespread toxics, are no longer a source of contamination of the local and global environment because they are phased out and disposed of	PCBs phased out and disposed of
	The risk of adverse health effects from POPs is decreased for those local communities living in close proximity to POPs wastes that have been disposed of or contained	Reduced risk of exposure to POPs of project-affected people
	The basis for the future implementation of the Stockholm Convention is established through the demonstration of innovative alternative products, best practices, and environmentally sound processes to the generation, use, or release of POPs	Knowledge management packages developed; the viability and cost-effectiveness of alternatives to POPs, in particular DDT, are demonstrated in a number of settings

IV. STRATEGIC FOCUS IN GEF-4

17. GEF-3 efforts focused on supporting the development of NIPs as required in Article 7 of the Stockholm Convention. As of December 31, 2006, enabling activities to develop NIPs are underway in 131 countries. Of these, 93 countries have either completed their enabling activities or will soon do so. This total includes 26 countries that have already officially submitted their NIP to the COP of the Stockholm Convention.

18. Activities during GEF-4 will therefore be characterized by a shift from preparation to the implementation of NIPs. In order to achieve the long-term success of the Stockholm Convention, strong emphasis will be placed on the sustainability of GEF interventions, focusing especially on countries whose policies and actions demonstrate their firm intention to follow through on their commitment to the Convention.

19. Projects addressing unintentionally produced POPs are expected to be mostly of a planning and strategy development nature under GEF-4, thereby preparing the groundwork for more systematic efforts that will be required in future phases of the GEF[7].

20. Under GEF-5, the following further developments are envisaged: a) a further shift towards implementation, with strategic program 2 gaining pre-eminence over strategic program 1; b) a more systematic approach to unintentionally produced POPs, DDT alternatives, and alternatives to POPs termiticides, reflected by these themes being addressed under strategic program 2 rather than strategic program 3; c) work to support countries' participation in the evaluation of the effectiveness of the Stockholm Convention; and d) a round of review and update of the NIPs, in particular when new POPs are added to the Convention[8].

V. STRATEGIC PROGRAMS IN GEF-4

21. Three strategic programs are proposed for implementation under GEF-4 which are described below and in Table 2. All projects approved under GEF-4 are expected to contribute to at least one of these programs.

Strategic Program 1: Strengthening Capacities for NIP Implementation

22. *Objective (a) – NIP Implementation:* The GEF will strengthen and/or build the capacity required in eligible[9] countries to implement their Stockholm Convention NIPs in a sustainable, effective, and comprehensive manner, while building upon and

[7] The Stockholm Convention COP at its third session in May 2007 adopted guidelines for best available techniques/best environmental practices.

[8] As of March 2007, 10 chemicals/families of chemicals are under consideration by the subsidiary body of the Convention for possible recommendation of listing under the Convention.

[9] Since the pertinent European Union (EU) legislation imposes stricter obligations on EU member states than does the Stockholm Convention, no funding for EU member states is foreseen (Regulation EC No. 850/2004 on persistent organic pollutants).

contributing to strengthening a country's foundational capacities for sound management of chemicals more generally.

23. *Outcomes:* GEF eligible countries have the capacity to implement the measures required to meet their obligations[10] under the Convention, including POPs reduction measures. As such measures will address the full range of chemicals (e.g., pesticides, industrial chemicals, and unintentionally produced by-products). Countries will also be implementing measures that will improve their general capacity to achieve the sound management of chemicals.

24. *Indicators*: The following outcome indicators are proposed as measures of capacity development for NIP implementation:

(a) legislative and regulatory framework in place in supported countries for the management of POPs and the sound management of chemicals in general

(b) Strengthened and sustainable administrative capacity, including chemicals management administration within the central government in supported countries

(c) Strengthened and sustainable capacity for enforcement in supported countries

25. *Scope:* Following Convention guidance, activities supported will be in conformity with, and supportive of, the priorities identified in countries' respective NIPs. Depending on NIP priorities, interventions can include: strengthening legislative and regulatory frameworks; strengthening of human and institutional capacity; strengthening of monitoring and enforcement capacity, including the capacity to contribute to the effectiveness evaluation of the Convention; development and implementation of instruments to secure resources for NIP implementation; and raising awareness of, and engaging with, various non-governmental stakeholders including the private sector.

26. This program will include assisting those countries that lag the farthest behind to establish basic foundational capacities for the sound management of chemicals. Cooperation and coordination will be encouraged to enhance synergies with countries' responses to related multilateral environmental agreements[11] addressing chemicals issues. These two latter points constitute an operational response to the amendment of the GEF Instrument (Article 1, Paragraph 3, as amended in 2004) that provides that "the agreed

[10] The COP of the Stockholm Convention at its third session in May 2007 adopted on a provisional basis the global monitoring plan (GMP) for the first effectiveness evaluation of the Convention. The COP invited "the GEF to incorporate activities related to the GMP and capacity-building in developing countries, SIDS, and CEITs, as priorities for providing financial support". The GEF will continue to work with the secretariat of the Stockholm Convention with a view to defining support that may be provided to strengthen the capacity of eligible countries to support the implementation of COP decisions related to effectiveness evaluation, through country-driven and sustainable activities consistent with the GEF's mandate. This could lead to specific indicators and targets under future phases of the GEF.

[11] For example Basel and Rotterdam Conventions and the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM).

incremental costs of activities to achieve global environmental benefits concerning chemicals management as they relate to the [six] GEF focal areas shall be eligible for funding."

27. *Priority Countries:* Support under this high-priority program should be targeted to countries that have limited capacity to implement their NIPs. Countries must demonstrate a willingness to adopt the necessary policies and to continue support for the institutions strengthened with GEF support, for example through inscribing support for POPs management and reduction activities in their national budgets. Therefore, it is expected that those countries that will receive support for capacity strengthening under GEF-4 will not require any such support for the same activities to meet current obligations of the Stockholm Convention under future phases of the GEF.

28. *Types of Projects*: Projects to be implemented under this program will be largely oriented towards technical assistance and capacity building.

29. *Objective (b) – NIP Development:* The GEF will continue to support eligible countries in meeting their obligation to develop and submit a NIP under the Stockholm Convention (enabling activities).

30. *Outcome:* GEF-eligible countries meet their obligations to develop and submit NIPs to the COP of the Stockholm Convention.

31. *Indicators:* Two indicators of output and outcome are to be tracked through the GEF-4 replenishment:

(a) NIPs submitted to the COP of the Stockholm Convention[12]

(b) Number of countries receiving support to develop their initial NIP

32. *Scope:* Efforts will be made to ensure that the NIP development process is embedded in a country's institutional framework for the sound management of chemicals, thereby contributing to strengthening that framework.

33. *Priority Countries:* This program will remain a priority for the small number of eligible[13] countries that have not yet prepared their NIPs. It is expected that this will complete the GEF's funding of the initial NIP.

34. *Types of Projects*: Projects to be implemented under this program will be largely oriented towards enabling activities.

[12] Parties to the Stockholm Convention have an obligation to submit a NIP to the COP of the Convention within two years of becoming a party.

[13] Following Convention guidance, the GEF Council has extended eligibility of POPs-enabling activities to developing countries and countries with economies in transition "that are in the process of becoming Parties to the Stockholm Convention".

Strategic Program 2: Partnering in Investments for NIP Implementation

35. *Objective:* The GEF will partner in investments needed for NIP implementation to achieve impacts in the reduction of POPs production, use, and releases, and to reduce the stress on human health and the environment caused by POPs. This will include promoting the use of substitute products or alternative practices that prevent or reduce the generation and/or release of POPs.

36. *Outcome:* Sustainably-reduced POPs production, use, and releases, through phase-out, destruction in an environmentally sound manner, and use of substitute products and alternative processes, that lead to reduced environmental and health risks resulting from POPs.

37. *Indicators:* The following four indicators[14] are proposed to track results under this program*:*

(a) POPs phased out from use (tons and cost per ton per compound)

(b) POPs phased out from production (tons and cost per ton per compound)

(c) POPs destroyed in an environmentally sound manner (tons and cost per ton per compound and mode of destruction)

(d) Reduced exposure to POPs, measured as the number of people living in close proximity to POPs wastes that have been disposed of or contained

38. *Scope:* Following Convention guidance, activities supported will be in conformity with, and supportive of, the priorities identified in countries' respective NIPs. Projects will seek to reduce POPs production, use, and releases through phase-out, destruction in an environmentally sound manner, and use of substitute products and alternative processes. The precise nature of these interventions will be defined by the NIP and could include, for example: identification, labeling, removal from use, and disposal in an environmentally sound manner of PCBs; use of non-POPs alternative products and practices for disease vector or termite control; or the environmentally sound destruction of POPs wastes and prevention of stockpiling. Emphasis will be placed on assisting countries in reducing their need for specific exemptions.

39. Consistent with priorities identified under a NIP, an intervention might specifically address threats from POPs to international waters, the sustainable management of land, or an area of high biodiversity conservation value. These linkages with the other GEF focal areas will be encouraged under GEF-4 in order to maximise the impact of GEF interventions.

40. *Priority Countries:* Support under this high-priority program should be targeted to countries that have already established much of the necessary enabling environment to

[14] Not all projects under this program will necessarily destroy POPs, but could decrease the risk of POPs releases and human exposure, for example, through maintaining a PCB transformer or containment of soil contamination.

implement their NIP, and that demonstrate a willingness to follow through on their commitment to phase-out/reduce the targeted POPs.

41. *Types of Projects:* Projects to be implemented under this program will be largely oriented towards investment, with some technical assistance and capacity building included. Industrial and private sector involvement is expected to be significant and will be promoted under this program, which will require the GEF agencies to adopt appropriate approaches targeted to these stakeholders. In general, techniques and environmental practices that will also reduce pollution with other problematic pollutants will be preferred. These types of activities would offer the greatest opportunities for replication, which will be systematically promoted.

Strategic Program 3: Partnering in the Demonstration of Feasible, Innovative Technologies and Best Practices for POPs Reduction and Substitution

42. *Objective (a) – Demonstrations:* In order to meet the future challenges that lay ahead in the implementation of the Stockholm Convention, the GEF will support projects that demonstrate and promote the replication of environmentally sound, alternative products to POPs, or the substitution of materials and processes to prevent POPs formation.

43. *Outcome:* Feasible and effective environmentally sound alternative products, practices, and techniques that prevent POPs production, use, or release are demonstrated. In particular, the GEF is expected to support a significant number of projects addressing DDT alternatives. Together with the two projects approved under GEF-3, this cohort of projects will provide a valuable dataset demonstrating the conditions necessary for successful implementation of DDT alternatives in a wide variety of socioeconomic and ecological settings.

44. *Indicator:* Number of environmentally sound, alternative products, practices, or techniques demonstrated that are cost-effective, out of the total number demonstrated.

45. *Scope:* Demonstration projects will be supported by the GEF where there is a need to test and demonstrate approaches before they could be implemented in a more systematic manner[15]. It is expected, therefore, that activities promoted through strategic program 3 could move up to strategic program 2 in future phases of the GEF. Funding for demonstration projects falls into two categories: a) projects that are linked to improved environmental practices that are not physical infrastructure (e.g., assistance to identify alternative products, practices, or processes to replace DDT use in disease vector control and POPs used as termiticides); and b) projects that demonstrate the use of a particular technique to help enhance the infrastructure of a country to manage POPs (e.g., improving the capacity for POPs destruction in GEF recipient countries) or the

[15] The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) has identified a number of issues that, if not addressed, could limit the successful implementation of the Stockholm Convention, including: alternatives to POPs termiticides; alternatives to DDT; lack of suitable destruction technologies in developing countries; and implementation of Best Available Technology / Best Environmental Practice (BAT/BEP).

demonstration of best available techniques/best environmental practices for the reduction of releases of unintentionally produced POPs.

46. Emphasis will be on demonstrating products, practices, or techniques that are appropriate within a particular context, rather than on the development and testing of untried products, practices, or techniques. In general, techniques and environmental practices that will also reduce pollution from other problematic pollutants will be preferred.

47. *Priority Countries:* Support will be targeted where: GEF intervention would have high demonstration value: the country already has the necessary enabling environment; and the country demonstrates a strong commitment to follow through on implementation following the conclusion of GEF support.

48. *Types of Projects:* Demonstration projects will include capacity building and technical assistance. Particular emphasis will be placed on the promotion of replication and wide dissemination of project outcomes. Priority will be given to collaborative projects, particularly those carried out in cooperation with the private sector.

49. *Objective (b) – Targeted Research:* GEF will support a limited number of targeted research activities where this would increase the quality and effectiveness of a significant portion of ongoing and future GEF-funded POPs activities.

50. *Outcome:* Increased quality and effectiveness of GEF's POPs portfolio through GEF projects, applying the results of targeted research.

51. *Indicator:* New projects that apply the results of GEF-supported targeted research. Although this indicator is not relevant during the GEF-4 time-frame, an indicator of output that will be tracked during GEF-4 is the number of targeted research projects addressing critical portfolio needs supported.

52. *Scope:* Taking into account the large body of existing research in industrialized countries, as well as the large potential to conduct further research there, it is expected that only a limited number of targeted research projects will be supported, focused on addressing information gaps in GEF client countries that would hinder the development of GEF projects and programs if left unaddressed. Examples include: the development/promotion of cost-effective techniques for the rapid assessment of POPs concentrations; development of methodologies for exposure assessment in susceptible populations; testing and demonstrating methodologies and techniques to identify and address contaminated sites related to stockpiles and wastes where this could generate significant cost-savings; and improvement in methods to estimate POPs releases.

53. *Priority Countries:* Targeted research will be supported in countries where projects can rely on existing institutions that can be harnessed and strengthened, as appropriate, in the process.

54. *Types of Projects:* Targeted research projects are expected to be MSPs that include technical assistance and capacity building in GEF-eligible countries' institutions, and which encourage South-South cooperation and networking.

Table 2: GEF Strategic Programs for GEF-4 Financing Under the POPs Focal Area

Strategic Programs	Expected outcomes	Indicators
1. Strengthening capacities for NIP implementation	NIP implementation: GEF-eligible countries have the capacity** to implement the measures to meet their obligations under the Stockholm Convention, including POPs reduction measures	• Legislative and regulatory framework in place for the management of POPs, and the sound management of chemicals in general, in supported countries • Strengthened and sustainable administrative capacity, including chemicals management administration within the central government in supported countries • Strengthened and sustainable capacity for enforcement in supported countries
	NIP development: GEF-eligible countries meet their obligation to develop and submit a NIP to the Stockholm Convention (enabling activities)	• NIPs submitted to the Stockholm Convention*
2. Partnering in investments for NIP implementation	Sustainably reduced POPs production, use, and releases, through phase-out, destruction in an environmentally sound manner, and use of substitute products and alternative processes, that lead to reduced environmental and health risks resulting from POPs	• POPs phased-out from use (tons and cost per ton per compound) • POPs phased-out from production (tons and cost per ton per compound) • POPs destroyed in an environmentally sound manner (tons and cost per ton per compound and per mode of destruction) • Reduced exposure to POPs, measured as number of people living in close proximity to POPs wastes that have been disposed of or contained
3. Partnering in the demonstration of feasible, innovative technologies and best practices for POPs reduction and substitution	Demonstrations: Feasible and effective environmentally sound alternative products, practices or techniques that avoid POPs production, use or release are demonstrated	• Number of environmentally sound alternative products, practices, or techniques demonstrated that are efficacious and cost-effective, out of the total number demonstrated
	Targeted research: Increased quality and effectiveness of the GEF POPs portfolio through GEF projects applying the results of targeted research	• New projects apply the results of GEF-supported targeted research (not relevant during GEF-4 time-frame)

* Applies to all NIPs submitted during the GEF-4 replenishment period, including those that were funded during previous replenishment periods.

** The difficulty of measuring capacity development is acknowledged. The definition of the baseline at the beginning of a project will be crucial. The GEF Office of Evaluation is conducting an evaluation of GEF's capacity development work that will inform the development and measurement of indicators for this strategic program.

VI. INTERLINKAGES WITH OTHER FOCAL AREAS

55. The POPs focal area has linkages with all other focal areas of the GEF, either because POPs are a driver for ecosystem degradation and removal of POPs reduces the stress on those ecosystems (e.g., biodiversity, sustainable land management, or international waters), or because interventions in one focal area can have co-benefits in other areas (e.g., climate change, ozone depletion), or because interventions can be complementary (e.g., international waters, ozone depletion). GEF-4 strategic programs with the greatest potential for such linkages are identified below.

56. POPs are a subset of persistent toxic substances (PTS) and were historically eligible for GEF funding under international waters (IW). In order to maximise complementarity between the two focal areas, the IW focal area will now focus it activities on non-POPs PTS in IW strategic programs 2 and 4. In instances where projects address the stress to IW from both POPs and PTS, they can be financed through contributions from both focal areas.

57. POPs are a threat to wildlife and biodiversity, and ultimately all POPs projects benefit the biodiversity focal area. The aquatic environment is both a sink for POPs and a major pathway for exposure to POPs. This translates to POPs resources being allocated to reducing releases to particular waterbodies or terrestrial ecosystems as a matter of priority,[16] thereby potentially contributing to biodiversity strategic programs 2 and 3.

58. With sustainable land management, the linkages are varied and concern all the strategic programs. Linkages could include interventions that reduce the reliance of local communities on POPs and other pesticides, or address the legacy of land degraded through historical pesticides abuse or obsolete pesticides spread over large areas. Programs that minimize slash and burn practices will have a beneficial impact on emissions of unintentionally produced POPs.

59. The ozone layer depletion focal area addresses different but not unrelated halogenated compounds. Capacities built to manage ozone-depleting substances (ODS) – for example, regarding trade and licensing – can be harnessed to manage POPs and vice-versa. As another example, specific technologies suitable for the destruction of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) are also suitable for the destruction of PCBs.

60. Linkages with the climate change focal area are no less important. With respect to adaptation, for example, changing climatic factors have to be taken into account when devising an integrated vector control strategy as an alternative to spraying DDT. With respect to mitigation, the major source categories singled out as responsible for

[16] Typically, even when this is not explicitly acknowledged at the program level, wherever a priority setting exercise takes place – for example, to decide which stockpile of obsolete POPs to remove as a priority –considerations take into account proximity of human settlement as well as proximity to aquatic systems and areas of biodiversity of significance.

unintentional production of POPs are all energy-intensive processes, and thus there are potentially strong linkages with climate change strategic program 2[17].

61. Exploring and exploiting these linkages will lead to designing potentially synergistic interventions that generate multi-focal area benefits.

[17] However, it is worth noting that synergies between promotion of energy efficiency and reduction of releases of POPs byproducts are neither always clear or automatic.