



TOGETHER
for a sustainable future

OCCASION

This publication has been made available to the public on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation.



TOGETHER
for a sustainable future

DISCLAIMER

This document has been produced without formal United Nations editing. The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries, or its economic system or degree of development. Designations such as “developed”, “industrialized” and “developing” are intended for statistical convenience and do not necessarily express a judgment about the stage reached by a particular country or area in the development process. Mention of firm names or commercial products does not constitute an endorsement by UNIDO.

FAIR USE POLICY

Any part of this publication may be quoted and referenced for educational and research purposes without additional permission from UNIDO. However, those who make use of quoting and referencing this publication are requested to follow the Fair Use Policy of giving due credit to UNIDO.

CONTACT

Please contact publications@unido.org for further information concerning UNIDO publications.

For more information about UNIDO, please visit us at www.unido.org



Swiss Agency for
Development
and Cooperation
SDC



Swiss Agency for
the Environment,
Forests and
Landscape SAEFL

International POPs Elimination Project

*Promotion of Active and Efficient Civil Society Participation in
Preparation for Implementation of the Stockholm Convention*

International POPs Elimination Project (IPEP) Final Performance Report

**Joseph DiGangi, Global Project Coordinator
International POPs Elimination Project
Environmental Health Fund
September 2006**

Table of Contents

3	List of tables
4	List of abbreviations
5	Acknowledgements
6	Executive summary
11	Introduction and objectives
12	Summary of performance against objectives and goals
16	Objective 1: Activities that provide concrete and immediate contributions to country efforts in preparing for Stockholm Convention implementation
16	Types of IPEP reports and activities
16	IPEP Project list
17	Translation
17	Website
17	Expert teams
18	Participation in National Implementation Plans
19	Contributing to increasing Stockholm Convention ratifications
19	Global day of action on POPs
19	Global egg study
22	Increased public awareness
23	Objective 2: Enhance the skills and knowledge of NGOs to help build their capacity as effective stakeholders in Convention implementation
23	Increased NGO capacity
25	Provided civil society policy inputs
26	Increased NGO – government collaboration
27	Fostered precedent-setting research
27	Increased collaboration between regions
28	Utility of workshops
28	Developed long-term commitment to work on POPs and chemical safety
29	Need for more NGO capacity
30	Objective 3: Help establish regional NGO coordination and capacity in all regions of the world
30	Regional hub responsibilities and selection
31	Outreach to NGOs
33	Replication of similar activities speeds implementation
33	Importance of face to face meetings
34	Importance of hubs

35	Annex 1. Project management
37	Annex 2. Funding
40	Annex 3. Output 1: Produce and disseminate POPs information
59	Annex 4. Output 2: Participation in National Implementation Plans
62	Annex 5. Output 3: Increased awareness
77	Annex 6. Output 4: Increased NGO capacity
84	Annex 7. IPEP project activity list

List of tables

14	IPEP output summary
40	Table 1. Country situation reports by country
41	Table 2. Hotspot reports by country
49	Table 3A. Policy briefs by country
51	Table 3B. Policy recommendations by country
59	Table 4. NGO participation in NIPs by country
62	Table 5. Public awareness campaigns by country
72	Table 6. Workshops and capacity building activities by country
77	Table 7. NGOs that will continue as stakeholders or providers of POPs-related information
82	Table 8. NGOs that have secured funding for future work on POPs and chemical safety

List of abbreviations

CEE	Central and Eastern European
COP	Conference of the Parties
CSO	Civil society organization
DDT	Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane
EECCA	Eastern Europe, Caucasus, and Central Asia
EHF	Environmental Health Fund
GAIA	Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives
GDA	Global Day of Action
GEF	Global Environment Facility
HCWH	Health Care Without Harm
IPEN	International POPs Elimination Network
IPEP	International POPs Elimination Project
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NIP	National Implementation Plan
PAM	Project activity memorandum
PAN	Pesticide Action Network
PCBs	Polychlorinated biphenyls
POPs	Persistent organic pollutants
PRTR	Pollutant release and transfer registry
PTS	Persistent toxic substances
RAPAL	Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y sus Alternativas en América Latina
RAPAM	Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México
SAICM	Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNITAR	United Nations Institute for Training and Research
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UPOPs	Unintentionally produced POPs
WHO	World Health Organization

Acknowledgements

Thank you to all funders, implementing agencies, Project Steering Committee members, and partners including the Global Environment Facility, UNIDO, UNEP, UNITAR, UNDP Small Grants Programme, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, Swiss Agency for the Environment Forests and Landscape, the Canada POPs Fund, the Dutch Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment (VROM), and the charitable foundations that support IPEN.

A very heartfelt thanks to the coordinators and colleagues of the regional hubs as the key to the success of IPEP; Mohamed Aly Abdelsalam El Banna, Maria Eugenia Acosta, Fernando Bejarano, Manny Calonzo, Upasana Choudhry, Henry Diouf, Ladislav Kleger, Hana Kuncova, Silvani Mng'anya, Jindrich Petrlik, Olga Speranskaya, Romeo Quijano, Sampaguita Quijano, and Martin Skalsky.

Thanks for guidance and advice throughout the Project from the Environmental Health Fund Global Chemical Safety Program, IPEN Secretariat, IPEN Co-Chairs, and the IPEN Steering Committee.

I also appreciate the cooperation of all Governments where IPEP was implemented.

Thank you to more than 350 NGOs who participated in IPEP for your hard work in advancing Stockholm Convention goals and moving towards a toxics free future.

Finally, thank you to my colleague, Jack Weinberg, the principal architect of IPEP, for his steady guidance and wisdom.

Executive summary

In many developing countries and countries with economies in transition, there has often been very limited and incomplete public awareness and understanding about the severe health and environmental harm caused by POPs and other chemical pollutants. NGOs could help address this problem but without new support and assistance, they lacked the capacity they needed to play their desired roles. These included effectively helping to raise public awareness about POPs, increasing civil society participation in Stockholm Convention-related activities, and in providing direct contributions to Stockholm Convention National Implementation Plan preparations and other activities aimed at helping their country prepare for effective Convention implementation.

To tackle these urgent needs, the International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN www.ipen.org) began a global NGO project called the International POPs Elimination Project (IPEP) in partnership with the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). The Global Environment Facility (GEF) provided core funding for the project. Major project co-financiers included agencies of the Swiss government in cooperation with United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR); the Canadian POPs Fund in cooperation with UNEP Chemicals; the Dutch Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment (VROM); and charitable foundation funders of IPEN. Information about IPEP management is described in Annex 1. Funding information can be found in Annex 2. The two-year Project began 1 May 2004 with three principal objectives^b:

- Objective 1: Encourage and enable NGOs in 40 developing and transitional countries to engage in activities that provide concrete and immediate contributions to country efforts in preparing for the implementation of the Stockholm Convention;
- Objective 2: Enhance the skills and knowledge of NGOs to help build their capacity as effective stakeholders in the Convention implementation process;
- Objective 3: Help establish regional and national coordination and capacity in all regions of the world in support of NGO contributions to effective Stockholm Convention implementation as well as longer term efforts to achieve chemical safety.

IPEP performance in each of these three objectives is discussed below.

^b See Project Document Section 9, Objective

Objective 1: Activities that provide concrete and immediate contributions to country efforts in preparing for Stockholm Convention implementation

The Project supported NGO participation in the development of Stockholm Convention National Implementation Plans (NIPs), training and awareness workshops, and public information and awareness-raising activities. It also supported the preparation and dissemination of NGO reports describing the country situation with respect to POPs, hotspot reports on contaminated sites or practices leading to POPs formation, and POPs-related policy briefs.^c

NIP Participation. IPEP served to substantially enhance meaningful participation by public interest NGOs in NIP preparations. By the end of the Project, 88 IPEP-associated NGOs had participated in the Stockholm Convention NIP preparations in 53 countries.

POPS Country Situation Reports. NGOs produced reports in 44 countries that described and assessed the country situation with respect to POPs and Stockholm Convention implementation. These country situation reports provided the basic information required by NGOs for awareness-raising activities.

POPs Awareness-Raising Activities. The Project supported wide, multi-lingual outreach on POPs and the Stockholm Convention by NGOs to all sectors of society including farmers, women, students, health care practitioners, incinerator operators, municipal workers, community based organizations, agricultural workers, academic professors, government officials, media and others. These efforts often included translation of materials into local languages. NGOs in 52 countries produced 150 public awareness-raising activities.

POPs Hotspot Reports. NGOs in 39 countries also performed research, collected samples for POPS analysis, organized community mapping, and devised strategies for preventing POPs formation, along with many other activities to characterize contaminated POPs hotspots or practices producing POPs. These included stockpiles of obsolete pesticides, informal sector practices, old factories, POPs pesticides in agriculture, waste incineration, dumpsites, and many others.

POPs-Related Policy Briefs. IPEP NGOs produced 21 focused policy briefs and 88 reports with policy recommendations for a total of 109 reports containing NGO policy recommendations. The topics included waste management, DDT and malaria, and how NGOs might better participate in decision-making processes in multi-lateral environmental agreements.

^c Available at the IPEP portion of the IPEN website www.ipen.org

Objective 2: Enhance the skills and knowledge of NGOs to help build their capacity as effective stakeholders in the Convention implementation process

Prior to IPEP, NGOs in many regions had more experience with other issues such as, for example, climate change, biodiversity, HIV AIDS, malaria, desertification, poverty eradication etc. IPEP has helped further increase the number of NGOs with an interest in POPs and other issues related to sound chemicals management, and it has helped build the capacity of both individuals and NGOs on POPs and the Stockholm Convention. The Project also helped increase technical capacity and the ability to engage governments on the POPs and issues related to sound chemicals management.

According to a survey conducted by the regional hubs, the impact of IPEP has motivated 200 NGOs in 65 countries to indicate that they are committed to continue as stakeholders, advocates, and/or providers of POPs information. In 27 countries, 37 NGOs indicated that they have already secured funding support to continue working on POPs and chemical safety issues.

Objective 3: Help establish regional NGO coordination and capacity in all regions of the world.

A key to the success of IPEP was the establishment of eight regional facilitation hubs based within existing NGOs. The hubs served both a strategic and helping function in IPEP. Their responsibilities included: identifying NGOs in their country and surrounding countries with an interest and ability to work on IPEP activities; help the NGOs prepare proposals with well identified outputs, indicators, a deadline and payment schedule, help NGOs with executing the activities and preparing the reports; facilitating communications between NGOs in the region; and disseminating relevant information to stakeholders and the public. The regional facilitation and coordination relationships established by the hubs during the project have now become an integral part of IPEN's global coordinating structure.

NGOs in each region selected the following NGOs to serve as regional hubs for the two-year term of IPEP:

Anglophone Africa

Silvani Mng'anya, Agenda for Environment and Responsible Development (AGENDA) (Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania) (*working in English*) Gambia, Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda

Central and Eastern Europe

Jindrich Petrlík, Arnika (Prague, Czech Republic) (*working in English*) Albania, Belarus, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Romania, Slovakia, Turkey

Eastern Europe, Caucasus, and Central Asia

Olga Speranskaya, Eco-Accord (Moscow, Russia) (*working in Russian*) Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Francophone Africa

Henry Diouf, Pesticide Action Network Africa (PAN Africa) (Dakar, Senegal) (*working in French*) Benin, Burundi, Cameroon, Congo, Guinea Bissau, Mali, Mauritania, Senegal, Togo

Latin America

Fernando Bejarano, Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México (RAPAM) (Texcoco, México) (*working in Spanish*) Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, México, Paraguay, Perú, Uruguay, Venezuela

Middle East

Mohamed Aly Abdelsalam El Banna, Day Hospital Institute for Development and Rehabilitation (Cairo, Egypt) (*working in Arabic*) Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Palestine, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Yemen

South Asia

Upasana Choudhry, Toxics Link (New Delhi, India) (*working in English*) Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka

Southeast Asia

Manny Calonzo and Romeo Quijano, Southeast Asia POPs Elimination Network (collaboration between Pesticide Action Network Philippines and the Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives [GAIA]) (Manila, Philippines) (*working in English*) Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Thailand

Developing regional facilitation hubs represented a major step forward in IPEN's organizational operation. For the first time, IPEN had an organized regional management structure designed to help develop NGO capacity and coordinate strategic work on the ground in eight large regions of the world.

Conclusion

IPEP successfully met its three objectives. It encouraged and enabled more than 350 non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in 65 developing countries and countries with economies in transition to engage in more than 290 activities within their countries that provided concrete and immediate contributions to country efforts in preparing for Stockholm Convention implementation. These activities greatly enhanced NGO skill and knowledge and prepared many to engage effectively in ongoing Stockholm Convention implementation activities. IPEP also established a system of regional NGO coordination hubs that have already evolved into a sustainable regional coordinating mechanism that is now an integral part of the organizational structure of the International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN).

Introduction and objectives

In July 1998, over 100 NGO representatives met just prior to the first POPs Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INC) meeting in Montreal, Canada. The NGOs formed the International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN) and unanimously adopted the POPs Elimination Platform.^d

This common platform guided the cooperative work of a large and diverse international coalition of NGOs from all regions to help shape and promote an intergovernmental agreement on provisions that, taken together, added up to an effective global POPs Treaty. IPEN maintained a strong NGO presence at all the POPs negotiating meetings, and at all the other working group meetings, workshops and other global and regional intergovernmental gatherings that shaped the final terms of the Convention. No one doubts that IPEN and its Platform had a substantial impact on the Convention's final shape and its provisions.

When the Convention was adopted at a Diplomatic Conference held in Stockholm in 2001, IPEN arrived at a crossroads: it had completed its initial mission to promote the adoption of an effective global POPs instrument. An IPEN meeting held at that time decided to continue the network and adopted a new IPEN common platform: the IPEN Stockholm Declaration.^e This Declaration established IPEN's new mission, "to facilitate effective involvement by its Participating Organizations in local, national, and international activities to promote the elimination of POPs and other persistent toxic substances."

IPEN's primary task became Stockholm Convention implementation and other measures aimed at achieving the elimination of POPs and other persistent toxic substances of equivalent concern. What began as a network whose aim was to influence the negotiated text of a Convention was transformed into a network to promote NGO activities aimed at actually eliminating pollutants from the world. IPEN's past strength had been to coordinate and facilitate NGO interventions in a global policy process. IPEN decided to prepare and execute the International POPs Elimination Project (IPEP) in order to contribute to this new mission and to enable NGO POPs elimination efforts at local, national and regional levels.

IPEP was designed to help NGOs participating in the IPEN network begin to overcome many existing barriers to effective NGO engagement in Stockholm Convention implementation and longer-term efforts to reduce and eliminate other persistent toxic substances (PTS). In many developing countries and countries with economies in transition, there is often very limited and incomplete public awareness and understanding

^d http://www.ipen.org/pops_platform.htm#platform

^e <http://www.ipen.org/stockholmdec.html>

about the severe health and environmental harm caused by POPs and other chemical pollutants. Data about POPs, obsolete stockpiles, and other toxic chemicals is often incomplete, inaccessible, or does not exist. The lack of testing facilities for POPs, especially unintentionally produced substances such as dioxins and furans (UPOPs), makes monitoring these substances difficult. Government responsibility for addressing POPs and other toxic chemicals tends to be divided between many ministries none of which generally view POPs and other chemical safety issues as a top priority. Nor have most countries had a history of public participation in national efforts aimed at addressing chemical pollution.

IPEP was developed and executed by IPEN in partnership with the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). The Global Environment Facility (GEF) provided core funding. Major project co-financers included agencies of the Swiss government in cooperation with United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR); the Canadian POPs Fund in cooperation with UNEP Chemicals; the Dutch Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment (VROM); charitable foundation funders and NGOs participating in IPEN. The two-year Project began 1 May 2004 with three principal objectives:^f

- Encourage and enable NGOs in 40 developing and transitional countries to engage in activities that provide concrete and immediate contributions to country efforts in preparing for the implementation of the Stockholm Convention;
- Enhance the skills and knowledge of NGOs to help build their capacity as effective stakeholders in the Convention implementation process;
- Help establish regional and national coordination and capacity in all regions of the world in support of NGO contributions to effective Stockholm Convention implementation as well as longer term efforts to achieve chemical safety.

This report will describe the objectives, outputs, and impacts of IPEP. For an excellent and more detailed review of IPEP in each of its eight regions, please see the individual regional reports posted on the IPEN website (click on IPEP) www.ipen.org.

Summary of performance against objectives and goals

IPEP met its three objectives. It encouraged and enabled more than 350 non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in 65 developing countries and countries with

^f See Project Document Section 9, Objective

economies in transition to engage in more than 290 distinct project activities within their countries. Each of these project activities was based on a Project Activity Memorandum that was agreed in advance between the NGOs carrying out the activity, the IPEP Regional Hub and IPEP Global Management. These project activities provided concrete and immediate contributions to country efforts in preparing for Stockholm Convention implementation.

IPEP performance exceeded expectations in each of the four key output areas: 1) produce and disseminate POPs information, 2) participation in National Implementation Plans, 3) increased awareness, and 4) increased NGO capacity.

IPEP Output Summary

	IPEP Output	Project Goal ⁹
Output 1: Produce and disseminate info		
Country situation reports	44	40
Hotspot reports	108	30
Policy briefs and recommendations	109	30
Output 2: Participation in NIPs	53 countries	20 countries
Output 3: Increased awareness		
Public awareness activities	150	40
Info and training workshops	53	20
Output 4: Increased NGO capacity		
Continued work on POPs	65 countries	30 countries
Secure funding to continue activities	27 countries	20 countries

The multidisciplinary nature of the IPEP activities meant that the various types of IPEP reports and activities were often combined in a single Project Activity Memorandum (PAM). For example, a PAM calling for developing a hotspot report might include a complete public awareness-raising campaign in the same proposal. For proper accounting, activities were tabulated based on what was actually done. There were only two special cases: country situation reports were in a category by themselves, and the documenting of policy briefs distinguished between reports dedicated as briefs and

⁹ See UNEP Project Document, Project Description, Activities and Financial Inputs Needed to enable Changes

reports containing NGO policy recommendations. Each of the topic categories presented is discussed further below in the body of the report.

The Project faced some unforeseen external challenges. During the Project period, the Asian region was hit by the tsunami which affected NGOs in Sri Lanka, the southern part of India, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand as they had to grapple with its after affects. Later a devastating earthquake shook the northern part of India and Pakistan. Finally, political disturbances disrupted communication and occupied the attention of NGOs in Nepal, Bangladesh, and Palestine. Despite these challenges, civil society groups kept the POPs and chemicals issues alive.

IPEP was successfully implemented along the lines described in the UNEP Project Document. Hubs were chosen in all the regions and served for the full term of the Project, guiding NGOs throughout the process and maintaining excellent collaborative relations with the global project manager. Hubs identified NGOs in their regions to participate in the project and worked with them to develop Project Activity Memoranda (PAMs) that describe project activities the NGO would perform and agreed payments for the work. These NGOs then performed the work outlined in a total of more than 290 PAMs with no defaults. The global project manager produced regular reports and maintained an excellent working relationship with UNIDO staff who implemented hundreds of money transfers directly to hundreds of developing country NGOs. There were, however, some problems and positive lessons after two years of IPEP activities that were revealed in implementing a global NGO project of this magnitude. These are discussed in the body of the report below during descriptions of each of the three Project objectives.

Output 1 Produce and disseminate POPs information

The goal for the two-year Project was to produce 40 Country Situation Reports. IPEP produced 44 Country Situation Reports in the following countries: Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bulgaria, Cameroon, China, Croatia, Czech Republic, Egypt, Estonia, Ghana, Georgia, Hungary, India, Jordan, Lebanon, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Mexico, Malaysia (2), Mali, Moldova, Nepal, Palestine, Philippines, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, Sri Lanka, Syria, Tanzania, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Venezuela, and Yemen. For a list of NGOs producing the reports, please see the list in Annex 3.

The IPEP goal was to have 30 Hotspot reports with approximately four per region. IPEP produced 108 Hotspot reports with the number of reports per region varying from seven to 33. For a list of NGOs producing the reports and their titles, please see Table 2 in Annex 3.

The goal for policy briefs was to produce 30 with approximately four per region. IPEP produced 21 focused policy briefs and 88 reports with policy recommendations for a total of 109 reports containing NGO policy recommendations in reports. For a list of NGOs producing the reports and their titles, please see Tables 3A and 3B in Annex 3.

Output 2 Participation in National Implementation Plans

The overall Project goal for NIP participation was to have NGOs participating in 2 – 3 countries per region for a total of 20 countries. Eighty-eight IPEP-associated NGOs participated in the NIPs in 53 countries during the Project period. For a list of NGOs and countries, please see Table 4 in Annex 4.

Output 3 Increased awareness

The goal for this output was to have eight public awareness-raising activities per region for a total of 40 for the Project. IPEP produced 150 activities with the number of activities per region varying from 10 to 44. For a list of NGOs, countries, and project titles, please see Table 5 in Annex 5.

IPEP also planned to have 2-3 informational workshops and capacity building activities per region for a total of 20. By the end the Project, IPEP NGOs had conducted 53 workshops with the number per region varying from 2 to 9. For a list of NGOs, countries, and project titles, please see Table 6 in Annex 5.

Output 4 Increased NGO capacity

One goal for this output was to have NGOs in more than 30 countries continue as stakeholders and/or advocates and/or providers of POPs-related information. According to a survey conducted by regional hubs, 200 IPEP participating NGOs in 65 countries indicated they plan to continue as Stockholm Convention stakeholders. For a list of NGOs and countries, please see Table 7 in Annex 6. Another goal for this output was to help NGOs in 20 countries secure funds or other sources of support to enable them to continue their activities. At the end of the Project, 37 IPEP-associated NGOs from 27 countries indicated that they had secured funds to continue working in the area. For a list of NGOs and countries, please see Table 8 in Annex 6.

Objective 1: Activities that provide concrete and immediate contributions to country efforts in preparing for Stockholm Convention implementation

Types of IPEP reports and activities

IPEP supported NGO work on three types of reports and three types of activities concerning POPs and Stockholm Convention. IPEP reports included country situation reports, hotspot reports, and policy briefs. IPEP activities included participation in the National Implementation Plan (NIP), training and awareness workshops, and public information and awareness-raising activities. A brief description of these follows.

Country situation reports: These reports described the state of Convention ratification, POPs sources, the extent of harm caused by POPs and other relevant country information. The intended audience for these reports was NGOs or academics and others with a public policy interest.

Hotspot reports: Hotspot reports described POPs-contaminated sites or a pattern of activities or practices that release POPs. The goal was for these reports to contribute toward building the support necessary for effective action aimed at reducing and eliminating POPs.

Policy briefs: The policy briefs identified a country-relevant policy topic relating to the Stockholm Convention and proposed solutions and public policies.

Participation in the NIP: This key activity of the project included both direct participation and providing substantive, useful information inputs into the NIP process.

Training and awareness workshops: The goal of the workshops was to increase knowledge and capacity about POPs and related issues among NGOs and provide support for NGO activities on POPs.

Public awareness-raising activities: These activities and campaigns helped the media and public understand POPs, the Convention, and possible solutions to POPs problems in the country.

IPEP Project list

A full list of IPEP Project titles and NGOs is listed by country in Annex 7. Project summaries provide a more informative view of the activities, but due to the size they occupy (more than 100 pages) they are presented instead on the IPEP website at www.ipen.org. In addition keyword categories on the website can help the viewer find reports about certain topics including: Country situation reports for contribution to NIP

processes; DDT; PCBs; Unintentionally produced POPs (dioxins, furans, HCB, PCBs); Obsolete pesticides; New POPs; POPs Hotspots; Waste management and POPs; Public information, education, capacity-building, and awareness-raising; Policy and legislation Pesticides, agriculture and integrated pest management; Inventories and data collection; Monitoring and assessment; Health and ecosystem impacts; Indigenous Peoples and POPs; and Alternatives to practices that use or generate POPs.

Translation

Since IPEP worked in five of the six UN languages, it also supported translation of key information and documents to ensure availability in Arabic, English, French, Russian, and Spanish. This helped spread POPs expertise around the growing network.

Website

To help provide access to IPEP results, the Project established a multi-lingual website. The IPEP website was developed and launched in March 2005 in coordination with the release of an interregional project to sample eggs for by-product POPs. The site features a Google search function and information about the partners, projects, and Hubs. The Library section includes relevant UN and GEF documents for work on POPs. Flags denote the working website languages: Arabic, English, French, Russian, and Spanish. The website was presented to participants of COP1 and has been integrated with the IPEN website at www.ipen.org. IPEN has secured the support needed to maintain and update this website.

Expert teams

The IPEP GEF Project Document called for establishing and maintaining five issue-focused NGO expert teams to provide support and assistance to NGOs. The idea was that NGOs could request policy or technical advice from the appropriate team and quickly move forward with their project activities. The teams would cover five topics: DDT, alternatives to POPs pesticides, obsolete stockpiles and wastes, inventories, and monitoring. This aspect of the Project was implemented differently than was originally imagined primarily because project planners expected it would be easier than it proved to be to raise co-finance money directly allocated to this task.

Therefore, a less-formal version of the expert teams was developed. Instead of a centralized global team responding to requests, NGOs developed relationships with academic experts, physicians, medical associations and academies of sciences, researchers, certified laboratory analysts, nurses, and other professionals in their countries and regions to mobilize needed expertise. Although the project did not establish five global expert teams as planned, NGOs did develop in its place sustainable mutually helpful relationships within the project as well as links with a great number of newly

identified professional experts interested in chemicals issues in their own countries and regions.

Participation in National Implementation Plans

In Article 7, the Stockholm Convention states the importance of governments consulting with civil society in formulating and implementing National Implementation Plans (NIPs); *“The Parties shall, where appropriate, cooperate directly or through global, regional and subregional organizations, and consult their national stakeholders, including women’s groups and groups involved in the health of children, in order to facilitate the development, implementation and updating of their implementation plans.”*

In addition, GEF guidelines stress the importance of participation in the NIP by a range of interest groups which includes *“...nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) such as relevant environmental, academic, social, women’s, and child protection organizations, and organizations from the industrial, commercial, agricultural and labor sectors.”*

IPEN’s policy is to strongly support genuine participation of NGOs in NIP preparation processes, including participation in decision making. Unfortunately, not all governments recognize the importance of civil society participation in NIP preparations. For the purposes of IPEP, we defined NIP participation to include both direct NGO contributions to the NIP process as well as useful inputs into the process in cases where NGOs encountered barriers to their substantive direct participation.

The IPEP goal was to have NGOs in 20 countries participate in some way in the NIP. By the end of the Project, 88 IPEP-associated NGOs had participated in the Stockholm Convention NIP preparations in 53 countries: Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Benin, Cambodia, Cameroon, Colombia, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Egypt, India, Gambia, Georgia, Ghana, Hungary, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Mali, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Moldova, Nepal, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Russia, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Thailand, Turkey, Togo, Uganda, Ukraine, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, and Yemen.

In some countries, IPEN NGOs were given important roles in the NIP preparation process including membership on the national coordinating committee and/or active participation in subcommittees. In other countries, the government did not allow meaningful participation of public interest NGOs even though, in some cases, POPs-producing industries were active players in NIP preparations. On the whole, however, IPEP served to substantially enhance meaningful participation by public interest NGOs in NIP preparations; IPEN will continue to strive for full civil society participation in the NIP and other processes involving decision making on chemicals policy.

Contributing to increasing Stockholm Convention ratifications

Following adoption of the Stockholm Convention in 2001, IPEN began actively campaigning in support of Convention ratification (or accession) in all countries where the network is active. During the two-year period of the IPEP project, a total of 18 countries with significant IPEP activities ratified including Argentina, Burundi, Chile, Congo, Gambia, India, Jordan, Kenya, Mauritania, Morocco, Nigeria, Peru, Romania, Sri Lanka, Syria, Thailand, Uganda and Venezuela.

Global Day of Action on POPs

IPEN called on NGOs around the world to engage in a Global Day of Action in support of POPs elimination to take place in May 2005, prior to the First Conference of the Parties of the Stockholm Convention (COP1). The purpose of this activity was raising public awareness on POPs, and it proved very effective. IPEP supported 60 NGOs in 38 countries in all regions to undertake 53 Global Day of Action activities. These events took different forms in different countries, but the results indicate the great potential of synchronized global NGO efforts.

The outreach activities included: public lectures at universities; roundtable discussions, workshops, and meetings with the National Coordinating Committee of the NIP or other relevant government officials; educational activities on waste management and incineration; citizen inventory activities with schoolchildren; events for youth; construction of a website devoted to NGO activities on POPs and chemical safety; publicizing the results of the global egg study (see below); field visit to an obsolete pesticide site with government officials; screening of NGO-produced videos on POPs, advocating on topics such as: Convention ratification, site cleanup, an end to smuggling, alternatives to incineration, and inclusion of new POPs in the Convention; and extensive outreach to print, TV, and radio media.

NGOs in the following countries mobilized activities for the Global Day of Action: Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Czech Republic, Egypt, Gambia, India, Jordan, Lebanon, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Mauritania, Mexico, Moldova, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Russia, Senegal, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tanzania, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, and Uruguay.

Global egg study

IPEP undertook two ground-breaking globally coordinated studies on POPs contamination in chicken eggs involving NGOs in all regions.^h Both studies found dangerous levels of POPs in eggs collected near potentially polluted sites such as waste incinerators, cement kilns, the metallurgical industry, waste dumps and chemical

^h Available here <http://www.oztoxics.org/ipepweb/egg/Hotspot%20Reports.html>

production facilities. The 17 countries included in the studyⁱ were chosen with priority to those countries that lack information about POPs in their environment.

The first study looked for dioxin, furan, PCB, and HCB contamination in home-raised chicken eggs from 21 locations in 17 countries on five continents. The sampling sites were selected for their proximity to a facility or hotspot that NGOs suspected was a significant environmental source of these unintentionally-produced POPs.

Seventy percent of the samples exceeded the EU limit for dioxins in eggs and sixty percent exceeded proposed EU limits for PCBs in eggs. Three egg samples reported in this study contained some of the highest dioxin levels ever measured in chicken eggs. These egg samples were collected near a metallurgical facility in Egypt, a thermal power plant in Bulgaria, and a chlor-alkali facility in Russia. In 12 of the 17 countries (70%), the IPEP study represented the first national data ever reported on unintentional POPs in eggs.^j

The study did not attempt to identify average of typical levels of POPs in eggs in the country. Rather, samples were taken near facilities NGOs that suspected of being significant POPs sources in an attempt to confirm the suspicion and to highlight the source.

The report on the findings of this study also included the following policy recommendations:

1. Information on unintentionally-produced POPs in food should be collected and made publicly available;
2. The likely POPs sources identified in the study should be prioritized for action under the NIP
3. POPs in wastes must be completely destroyed (several dump sites were featured)
4. Guidelines need to be developed on how to design facilities that avoid POPs formation
5. Implement Convention Article 5 (c) promoting material substitution to prevent POPs formation and release.

The study demonstrated the importance of monitoring in Convention implementation. In Kenya, the national television station produced a documentary on the dumpsite upwind from where the eggs were sampled.

ⁱ Belarus, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Egypt, India, Kenya, Mexico, Mozambique, Pakistan, Philippines, Russia, Senegal, Slovakia, Tanzania, Turkey, Uruguay and the United States

^j The countries are: Belarus, Bulgaria, Egypt, India, Mexico, Kenya, Mozambique, Pakistan, Philippines, Senegal, Tanzania, Turkey, and Uruguay.

NGOs in the Philippines widely publicized the results in the media and the government requested independent testing of the medical waste incinerator's emissions. When the company refused, the government cancelled their permit.

In Uruguay, the cement kiln company had insisted that it only burned agricultural refuse. After the results of the egg testing showed high PCB levels, another explanation had to be found. Residents of the town stepped forward and reported that the kiln was in fact burning chlorine-containing wastes.

Eggs sampled near a waste dump in Senegal unexpectedly did not show the congener pattern of a burning dump, but rather, that associated with certain chlorinated solvents. The results pointed to industrial dumping of chlorinated solvents such as pentachlorophenol.

In Egypt, the record-setting high results focused attention on the Helwan industrial area as a POPs hotspot that needed to be addressed in the NIP.

The Indian press described the study's result as the toxic link to medical waste incineration. It pointed out that no monitoring of medical waste incinerators is done in India and that no norms for food safety exist.

Eggs in the Czech Republic sampled near a chlorine-chemical manufacturing facility showed high levels of HCB and reinforced the need to fully account for this by-product POP in national inventories.

In Russia, the IPEP study produced only the second measurements of dioxins in chicken eggs collected near Dzershinsk, which is named by the Guinness Book of World Records as the world's most polluted industrial town. A large national press conference focused new attention on POPs in Russian food. Study results were disseminated to more than 500 Russian-speaking NGOs.

A second study looked at the same eggs for the presence of the pesticide hexachlorocyclohexane (HCH, Lindane), and at brominated flame retardants, such as polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs) and hexabromocyclododecane (HBCD). This study tested for chemicals with properties that are very similar to the original 12 POPs listed in the Stockholm Convention.

Lindane, beta-HCH and the PBDE flame retardants were found in all samples. The flame retardant, HBCD, appeared in 80 percent of the samples. This study produced the first data on these substances in the environment for most of the countries examined.

The principal IPEN policy recommendation from the second study was to add Lindane and PBDE to the Stockholm Convention. Less a month later, Norway proposed the addition of PBDE to the Convention and Mexico proposed the addition of Lindane. The

POPs Review Committee of the Convention has examined both substances (along with three others) and determined that they fit the POPs screening criteria. The Committee is continuing to examine the risk profiles and socio-economic considerations of the candidate substances to determine if they will be recommended for addition to the Stockholm Convention.

Increased public awareness

IPEP has significantly boosted the understanding among NGOs and the public about what POPs are, including their sources, effects and possible remedial measures. In many countries, this has contributed to increased attention to the topic by the news media. The project did outreach to a wide range of groups including: farmers, women, students, health care practitioners, incinerator operators, municipal workers, community based organizations, agricultural workers, academics, government officials, media and others. As called for in the Convention, many of the IPEP awareness-raising efforts were directed to the most vulnerable. NGOs in 52 countries produced 150 public awareness-raising activities and we have reports from more than 20 countries where these activities were reflected in local or national media.

IPEP has enhanced the ability of governments to honor their commitments under Stockholm Convention Articles 9 and 10, which require them, inter alia, to undertake information exchange concerning alternatives to POPs and POPs reduction or elimination; and to promote and facilitate: awareness among policymakers and the public of POPs, educational programs on POPs, provision to the public of all available information on POPs, and public participation in addressing POPs.

The awareness-raising activities disseminated up to date information on POPs which helped orient new NGOs to the topic and, in some cases, helped prepare NGOs for participation in the NIP. Information exchange between NGOs helped to forge links between organizations working on POPs in different countries and regions. In some regions, IPEP information on POPs has become part of the collection of public libraries or in those of institutions dealing with chemical safety.

An important part of IPEP awareness-raising activities has been to produce materials in both UN and local languages. For example in Paraguay, materials were produced in Guaraní, an Indigenous language, as well as Spanish. In India, reports and activities were conducted in Bengali, Hindi, Telugu, Malayalam, and Punjabi. IPEP produced the first POPs materials available in Nepali and reports in Pakistan were also presented in Pashto. This has helped dissemination and increase stakeholder participation.

The NGOs serving as IPEP regional hubs have described the change in public and NGO awareness over the course of the Project as a “quantum leap” in knowledge about POPs and chemicals and their impacts on public health and the environment.

Objective 2: Enhance the skills and knowledge of NGOs to help build their capacity as effective stakeholders in the Convention implementation process

Increased NGO capacity

Prior to IPEP, NGOs in many regions tended to have more experience with other issues such as, for example, climate change, biodiversity, HIV AIDS, malaria, desertification, poverty eradication etc. IPEP has helped increase the number of NGOs with an interest in POPs and other issues related to sound chemicals management, and it has helped build the capacity of both individuals and NGOs in relationship to POPs elimination and the Stockholm Convention implementation.

For some NGOs, IPEP represented their first opportunity to develop a proposal with a timeline of activities, execute it, write the report, and receive payment. In implementing IPEP activities NGOs learned about the Convention and its ratification process, or how to investigate the details of a contaminated site, or how to assemble a policy proposal, or how to run a public awareness-raising campaign. This learning by doing approach yielded high-quality work as evidenced in the numerous IPEP reports. In addition, many NGOs also learned for the first time about the roles of UN agencies in POPs elimination and chemical safety including UNIDO, UNEP, UNDP, WHO, UNITAR, FAO, and others.

The Project helped enhance the management capabilities of the hub NGOs, required them to develop coordinating and helping relations with NGOs in their regions, and required them also to provide assistance on technical questions and with project management. Some of the technical issues included the use of emission factors in constructing dioxin inventories; pollutant release and transfer registers; pesticide toxicology; sampling methodologies; regulatory limits in a variety of media; Integrated Pollution Prevention Control; and many others.

IPEP helped to build the capacity of community leaders around contaminated sites by providing them with information about the sites that would need in order to participate constructively in for planning remediation. Finally, in several regions, IPEP helped the training of workers as trainers who can now train co-workers on issues related to POPs and the Stockholm Convention.

IPEP produced 53 capacity-building workshops in all regions that helped NGOs and the public audiences build expertise on POPs. In some cases the hubs assembled groups of regional or national experts to help them prepare and execute the workshops and provide helpful services on POPs and other chemical safety issues to NGOs. Many of these experts continue helping NGOs to: prepare policy papers on chemicals management; participate in NIPs; strengthen their role in the development of pollutant release and

transfer registers; organize campaigns against chemical pollution; and promote sustainable waste management and the zero waste approach.

IPEP helped provide a platform for civil society to build capacities and engage with the issue of POPs in a more organized way. Even though the financial resources available to the project were relatively small given its global nature and the number of countries it covered, project results have proved to be of very great value. The project catalyzed the collaboration of many organizations and has created a platform for larger debate and conversations on the issue. This initiative has been able to bring together many important stakeholders and engage them in focussing on the issue of POPs.

Provided civil society policy inputs

IPEP provided significant opportunities for NGOs to have impacts on POPs policies. This included impacts on the NIP, government decisions on clean up of contaminated sites, inventories, permitting, and many others. Many recommendations elaborated by NGOs during the implementation of IPEP-related initiatives were incorporated into NIPs and other governmental policies and strategies on chemicals.

As mentioned above, 88 IPEP-associated NGOs have participated in the Stockholm Convention NIP preparations in 53 countries. This included directly contributing to the process by participating in the inter-ministerial committees for development of the NIP or the provision of substantive, useful inputs into the process in cases where public interest NGOs were not able to directly participate in NIP committees.

IPEP made especially important contributions to national POPs inventories. These included unauthorised storages of banned, obsolete and unmarked pesticides; PCB inventory; and evaluation of dioxin/furan sources.

The NGO activities under IPEP also contributed to current Convention policy discussions regarding addition of new POPs substances to the Convention. These included preliminary studies of environmental contamination by brominated flame retardants and Lindane in several countries.

IPEP also contributed to Stockholm Convention-related policy discussions on POPs sources and on POPs in wastes, (a cross-cutting issue between the Basel and Stockholm Conventions). Reports produced by NGOs in the context of IPEP have provided inputs to policy discussions at Stockholm Convention COP1 and 2, the Expert Group on Best Available Techniques/Best Environmental Practices (BAT/BEP) and the POPs Review Committee.

IPEP activities have elevated the recognition of the role of NGOs in the implementation of the Stockholm Convention, and have raised the level of NGO relationships with government officials responsible for Convention implementation. The Project has helped

advance the idea that Stockholm Convention implementation is not some highly complex matter to be left to foreign or national experts, but is something that well-informed NGOs and citizens can contribute to by highlighting important civil society concerns and by forwarding their own proposals for effective Convention implementation.

Increased NGO – government collaboration

Participation in government and UN – initiated activities was a new experience for some of the IPEP NGOs. It was a largely a successful experience that helped to build new relationships, new forms of cooperation, and new ways of working. The project also greatly contributed to raising the awareness of local NGOs and local government officials on POPs issues. Because of IPEP, many government officials and NGOs learned to establish trustful and collaborative relationships. Numerous government officials came to view their interactions with the NGOs who were working on IPEP as a win-win situation.

For example, in a number of countries, the NGOs interested in working on IPEP initially had a difficult time convincing their governments to agree that NGOs should be allowed an active role in the NIP process. When IPEP project management was informed, we contacted the Implementing Agency for the country's GEF Enabling Activities Project, provided the names of NGOs who had both an interest and the ability to participate in the NIP process, and requested help in getting them invited to participate. The results were mixed, but in some cases not only was the NGO invited to participate, but the invitation resulted in the development of excellent collaborative relations between the invited NGOs and the other NIP participants.

IPEP has helped NGOs to become known to the government agencies. In some regions, IPEP contributed to regional dialogue workshops with both NGOs and government officials participating. In some cases, relationships built during these regional workshops, together with good outcomes from IPEP activities, contributed to decisions by government to invite NGOs to participate in the National Coordination Committee to develop the NIP.

While the nature of participation mechanisms associated with Stockholm Convention implementation are still being worked out in many countries, NGOs have learned to value opportunities to participate, and many have been able to make important contributions and to provide significant input. Overall, IPEP has encouraged many governments to view national, regional, and global NGO networks as a significant contributing asset in the implementation of the Stockholm Convention. IPEP has succeeded in promoting and strengthening NGO partnerships with international organizations, different levels of governmental authorities and the academic community.

Fostered precedent-setting research

IPEP activities include a number of research projects that have become precedents in their countries. The IPEP egg study described above had a global impact since it provided monitoring data for unintentionally-produced POPs (UPOPs) including dioxins, furans, HCB, and PCBs. In 12 of the 17 countries (70%), the IPEP study represented the first information about these POPs in eggs ever reported. These countries include Belarus, Bulgaria, Egypt, India, Mexico, Kenya, Mozambique, Pakistan, Philippines Senegal, Tanzania, Turkey, and Uruguay. In Russia, IPEP supported a study of brominated flame retardants (BFRs) in the environment at several locations. It was the second study in Russia of this contaminant in the environment, and was the first to look at BFR contamination in computer rooms. IPEP produced the first data ever collected of BFRs in the environment in Belarus.

IPEN reports have provided a basis for NGO presentations in national, regional, and international fora. For example, an IPEP project carried out by a Mexican NGO with assistance from a consultant assessed dioxin emission factors in the UNEP Dioxin Toolkit; compared these with data in the published literature; and demonstrated that that by using well-supported alternate emissions factors, national source priorities in a country's dioxin inventory can change dramatically. This study was presented in a side event at Stockholm Convention COP2 and was very well received by the delegates. IPEP-supported research has made solid contributions to knowledge about POPs and as increased recognition of the network's technical and scientific capabilities.

Increased collaboration between regions

IPEP helped foster increased collaboration between NGOs working in different regions. These partnerships made a valuable contribution to the overall success of IPEP. For example the hub for Latin America prepared the "Citizens Guide to the Stockholm Convention" which described NGO participation in the NIPs. Parts of this important publication were translated into Arabic, French, and Russian by the hubs and used for raising NGO awareness in this field in the Middle East, Francophone Africa, and Eastern Europe Caucasus, and Central Asia (EECCA).

The EECCA hub provided materials and a presentation on PRTR issues to Toxics Link (India) for use in a workshop in India on Stockholm Convention implementation and POPs. At the same workshop in India, a representative from the NGO Arnika, the CEE hub, presented useful information on dioxin inventories to NGOs from the South Asia region. Later, the CEE hub collaborated with the NGO, SDPI, in Pakistan to perform a study of dioxin and furan content in ashes from medical waste incinerators in Pakistan.

Some regions also promoted collaborations between NGOs in different countries within the region. For example, NGOs in Malaysia, Indonesia, and the Philippines collaborated on a zero waste policy brief that described and compared the situation in the three

countries. IPEP provided one of the first opportunities for collaborative NGO work of this kind.

Utility of workshops

Workshops in IPEP regions provided venues for interaction between NGOs engaged in the Project and opportunities for discussion and learning. This helped strengthen NGO participation and capacities, particularly when there were widely differing levels of experience, knowledge, and status of Convention ratification within the region. Many of these workshops engaged government officials and in some cases, they also served to help increase the capacity of government officials. In many cases, new NGOs who were invited to workshops ended up becoming actively engaged in POPs work. In some cases, regional workshops led to corresponding national workshops that further expanded the interest in the Convention among civil society and government participants. The workshops also provided an excellent place for NGOs to meet and communicate with one another and some national POPs elimination networks formed as a result of workshops.

Developed long-term commitment to work on POPs and chemical safety

An important indicator of the commitment to continue work on POPs and chemicals issues is the large number of NGOs that intend to continue as stakeholders and/or as advocates. Table 7 (Annex 6) shows that 200 NGOs in 65 countries have indicated that they intend to continue work on chemicals and POPs. In addition, 37 IPEP-associated NGOs from 27 countries have secured funding to working in the area (see Table 8 in Annex 6). The Stockholm Convention and its implementation have inspired a great deal of enthusiasm and energy on the part of many NGOs in all regions.

Hub consultations with NGOs in their region have revealed that they have a great desire to continue work on POPs. It has also revealed that most IPEP-participating NGOs have found contributing to government policy both at the national and local levels to be very useful. Many NGOs working on IPEP discovered gaps in government-generated data, and most of them want to continue working to help fill these gaps. We find this to be an indication of the empowering impact of engagement in IPEP on the part of organizations and community members who were involved in project activities.

By coincidence, preparations for the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) took place during the same time period as IPEP implementation. IPEP hubs, because the structure already existed, played key roles in organizing and mobilizing NGOs in their regions for engagement in the SAICM preparatory process. This simultaneous involvement of the IPEP hubs in regionally coordinating both IPEP project activities and NGO participation in SAICM preparations reinforced the idea of the

important synergies between Stockholm Convention implementation and more foundational concerns associated with achieving sound chemicals management.

Need for more NGO capacity

IPEP illustrated the benefits of engaging NGOs in activities to prepare their countries for Stockholm Convention implementation. However, in many countries, when the project started, NGO capacity in the fields of POPs and chemical safety was at a very low level. In those countries and regions with higher initial NGO capacity, the project results were most impressive, as were the provision of concrete benefits to actual Convention implementation and civil society involvement. On the other hand, in many countries, the NGOs participating in IPEP realized that they were starting at a low level and needed to still greatly increase their expertise in chemical policy, hotspot characterization, health effects, alternatives, clean production, PRTR, analytical laboratories, media, and interaction with other stakeholders (government, NGO, and private sector) etc. Many also were exposed to learning new roles in relationships with their governments and international institutions. IPEP triggered an awakening and a great advance in NGO capacity, but it was just a first step and much more is needed.

Objective 3: Help establish regional NGO coordination and capacity in all regions of the world

Regional hub responsibilities and selection

One of IPEP's objectives was to establish regional NGO coordination for POPs and related chemical safety work. Identifying NGOs to serve as project regional facilitation hubs was the first step in implementing the Project. In the end, the hubs and their role were crucial to the success of the Project.

Hub responsibilities

The hubs served both a strategic and helping function in IPEP. Their responsibilities included:

- Identifying NGOs with an interest and ability to work on IPEP activities at various levels;
- Helping NGOs prepare a Project Activity Memorandum (PAM) between the Hub and the selected NGOs that described IPEP activities the NGO was interested in carrying out, including well identified outputs, indicators, a deadline and payment schedule,
- Helping NGOs with advice on the execution of project activities and preparation of the reports;
- Facilitating communications between NGOs in the region and disseminating relevant information to stakeholders and the public.

Some hubs established an advisory committee of NGOs in the region to guide them on decisions related to project activities and strategies for the region.

Flexibility in how the NGO serving as regional hub organized their personnel arrangements proved to be a wise decision. Some hub NGOs hired new staff to largely or exclusively carry out their hub responsibilities. Some re-distributed responsibilities among existing staff. Others, such as the Central and Eastern Europe hub organized their work by country with different personnel taking responsibility for different countries. The flexible arrangements reinforced the region and country-driven nature of the Project and enabled the hub NGOs to implement the most efficient and cost-effective method of getting its work done.

Selection

A process was designed and carried out to select NGOs that would serve as regional hubs in the following eight regions: Anglophone Africa; Central and Eastern Europe; Eastern Europe, Caucasus, and Central Asia; Francophone Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean; Middle East; South Asia; and Southeast and East Asia and the Pacific.

After a call for nominees across the IPEN network, NGOs in each region selected the organization that would serve as their regional hub. A sub-committee of the IPEN

steering committee helped NGOs establish a regional review committee in each region. The regional review committees evaluated the responses to questionnaires, made selections by consensus, and recommended candidates to the steering committee for approval. The following NGOs were selected in the process and served as regional hubs for the two-year term of IPEP:

Anglophone Africa (*working in English*): Agenda for Environment and Responsible Development (AGENDA) (Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania)

Central and Eastern Europe (*working in English*): Arnika (Prague, Czech Republic)

Eastern Europe, Caucasus, and Central Asia (*working in Russian*): Eco-Accord (Moscow, Russia)

Francophone Africa (*working in French*): Pesticide Action Network Africa (PAN Africa) (Dakar, Senegal)

Latin America (*working in Spanish*): Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México (RAPAM) (Texcoco, México)

Middle East (*working in Arabic*): Day Hospital Institute for Development and Rehabilitation (Cairo, Egypt)

South Asia (*working in English*): Toxics Link (New Delhi, India)

Southeast Asia (*working in English*): Southeast Asia POPs Elimination Network (collaboration between Pesticide Action Network Philippines and the Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives [GAIA]) (Manila, Philippines)

Developing regional facilitation hubs represented a major step forward in IPEN's organizational operation. For the first time, IPEN had an organized regional management structure designed to help develop NGO capacity and coordinate strategic work on the ground in eight large regions of the world.

Outreach to NGOs

Hubs faced an immediate task of introducing IPEP to NGOs in their own and surrounding countries and evaluating their interests and experience so as to match them with appropriate IPEP activities. Each hub resolved this challenge differently depending on the situation in the region.

The Middle East represented a special challenge since IPEN previously had no active presence in the region. As hub, Day Hospital Institute began by first identifying databases of NGOs and selecting 70 organizations for extensive outreach and information. Since most of these NGOs had experience in other areas, the hub worked extensively for more than six months to introduce chemical safety, POPs, and the Stockholm Convention to the NGOs in the region as an area of possible work. By the end of two years, 20 NGOs in

nine countries participated in the Project. Countries included Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Palestine, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, and Yemen.

Extensive outreach to NGOs had occurred Anglophone Africa, but at the time IPEP started, few NGOs were actively engaged in POPs-related activities. To develop IPEP, AGENDA made use of a large regional NGO meeting it helped host which was attended by NGOs from 13 African countries. The Eastern Africa Regional NGOs/CSOs Workshop on the Implementation of International and Regional Chemicals Conventions was held in Arusha, Tanzania in April 2004, just before the start of IPEP in May. AGENDA presented the project opportunities and objectives to meeting participants and later sought assistance from government representatives during SAICM Prep-Com meetings and COP1 of the Stockholm Convention to cover more countries including Nigeria, Ghana, and Gambia. All together, 14 NGOs and two trade unions from seven countries participated in IPEP including Gambia, Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa, Tanzania, and Uganda. Most of these are new countries for IPEN work.

Aside from Senegal, IPEN has also been historically thin in Francophone Africa. To help introduce IPEP to NGOs in the region, PAN Africa communicated through IPEN, GAIA, and Stockholm Convention focal points as well as through PAN network organizations. Eventually, the persistence of the hub generated enough interest to mobilize 15 NGOs working in 10 countries; Benin, Burundi, Cameroon, Guinea Bissau, Mali, Mauritania, Republic of Congo, Senegal, and Togo. Most of these countries are new to IPEN.

Though it contains highly active IPEN NGOs, the South Asia region also faced a large outreach process to connect with NGOs outside of India and Pakistan. Toxics Link used NGO networks and searched for groups with a history of active work in their countries. By the end of the two-year Project, the hub managed to mobilize 40 NGOs of which 36 were new to the IPEN network and a majority even new to the issue. In this region, IPEP was implemented in Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka.

Some regions utilized pre-existing networks to initiate regional coordination of IPEP. For example, Arnika in the Central and Eastern European region (CEE) had a history of NGO organizing regional NGO cooperation dating back to 2000. To mobilize work for IPEP, the hub held a regional kick-off meeting at the beginning of the Project in the Czech Republic that quickly produced proposals. More than 20 NGOs participated in IPEP from 10 countries including Albania, Belarus, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Croatia, Hungary, Estonia, Romania, Slovakia, and Turkey. Albania, Croatia, Estonia, and Turkey are new countries for IPEN work.

In a like manner, RAPAM in the Latin American region utilized pre-existing networks to find NGOs for activities including Health Care Without Harm (HCWH), Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives (GAIA), IPEN, and the Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y sus Alternativas en América Latina (RAPAL or PAN Latin America). These networks and other contacts produced 16 NGOs working on IPEP in ten countries including Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

In Southeast Asia, SEAPEN reached out to NGO contacts in the PAN Asia Pacific network and Waste-Not Asia, and other networks involved in pesticides, wastes, incineration, environmental and sustainable agriculture issues. In addition, the hub utilized radio interviews that were broadcast in the Philippines and in some parts of Southeast Asia to discuss IPEP and the POPs issue. SEAPEN mobilized 38 NGOs in seven countries including Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, and Thailand.

Eco-Accord, the EECCA hub, began a news service for Russian-speaking NGOs on chemical safety topics in 1999. By the time IPEP started, the service had 500 NGO subscribers who had already been exposed to topics such as POPs and the Stockholm Convention. Eco-Accord mobilized both experienced and new NGOs in 10 countries; Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan. The IPEP project in the EECCA region involved the participation of more than 200 NGOs.

Occasionally there were communication problems between hubs and NGOs in the region. Sometimes this resulted from changes in the NGO staff functioning as regional project coordinators resulting in delays in project execution.

Replication of similar activities speeds implementation

Several projects such as the global egg sampling encouraged NGOs in different countries and regions to submit similar Project Activity Memoranda (PAMs) which helped produce uniform results and sped up the process. Another benefit of this approach was building global and regional cooperation, especially on cross-cutting issues and had the benefit of allowing the entrance of new NGOs to do projects which could be replicated from country to country. It also brought new information about country specific problems into the regional body of work.

Importance of face to face meetings

The smooth implementation of IPEP was made possible by several key face to face meetings. The hubs and global project manager met several times together and with representatives of UN agencies. The first meeting was to help plan the Project; the second meeting was to discuss implementation and to answer questions before starting. Several additional meetings were held to assess implementation. Additionally, the global project manager visited all eight regions to have meetings with the hub NGO and other NGOs in the region. These interactions proved essential for establishing key information and operating practices and building relationships between IPEN and the UN agencies, and between hubs and the global project manager. Although the project budget did not call for this number of face to face meetings, extra-budgetary resources were found to supplement the original budget in order to enable them.

Importance of hubs

Establishing or enhancing regional and NGO coordination and communication in support of POPs elimination and chemical safety was an important Project goal. It was achieved and proved to be a key to the success of IPEP. All the hubs effectively reached out to NGOs in several countries, assessed their strengths and weaknesses, helped them participate in IPEP by developing activity ideas, and monitored their progress throughout the course of the two years. The hubs also provided translation facilities and acted as a distributor of important information. IPEP hubs often also helped enable NGOs to participate in activities strengthening Convention implementation in their countries. One hub calls this the “activity magnification effect” of the hub structure and describes its impact as unprecedented. Finally, hubs helped many NGOs in their regions obtain financial support to continue their work. During IPEP implementation, the hubs took on coordinating and communications roles in their regions in support of POPs elimination and chemical safety efforts above and beyond those required by the project. These roles and the regional relationships established during the project are no longer dependant upon this or any project, a key component of the sustainability of the IPEP project.

Annex 1. Project management

There were three levels of project management; UN agencies, Global Project Management, and Regional Hubs. The UN agencies included UNEP and UNIDO. UNEP GEF (in Nairobi) was the Project Implementing Agency with final responsibility for Project oversight, monitoring, and evaluation. UNIDO (in Vienna) had a closer management relationship to the Project. UNIDO held IPEP GEF funds, and upon receipt of an invoice from project management, disbursed money directly to NGOs around the world working on the Project.

The Environmental Health Fund (EHF) had lead responsibility for global aspects of Project management. As Executing Agency, EHF was responsible to UNEP and UNIDO for successful Project execution in conformity with the terms of the approved Project Brief. At the same time, EHF remained politically responsible to the IPEN Steering Committee in its execution of IPEP global management functions. Project Activity Memoranda (PAMs) agreed between hubs and NGOs in their regions as a basis of all project activities were reviewed by EHF for quality and conformity with IPEP objectives. All payments to NGOs working on the Project were reviewed by EHF.

The regional facilitation hubs served both a strategic and helping function in IPEP. Their responsibilities included:

- Identifying NGOs with an interest and ability to work on IPEP activities at various levels;
- Helping NGOs prepare a Project Activity Memorandum (PAM) between the Hub and the selected NGOs that described IPEP activities the NGO was interested in carrying out, including well identified outputs, indicators, a deadline and payment schedule,
- Helping NGOs with advice on the execution of project activities and preparation of the reports;
- Facilitating communications between NGOs in the region and disseminating relevant information to stakeholders and the public.

The following NGOs were selected in the process and served as regional hubs for the two-year term of IPEP:

Anglophone Africa (*working in English*): Agenda for Environment and Responsible Development (AGENDA) (Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania)

Central and Eastern Europe (*working in English*): Arnika (Prague, Czech Republic)

Eastern Europe, Caucasus, and Central Asia (*working in Russian*): Eco-Accord (Moscow, Russia)

Francophone Africa (*working in French*): Pesticide Action Network Africa (PAN Africa) (Dakar, Senegal)

Latin America (working in Spanish): Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México (RAPAM) (Texcoco, México)

Middle East (working in Arabic): Day Hospital Institute for Development and Rehabilitation (Cairo, Egypt)

South Asia (working in English): Toxics Link (New Delhi, India)

Southeast Asia (working in English): Southeast Asia POPs Elimination Network (collaboration between Pesticide Action Network Philippines and the Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives [GAIA]) (Manila, Philippines)

Developing regional facilitation hubs represented a major step forward in IPEN's organizational operation. For the first time, IPEN had an organized regional management structure designed to help develop NGO capacity and coordinate strategic work on the ground in eight large regions of the world.

The IPEN Steering Committee approved the development of this Project, and a subgroup of the IPEN Steering Committee played an active role in Project development and execution. This group met in 2002 and 2004 to plan Project ideas and implementation. The Steering Committee acted on the recommendations of the regional review committees during the hub selection process and received updates during Project execution on teleconference calls.

Members of the IPEP Project Steering Committee included:

Fernando Bejarano, Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México (RAPAM), Mexico City, Mexico

Craig Boljkovac, UNITAR, POPs Programme Coordinator, Geneva, Switzerland

Henry Diouf, Pesticide Action Network Africa, Dakar, Senegal

Mohamed Eisa, UNIDO, Industrial Development Officer, PTC/MEA, Vienna, Austria

Uygar Ozesmi, GEF SGP, Environmental Specialist, International Waters and Land Degradation, UNDP GEF Small Grants Programme, New York, USA

Romeo Quijano, Pesticide Action Network, Philippines

Jack Weinberg/Joseph DiGangi, Global Chemical Safety Program Environmental Health Fund, Chicago, USA

Bahar Zorofi, UNEP, Programme Officer, Persistent Organic Pollutants Enabling Activities, Division of GEF Coordination, Nairobi, Kenya

Annex 2. Funding

As a Medium-Sized GEF Project, the originally approved budget in the IPEP Project document included USD \$1,000,000 from the Global Environment Facility and USD \$1,000,000 in co-finance for a total Project budget of USD \$2,000,000. In the end, the total cash and in-kind contributions to the project exceeded USD \$2,800,000.

Co-finance fundraising for IPEP included several sources of cash co-finance for a total of over USD \$1,000,000 USD. IPEN and its charitable foundations provided USD \$550,000. The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) and the Swiss Agency for the Environment Forests and Landscape (SAEFL) contributed USD \$100,000 through UNITAR. The Dutch Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment (VROM) contributed €100,000 through the Environmental Health Fund (EHF), the executing agency. Finally, the Canada POPs Fund contributed USD \$250,000 for IPEP funding through UNEP Chemicals.

Summary of IPEP cash and co-finance contributions (USD)

Source	Cash	In-kind support	Total
GEF/ UNEP	\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000
Canada POPs Fund/ UNEP Chemicals	250,000		250,000
SDC/SAEFL/ UNITAR	100,000		100,000
VROM/EHF	120,000		120,000
Anonymous donor / EHF	100,000		100,000
IPEN in-kind support		\$200,000 ^a	200,000
Environmental Health Fund		100,000 ^b	100,000
Center for International Environmental Law, Commonwealth, and Pesticide Action Network North America		50,000 ^c	50,000
Cash and in-kind contributions directly raised or provided by developing and transition country NGOs ^d	194,335	734,489	928,824
Totals	\$1,764,335	\$1,084,489	\$2,848,824

^a The source of these funds is charitable foundation donors to IPEN; the services included IPEN staff time and organizational support; support from IPEN workgroups; and funds for travel and related expenses for global meetings

^b The source of these funds is charitable foundation donors to EHF; the services included co-finance for global project manager salary, benefits and office; other professional staff support; international travel costs

^c The source of these fund is charitable foundation donors to the NGOs; the services provided include staff support and travel costs

^d See table below for breakdown

IPEP secured substantial cash and in kind co-financing from the developing and transition country NGOs participating in the project. Cash co-finance came in the form of

grants and funding support for workshops totaling USD \$194,335. Funders in this category included: the Swedish EPA through the International Chemical Secretariat, the Ministries of Health and Environment of Brazil, Ministry of Environment of Costa Rica, Ministry of Environment of the Czech Republic, Ministry of Environment of Sri Lanka and many charitable foundations.

These NGOs additionally provided significant amounts of in-kind co-financing. In the eight regions this added up to USD \$734,489. Each hub surveyed the participating NGOs in its region to determine the in-kind contributions from its region and prepared a report based on categories such as staff time, volunteer time, transportation and travel, and educational materials. The total amount of co-finance generated by these NGOs during IPEP totaled USD \$928,824.

Breakdown of NGO in-kind contributions (USD)

Region	Cash	In-kind
Anglophone Africa	\$21,142	\$28,493
Central and Eastern Europe	\$137,241	
Eastern Europe, Caucasus, and Central Asia	\$26,731	\$125,000
Francophone Africa	\$46,000	\$179,700
Latin America	\$96,026	\$133,273
Middle East		\$66,000
South Asia	\$3,900	\$119,393
Southeast Asia	\$536	\$82,630
Total	\$194,335	\$734,489

The project encountered two problems in delivering funds to NGOs: the amounts and the timing of transfers. In many ways, the small size the IPEP grants did not at all match the magnitude of the POPs problems in the countries. For example, once NGOs realized the potential of IPEP, many were interested in monitoring and testing projects. However, fiscal limitations made it difficult to conduct these types of studies especially in regions where laboratory analysis is very expensive.

Delays in the delivery and receipt of IPEP payments sometimes delayed work on project activities and also caused some frustration. At the start of the Project, IPEN and UNIDO agreed to a three-payment system (an initial payment of \$500; a final payment of 20% on completion; and a middle payment of the difference). This proved burdensome to all, and was changed to a one- or two-payment system which helped reduce paper work and increase the speed of response. The willingness and ability of UNIDO efficiently transferring funds directly to NGOs in 65 countries through bank transfers and UNDP

country offices was a key to Project success. Transferring cash co-finance derived funds to NGOs in developing countries often created challenges and increased the project's appreciation of the services provided by UNIDO in transferring the GEF-derived funds.

Annex 3

Output 1: Produce and disseminate POPs information

Country Situation Reports

Goal for end of Project: 40

IPEP Country Situation Reports: 44

The goal at the end of the Project was to have 4 – 5 Country Situation reports per region. The breakdown of reports by Region is as follows: Anglophone Africa (4 countries); Central and Eastern Europe (10); Eastern Europe, Caucasus, and Central Asia (8); Francophone Africa (4); Latin America (3); Middle East (7); South Asia (4); and Southeast Asia (4).

Table1. Country situation reports by country

Country	Project	NGO
Albania	2 ALB	EDEN Center and Arnika
Argentina	1ARG	Taller Ecologista
Armenia	3ARM	Centre for Environmental Studies
Azerbaijan	3AZE	Ruzygar
Bangladesh	1BGD	Environment and Social Development Organization
Belarus	1BYE	Foundation for the Realization of Ideas
Bulgaria	2BUL	Greenjustice, Friends of the Earth / Ecoglasnost
Burundi	1BDI	Propreté Environnement Santé
Cameroon	1CMR	Cameroon Pesticide Action Network
China	1CPR	Pesticide Eco-Alternatives Center (PEAC)
Croatia	1CRO	Green Action
Czech Republic	3CEH	Arnika Association
Egypt	10EGY	Day Hospital Institute for Development and Rehabilitation
Estonia	1/EST	Estonian Green Movement
Ghana	1GHA	Environment Youth Action Network (EYAN) and Integrated Community Network (ICC)
Georgia	1 GEO	Ecovision
Hungary	3HUN	Clean Air Action Group
India	4IND	Toxics Link
Jordan	3JOR	Badia Revival and Environmental Protection Society
Lebanon	4LEB	Lebanese Environment Forum
Kazakhstan	1KAZ	Greenwomen
Kenya	1KEN	Physicians for Social Responsibility Kenya
Kyrgyzstan	1KYR	For Civil Society
Mexico	12MEX	Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México (RAPAM)
Malaysia	1MAL	Pesticide Action Network Asia Pacific
Malaysia	2MAL	Consumers Association of Penang
Mali	1MLI	Association pour la Défense de l'Environnement et la Sensibilisation des Consommateurs (ADESCOM)
Moldova	3MOL	Habitat

Nepal	3NEP	Society for Human Rights, Environment, Law and Governance Activities
Palestine	2PAL	Palestinian Environmental Friends
Philippines	4PHI	Pesticide Action Network Philippines
Romania	1ROM	Environmental Experts Association
Russia	4RUS	Eco-Accord
Slovakia	5 SLO	Friends of the Earth
Sri Lanka	1SLR	Centre for Environmental Justice
Syria	1SYR	Environmental Protection and Sustainable Development Society
Tanzania	4URT	Environmental, Human Rights Care and Gender Organization
Togo	3TOG	Alliance Nationale des Consommateurs et de l'Environnement / Pesticide Action Network
Tunisia	1TUN	Environmental Protection Association
Turkey	1TUR	Bumerang
Uganda	2UGA	Climate & Development, National Association of Professional Environmentalists, National Union of Plantation and Agricultural Workers, Environmental NGO Lobby Group, Uganda Environmental Education Foundation, Uganda Coalition for Sustainable Development
Ukraine	2UKR	Ecological Charitable Fund
Venezuela	1VEN	Fundacion Aguaclara
Yemen	1YEM	Yemeni Society for Environment and Sustainable Development

Hotspot Reports

Goal for end of Project: 30

IPEP Hotspot Reports: 108

The goal at the end of the Project is to have approximately 4 Hotspot reports per region. The breakdown of reports by Region is as follows: Anglophone Africa (13); Central and Eastern Europe (33); Eastern Europe, Caucasus, and Central Asia (21); Francophone Africa (7); Latin America (5); Middle East (6); South Asia (11); and Southeast Asia (12).

Table 2. Hotspot reports by country

Country	Project	Description	NGO
Albania	1ALB	Sharra Dumpsite in Tirana, Albania	EDEN Center
Albania	3ALB	Pesticide contamination in the abandoned chemical plant, Porto Romano	EDEN Center
Argentina	4ARG	Contribution to a pollutants-free future: Opportunities to move towards health care waste treatment without incineration in Latin America	Health Care Without Harm – Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives

Armenia	1ARM	PCBs Monitoring in Environmental Media in Armenia and Identification of Hot Spots	Ecotox
Armenia	2ARM	Environmental Security for Residents of Ararat Oblast	Armenian Women for Health and Healthy Environment
Armenia	8ARM	Identification of potential sources of dioxins and furans in Armenia and elaboration of recommendations aimed at reducing their negative impact on human health and the environment	Ecotox
Azerbaijan	1AZE	Public Environmental Inventory of Pesticides in the Republic of Azerbaijan and Organisation of a Public Movement for their Elimination	Ruzgyar
Bangladesh	2BGD	Identification and Mapping of POPs Contaminated Sites	Environment and Social Development Organization
Belarus	1BYE	Verkhnedvinsk – disposal place of obsolete pesticides, including DDT	Foundation for the Realization of Ideas
Belarus	1BYE	Petrochemical enterprise complex in Novopolotsk	Foundation for the Realization of Ideas
Belarus	2BYE	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	Foundation for the Realization of Ideas
Belarus	7BYE	Cement kilns in Belarus	Foundation for the Realization of Ideas
Belarus	8BYE	Brominated flame retardants in Belarus	Foundation for the Realization of Ideas
Bulgaria	5BUL	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	Za Zemiata
Bulgaria	6BUL	Lindane in Bulgaria	Friends of the Earth/Ecoglasnost
Bulgaria	8BUL	Zero waste as a Best Environmental Practice to address the POPs issues created by waste incineration and/or landfilling of waste	Romani Baht Foundation
Congo	1PRC	Comparative study on environmental, socio-economic and health impacts of POPs use and contamination in contaminated areas: Ouesse and Nkanyi	Association pour la Protection de l'Environnement et pour la Promotion de l'Agriculture Biologique (ALPEPAB)
Czech Republic	2CEH	POPs pesticides in the Czech Republic	Czech Ecological Society and Arnika Association
Czech Republic	3CEH	POPs in the mine Jan Sverma	Arnika Association

		near Lampertice and its neighborhood	
Czech Republic	4CEH	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	Arnika Association
Czech Republic	5CEH	Egg sampling coordination	Arnika Association
Czech Republic	9CEH	Global egg sample data analysis and report writing	Arnika Association
Czech Republic	14CEH	Spolchemie chlor-alkali and chlorine based chemical production plant in Usti nad Labem	Arnika Association
Czech Republic Pakistan	14CEH	POPs in residues from waste incineration in Pakistan	Arnika Association Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI)
Czech Republic	16CEH	Public participation in IPPC procedure: Spolana	Arnika Association
Czech Republic	16CEH	Public participation in IPPC procedure: Epitetra	Arnika Association and Civic League Usti nad Labem
Czech Republic	17CEH	Polybrominated diphenylethers in the Czech Republic	Arnika Association
Czech Republic	18CEH	Analysis of information in the Integrated Pollution Register concerning year 2004, from the point of view of POPs monitoring	Arnika Association
Czech Republic	19CEH	Zero waste as Best Environmental Practice for waste management in CEE countries	Arnika Association with Friends of the Earth Slovakia; Romani Baht Foundation, Romania; Waste Management Association, Latvia; HuMuSz, Hungary; and Friends of the Earth, Czech Republic
Czech Republic	20CEH	Lysa na Labem: hazardous waste incinerator and POPs waste stockpile in Milovice	Civic Association Lysin and Arnika Association
Czech Republic	21CEH	Liberec municipal waste incinerator: a significant source of POPs	Arnika Association
Czech Republic	22CEH	Lindane in the Czech Republic	Czech Ecological Society and Arnika Association
Egypt	3EGY	Monitoring of dioxins in fish produced in the impact zone of Helwan cement and steel plants	Day Hospital Institute for Development and Rehabilitation
Egypt	4EGY	Health Status of Random Sample, particular Children, of the Impact Zone of El Kafer El Zaiat plant for pesticide & chemical	Egypt Suns Association for Development and Environmental Protection

		production (formerly DDT producing)	
Egypt	5EGY	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	Day Hospital Institute for Development and Rehabilitation
Egypt	12EGY	Activities on egg sampling at the Helwan industrial area	Day Hospital Institute for Development and Rehabilitation
Georgia	2GEO	Public awareness campaign on pesticides, including obsolete and banned pesticides and their impact on human health	Georgian Environmental and Biological Monitoring Association (GEBMA)
Hungary	1HUN	Zero waste as Best Environmental Practice to address POPs issues created by waste incineration and/or landfilling of waste	HuMuSz – Waste Prevention Alliance
Hungary	2HUN	Lindane in Hungary	Clean Air Action Group
India	3IND	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs: POPs Hotspot Report on Lucknow City	Toxics Link
India	11IND	Establishing the Prevalence of POPs Pesticide Residues in Water, Soil and Vegetable Samples and Creating Awareness About their Ill-effects	Janhit Foundation
India	16IND	Awareness generation on POPs among the farming community	Association for Rural and Tribal Development (ACTION)
India	17IND	Empowering community to improve environmental health through reduction in POPs	Students Relief Society
Indonesia	1INS	Awareness Campaign on the Danger of POPs and Other Pesticides to Human Health and Environment through Action Research Activity by a Rural Community	Farmer's Initiatives for Ecological Livelihoods and Democracy (FIELD)
Indonesia	3INS	Monitoring of banned pesticides in Indonesia	Gita Pertiwi
Kenya	3KEN	Kitengela obsolete pesticides store in Kenya	Environmental Liaison Education and Action for Development
Kenya	4KEN	A study on waste incineration activities in Nairobi that release dioxin and furan into the environment	Environmental Liaison Education and Action for Development
Kenya	5KEN	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	Environmental Liaison, Education and Action for Development
Kazakhstan	3KAZ	PCB contamination of the	Greenwomen

		Eastern-Kazakhstan region: monitoring and inventories of PCB sources and ways to address the problem	
Kyrgyzstan	3KYR	Identification of Sources of Dioxins, Furans, PCBs and the Campaign against POPs Pollution in Central Asia	For Civil Society, Clean Fergana (Uzbekistan)
Lebanon	5LEB	Lebanon hotspot: Garbage Mountain	Association pour la Protection de l'Environnement et du Patrimoine (APEP)
Malaysia	2MAL	Consumer Report on the Broga Incinerator Project – A Contribution to the Public Debate on the Use of Incineration for Managing Municipal Discards in Malaysia	Consumers Association of Penang
Mauritania	1MAU	Strategy proposal for the identification and control of devices containing PCBs in the Islamic Republic of Mauritania: Case study in Nouakchott	Agir pour une Gestion Rationnelle pour l'Environnement en Mauritanie (AGREEM)
Mexico	3MEX	Identification of POPs pollution sources using a participatory approach in Eastern Morelos, Mexico	Centro de Análisis Social, Información y Formación Popular, A.C. (CASIFOP)
Mexico	5MEX	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México
Mexico	8MEX	Mexican Isthmus: generation of and contamination by Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	Ambiente y Bienestar Humano, S.C and Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México
Moldova	2MOL	POPs in Trans-Dniesteria (Moldova) - Situation Assessment and Public Information	"Eco-TIRAS" International Environmental Association of River Warriors, Turunchuk, Doctors for the Environment
Moldova	8MOL	No to Waste Incineration	Chisinau Territorial Organisation of the Environmental Movement of Moldova
Nepal	1NEP	Identification of a POPs Hotspot – Examination of DDT and Lindane (BHC) Residues in Potato and Farm Soil	Nepal Forum of Environmental Journalists
Nepal	4NEP	Governmental and public awareness-raising on POPs	Forum for Justice
Nepal	10NEP	Bio-medical waste and POPs: A study on current practices in	Centre for Public Health and Environmental Development

		Nepal	(CEPHED)
Nigeria	3NIR	Identification and control of POPs contaminated sites in Lago, south-western Nigeria	Nigerian Environmental Society
Nigeria	4NIR	Assessment of the Lagos Lagoon for POPs sources, types, and impacts	Friends of the Environment
Palestine	1PAL	Raising awareness, evaluation and assessment of POPs and its sources in the Gaza Strip	Green Peace Association
Pakistan	2PAK	Physical verification, environmental and health impacts of a POP (DDT) factory in North West Frontier Province (NWFP), Pakistan	Sustainable Development Policy Institute
Pakistan	3PAK	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	Sustainable Development Policy Institute
Philippines	2PHI	Monitoring community exposure to PCBs located at the Meralco Pasig Central Service Station	Advocates of Science and Technology for the People (AGHAM)
Philippines	3PHI	POPs environmental scanning and social investigation of toxically critical areas along Manila Bay	Fisherfolk Against Toxics
Philippines	6PHI	Participatory Action Research in Support of a Community Struggle against an Incineration Facility for Health Care Waste	Cavite Green Coalition and the Institute for Educational and Ecological Alternatives
Philippines	7PHI	Community Health Assessment in POPs-Contaminated Community (Target Village, Sapang Bato, Angeles City)	Peoples' Task Force on Bases Cleanup (PTFBC)
Philippines	8PHI	POPs pesticides in a watershed area: Focus on endosulfan	Lakaba
Philippines	9PHI	Participatory action research on POPs pesticides in a Philippine rural community	Resistance and Solidarity Against Agrochemical Transnational Corporations (RESIST) and Pesticide Action Network Philippines
Philippines	10PHI	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	Cavite Green Coalition, Ecowaste Coalition, Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives and the Health Care Without Harm
Philippines	12PHI	Ecological Waste Management Demonstration Project at the 23 rd Southeast Asian Games to	Ecowaste Coalition in cooperation with the Ayala Foundation, Cavite Green

		Prevent and Reduce Wasting, Dumping and Burning	Coalition, Concerned Citizens Against Pollution, Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives, Greenpeace Southeast Asia, Mother Earth Foundation, Smokey Mountain Community, Soroptimist International of Makati City, and Zero Waste Philippines
Romania	3ROM	Constanta medical waste incinerator	Mare Nostrum
Russia	1RUS	The time to act: Addressing obsolete pesticides	Women Network in the Urals
Russia	2RUS	Levels of polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins (PCDD/Fs) and Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) in Breast Milk of Women - Residents of Magnitogorsk	Iskorka
Russia	8RUS	Pesticides: A Real Threat	Eco-Accord
Russia	9RUS	PCBs Pollution of Nizhegorodskaya Oblast: Territory Monitoring and Inventories of PCBs Sources as an Option to Address the Problem	Eco-SPES
Russia	10RUS	The Role of Inter-Sectoral Partnerships in Development of Regional and Local PRTRs	Volgograd Ecopress
Russia	12RUS	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	Eco SPES
Russia	13RUS	Reproductive Health Effects Associated with Exposure to PCBs Among Natives of the Russian Arctic	North-western Center of Hygiene and Public Health
Russia	14RUS	Reducing POPs exposure in northern natives	North-western Center of Hygiene and Public Health
Russia	27RUS	Health Status of Residents, particular Children, of the Impact Zone of Karabash copper enterprise, Cheliabinsk region, and Tobolsk oil and chemical enterprise, Tumen region	Iskorka
Russia	28RUS	Assessment of Contamination of Chicken Eggs by Some POPs in Different Regions of Russia	Environment Risk Health
Russia	29RUS	Public participation in primary inventories of stockpiles of banned and obsolete pesticides	Women Network in the Urals

Russia	32RUS	Brominated flame retardants in the Russian Federation	Eco-SPES
Russia	37RUS	Evaluation of potential risk of obsolete pesticide stockpiles for human health and the environment	Women Network in Urals
Senegal	5SEN	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	PAN Africa
Senegal	6SEN	The waste management issue in Senegal: the example of Thies, outlining solutions to the waste incineration	Association pour la Défense de l'Environnement et des Consommateurs (ADEC)
Senegal	9SEN	Inventory of some informal sector activities releasing and using POPs in Senegal and production of an awareness-raising film on these activities for promoting best practices	PAN Africa
Senegal	10SEN	Documenting the recourse to DDT powder in the process of transformation and keeping of some fishing products	AGRINAT
Slovakia	1SLO	Kosice municipal waste incinerator	Spoločnosť priateľov Zeme (Friends of the Earth)
Slovakia	2SLO	Monitoring POPs pesticides in the Slovak Republic	OIKOS
Slovakia	4SLO	RSTO hazardous waste landfill Duslo Sala – a POPs waste hotspot	Friends of the Earth
South Africa	4SAF	Incineration and POPs releases in South Africa	groundWork
South Africa	5SAF	DDT contamination in South Africa	groundWork
Sri Lanka	4SRL	Minimizing the adverse impacts of POPs through an awareness programme	Balangoda Environmental Forum (BEF)
Tanzania	2URT	Old Korogwe DDT site in Tanzania	Agenda for Environment and Responsible Development
Tanzania	3URT	PCBs sources and releases in Tanzania	Agenda for Environment and Responsible Development
Tanzania	6URT	Water and sediments analysis in Vikuge POPs contaminated site in Tanzania	Agenda for Environment and Responsible Development
Tanzania	7URT	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	Agenda for Environment and Responsible Development
Thailand	3THA	Dioxin Hotspot Report - Case Study of Municipal Waste	Campaign for Alternative Industry Network and Greenpeace

		Incinerators in Phuket and Samui	Southeast Asia
Togo	1TOG	Socio-economic, health and environmental impact study of pesticide use in agriculture in Davie	Association Nationale des Consommateurs et de l'Environnement (ANCE – PAN Togo)
Turkey	1TUR	Pesticide stockpile in Derince, Kocaeli	Bumerang
Turkey	1TUR	Petkim Petrochemical Co. (PVC plant)	Bumerang
Turkey	2TUR	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	Bumerang and Arnika
Uganda	1UGA	Identification of activities or practices that release POPs in Uganda	Environmental NGOs Lobby Group
Uganda	3UGA	Kawanda Agricultural Research Institute (KARI) Uganda	National Association of Professional Environmentalists
Uruguay	1URU	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	RAPAL-UY and REDES

Policy Recommendations

Goal for end of Project: 30

Total for IPEP Policy Recommendations: 109

IPEP Focused Policy Briefs: 21

IPEP Reports with Policy Recommendations: 88

The goal at the end of the Project is to have approximately 4 Policy Briefs per region. The breakdown of reports by Region is as follows: Anglophone Africa (Total = 19; 4 focused briefs; 15 reports with recommendations); Central and Eastern Europe (Total = 27; 6 focused briefs; 21 reports with recommendations); Eastern Europe, Caucasus, and Central Asia (Total = 22; 2 focused briefs; 20 reports with recommendations); Francophone Africa (Total = 10 ; 2 focused briefs; 8 reports with recommendations); Latin America (Total = 8; 3 focused briefs; 5 reports with recommendations); Middle East (Total = 10 ; 2 focused briefs; 8 reports with recommendations); South Asia (Total = 5; 0 focused briefs; 5 reports with recommendations); and Southeast Asia (Total = 8; 2 focused briefs; 6 reports with recommendations).

Table 3A. Policy briefs by country

Country	Project	Topic	NGO
Argentina	3ARG	Participation in the Argentina National Implementation Plan (NIP) of the Stockholm Convention: Focusing on Children's Chemical Safety	Asociación Argentina de Médicos por el Medio Ambiente (AAMMA)
Argentina	4ARG	Contribution to a pollutants-	Health Care Without Harm –

		free future: Opportunities to move towards health care waste treatment without incineration in Latin America	Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives
Belarus	6BYE	Guidelines for Stockholm Convention implementation in Belarus	FRI
Bulgaria	1BUL	National hazardous waste treatment centre	Za Zemiata
Bulgaria	8BUL	Zero waste as a Best Environmental Practice to address the POPs issues created by waste incineration and/or landfilling of waste	Romani Baht Foundation
Czech Republic	2CEH	Hazardous waste incinerators and POPs in the Czech Republic	Czech Ecological Society
Egypt	13EGY	Developing regional NGO strategies on POPs and chemicals management	Arab Network for Environment and Development (RAED)
India	7IND	Case study of zero waste Kovalam: A progressive waste management programme with a focus on best available technology options and material substitution	Thanal
Indonesia	2INS	Policy Brief on Zero Waste: A Proposal for a POPs-Free Alternative to Managing Municipal Discards in Indonesia, Malaysia and The Philippines	Balifokus (Indonesia), Consumers' Association of Penang (Malaysia), Ecological Waste Coalition (Philippines), Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives (Philippines)
Jordan	4JOR	POPs and Policy in Jordan	Jordan International Center for Development and Peace
Kenya	2KEN	Approaches to effective malaria control that avoid DDT in Kenya: Use of <i>Bacillus thuringiensis israelensis</i> (BTi)	African Centre for Environmental Advocacy and Governance
Kyrgyzstan	2KYR	Inter-Agency and Inter-Sectoral Cooperation at National and Local Levels to Address POPs-Associated Problems	Independent Ecological Expertise
Mauritania	1MAU	Strategy proposal for the identification and control of devices containing PCBs in the Islamic Republic of	Agir pour une Gestion Rationnelle pour l'Environnement en Mauritanie (AGREEM)

		Mauritania: Case study in Nouakchott	
Mexico	7MEX	Estimating Releases and Prioritizing Sources in the Context of the Stockholm Convention: Dioxin Emission Factors for Forest Fires, Grassland and Moor Fires, Open Burning of Agricultural Residues, Open Burning of Domestic Waste, Landfill and Dump Fires	Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México and Owltree Consulting
Romania	2ROM	Non-POPs strategy for crops protection	Environmental Experts Association
Russia	1RUS	The time to act: Addressing obsolete pesticides	Women Network in the Urals
Russia	14RUS	Reducing POPs exposure in northern natives	North-western Center of Hygiene and Public Health
Senegal	6SEN	The waste management issue in Senegal: the example of Thies, outlining solutions to the waste incineration	Association pour la Défense de l'Environnement et des Consommateurs (ADEC)
Slovakia	3SLO	Environmental impact assessment of the regional recovery and destruction center for hazardous waste – western Slovakia region	Friends of the Earth
South Africa	1SAF	National application of best available techniques (BAT) to eliminate POPs and their by-products	Earthlife Africa – eThekweni
Tanzania	5URT	Community and workplace monitoring as a tool for the identification of POPs exposures	Tanzania Plantation and Agricultural Workers Union
Uganda	4UGA	Non-POPs strategies for crop protection	National Union of Plantation and Agricultural Workers, Uganda

Table 3B. Policy recommendations by country

Country	Project	Topic	NGO
Albania	1ALB	Sharra Dumpsite in Tirana, Albania	EDEN Center
Armenia	7ARM	Empowering the Armenian public to take actions towards	Armenian Women for Health and Healthy Environment

		environmentally sound waste management	
Armenia	8ARM	Identification of potential sources of dioxins and furans in Armenia and elaboration of recommendations aimed at reducing their negative impact on human health and the environment; govt – NGO workshop	Ecotox
Bangladesh	2BGD	Identification and Mapping of POPs Contaminated Sites	Environment and Social Development Organization
Belarus	1BYE	Verkhnedvinsk – disposal place of obsolete pesticides, including DDT	Foundation for the Realization of Ideas
Belarus	1BYE	Petrochemical enterprise complex in Novopolotsk	Foundation for the Realization of Ideas
Belarus	7BYE	Cement kilns in Belarus	Foundation for the Realization of Ideas
Belarus	8BYE	Brominated flame retardants in Belarus	Foundation for the Realization of Ideas
Benin	1BEN	Awareness-raising on POPs for health and environmental protection	Organisation Béninoise pour la Promotion de l'Agriculture Biologique (OBEPAB)
Brazil	1BRA	Mobilizing Brazilian civil society for Stockholm Convention Implementation	Associacao de Combate aos POPs (ACPO)
Bulgaria	5BUL	Sampling free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	Za Zemiata
Cambodia	2CMB	Raising Public Awareness on Persistent Organic Pollutants Program	Cambodian Centre for Study and Development of Agriculture (CEDAC)
Costa Rica	1COS	National Workshop: Environmental and health problems of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs): Challenges for Costa Rica	Instituto Regional de Estudios en Sustancias Tóxicas (IRET) Universidad Nacional
Czech Republic	2CEH	POPs pesticides in the Czech Republic	Czech Ecological Society and Arnika Association
Czech Republic	3CEH	POPs in the mine Jan Sverma near Lampertice and its neighborhood	Arnika Association
Czech Republic	4CEH	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	Arnika Association
Czech Republic	14CEH	Spolchemie chlor-alkali and chlorine based chemical production plant in Usti nad	Arnika Association

		Labem	
Czech Republic Pakistan	14CEH	POPs in residues from waste incineration in Pakistan	Arnika Association Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI)
Czech Republic	17CEH	Polybrominated diphenylethers in the Czech Republic	Arnika Association
Czech Republic	19CEH	Zero waste as Best Environmental Practice for waste management in CEE countries	Arnika Association with Friends of the Earth Slovakia; Romani Baht Foundation, Romania; Waste Management Association, Latvia; HuMuSz, Hungary; and Friends of the Earth, Czech Republic
Czech Republic	20CEH	Lysa na Labem: hazardous waste incinerator and POPs waste stockpile in Milovice	Civic Association Lysin and Arnika Association
Czech Republic	21CEH	Liberec municipal waste incinerator: a significant source of POPs	Arnika Association
Czech Republic	22CEH	Lindane in the Czech Republic	Czech Ecological Society and Arnika Association
Egypt	2EGY	Let's cooperate to protect our children from persistent organic pollutants	Environmental Pioneers Association
Egypt	4EGY	Health Status in the Impact Zone of the El Kafr El-Zayat chemical plant	Egypt Sons Association for Development & Environmental Protection
Egypt	5EGY	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	Day Hospital Institute for Development and Rehabilitation
Egypt	7EGY	Global day of action on POPs in Egypt	Arab Office for Youth and Environment (AOYE)
Georgia	2GEO	Public awareness campaign on pesticides, including obsolete and banned pesticides and their impact on human health	Georgian Environmental and Biological Monitoring Association (GEBMA)
Guinea Bissau	2GUI	Information and awareness-raising workshop on the Stockholm Convention for stakeholders	Association des Consommateurs de Biens et Services (ACOBES)
Hungary	2HUN	Lindane in Hungary	Clean Air Action Group
India	3IND	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs: POPs Hotspot Report on Lucknow City	Toxics Link
India	11IND	Establishing the Prevalence of	Janhit Foundation

		POPs Pesticide Residues in Water, Soil and Vegetable Samples and Creating Awareness About their Ill-effects	
Indonesia	1INS	Awareness Campaign on the Danger of POPs and Other Pesticides to Human Health and Environment through Action Research Activity by a Rural Community	Farmer's Initiatives for Ecological Livelihoods and Democracy (FIELD)
Jordan	1JOR	Stockholm Convention in action in Jordan	Land and Human to Advocate Progress (LHAP)
Kazakhstan	3KAZ	PCB contamination of the Eastern-Kazakhstan region: monitoring and inventories of PCB sources and ways to address the problem	Greenwomen
Kenya	3KEN	Kitengela obsolete pesticides store in Kenya	Environmental Liaison, Education and Action for Development
Kenya	4KEN	A study on waste incineration activities in Nairobi that release dioxin and furan into the environment	Environmental Liaison, Education and Action for Development
Kenya	5KEN	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	Environmental Liaison, Education and Action for Development
Lebanon	3LEB	National campaign for raising awareness of POPs and the Stockholm Convention	AMWAJ for the Environment
Lebanon	5LEB	Lebanon Hotspot Report: the Garbage Mountain	Association pour la Protection de l'Environnement et du Patrimoine (APEP)
Mexico	5MEX	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs; TV and print	Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México
Mexico	8MEX	Mexican Isthmus: generation of and contamination by Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	Ambiente y Bienestar Humano, S.C and Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México
Moldova	8MOL	No to Waste Incineration	Chisinau Territorial Organisation of the Environmental Movement of Moldova
Morocco	1MOR	Prevention of morbidity and mortality due to POPs	Societe Marocaine de Toxicologie Clinique et

		pesticides in Morocco	Analytique (SMTCA)
Nigeria	2NIR	Stakeholders reflection and workshop on the Nigerian POPs situation	Friends of the Environment
Nigeria	3NIR	Identification and control of POPs contaminated sites in Lago, south-western Nigeria	Nigerian Environmental Society
Nigeria	4NIR	Assessment of the Lagos Lagoon for POPs sources, types, and impacts	Friends of the Environment
Nigeria	5NIR	Awareness-raising on socio-economic effects of POPs in Nigeria	Nigerian Environmental Study / Action Team
Pakistan	2PAK	Physical verification, environmental and health impacts of a POP (DDT) factory in North West Frontier Province (NWFP), Pakistan	Sustainable Development Policy Institute
Pakistan	3PAK	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	Sustainable Development Policy Institute
Philippines	2PHI	Monitoring community exposure to PCBs located at the Meralco Pasig Central Service Station	Advocates of Science and Technology for the People (AGHAM)
Philippines	3PHI	POPs environmental scanning and social investigation of toxically critical areas along Manila Bay	Fisherfolk Against Toxics
Philippines	10PHI	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	Cavite Green Coalition, Ecowaste Coalition, Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives and the Health Care Without Harm
Philippines	12PHI	Ecological Waste Management Demonstration Project at the 23 rd Southeast Asian Games to Prevent and Reduce Wasting, Dumping and Burning	Ecowaste Coalition in cooperation with the Ayala Foundation, Cavite Green Coalition, Concerned Citizens Against Pollution, Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives, Greenpeace Southeast Asia, Mother Earth Foundation, Smokey Mountain Community, Soroptimist International of Makati City, and Zero Waste Philippines
Romania	3ROM	Constanta medical waste incinerator	Mare Nostrum

Russia	1RUS	Time to Act: Addressing Obsolete Pesticides	Women Network in the Urals
Russia	8RUS	Pesticides: A Real Threat	Eco-Accord
Russia	9RUS	PCBs Pollution of Nizhegorodskaya Oblast: Territory Monitoring and Inventories of PCBs Sources as an Option to Address the Problem	Eco-SPES
Russia	10RUS	The Role of Inter-Sectoral Partnerships in Development of Regional and Local PRTRs	Volgograd Ecopress
Russia	12RUS	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	Eco-SPES
Russia	28RUS	Reducing health and enviro impacts of POPs pesticides	Environment – Risk - Health
Russia	29RUS	Public participation in primary inventories of stockpiles of banned and obsolete pesticides	Women Network in the Urals
Russia	30RUS	A survey of the chemicals management policy of the Russian Federation	Eco-Accord, Federal Agency on Ecological, Technological and Nuclear Control, Greenpeace Russia, Volgograd Ecopress, JSC Kaustic, Eco-SPES
Russia	32RUS	Brominated flame retardants in the Russian Federation	Eco-SPES
Russia	33RUS	Organization and holding of public hearings of Khimprom Company in Ufa	Union of Environmentalists of Bashkiria
Russia	34RUS	Enhancement of public decision making on reduction of POPs environmental releases	Volgograd Ecopress
Russia	37RUS	Evaluation of potential risk of obsolete pesticide stockpiles for human health and the environment	Women Network in Urals
Senegal	2SEN	International conference on the theme: “Implementing multilateral agreements relating to chemicals in African French speaking countries: Obstacles and opportunities”	Pesticide Action Network Afrique
Senegal	5SEN	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	PAN Africa

Senegal	9SEN	Inventory of some informal sector activities releasing and using POPs in Senegal and production of an awareness-raising film on these activities for promoting best practices	PAN Africa
Senegal	10SEN	Documenting the recourse to DDT powder in the process of transformation and keeping of some fishing products	AGRINAT
Slovakia	1SLO	Kosice municipal waste incinerator	Spoločnosť priateľov Zeme (Friends of the Earth)
South Africa	4SAF	Incineration and POPs releases in South Africa	groundWork
South Africa	5SAF	DDT contamination in South Africa	groundWork
Tanzania	2URT	Old Korogwe DDT site in Tanzania	Agenda for Environment and Responsible Development
Tanzania	3URT	PCBs sources and releases in Tanzania	Agenda for Environment and Responsible Development
Tanzania	6URT	Water and sediments analysis in Vikuge POPs contaminated site in Tanzania	Agenda for Environment and Responsible Development
Tanzania	7URT	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	Agenda for Environment and Responsible Development
Togo	2TOG	Global day of action on POPs in Togo	Association Nationale des Consommateurs et de l'Environnement (ANCE – PAN Togo)
Togo	4TOG	Togolese NGO and Civil Society Awareness-Raising and Information Project on the Stockholm Convention and POPs	Consortium des ONGs et Associations en Matière d'Environnement au TOGO (COMET)
Turkey	1TUR	Pesticide stockpile in Derince, Kocaeli	Bumerang
Turkey	1TUR	Petkim Petromchemical Co. (PVC plant)	Bumerang
Uganda	1UGA	Identification of activities or practices that release POPs in Uganda	Environmental NGOs Lobby Group
Uganda	3UGA	Kawanda Agricultural Research Institute (KARI) Uganda	National Association of Professional Environmentalists
Ukraine	1UKR	Partnerships Between NGOs and Research Facilities for Capacity Building to Reduce	Mama-86-Kharkov

		Adverse Health and Environmental Impacts of POPs	
Ukraine	5UKR	Raising public awareness of the Stockholm Convention on POPs in Ukraine	Mama-86-Kharkov
Uruguay	1URU	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	RAPAL-UY and REDES

Annex 4

Output 2: Participation in National Implementation Plans

Goal for end of Project: 20 countries with 20 IPEP-related NGOs participating
IPEP NIP participation: 53 countries with 88 IPEP-related NGOs participating

The goal at the end of the Project is to have NGOs participating in approximately 2 – 3 countries per region. The breakdown of participation by Region is as follows: Anglophone Africa (6 countries; 14 NGOs); Central and Eastern Europe (8 countries; 11 NGOs); Eastern Europe, Caucasus, and Central Asia (9 countries; 12 NGOs); Francophone Africa (7 countries; 7 NGOs); Latin America (10 countries; 18 NGOs); Middle East (4 countries; 9 NGOs); South Asia (5 countries; 5 NGOs); and Southeast Asia (4 countries; 12 NGOs).

Table 4. NGO participation in NIPs by country

Country	NGO
Argentina	Asociación Argentina de Médicos por el Medio Ambiente
	Centro de Estudios sobre Tecnologías Apropriadas de la Argentina (CETAAR)
	Acción por la Biodiversidad
	Citizen's Anti-Incineration Coalition
	Taller Ecologista
Armenia	Armenian Women for Health and a Healthy Environment
	Ecotox
Azerbaijan	Ruzgar
Bangladesh	Environment and Social Development Organization
Belarus	Foundation for the Realization of Ideas
Benin	Organisation Béninoise pour la Promotion de l'Agriculture Biologique
Brazil	Associação de Combate aos POP's (ACPO)
Bulgaria	Green Justice
	Romani Baht Foundation
	Za Zemiata (For the Earth)
Cambodia	Cambodian Centre for Study and Development of Agriculture (CEDAC)
	NGO Forum on Cambodia
	Mlup Baitang (Green Shade)
Cameroon	Cameroon Pesticide Action Network
Colombia	RAPALMIRA - Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y sus Alternativas en Colombia
Chile	Alianza por una Mejor Calidad de Vida/ Red de Acción en Plaguicidas y sus Alternativas para América Latina
Colombia	RAPALMIRA/ Red de Acción en Plaguicidas y sus Alternativas para América Latina
Congo	Association pour la Protection de l'Environnement et pour la Promotion de l'Agriculture Biologique

Costa Rica	IRET-UNA Instituto Regional de Estudios en Sustancias Tóxicas de la Universidad Nacional
Czech Republic	Arnika Association (Toxics and Waste Programme and Center for Citizen's Support)
	Czech Ecological Society
Egypt	Day Hospital Institute for Development and Rehabilitation
	El Horia Society for Social Development
	Friends of Environment Association
	Egyptian Back to Nature
	Young Women Christian Association
	Pioneers in Environment
India	Toxics Link
Gambia	Stay Green Foundation
Georgia	Union for Sustainable Development ECOVISION
Ghana	Environment Youth Action Network (EYAN)
	Integrated Community Network (ICC)
Hungary	Clean Air Action Group
Jordan	Land and Human to Advocate Progress (LHAP)
Kazakhstan	Greenwomen
Kenya	Physicians for Social Responsibility - Kenya
	African Centre for Environmental Advocacy and Governance (CEAG Africa)
	Environmental Liaison, Education and Action for Development (ENVILEAD)
	iLima - Kenya
Kyrgyzstan	Independent Ecological Expertise
	For Civil Society
Lebanon	AMWAJ Association
Mali	Fondation pour le Développement au Sahel
Malaysia	Malaysian Environmental Non-governmental Organisations Support Unit (MENGO)
Mauritania	Agir pour une Gestion Rationnelle pour l'Environnement en Mauritanie
Mexico	Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México
	Centro de Análisis Social, Información y Formación Popular, A.C. (CASIFOP)
	Ecological Action (Acción Ecológica)
	Organización y Desarrollo Social, S.C,
Moldova	Chisinau Territorial Organization of the Environmental Movement of Moldova
Nepal	Nepal Forum for Environmental Journalists
Pakistan	Sustainable Development Policy Institute
Paraguay	ALTERVIDA
Peru	Red de Acción en Alternativas a los Agroquímicos (RAAA)
Philippines	Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives
	Pesticide Action Network – Philippines

	Ecological Waste Coalition
	Greenpeace Southeast Asia
	People's Task Force for Bases Clean Up
	Mother Earth Foundation
Poland	Waste Prevention Association (3R)
Romania	Environmental Experts Association (EEA)
Russia	Eco-Accord
	Women Network in the Urals
Senegal	Pesticide Action Network Afrique
Slovakia	Friends of the Earth
South Africa	Earthlife Africa (ELA)
	groundWork
Sri Lanka	Sri Lanka Environmental Exploration Society
Tanzania	Agenda for Environment and Responsible Development
	Environmental, Human Rights Care and Gender Organization
Thailand	Greenpeace Southeast Asia
	Thai POPs Elimination Network
Turkey	Bumerang
Togo	Association Nationale des Consommateurs et de l'Environment
Uganda	Climate and Development Initiatives (CDI)
	Environmental NGOs Lobby Group (ENGO-LOG)
	National Association of Professional Environmentalists (NAPE)
Ukraine	Mama 86
Uruguay	RAPAL Uruguay
	REDES Friends of the Earth Uruguay
Uzbekistan	For Environmentally Clean Fergana
Venezuela	Fundacion Aguaclara
Yemen	Yemeni Association for Environment and Sustainable Development

Annex 5

Output 3: Increased awareness

Public awareness-raising activities

Goal for end of Project: 40

IPEP NGO activities with awareness-raising: 150

The goal at the end of the Project is to have approximately 8 public awareness activities per region. The breakdown of activities by Region is as follows: Anglophone Africa (14); Central and Eastern Europe (15); Eastern Europe, Caucasus, and Central Asia (44); Francophone Africa (11); Latin America (15); Middle East (14); South Asia (27); and Southeast Asia (10).

Table 5. Public awareness campaigns by country

Country	Project	Topic	NGO
Albania	1ALB	Sharra Dumpsite in Tirana, Albania	EDEN Center
Argentina	2ARG	Capacity building to strengthen community participation in the implementation of the Stockholm Convention: Focusing on Children and Chemical Safety	Asociación Argentina de Médicos por el Medio Ambiente (AAMMA)
Argentina	4ARG	Contribution to a pollutants-free future: Opportunities to move towards health care waste treatment without incineration in Latin America	Health Care Without Harm – Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives
Argentina	6ARG	Dirty Dozen magazine printing	Global Alliance for Incineration Alternatives (GAIA)
Argentina	7ARG	Global day of action in Argentina; egg report release	Global Alliance for Incineration Alternatives (GAIA); Citizen's Anti-incineration Coalition
Argentina	8ARG	Global day of action in Argentina; puppets and POPs	Centro de Estudios sobre Tecnologías Apropriados de la Argentina (CETAAR)
Armenia	1ARM	PCBs Monitoring in Environmental Media in Armenia and Identification of Hot Spots	Ecotox
Armenia	2ARM	Environmental Security for Residents of Ararat Oblast	Armenian Women for Health and Healthy Environment
Armenia	4ARM	NGO campaign against waste incineration in Armenia	Armenian Women for Health and Healthy Environment
Armenia	5ARM	Global day of action; Raising	Ecotox

		awareness on POPs pollution and associated health impacts	
Armenia	6ARM	Global day of action; Yerevan University and State Museum Natural History	Khazer
Armenia	7ARM	Empowering the Armenian public to take actions towards environmentally sound waste management	Armenian Women for Health and Healthy Environment
Azerbaijan	1AZE	Public Environmental Inventory of Pesticides in the Republic of Azerbaijan and Organisation of a Public Movement for their Elimination	Ruzgyar
Azerbaijan	2AZE	Global day of action; Environmental Field Study of the Pesticide Elimination Site	Ruzgyar
Bangladesh	3BGD	Public Information and Capacity Building on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and their Disposal	Association for Community Development (ACD)
Belarus	3BYE	Global day of action; construction materials and POPs	International Academy of Ecology Belarus Division
Belarus	4BYE	Dirty Dozen magazine	Foundation for the Realization of Ideas
Belarus	5BYE	Global day of action	Foundation for the Realization of Ideas
Benin	1BEN	Awareness-raising on POPs for health and environmental protection	Organisation Béninoise pour la Promotion de l'Agriculture Biologique (OBEPAB)
Benin	2BEN	Training grassroots communities on exposure risks to POPs in the district of Oueme-Benin	Organisation des Femmes pour la Gestion de l'Energie, de l'Environnement et la Promotion du Développement Intégré (OFEDI)
Benin	3BEN	Global day of action	Organisation des Femmes pour la Gestion de l'Energie, de l'Environnement et la Promotion du Développement Intégré (OFEDI)
Bulgaria	4BUL	Global day of action	Friends of the Earth/Ecoglasnost
Bulgaria	5BUL	Sampling free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	Za Zemiata
Burundi	1BDI	Country situation report on POPs in Burundi	Propreté – Environnement – Santé (PES)
Burundi	2BDI	Global day of action against POPs in Burundi	Propreté – Environnement – Santé (PES)
Cambodia	1CMB	Awareness-Raising Report on	NGO Forum on Cambodia

		POPs Issues and the Stockholm Convention	
Cambodia	2CMB	Raising Public Awareness on Persistent Organic Pollutants Program	Cambodian Centre for Study and Development of Agriculture (CEDAC)
Chile	1CHI	Global day of action in Chile	Red de Acción en Plaguicidas y sus Alternativas en América Latina en América Latina (RAPAL) y Alianza por una Mejor Calidad de Vida (RAP-Chile)
Colombia	1COL	Global day of action in Colombia	RAPALMIRA
Congo	2PRC	Global day of action on POPs in Republic of Congo	Association pour la Protection de l'Environnement et pour la Promotion de l'Agriculture Biologique (ALPEPAB)
Congo	3PRC	Raising awareness of the Stockholm Convention on POPs and POPs impacts in the localities of Brazzaville, Nkayi and Ouessou	Association pour la Protection de l'Environnement et pour la Promotion de l'Agriculture Biologique (ALPEPAB)
Czech Republic	4CEH	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	Arnika Association
Czech Republic	7CEH	Translation of reports from Bulgarian, Czech, and Russian into English	Arnika Association
Czech Republic	10CEH	Global day of action	Arnika Association
Czech Republic	11CEH	Printing reports for public distribution	Arnika Association
Czech Republic	12CEH	Public awareness-raising in the CEE region	Arnika Association
Czech Republic	15CEH	Translation and English proofing of reports	Arnika Association
Czech Republic	23CEH	Printing reports for public distribution	Arnika Association
Czech Republic	24 CEH	Translation and English proofing of reports	Arnika Association
Egypt	2EGY	Together for protecting our children from cancerous organic pollutants: raising public awareness on POPs in Egypt	Environmental Pioneers Association
Egypt	6EGY	Global day of action: meeting with government officials	Dreamers of Tomorrow
Egypt	7EGY	Global day of action: youth and POPs	AOYE
Egypt	12EGY	Activities on egg sampling at the Helwan industrial area	Day Hospital Institute for Development and Rehabilitation

Gambia	1GAM	Global day of action; press conference and TV panel	Stay Green Foundation
Georgia	2GEO	Public awareness campaign on pesticides, including obsolete and banned pesticides and their impact on human health	Georgian Environmental and Biological Monitoring Association (GEBMA)
Guinea Bissau	2GUI	Information and awareness-raising workshop on the Stockholm Convention for stakeholders	Association des Consommateurs de Biens et Services (ACOBES)
India	2IND	Campaign and Awareness Building on POPs and Participation in Developing of National Implementation Plan	Society for Direct Initiative for Social and Health Action (DISHA)
India	3IND	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs: POPs Hotspot Report on Lucknow City	Toxics Link
India	5IND	Global day of action on POPs in India	Toxics Link
India	6IND	Preparation of a Manual on POPs and Women's Health	Chintan Environmental Research and Action Group
India	8IND	Training junk dealers to learn about POPs present / created in their premises and to understand the importance of minimizing them	Chintan Environmental Research and Action Group
India	9IND	Series of Peoples' dialogues on the Environmental Health Crisis in the Cotton belt of Malwa Region in Punjab	Kheti Virasat Mission
India	10IND	Production of awareness material for the farmers on the harmful impacts of POPs and pesticides and promotion of alternatives	Kheti Virasat Mission
India	11IND	Establishing the Prevalence of POPs Pesticide Residues in Water, Soil and Vegetable Samples and Creating Awareness About their Ill-effects	Janhit Foundation
India	12IND	Public awareness activities and campaign on POPs (Hello Zindagi – Avida POPs Campaign)	Prithvi Innovations

India	13IND	Organic Farming - An Answer to the Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	Gramin Vikas Evam Paryavaran Sanstha, (GVEPS)
India	15IND	Awareness on Persistent Organic Pollutants	Environment Centre
India	16IND	Awareness generation on POPs among the farming community	Association for Rural and Tribal Development (ACTION)
India	17IND	Empowering community to improve environmental health through reduction in POPs	Students Relief Society
Indonesia	1INS	Awareness Campaign on the Danger of POPs and Other Pesticides to Human Health and Environment through Action Research Activity by a Rural Community	Farmer's Initiatives for Ecological Livelihoods and Democracy (FIELD)
Jordan	1JOR	Stockholm Convention in Action in Jordan	Land and Human to Advocate Progress
Jordan	2JOR	Global day of action: public hearing on POPs	Land and Human to Advocate Progress
Kazakhstan	2KAZ	Global day of action	Greenwomen
Kenya	3KEN	Kitengela obsolete pesticides store in Kenya	Environmental Liaison Education and Action for Development
Kenya	5KEN	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs; TV and print	Environmental Liaison, Education and Action for Development
Kenya	6KEN	Global day of action; TV and print	iLima – Kenya, PSR-Kenya, African Centre for Environmental Advocacy and Governance (CEAG Africa)
Kyrgyzstan	3KYR	Identification of Sources of Dioxins, Furans, PCBs and the Campaign against POPs Pollution in Central Asia	For Civil Society, Clean Fergana (Uzbekistan)
Kyrgyzstan	4KYR	Analyzing and Assessment of POPs situation in the Kochkor region of the Kyrgyz Republic	Unison
Kyrgyzstan	5KYR	Information and Awareness Raising Campaign to Lobby the Ratification Of the Stockholm Convention in Kyrgyzstan	Independent Ecological Expertise
Lebanon	1LEB	Together let's eliminate POPs	Association pour la protection de l'environnement et du patrimoine – Nabatieh (APEP)
Lebanon	2LEB	Global day of action	Association pour la protection de l'environnement et du patrimoine –

			Nabatieh (APEP)
Lebanon	3LEB	National POPs Campaign in Lebanon	AMWAJ for the Environment
Mauritania	2MAU	Global day of action	Agir pour une Gestion Rationnelle pour l'Environnement en Mauritanie
Malaysia	3MAL	Public awareness-raising on incineration using film: "ALICE LIVES HERE" – Documentation and Popularization of a Community Struggle against the Broga Municipal Waste Incinerator Project	Broga Documentary Group
Mexico	2MEX	Citizen's Guide to the Stockholm Convention	Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México (RAPAM)
Mexico	3MEX	Identification of POPs pollution sources using a participatory approach in Eastern Morelos, Mexico	Centro de Análisis Social, Información y Formación Popular, A.C. (CASIFOP)
Mexico	4MEX	Translating the Citizen's Guide to the Stockholm Convention into English	Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México
Mexico	5MEX	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs; TV and print	Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México
Mexico	9MEX	Global day of action on POPs in Mexico	Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México
Moldova	1MOL	Moldova without Persistent Organic Pollutants	Chishinau Territorial Organisation of the Moldova Environmental Movement
Moldova	2MOL	POPs in Trans-Dniesteria (Moldova) - Situation Assessment and Public Information	"Eco-TIRAS" International Environmental Association of River Warriors, Turunchuk, Doctors for the Environment
Moldova	4MOL	Global day of action; Children against Persistent Organic Pollutants	Chishinau Territorial Organisation of the Environmental Movement of Moldova
Moldova	5MOL	Global day of action; Information campaign on POPs and associated risks in rural areas of Moldova	Habitat Environmental News Agency
Moldova	6MOL	Global day of action; Beware of Persistent Organic Pollutants	Ecotox
Moldova	7MOL	Global day of action; I Know, therefore I Am Protected	Doctors for Ecology
Moldova	8MOL	No to Waste Incineration	Chishinau Territorial Organisation of the

			Environmental Movement of Moldova
Morocco	1MOR	Prevention of morbidity and mortality due to POPs pesticides	Société Marocaine de Toxicologie Clinique et Analytique
Morocco	2MOR	Global day of action - Together against pesticide damages	Société Marocaine de Toxicologie Clinique et Analytique
Nepal	1NEP	Identification of a POPs Hotspot – Examination of DDT and Lindane (BHC) Residues in Potato and Farm Soil	Nepal Forum of Environmental Journalists
Nepal	2NEP	Public information and awareness campaign on POPs	Nepal Forum of Environmental Journalists
Nepal	4NEP	Governmental and public awareness-raising on POPs	Forum for Justice
Nepal	5NEP	Production of IEC material on POPs and its Dissemination through Interaction Programs	Center for Public Health and Environment Development
Nepal	7NEP	Global day of action	Nepal Forum of Environmental Journalists (NEFEJ)
Nepal	8NEP	Public information and awareness-raising on unintentionally-produced POPs	Nepal Forum of Environmental Journalists (NEFEJ)
Nigeria	1NIR	Global day of action; youth	Nigerian Environment Society (NES)
Nigeria	2NIR	Stakeholders reflection and workshop on the Nigerian POPs situation	Friends of the Environment
Nigeria	5NIR	Awareness raising on socio-economic effects of POPs in Nigeria	Nigerian Environmental Study / Action Team (NEST)
Pakistan	1PAK	Skill Share Workshop on POPs and South Asia Regional Hub Steering Committee Meeting	Toxics Link and Sustainable Development and Policy Institute
Pakistan	2PAK	Physical verification, environmental and health impacts of a POP (DDT) factory in North West Frontier Province (NWFP), Pakistan	Sustainable Development Policy Institute
Pakistan	3PAK	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	Sustainable Development Policy Institute
Pakistan	4PAK	Global day of action	SDPI
Paraguay	1PAR	Implementation of the Stockholm Convention in Paraguay: Participation of the	Altervida

		civil society in awareness-raising on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	
Peru	1PER	Global day of action on POPs in Peru	Red de Accion en Alternativas al Uso de Agroquimicos
Philippines	5PHI	Global Week of Action on POPs	Ecowaste Coalition
Philippines	6PHI	Participatory Action Research in Support of a Community Struggle against an Incineration Facility for Health Care Waste	Cavite Green Coalition and the Institute for Educational and Ecological Alternatives
Philippines	8PHI	POPs pesticides in a watershed area: Focus on endosulfan	Lakaba
Philippines	9PHI	Participatory action research on POPs pesticides in a Philippine rural community	Resistance and Solidarity Against Agrochemical Transnational Corporations (RESIST) and Pesticide Action Network Philippines
Philippines	10PHI	Ecological Waste Management Demonstration Project at the 23 rd Southeast Asian Games to Prevent and Reduce Wasting, Dumping and Burning	Ecowaste Coalition in cooperation with the Ayala Foundation, Cavite Green Coalition, Concerned Citizens Against Pollution, Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives, Greenpeace Southeast Asia, Mother Earth Foundation, Smokey Mountain Community, Soroptimist International of Makati City, and Zero Waste Philippines
Russia	1RUS	The time to act: Addressing obsolete pesticides	Women Network in the Urals
Russia	10RUS	The Role of Inter-Sectoral Partnerships in Development of Regional and Local PRTRs	Volgograd Ecopress
Russia	12RUS	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs; TV and print	Eco-SPES
Russia	15RUS	Global day of action; The Fifteenth Anniversary of the Dioxin Dump in Ufa	Union of Ecologists of the Republic of Bashkortostan
Russia	16RUS	Global day of action; govt and school children	Chapaevsk Medical Association
Russia	17RUS	Global day of action; egg sampling results	Eco Accord
Russia	18RUS	Global day of action; students and teachers	Ural Environmental Union
Russia	19RUS	Global day of action; schools, radio, info picket	EcoSpes

Russia	20RUS	Global day of action, students, teachers, obsolete pesticides	Infosfera
Russia	21RUS	Global day of action, seminar Moscow State University	Independent Ecological University
Russia	22RUS	Global day of action, 3 radio broadcasts, TV	Centre for Environmental Information
Russia	23RUS	Global day of action, brochure	Taiga Novosibirsk Nature Protection Team and the West Siberia Environmental Monitoring Centre
Russia	24RUS	Global day of action, youth, outdoor action, petition	Volgograd Ecopress Information Centre and Ecology Club
Russia	29RUS	Public participation in primary inventories of stockpiles of banned and obsolete pesticides	Women Network in the Urals
Russia	33RUS	Organization and holding of public hearings of Khimprom Company in Ufa	Union of Environmentalists of Bashkiria
Russia	34RUS	Enhancement of public decision making on reduction of POPs environmental releases	Volgograd Ecopress
Russia	37RUS	Evaluation of potential risk of obsolete pesticide stockpiles for human health and the environment	Women Network in Urals
Russia	38RUS	Public campaign on pesticides, including banned and obsolete ones and health impacts of pesticides	Volgograd Ecopress
Senegal	9SEN	Inventory of some informal sector activities releasing and using POPs in Senegal and production of an awareness-raising film on these activities for promoting best practices	PAN Africa
South Africa	2SAF	Global day of action; TV print	groundwork
South Africa	3SAF	Global day of action; TV print	Earthlife Africa – eThekweni
Sri Lanka	2SRL	Global day of action	Centre for Environment Justice (CEJ)
Sri Lanka	3SRL	National training and awareness programme on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPS)	Centre for Environment Justice (CEJ), Green Movement Sri Lanka
Sri Lanka	4SRL	Minimizing the adverse impacts of POPs through an awareness programme	Balangoda Environmental Forum (BEF)
Sudan	1SUD	Global day of action	Sudanese Environment Conservation

			Society (SECS)
Syria	2SYR	Stockholm Convention awareness activities	Syrian Coast Society for Environmental Protection
Tanzania	7URT	Sampling of free-range chicken eggs for U-POPs	Agenda for Environment and Responsible Development
Tanzania	8URT	Global day of action, press	Agenda for Environment and Responsible Development
Tanzania	9URT	Global day of action, press	Environmental, Human Rights Care and Gender Organization
Thailand	2THA	Formation of the Thai POPs Elimination Network and NGO Coordination with the Pollution Control Department	Campaign for Alternative Industry Network and Greenpeace Southeast Asia
Togo	2TOG	Global day of action on POPs in Togo	Association Nationale des Consommateurs et de l'Environnement (ANCE – PAN Togo)
Togo	4TOG	Togolese NGO and Civil Society Awareness-Raising and Information Project on the Stockholm Convention and POPs	Consortium des ONGs et Associations en Matière d'Environnement au TOGO (COMET)
Turkey	3TUR	Global day of action	Bumerang and Arnika Association
Turkey	4TUR	Public awareness project on POPs in Turkey	Bumerang
Uganda	5UGA	Global day of action; press	NAPE
Uganda	6UGA	Global day of action; press	ENGOLOG
Ukraine	1UKR	Partnerships Between NGOs and Research Facilities for Capacity Building to Reduce Adverse Health and Environmental Impacts of POPs	Mama-86-Kharkov
Ukraine	3UKR	Global day of action, students, teachers, government	Mama 86
Ukraine	4UKR	Global day of action, Kiev National University workshop	Ukrainian Geographic Society
Ukraine	5UKR	Raising public awareness of the Stockholm Convention on POPs in Ukraine	Mama-86-Kharkov
Uruguay	2URU	Global day of action on POPs in Uruguay	Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y sus Alternativas en Uruguay (RAPAL-UY) y REDES Amigos de la Tierra (Uruguay)
Uzbekistan	1UZB	Informing citizens of the Karakalpakstan Republic on the danger of POPs dumping located nearby	Women for Sustainable Development

Yemen	1YEM	Country situation report and public awareness activities	Yemen Environment and Sustainable Development Society
-------	------	--	---

Workshops, capacity building

Goal for end of Project: 20

IPEP NGO activities involving workshops: 53

The goal at the end of the Project is to have approximately 2 – 3 workshops and capacity building activities per region. The breakdown of activities by Region is as follows: Anglophone Africa (6); Central and Eastern Europe (6); Eastern Europe, Caucasus, and Central Asia (9); Francophone Africa (2); Latin America (5); Middle East (8); South Asia (8); and Southeast Asia (9).

Table 6. Workshops and capacity building activities by country

Country	Project	Topic	NGO
Argentina	2ARG	Capacity building to strengthen community participation in the implementation of the Stockholm Convention: Focusing on Children and Chemical Safety	Asociación Argentina de Médicos por el Medio Ambiente (AAMMA)
Armenia	4ARM	NGO campaign against waste incineration in Armenia; Ministry of Urban Develop; seminar, govt and NGOs	Armenian Women for Health and a Healthy Environment
Armenia	8ARM	Identification of potential sources of dioxins and furans in Armenia and elaboration of recommendations aimed at reducing their negative impact on human health and the environment; govt – NGO workshop	Ecotox
Azerbaijan	1AZE	Public Environmental Inventory of Pesticides in the Republic of Azerbaijan and Organisation of a Public Movement for their Elimination; seminar	Ruzygar
Bangladesh	3BGD	Public Information and Capacity Building on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and their Disposal	Association for Community Development (ACD)
Bangladesh	4BGD	National Level POPs Awareness and Capacity Building Workshop in Bangladesh	Environment and Social Development Organization (ESDO)

Belarus	5BYE	Global day of action informative workshop for NGOs	Foundation for the Realization of Ideas
Brazil	1BRA	Mobilizing Brazilian civil society for Stockholm Convention Implementation	Associação de Combate aos POPs (ACPO)
Bulgaria	3BUL	Conference on pesticide impacts in the Danube and Black Sea region	Friends of the Earth/Ecoglasnost
Bulgaria	4BUL	Global day of action workshop on POPs	Friends of the Earth/Ecoglasnost
Cambodia	1CMB	Awareness-Raising Report on POPs Issues and the Stockholm Convention	NGO Forum on Cambodia
Cambodia	2CMB	Raising Public Awareness on Persistent Organic Pollutants Program	Cambodian Centre for Study and Development of Agriculture (CEDAC)
Costa Rica	1COS	National Workshop: Environmental and health problems of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs): Challenges for Costa Rica	Instituto Regional de Estudios en Sustancias Tóxicas (IRET) Universidad Nacional
Czech Republic	6CEH	Regional workshop & Hub mtg	Arnika Association
Czech Republic	13CEH	NGO capacity building in CEE region with focus on international cooperation regarding POPs and Stockholm Convention issues	Arnika Association
Egypt	2EGY	Together for protecting our children from cancerous organic pollutants: raising public awareness on POPs in Egypt	Environmental Pioneers Association
Egypt	7EGY	Global day of action on POPs in Egypt	Arab Office for Youth and Environment (AOYE)
Egypt	13EGY	Developing regional NGO strategies on POPs and chemicals management	Arab Network for Environment and Development (RAED)
Gambia	1GAM	Global day of action workshop with NGOs and government	Stay Green Foundation
Guinea Bissau	2GUI	Information and awareness-raising workshop on the Stockholm Convention for stakeholders	Association des Consommateurs de Biens et Services (ACOBES)
India	16IND	Awareness generation on POPs among the farming community	Association for Rural and Tribal Development (ACTION)
Indonesia	1INS	Awareness Campaign on the Danger of POPs and Other Pesticides to Human Health and	Farmer's Initiatives for Ecological Livelihoods and Democracy (FIELD)

		Environment through Action Research Activity by a Rural Community	
Jordan	1JOR	Stockholm Convention in Action in Jordan	Land and Human to Advocate Progress (LHAP)
Kenya	6KEN	Global day of action capacity building CBOs	iLima – Kenya, PSR-Kenya, African Centre for Environmental Advocacy and Governance (CEAG Africa)
Kyrgyzstan	5KYR	Information and Awareness Raising Campaign to Lobby the Ratification Of the Stockholm Convention in Kyrgyzstan; 3 regional workshops	Independent Ecological Expertise
Lebanon	1LEB	Together let's eliminate POPs	Association pour la protection de l'environnement et du patrimoine – Nabatieh (APEP)
Lebanon	3LEB	National POPs Campaign in Lebanon	AMWAJ for the Environment
Mexico	11 MEX	Expert team and capacity building on POPs in Mexico	Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México (RAPAM)
Moldova	2MOL	POPs in Trans-Dniesteria (Moldova) - Situation Assessment and Public Information; 7 seminars	"Eco-TIRAS" International Environmental Association of River Warriors, Turunchuk, Doctors for the Environment
Moldova	4MOL	Global day of action; Children against Persistent Organic Pollutants	Chisinau Territorial Organisation of the Environmental Movement of Moldova
Morocco	1MOR	Prevention of morbidity and mortality due to POPs pesticides	Société Marocaine de Toxicologie Clinique et Analytique
Nepal	4NEP	Governmental and public awareness-raising on POPs	Forum for Justice
Nepal	9NEP	National Level Awareness and Training Workshop on POPs	Centre for Public Health and Environmental Development (CEPHED), Forum for Justice and Society for Human Rights, and Environment, Law and Governance Activities (SHELGA)
Nigeria	2NIR	Stakeholders reflection and workshop on the Nigerian POPs situation	Friends of the Environment
Nigeria	3NIR	Identification and control of POPs contaminated sites in Lago, south-western Nigeria	Nigerian Environmental Society
Nigeria	5NIR	Awareness-raising on socio-economic effects of POPs in Nigeria	Nigerian Environmental Study / Action Team

Pakistan	1PAK	Skill Share Workshop on POPs and South Asia Regional Hub Steering Committee Meeting	Toxics Link and Sustainable Development and Policy Institute
Pakistan	2PAK	Physical verification, environmental and health impacts of a POP (DDT) factory in North West Frontier Province (NWFP), Pakistan	Sustainable Development Policy Institute
Paraguay	1PAR	Implementation of the Stockholm Convention in Paraguay: Participation of the civil society in awareness-raising on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	Altervida
Philippines	6PHI	Participatory Action Research in Support of a Community Struggle against an Incineration Facility for Health Care Waste	Cavite Green Coalition and the Institute for Educational and Ecological Alternatives
Philippines	8PHI	POPs pesticides in a watershed area: Focus on endosulfan	Lakaba
Philippines	9PHI	Participatory action research on POPs pesticides in a Philippine rural community	Resistance and Solidarity Against Agrochemical Transnational Corporations (RESIST) and Pesticide Action Network Philippines
Philippines	10PHI	Ecological Waste Management Demonstration Project at the 23 rd Southeast Asian Games to Prevent and Reduce Wasting, Dumping and Burning	Ecowaste Coalition in cooperation with the Ayala Foundation, Cavite Green Coalition, Concerned Citizens Against Pollution, Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives, Greenpeace Southeast Asia, Mother Earth Foundation, Smokey Mountain Community, Soroptimist International of Makati City, and Zero Waste Philippines
Russia	10RUS	The Role of Inter-Sectoral Partnerships in Development of Regional and Local PRTRs	Volgograd Ecopress
Russia	30RUS	Health and environmental impact of toxic chemicals: chemical management policies of Russia and EU countries	EcoAccord
Senegal	2SEN	International conference on the theme: "Implementing multilateral agreements relating to chemicals in African French speaking countries: Obstacles and opportunities"	Pesticide Action Network Afrique

Sri Lanka	2SRL	Global day of action	Centre for Environment Justice (CEJ)
Tanzania	5URT	Community and workplace monitoring as a tool for the identification of POPs exposures	Tanzania Plantation and Agricultural Workers Union
Thailand	1THA	Southeast Asia International POPs Elimination Project meeting and skillshare on enhancing NGO/CSO participation in the National Implementation Plans on POPs	Pesticide Action Network – Philippines and Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives
	2THA	Formation of the Thai POPs Elimination Network and NGO Coordination with the Pollution Control Department	Campaign for Alternative Industry Network and Greenpeace Southeast Asia
Turkey	4TUR	Public awareness project on POPs in Turkey	Bumerang
Ukraine	1UKR	Partnerships Between NGOs and Research Facilities for Capacity Building to Reduce Adverse Health and Environmental Impacts of POPs	Mama-86-Kharkov
Yemen	1YEM	Country situation report and public awareness activities	Yemen Environment and Sustainable Development Society

Annex 6

Output 4: Increase NGO capacity

NGOs continue work

Goal for end of project: NGOs in more than 30 countries continue as stakeholders and/or advocates and/or providers of POPs-related information

IPEP NGOs continuing work: 200 NGOs in 65 countries participating

Table 7. NGOs that have indicated they will continue as stakeholders, advocates, or providers of POPs-related information

Country	NGO
Albania	EDEN Center
Armenia	Armenian Women for Health and a Healthy Environment
	Ecotox
	The Centre of Environmental Studies
Argentina	Taller Ecologista
	Asociación Argentina de Médicos por el Medio Ambiente (AAMMA)
	Health Care Without Harm Latin America (HCWH)
	Global Alliance for Incineration Alternatives (GAIA)
	Centro de Estudios sobre Tecnologías Apropriadas de Argentina (CETAAR)
Azerbaijan	Ruzgar
	Environmental movement "For the Clean Caspian Sea"
	Environmental fund, Eko-TES
Bangladesh	Environment and Social Development Organization
	Association for Community Development
Belarus	Foundation for the Realization of Ideas (FRI)
	International Academy of Ecology Belarus Division
Benin	Organisation des Femmes pour la Gestion de l'Energie, de l'Environnement et la Promotion du Développement Intégré (OFEDI)
	Organisation Béninoise pour la Promotion de l'Agriculture Biologique (OBEPAB)
Brazil	CAPA - Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y sus Alternativas en Brazil
	Associação de Combate aos POPs (ACPO)
Bulgaria	Green Justice
	Friends of the Earth/Ecoglasnost
	Romani Baht Foundation
	Za Zemiata (For the Earth)
Burundi	Propreté – Environnement – Santé (PES)
Cameroon	Cameroon Pesticide Action Network
	Front Africain pour la Défense de la Nature et de l'Homme (FADENAH)
Cambodia	NGO Forum of Cambodia
	Cambodian Centre for Study and Development of Agriculture (CEDAC)

Chile	Alianza por una Mejor Calidad de Vida
China	Pesticide Eco-Alternatives Center
Colombia	RAPALMIRA - Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y sus Alternativas en Colombia
Congo	Association pour la Protection de l'Environnement et pour la Promotion de l'Agriculture Biologique (APEPAB)
Costa Rica	Instituto Regional de Estudios en Sustancias Tóxicas (IRET)
Croatia	Zelena Akcija (Green Action)
	CEE Bankwatch Network
Cuba	CEDAR - UNAH
Czech Republic	Arnika Association (Toxics and Waste Programme and Center for Citizens' Support)
	Czech Ecological Society
	Lysin
Ecuador	Taller Ecologista - Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y sus Alternativas en Ecuador
Egypt	Environmental Pioneers Association
	Day Hospital Institute for Development and Rehabilitation
	Egypt Suns Association for Development and Environmental Protection
	Dreamers of Tomorrow
	Arab Office for Youth and Environment
	Arab Network for Environment and Development (RAED)
Estonia	Estonian Green Movement
Gambia	Stay Green Foundation
Georgia	Ecovision Union on Sustainable Development
	Georgia Environmental and Biological Monitoring Association
Ghana	Environment Youth Action Network
	Integrated Community Network
Guinea Bissau	Association des Consommateurs de Biens et Services (ACOBES)
Hungary	Clean Air Action Group
	HuMuSz
India	Kheti Virasat Mission
	Association for Rural and Tribal Development (ACTION)
	Environment Centre
	Toxics Link
	Prithvi Innovations
	Gramin Vikas Evam Paryavaran Sanstha (GVEPS)
	Students Relief Society
	Thanal
Indonesia	Balifokus
	Gita Pertiwi
	Farmer's Initiatives for Ecological Livelihoods and Democracy (FIELD)
Jordan	Land and Human to Advocate Progress (LHAP)
	Badia Revival and Environmental Protection Society
	Jordan International Center for Development and Peace

Kazakhstan	Greenwomen
	"Ecocentre", "Naurzum"
Kenya	African Centre for Environmental Advocacy and Governance
	Physicians for Social Responsibility – Kenya
	Environmental Liaison, Education and Action for Development
	iLima - Kenya
Kyrgyzstan	For Civil Society
	Independent Ecological Expertise
	Unison
Lebanon	Association pour la protection de l'environnement et du patrimoine –Nabatieh (APEP)
	AMWAJ for the Environment
	Lebanese Environmental Forum (LEF)
Mali	Association pour la Défense de l'Environnement et la Sensibilisation des Consommateurs (ADESCOM)
	PAN Mali / Fondation pour le Développement du Sahel
Malaysia	Consumer's Association of Penang
	Broga Documentary Team
	Sahabat Alam Malaysia
	Pesticide Action Network – Asia Pacific
Mauritania	Agir pour une Gestion Rationnelle pour l'Environnement en Mauritanie (AGREEM)
Mexico	Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México (RAPAM)
	Centro de Análisis Social, Información y Formación Popular, A.C. (CASIFOP)
	Taller Ecologista
	Greenpeace Mexico
	Fed Fronteriza Salud y Ambiente
	CONTEC
Moldova	Chisinau Territorial Organisation of the Environmental Movement of Moldova
	Habitat Regional Development Agency
	Eco-TIRAS International Environmental Association of River Warriors
	Pelican
	Turunchuk
	Eco-Dniester
	Doctors for the Environment, Friends of Animals and the Nature
	Association of Environmental Information and Education
	ECOSFERA
	Green Wave
	Club of young environmentalists Kypushorul Ecologic
	Green World
	SalvaEco
Morocco	Société Marocaine de Toxicologie Clinique et Analytique
Nepal	Centre for Public Health and Environmental Development (CEPHED)
	Forum for Justice
	Nepal Forum of Environmental Journalists (NEFEJ)

	Society for Human Rights, Environment, Law and Governance Activities (SHELGA)
Nigeria	Friends of the Environment (FOTE)
	Nigerian Environmental Society (NES)
	Nigerian Environmental Study/Action Team (NEST)
Pakistan	Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI)
Palestine	Green Peace Association
	Palestinian Environmental Friends Association
Paraguay	Altervida - Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y sus Alternativas en Paraguay
Peru	Red de Accion en Alternativas al uso de Agroquímicos (RAAA)
Philippines	Cavite Green Coalition
	Ecological Waste Coalition
	Greenpeace Southeast Asia
	Health Care Without Harm
	Institute for the Development of Educational and Ecological Alternatives
	Zero Waste Philippines
	Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives
	Pesticide Action Network – Philippines
	Fisherfolk Against Toxics (Pamalakaya)
	Advocates of Science and Technology for the People (AGHAM)
	Strength of the Youth (Lakaba)
	Resist
Romania	Environmental Experts Association (EEA)
	Mare Nostrum
Russia	Eco-Accord
	Environment Risk Health
	North-western Centre of Hygiene and Public Health
	Women Network in the Urals
	Iskorka
	The Union of Ecologists of the Republic of Bashkortostan
	Volgograd Ecopress
	Eco-SPES
	Chapaevsk Medical Association
	The Water of Life
	Magnitogorsk students' environmental NGO "Eco-View"
	Chelyabinsk oblast School of Social Health
	Chelyabinsk State Agro-engineering University
	The students' scientific society "Earth Ecology" section
	Magnitogorsk children's environmental centre
	The Institute of Agro-ecology (subsidiary of Chelyabinsk State Agro-engineering University)
	Rzhavsk agro-ecologic school of Agapovskiy district
	Schuchanskiy district organisation of the Russian Green Cross
	Greenpeace-Russia

Senegal	Pesticide Action Network Africa
	AGRINAT
	Association pour la Défense de l'Environnement et des Consommateurs (ADEC)
	Réseau Nord pour la Protection et la Conservation de l'Environnement Mondial (RENPEM)
Slovakia	Friends of the Earth Slovakia
	Oikos
South Africa	Earthlife Africa (ELA)
	groundWork
Sudan	Sudanese Environment Conservation Society (SECS)
Syria	Environmental Protection & Sustainable Development Society
	Syrian Coast Society for Environmental Protection
Tanzania	AGENDA for Environment and Responsible Development
	Environmental, Human Rights Care and Gender Organization (ENVIROCARE)
	Tanzania Plantation and Agricultural Workers Union (TPAWU)
Thailand	Alternative Agriculture Network
	Campaign for Alternative Industry Network
	Chochom Thai Foundation
	Foundation For Consumers
	Greenpeace Southeast Asia
	Institute for Sustainable Agriculture Community
	Phuket Environmental and Conservation Group
	Thai Environment and Community Development Association
Togo	Alliance Nationale des Consommateurs et de l'Environnement / Pesticide Action Network (ANCE Togo)
	Consortium des ONGs et Associations en Matière d'Environnement au TOGO (COMET)
Turkey	Bumerang
Uganda	Environmental NGOs Lobby Group (ENGO-LOG)
	National Association of Professional Environmentalists (NAPE)
	National Union of Plantation and Agricultural Workers, Uganda (NUPAWU)
	Uganda Environmental Education Foundation (UEEF)
	Uganda Coalition for Sustainable Development (UCSD)
Ukraine	Mama-86-Kharkov
	Ukrainian Geographical Society
	Eco-Pravo-Kharkov
	Independent Environmental Information Agency
	"Public Initiatives" Charity Fund
	Environmental NGO of schoolers and young students "Ecocentre"
	"Pechenegi" environmental group
	Kharkov Centre of Women's Studies
	"Panna" international fund
	Eco-cultural fund "Bakhmat"

	The Youth Environmental League of Pridneprovie
Uruguay	Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y sus Alternativas en Uruguay (RAPAL-UY) y REDES Amigos de la Tierra (Uruguay)
Uzbekistan	Women for Sustainable Development
Venezuela	Fundación Aguaclara
Yemen	Yemen Environment and Sustainable Development Society

NGOs secure funding for future work

Goal for end of project: NGOs in 20 countries secured funds or other sources of support to enable to continue activities

IPEP NGOs secured funding: 37 NGOs in 27 countries

Table 8. NGOs that have indicated that they have secured funding for future work on POPs and chemical safety

Country	NGO	Topic
Albania	EDEN Center	Wastes
Argentina	Centro de Estudios sobre Tecnologías Apropriadas de Argentina	Pesticides
	Cuidado a la Salud sin Daño	Medical waste
	Citizen's Anti-Incineration Coalition	Zero waste, incineration
Belarus	Foundation for the Realization of Ideas (FRI)	Green consumerism
Benin	Organisation des Femmes pour la Gestion de l'Energie, de l'Environnement et la Promotion du développement intégré (OFEDI).	Raising awareness
Brazil	CAPA - Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y sus Alternativas en Brazil	Pesticides
Bulgaria	Friends of the Earth/Ecoglasnost	Pesticides
	Za Zemiata (For the Earth)	Waste incineration
Chile	Alianza por una Mejor Calidad de Vida	Pesticides
Colombia	RAPALMIRA - Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y sus Alternativas en Colombia	Pesticides
Costa Rica	Instituto Regional de Estudios en Sustancias Tóxicas (IRET)	Pesticides
Cuba	CEDAR – UNAH	Pesticides
Czech Republic	Arnika Association (Toxics and Waste Programme and Center for	POPs, wastes, chemical safety

	Citizens' Support)	
	Lysin	Waste incineration
Egypt	Day Hospital Institute for Development and Rehabilitation	POPs, chemical conventions, public awareness
Hungary	Clean Air Action Group	Pesticides
	HuMuSz	Waste management
India	Toxics Link	POPS, medical waste, electronic waste
	Thanal	Zero waste, POPs, chemical issues
Kazakhstan	Greenwomen	POPs public awareness
Malaysia	Consumers' Association of Penang	Waste incineration, zero waste, POPs
Mauritania	Agir pour une Gestion Rationnelle pour l'Environnement en Mauritanie (AGREEM)	Raising awareness on POPs with UNDP/SGP
Mexico	Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México (RAPAM)	Medical and municipal waste
	Greenpeace Mexico	POPs in electronic industry
	Red Fronteriza de Salud y Ambiente	Pesticides
Paraguay	Altervida - Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y sus Alternativas en Paraguay	Pesticides
Peru	Red de Accion en Alternativas al uso de Agroquímicos (RAAA)	Pesticides
Philippines	Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives	Waste incineration, zero waste, POPs
	Pesticide Action Network – Philippines	Community action monitoring, public awareness-raising on POPs, pesticides
	Ecological Waste Coalition	Waste incineration, zero waste, POPs
Russia	Eco-Accord	POPs, wastes
Senegal	PAN-Africa	POPs, obsolete, pesticides, chemical safety, raising awareness
Slovakia	Friends of the Earth Slovakia	POPs, wastes, chemical safety
Tanzania	AGENDA for Environment and Responsible Development (AGENDA)	Characterization of contaminated sites
Togo	Alliance Nationale des Consommateurs et de l'Environnement-Togo (ANCE TOGO) / Pesticide Action Network Togo (PAN TOGO)	Raising awareness, promotion of alternatives to POPs pesticides
Uruguay	Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y sus Alternativas en Uruguay (RAPAL-UY)	Pesticides

Annex 7 IPEP project activity list

A full list of IPEP Project titles and NGOs is listed here by country. Project summaries provide a more informative view of the activities, but due to the size they occupy (more than 100 pages) they are presented instead on the IPEP website at www.ipen.org. In addition keyword categories on the website can help the viewer find reports about certain topics including: Country situation reports for contribution to NIP processes; DDT; PCBs; Unintentionally produced POPs (dioxins, furans, HCB, PCBs); Obsolete pesticides; New POPs; POPs Hotspots; Waste management and POPs; Public information, education, capacity-building, and awareness-raising; Policy and legislation Pesticides, agriculture and integrated pest management; Inventories and data collection; Monitoring and assessment; Health and ecosystem impacts; Indigenous Peoples and POPs; Alternatives to practices that use or generate POPs

Albania

1ALB Awareness-raising campaign on POPs levels in wastes in Albania
EDEN Center

2ALB Albania country situation report on POPs
EDEN Center and Arnika

3ALB Pesticide contamination in the abandoned chemical plant, Porto Romano
EDEN Center and Arnika

Argentina

1ARG Argentina country situation report on POPs
Taller Ecologista

2ARG Capacity building to strengthen community participation in the implementation of the Stockholm Convention: Focusing on Children and Chemical Safety
Asociación Argentina de Médicos por el Medio Ambiente (AAMMA)

3ARG Participation in the Argentina National Implementation Plan (NIP) of the Stockholm Convention: Focusing on Children's Chemical Safety
Asociación Argentina de Médicos por el Medio Ambiente (AAMMA)

4ARG Contribution to a pollutants-free future, Opportunities to move towards health care waste treatment without incineration in Latin America
Health Care Without Harm Latin America and Global Alliance for Alternatives to Incineration (GAIA)

6ARG Spanish Translation of Dirty Dozen Articles Magazine special issue on POPs
Global Alliance for Alternatives to Incineration (GAIA)

7ARG Global week of action on POPs in Argentina
Acción por la Biodiversidad and the Citizen's Anti-Incineration Coalition

8ARG Global week of action on POPs in Argentina
Centro de Estudios sobre Tecnologías Apropriadas de Argentina (CETAAR)

Armenia

1ARM PCBs monitoring in environmental media in Armenia and identification of hot spots
Ecotox

2ARM Environmental Security for Residents of Ararat Oblast
Armenian Women for Health and Healthy Environment (AWHHE)

3ARM Armenia country situation report
Center for Environmental Studies (CES) with the Centre of Legal Protection of the Environment "ERAS", Ecotox, Shoger Union, and Biosustainability

4ARM Global day of action on POPs in Armenia: waste incineration in Armenia
Armenian Women for Health and Healthy Environment (AWHHE)

5ARM Global day of action on POPs in Armenia
Ecotox

6ARM Global day of action on POPs in Armenia
Khazer

7ARM Empowering the Armenian public to take actions towards environmentally sound waste management
Armenian Women for Health and Healthy Environment (AWHHE)

8ARM Identification of potential sources of dioxins and furans in Armenia and elaboration of recommendations aimed at reducing their negative impact on human health and the environment
Ecotox

Azerbaijan

1AZE Public Environmental Inventory of Pesticides in the Republic of Azerbaijan and Organisation of a Public Movement for their Elimination
Ruzgar with Ecological movement “For Clean Caspian”, Ecological Fund, and Eko-TES

2AZE Azerbaijan country situation report on POPs
Ruzgar

3AZE Global day of action on POPs in Azerbaijan: Environmental Field Study of the Pesticide Elimination Site
Ruzgar

Bangladesh

1BGD Bangladesh country situation report on POPs
Environment and Social Development Organization-ESDO

2BGD Identification and Mapping of POPs Contaminated Sites
Environment and Social Development Organization-ESDO

3BGD Public Information and Capacity Building on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and their Disposal
Association for Community Development (ACD)

4BGD National Level POPs Awareness and Capacity Building Workshop in Bangladesh
Environment and Social Development Organization-ESDO

Belarus

1BYE Belarus country situation report on POPs; Hotspot report on Verkhnedvinsk obsolete pesticide dump; Hotspot report on Novopolotsk petrochemical complex
Foundation for Realization of Ideas (FRI)

2BYE Egg sampling for by-product POPs
Foundation for Realization of Ideas (FRI)

3BYE Global day of action on POPs in Belarus
International Academy of Ecology Belarus Division (BOMAE)

4BYE Dirty Dozen magazine
Foundation for Realization of Ideas (FRI)

5BYE Global day of action on POPs in Belarus

Foundation for Realization of Ideas (FRI)

6BYE Practical Implementation of the Stockholm Convention in Belarus
Foundation for Realization of Ideas (FRI)

7BYE Burning waste in cement kilns and POPs
Foundation for Realization of Ideas (FRI)

8BYE Brominated Flame Retardants in Minsk – Releases and alternatives
Foundation for Realization of Ideas (FRI)

Benin

1BEN Awareness-raising on POPs for health and environmental protection
Organisation Béninoise pour la Promotion de l'Agriculture Biologique (OBEPAB)

2BEN Training grassroots communities on exposure risks to POPs in the district of
Oueme-Benin
Organisation des Femmes pour la Gestion de l'Energie, de l'Environnement et la
Promotion du Développement intégré (OFEDI)

3BEN Global day of action on POPs in Benin
Organisation des Femmes pour la Gestion de l'Energie, de l'Environnement et la
Promotion du Développement intégré (OFEDI)

Brazil

1BRA Mobilizing Brazilian civil society for Stockholm Convention implementation
workshop
Associação de Combate aos POP's (ACPO)

Bulgaria

1BUL Raising public awareness about POPs waste destruction and publication of policy
briefs on related issues in Bulgaria
Za Zemiata

3BUL Conference on pesticide impacts in the Danube and Black Sea Region
National Movement Ecoglasnost - Friends of the Earth Bulgaria

4BUL Global day of action on POPs in Bulgaria
National Movement Ecoglasnost - Friends of the Earth Bulgaria

5BUL Egg sampling for by-product POPs
Za Zemiata

6BUL Lindane in Bulgaria
National Movement Ecoglasnost - Friends of the Earth Bulgaria

7BUL Bulgaria country situation report on POPs
National Movement Ecoglasnost - Friends of the Earth Bulgaria

8BUL Awareness-raising campaign on zero waste as Best Environmental Practice to address POPs Issues created by waste incineration and/or landfilling of waste - Case study in Bulgaria
Romani Baht Foundation

Burundi

1BDI Burundi country situation report on POPS
Propreté – Environnement – Santé (PES)

2BDI Global day of action on POPs in Burundi
Propreté – Environnement – Santé (PES)

Cambodia

1CMB Awareness-Raising Report on POPs Issues and the Stockholm Convention
NGO Forum on Cambodia

2CMB Raising Public Awareness on Persistent Organic Pollutants Program
Cambodian Centre for Study and Development of Agriculture (CEDAC)

Cameroon

1CMR Cameroon country situation report on POPS
Cameroon Pesticide Action Network

2CMR Public awareness-raising among public and private press actors of the Stockholm Convention on POPs
Front African pour la Defense de la Nature et de l'Homme (FADENAH)

Chile

1CHI Global week of action on POPS in Chile
Alianza por una Mejor Calidad de Vida

China

1CPR

Colombia

1COL Global week of action on POPs in Colombia

RAPALMIRA

Congo

1PRC Comparative study on environmental, socio-economic and health impacts of POPs use and contamination in contaminated areas: Ouesse and Nkanyi

Association pour la Protection de l'Environnement et pour la Promotion de l'Agriculture Biologique (ALPEPAB)

2PRC Global day of action on POPs in Congo

Association pour la Protection de l'Environnement et pour la Promotion de l'Agriculture Biologique (ALPEPAB)

3PRC Raising awareness of the Stockholm Convention on POPs and POPs impacts in the localities of Brazzaville, Nkayi and Ouessou

Association pour la Protection de l'Environnement et pour la Promotion de l'Agriculture Biologique (ALPEPAB)

Costa Rica

1COS National workshop: Environmental and health problems of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs): Challenges for Costa Rica

Instituto Regional de Estudios en Sustancias Tóxicas (IRET) Universidad Nacional.

Croatia

1CRO Croatia country situation report on POPs

Green Action (Zelena Akcija)

Czech Republic

2CEH Hot-spot report "POPs pesticides in the Czech Republic" and

Policy brief on "POPs and hazardous waste incineration in the Czech Republic"

Czech Ecological Society

3CEH Czech Republic country situation report; POPs in Mine Jan Sverma near Lampertice
Arnika

4CEH Template report for egg Sampling for by-product POPs
Civic Association Lysin, Arnika

5CEH Global coordination of egg sampling for by-product POPs
Arnika

6CEH Capacity building workshop "Persistent Organic Pollutants and Waste and Chemicals Policy" and its follow up activities
Arnika

7CEH Proofing and translation
Arnika

8CEH Egg sampling for by-product POPs and public raising awareness activities
Arnika, Civic League Ústí nad Labem, and Civic Association "Lidi pro Liberec"

9CEH Global eggs sampling for by-product POPs - interpretation of the results and national reports
Arnika

10CEH Global week of action on POPs in the Czech Republic
Arnika and Civic Association Mokra

11CEH Report printing
Arnika

12CEH Awareness-raising project for CEE Region Authorities
Arnika

13CEH Expert teams and NGO capacity building in the CEE Region
Arnika

14CEH Expert Team Activities on POPs in Waste
Arnika

15CEH Proofing and translation
Arnika

16CEH Public participation in IPPC processes in the Czech Republic and POPs
Arnika and Civic League Ústí nad Labem

17CEH PBDEs in the Czech Republic
Arnika

18CEH POPs in the first PRTR data in the Czech Republic – analysis
Arnika

19CEH Regional expert team activities on zero waste as Best Environmental Practice to
address POPs issues
Arnika

20CEH Milovice and Lysa nad Labem - two POPs hot spots in Central Bohemia
Civic Association Lysin and Arnika

21CEH Municipal waste incinerator in Liberec - important POPs source
Arnika

22CEH Lindane - a pesticide for the POPs list
Czech Ecological Society and Arnika

23CEH Report printing
Arnika

24CEH Proofing and translation
Arnika

Egypt

2EGY Together for protecting our children from cancerous organic pollutants: raising
public awareness on POPs in Egypt
Environmental Pioneers Association

3EGY Monitoring of dioxins in fish produced in the impact zone of Helwan cement and
steel plants
Day Hospital for Development and Rehabilitation

4EGY Health Status of Random Sample, particular Children, of the Impact Zone of El
Kafer El Zaiat plant for pesticide and chemical production (formerly DDT producing)
Egypt Suns Association for Development and Environmental Protection

5EGY Egg sampling for by-product POPs
Day Hospital for Development and Rehabilitation

6EGY Global day of action on POPs in Egypt
Dreamers of Tomorrow

7EGY Global day of action on POPs in Egypt: Youth and POPs
Arab Office for Youth and Environment (AOYE)

8EGY Translation
Day Hospital for Development and Rehabilitation

9EGY Translation
Day Hospital for Development and Rehabilitation

10EGY Egypt country situation report on POPs
Day Hospital for Development and Rehabilitation

11EGY Translation
Day Hospital for Development and Rehabilitation

12EGY Awareness-raising activities on egg sampling at the Helwan industrial area
Day Hospital for Development and Rehabilitation

13EGY Developing regional NGO strategies on POPs and chemicals management
Arab Network for Environment and Development (RAED)

Estonia

1EST Estonia country situation report on POPs; Awareness-raising campaign on POPs levels in wastes in Estonia
Estonian Green Movement

Gambia

1GAM Global day of action on POPs in Gambia
Stay Green Foundation

Ghana

1GHA Ghana country situation report on POPs
Environment Youth Action Network (EYAN) in collaboration with Integrated Community Network (ICC)

Georgia

1GEO Georgia country situation report on POPs
ECOVISION Union on Sustainable Development

2GEO Public awareness campaign on pesticides, including obsolete and banned pesticides, impact on human health
Georgian Environmental and Biological Monitoring Association (GEBMA)

Guinea Bissau

2GUI Information and awareness-raising workshop on the Stockholm Convention on POPs meant for NGOs, other civil society organisations, chemical users and the press of Guinea Bissau
Association des Consommateurs de Biens et Services (ACOBES)

Hungary

1HUN Zero waste case study; Public awareness-raising on zero waste to address POPs from incineration and landfilling
HuMuSz

2HUN Lindane in Hungary
Clean Air Action Group (CAAG)

3HUN Hungary country situation report on POPs pesticides
Clean Air Action Group (CAAG)

India

2IND Campaign and awareness building on POPs and participation in developing of the National Implementation Plan
Society for Direct Initiative for Social and Health Action (DISHA)

3IND POPs hotspot report on Lucknow City and egg sampling
Toxics Link

4IND India country situation report on POPs
Toxics Link

5IND Global day of action on POPs in India
Toxics Link

6IND Preparation of a manual on POPs and women's health
Chintan Environmental Research and Action Group

7IND Case study of zero waste Kovalam: A progressive waste management programme with a focus on best available technology options and material substitution
Thanal

8IND Training junk dealers to learn about POPs present / created in their premises and to understand the importance of minimizing them
Chintan Environmental Research and Action Group

9IND Series of Peoples' dialogues on the environmental health crisis in the cotton belt of the Malwa Region in Punjab
Kheti Virasat Mission

10IND Production of awareness material for the farmers on the harmful impacts of POPs and pesticides and promotion of alternatives
Kheti Virasat Mission

11IND Establishing the prevalence of POPs pesticide residues in water, soil and vegetable samples and creating awareness about their ill-effects
Janhit Foundation

12IND Public awareness activities and campaign on POPs (Hello Zindagi- Alvida POPs Campaign)
Prithvi Innovations

13IND Organic farming - An answer to the Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)
Gramin Vikas Evam Paryavaran Sanstha, (GVEPS)

14IND

15IND Awareness on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)
Environment Centre

16IND Awareness generation on POPs among the farming community
Association for Rural and Tribal Development (ACTION)

17IND Empowering community to improve environmental health through reduction POPs
Students Relief Society

Indonesia

1INS Awareness campaign on the danger of POPs and other pesticides to human health and environment through action research activity by a rural community
Farmer's Initiatives for Ecological Livelihoods and Democracy (FIELD)

2INS Policy brief on zero waste: A proposal for a POPs-free alternative to managing municipal discards in Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines
Balifokus (Indonesia), Consumers' Association of Penang (Malaysia), Ecological Waste Coalition (Philippines), and Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives (Philippines)

3INS Monitoring of banned pesticides in Indonesia
Gita Pertiwi

Jordan

1JOR Stockholm Convention in Action in Jordan
Land and Human to Advocate Progress (LHAP)

2JOR Global day of action on POPs in Jordan: public hearing
Land and Human to Advocate Progress (LHAP)

3JOR Jordan country situation report on POPs
Badia Revival and Environmental Protection Society

4JOR POPs and Policy in Jordan
Jordan International Center for Development and Peace

Kazakhstan

1KAZ Kazakhstan country situation report on POPs
Greenwomen with Eco-Forum of Kazakh NGOs, Naursum NGO from Kustanai, and Ecomuseum NGO from Karaganda

2KAZ Global day of action on POPs in Kazakhstan
Greenwomen with Eco-Forum of Kazakh NGOs, Naursum NGO from Kustanai, and Ecomuseum NGO from Karaganda

3KAZ PCB contamination of the Eastern-Kazakhstan region: monitoring and inventories of PCB sources; ways to address the problem
Greenwomen

Kenya

1KEN Kenya country situation report on POPs
Association of Physicians and Medical Workers for Social Responsibility (PSR-Kenya)

2KEN Approaches to effective malaria control that avoid DDT in Kenya: Use of *Bacillus thuringiensis israelensis* (BTi)
African Center for Environmental Advocacy and Governance (CEAG Africa)

3KEN Kitengela obsolete pesticides store in Kenya
Environmental Liaison, Education and Action for Development (ENVILEAD)

4KEN Study on waste incineration activities in Nairobi that release dioxin and furan into the environment
Environmental Liaison, Education and Action for Development (ENVILEAD)

5KEN Egg Testing - Contamination of chicken eggs near the Dandora dumpsite in Kenya by dioxins, PCBs and hexachlorobenzene
Environmental Liaison, Education and Action for Development (ENVILEAD)

6KEN Global day of action on POPs in Kenya
PSR- Kenya, CEAG Africa and iLima – Kenya

Kyrgyzstan

1KYR Kyrgyzstan country situation report on POPs
For Civil Society

2KYR Inter-agency and inter-sectoral cooperation at national and local levels to address POPs-associated problems
Independent Ecological Expertise

3KYR Identification of sources of dioxins, furans, PCBs and the campaign against POPs pollution in central Asia
For Civil Society and Clean Fergana, Uzbekistan

4KYR Analyzing and assessment of the POPs situation in the Kochkor region of the Kyrgyz Republic
Civic Environmental Foundation “UNISON”

5KYR Information and awareness-raising campaign to lobby for the ratification of the Stockholm Convention in Kyrgyzstan
Independent Ecological Expertise

Lebanon

1LEB Together let's eliminate POPs

Association pour la protection de l'environnement et du patrimoine –Nabatieh (APEP)

2LEB Global day of action on POPs in Lebanon

Association pour la protection de l'environnement et du patrimoine –Nabatieh (APEP)

3LEB National POPs Campaign in Lebanon

AMWAJ for the Environment

4LEB Lebanon country situation report

Lebanese Environmental Forum (LEF)

5LEB Garbage mountain

Association pour la Protection de l'Environnement et du Patrimoine (APEP)

Malaysia

1MAL Malaysia country situation report on pesticides

Pesticide Action Network Asia Pacific

2MAL Report on Persistent Organic Pollutants in Malaysia and Efforts to Raise

Consumer Awareness and Action to Protect Public Health and the Environment

Consumers' Association of Penang

3MAL Public awareness-raising on incineration using film: ALICE LIVES HERE” –

Documentation and Popularization of a Community Struggle against the Broga Municipal Waste Incinerator Project

Broga Documentary Group

Mali

1MLI Country situation report on Mali

Association pour la Défense de l'Environnement et la Sensibilisation des Consommateurs (ADESCOM)

Mauritania

1MAU Strategy proposal for the identification and control of devices containing PCBs in the Islamic Republic of Mauritania: Case study in Nouakchott.

Agir pour une Gestion Rationnelle pour l'Environnement en Mauritanie (AGREEM)

2MAU Global day of action on POPs in Mauritania
 Agir pour une Gestion Rationnelle pour l'Environnement en Mauritanie (AGREEM)

Mexico

2MEX Citizen's guide to the Stockholm Convention
 Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México (RAPAM)

3MEX Identification of POPs pollution sources using a participatory approach in Eastern Morelos, Mexico
 Centro de Análisis Social, Información y Formación Popular, A.C. (CASIFOP)

4MEX Translation of Citizen's Guide
 Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México (RAPAM)

5MEX Egg Sampling for by-product POPs in Coatzacoalcos, Veracruz, Mexico
 Organización y Desarrollo Social and Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México (RAPAM)

6MEX Translation
 Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México (RAPAM)

7MEX Inventories of Unintentional Pops (UPOPs) in Latin America, a comparative study
 Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México (RAPAM) and Owltree Consulting

8MEX Mexican Isthmus: generation of and contamination by Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)
 Ambiente y Bienestar Humano and Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México (RAPAM)

9MEX Global day of action on POPs in Mexico
 Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México (RAPAM)

10MEX Translation: Dirty Dozen magazine
 Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México (RAPAM)

11MEX POPs Public Awareness Campaign in Mexico
 Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México (RAPAM)

12MEX Mexico country situation report on POPs
 Red de Acción sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en México (RAPAM)

Moldova

1MOL Moldova without Persistent Organic Pollutants
Chisinau Territorial Organisation of the Environmental Movement of Moldova

2MOL POPs in Trans-Dniesteria (Moldova) - Situation Assessment and Public Information

"Eco-TIRAS" International Environmental Association of River Warriors with Turunchuk and Doctors for the Environment

3MOL Moldova country situation report on POPs
Habitat Regional Development Agency

4MOL Global of action on POPs in Moldova: children against POPs
Chisinau Territorial Organisation of the Environmental Movement of Moldova

5MOL Global day of action on POPs in Moldova
Habitat Environmental News Agency

6MOL Global day of action on POPs in Moldova
Ecotox

7MOL Global day of action on POPs in Moldova
Doctors for Ecology

8MOL No to waste incineration
Chisinau Territorial Organisation of the Environmental Movement of Moldova

Morocco

1MOR Prevention of morbidity and mortality due to POPs pesticides
Société Marocaine de Toxicologie Clinique et Analytique

2MOR Global day of action on POPs in Morocco
Société Marocaine de Toxicologie Clinique et Analytique

Nepal

1NEP Identification of a POPs Hotspot – Examination of DDT and Lindane (BHC)
Residues in Potato and Farm Soil
Nepal Forum of Environmental Journalists (NEFEJ)

2NEP Public Information and Awareness Campaign on POPs

Nepal Forum of Environmental Journalists (NEFEJ)

3NEP Nepal country situation report on POPs
Society for Human Rights, Environment, Law and Governance Activities (SHELGA)

4NEP Governmental and Public Awareness-raising on POPs
Forum for Justice

5NEP Production of IEC material on POPs and its Dissemination through Interaction
Programs
Centre for Public Health and Environmental Development (CEPHED)

7NEP Global day of action on POPs in Nepal
Nepal Forum of Environmental Journalists (NEFEJ)

8NEP Public Information and Awareness Raising on Unintentionally Produced POPs
Nepal Forum of Environmental Journalists (NEFEJ)

9NEP National Level Awareness and Training Workshop on POPs
Centre for Public Health and Environmental Development (CEPHED)

10NEP Bio-Medical Waste and POPs: A Study on Current Practices in Nepal
Centre for Public Health and Environmental Development (CEPHED)

Nigeria

1NIR Global day of action on POPs in Nigeria
Nigerian Environmental Society (NES)

2NIR Report and stakeholders reflection workshop on the Nigerian POPs situation
Friends Of The Environment (FOTE)

3NIR Identification and control of POPs-contaminated Sites in Lagos, South Western
Nigeria and stakeholders' workshop
Nigerian Environmental Society (NES)

4NIR Assessment of the Lagos Lagoon for POPs sources, types and impacts
Friends Of The Environment (FOTE)

5NIR Awareness-raising on the socio-economic effects of POPs in Nigeria
Nigerian Environmental Study/Action Team (NEST)

Pakistan

1PAK Skill Share Workshop on POPs and South Asia Regional Hub Steering Committee Meeting

Toxics Link and Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI)

2PAK Physical verification, environmental and health impacts of a POP (DDT) factory in North West Frontier Province (NWFP), Pakistan

Sustainable Development policy Institute (SDPI)

3PAK Egg sampling for by-product POPs

Sustainable Development policy Institute (SDPI)

4PAK Global day of action on POPs in Pakistan

Sustainable Development policy Institute (SDPI)

Palestine

1PAL Raising awareness, evaluation and assessment of POPs and its sources in the Gaza Strip

Green Peace Association

2PAL Palestine country situation report on POPs

Palestinian Friends Association

Paraguay

1PAR: Implementation of the Stockholm Convention in Paraguay: Participation of the civil society in awareness-raising of Persistent Organic Pollutants

Altervida

Peru

1PER Global week of action on POPs in Peru

Red de Accion en Alternativas al uso de Agroquímicos (RAAA)

Philippines

2PHI Monitoring community exposure to PCBs located at the Meralco Pasig Central Service Station

Advocates of Science and Technology for the People (AGHAM)

3PHI POPs environmental scanning and social investigation of toxically critical areas along Manila Bay
Fisherfolk Against Toxics (PAMALAKAYA)

4PHI Philippines country situation report on POPs pesticides
Pesticide Action Network Philippines

5PHI Global week of action on POPs in the Philippines
Ecowaste Coalition

6PHI Participatory Action Research in Support of a Community Struggle against an Incineration Facility for Health Care Waste
Cavite Green Coalition and the Institute for Educational and Ecological Alternatives

7PHI Community Health Assessment in POPs-Contaminated Community (Target Village, Sapang Bato, Angeles City)
Peoples' Task Force on Bases Cleanup

8PHI POPs pesticides in a watershed area: Focus on endosulfan
Lakaba (Strength of Youth)

9PHI Participatory action research on POPs pesticides in a Philippine rural community
Resistance and Solidarity Against Agrochemical Transnational Corporations (RESIST)

10PHI Egg sampling for by-product POPs in chicken eggs
Cavite Green Coalition, Ecowaste Coalition, Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives and the Health Care Without Harm

12PHI Ecological Waste Management Demonstration Project at the 23rd Southeast Asian Games to Prevent and Reduce Wasting, Dumping and Burning
Ecowaste Coalition in cooperation with the Ayala Foundation, Cavite Green Coalition, Concerned Citizens Against Pollution, Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives, Greenpeace Southeast Asia, Mother Earth Foundation, Smokey Mountain Community, Soroptimist International of Makati City, and Zero Waste Philippines

Romania

1ROM Romania country situation report on POPs
Environmental Experts Association (EEA)

2ROM Policy brief on non-POPs crop protection and hotspot report for healthcare wastes for Romania
Environmental Experts Association (EEA)

3ROM Constanta medical-waste incinerator
Mare Nostrum

Russia

1RUS The time to act: Addressing obsolete pesticides
Women Network in the Urals

2RUS Levels of polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins (PCDD/Fs) and Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) in Breast Milk of Women - Residents of Magnitogorsk
Iskorka

3RUS Translation including public involvement in the primary inventory of obsolete pesticide stockpiles
Eco-Accord

4RUS Russia country situation report on POPs
Eco-Accord

6RUS Translation including Citizen's guide to the Stockholm Convention
Eco-Accord

7RUS Translation and communication
Eco-Accord

8RUS Pesticides a real threat
Eco-Accord

9RUS PCBs Pollution of Nizhegorodskaya Oblast: Territory Monitoring and Inventories of PCBs Sources as an Option to Address the Problem
Eco SPES

10RUS The role of inter-sectoral partnerships in development of regional and local PRTRs
Volgograd Ecopress

11RUS
12RUS Egg sampling for by-product POPs
Eco SPES

13RUS Reproductive health effects associated with exposure to PCBs among Natives of the Russian Arctic
The North-western Centre of Hygiene and Public Health

14RUS Development of an action plan for reducing the exposure to POPs among Natives of the Russian Arctic

The North-western Centre of Hygiene and Public Health

15RUS Global day of action on POPs in Russia: Fifteenth anniversary of the dioxin dump in Ufa

The Union of Ecologists of the Republic of Bashkortostan

16RUS Global day of action on POPs in Russia: Raising public awareness on health impacts of POPs

Chapaevsk Medical Association

17RUS Global day of action: dioxins in Russian food

Eco-Accord

18RUS Global of action on POPs

Ural Environmental Union

19RUS Global day of action on POPs: POPs in Nizhegorodskiy Oblast

EcoSPES

20RUS Global day of action on POPs: Identification of banned and unauthorised pesticide stockpiles in the Moscow region

Infosfera

21RUS Global day of action on POPs: MSU Students against POPs

Students' Union of Moscow State University

22RUS Global day of action on POPs: mass media

Centre for Environmental Information (Nijni Novgorod, Russia)

23RUS Global day of action on POPs: POPs as a Threat for Life

"Taiga" Novosibirsk Nature Protection Team and the West Siberia Environmental Monitoring Centre

24RUS Global day of action on POPs: Act with us against POPs!

Volgograd Ecopress

26RUS Translation

Eco-Accord

27RUS Health status of residents, particular children, of the impact zone of Karabash copper enterprise, Cheliabinsk region, and Tobolsk oil and chemical enterprise, Tumen region
Iskorka

28RUS Assessment of Contamination of Chicken Eggs by Some POPs in Different Regions of Russia
Environment-Health-Risk

29RUS Public Participation in Primary Inventories of Stockpiles of Banned and Obsolete Pesticides
Women Network in the Urals

30RUS Survey of chemicals management policy of the Russian Federation and regional workshop on health and environmental impact of toxic chemicals
Eco-Accord

31RUS Translation
Eco-Accord

32RUS Identification of Sources and Releases of Brominated Flame Retardants in Moscow city, identification of alternatives and management strategies
EcoSPES

33RUS Organisation and Holding of Public Hearings on Reorganisation of "Khimprom" Company in Ufa
The Union of Ecologists of the Republic of Bashkortostan

34RUS Enhancement of Public Participation in Decision-making on Reduction of POPs Environmental Releases
Volgograd Ecopress

35RUS DDT and DDE in Russian Arctic and reproductive health of Indigenous Peoples
The North-western Centre of Hygiene and Public Health

36RUS Translation including Estimating releases and prioritizing sources in the context of the Stockholm Convention
Eco-Accord

37RUS Evaluation of potential risk of obsolete pesticide stockpiles for human health and the environment
Women Network in the Urals

38RUS Public awareness campaign on pesticides, including obsolete and banned pesticides, impact on human health
Volgograd Ecopress

Senegal

2SEN International conference on the theme: “Implementing multilateral agreements relating to chemicals in African French speaking countries: Obstacles and opportunities”.
Pesticide Action Network (PAN) Africa

3SEN Translation
Pesticide Action Network (PAN) Africa

4SEN Translation
Pesticide Action Network (PAN) Africa

5SEN Egg Sampling for by-product POPs
Pesticide Action Network (PAN) Africa

6SEN Waste management issue in Senegal: the example of Thies, outlining solutions to the waste incineration
Association pour la Défense de l’Environnement et des Consommateurs

7SEN Translation
Pesticide Action Network (PAN) Africa

8SEN Translation
Pesticide Action Network (PAN) Africa

9SEN Inventory of some informal sector activities releasing and using POPs in Senegal; production of a raising awareness film on these activities for promoting best practices.
Pesticide Action Network (PAN) Africa

10SEN Documenting the recourse to DDT powder in the process of transformation and keeping of some fishing products
AGRINAT

Slovakia

1SLO Kosice municipal waste incinerator; public awareness-raising campaign
Friends of the Earth Slovakia

2SLO Monitoring of pesticides in Slovakia with a focus on POPs pesticides
OIKOS

3SLO Raising public awareness about POPs destruction and policy brief on a new
potential POPs source in Sala
Friends of the Earth Slovakia

4SLO Awareness-raising campaign on POPs levels in wastes in Slovakia; RSTO landfill
in Slovakia
Friends of the Earth Slovakia

5SLO Country situation report on POPs in Slovakia
Friends of the Earth Slovakia

South Africa

1SAF National application of Best Available Techniques (BAT) to eliminate POPs and
their by-products
Earthlife Africa (ELA)

2SAF Global day of action on POPs in South Africa
groundWork

3SAF Global day of action on POPs in South Africa
Earthlife Africa (ELA)

4SAF Incineration and POPs release in South Africa
groundWork

5SAF DDT-contaminated site
groundWork

Sri Lanka

1SRL Sri Lanka country situation report on POPs
Centre for Environment Justice (CEJ)

2SRL Global day of action on POPs in Sri Lanka
Centre for Environment Justice (CEJ)

3SRL National Training and Awareness Programme on Persistent Organic Pollutants
(POPs)
Centre for Environment Justice (CEJ)

4SRL Minimizing the Adverse Impacts of POPs through an Awareness Programme
Balangoda Environmental Forum (BEF)

Sudan

1SUD Global of action on POPs in Sudan
Sudanese Environment Conservation Society (SECS)

Syria

1SYR Syria country situation report
Environmental Protection and Sustainable Development Society

2SYR Stockholm Convention awareness activities
Syrian Coast Society for Environmental Protection

Tanzania

2URT Old Korogwe DDT Contaminated Site
AGENDA for Environment and Responsible Development (AGENDA)

3URT PCBs Sources and Releases
AGENDA for Environment and Responsible Development (AGENDA)

4URT Tanzania country situation report on POPs
Environmental, Human Rights Care and Gender Organisation (ENVIROCARE)

5URT Community and Workplace Monitoring as a Tool for the Identification of POPs
Exposures
Tanzania Plantation and Agricultural Workers Union (TPAWU)

6URT Preliminary study of the Vikuge DDT-contaminated site and Water and Sediments
Analysis at the Vikuge POPs-contaminated Site
AGENDA for Environment and Responsible Development (AGENDA)

7URT Contamination of chicken eggs near the Vikuge obsolete pesticides stockpile in
Tanzania by dioxins, PCBs and hexachlorobenzene
AGENDA for Environment and Responsible Development (AGENDA)

9URT Global day of action on POPs in Tanzania
AGENDA, ENVIROCARE and TPAWU

Thailand

1THA Southeast Asia International POPs Elimination Project meeting and skillshare on enhancing NGO/CSO participation in the National Implementation Plans on POPs
Pesticide Action Network – Philippines and Global Alliance for Incinerator Alternatives

2THA Formation of the Thai POPs Elimination Network and NGO Coordination with the Pollution Control Department
Campaign for Alternative Industry Network and Greenpeace Southeast Asia

3THA Dioxin Hotspot Report - Case Study of Municipal Waste Incinerators in Phuket and Samui
Campaign for Alternative Industry Network and Greenpeace Southeast Asia

Togo

1TOG Socio-economic, health and environmental impact study of pesticide use in agriculture in Davie
Alliance Nationale des Consommateurs et de l'Environnement / Pesticide Action Network (ANCE/PAN Togo)

2TOG Togo country situation report on POPS
Alliance Nationale des Consommateurs et de l'Environnement / Pesticide Action Network (ANCE/PAN Togo)

3TOG Global day of action on POPs in Togo
Alliance Nationale des Consommateurs et de l'Environnement / Pesticide Action Network (ANCE/PAN Togo)

4TOG Togolese NGO and Civil Society Awareness-Raising and Information Project on the Stockholm Convention and POPs
Consortium des ONGs et Associations en Matière d'Environnement au TOGO (COMET)

Tunisia

1TUN Tunisia country situation report on POPs
Environmental Protection Association

Turkey

1TUR Two hotspots in Turkey: Petkim Petrochemical Co and a pesticide stockpile in Derince, Kocaeli, Turkey
Arnika, Bumerang, and Greenpeace Mediterranean

2TUR Egg sampling for by-product POPs - Contamination of chicken eggs near the hazardous waste incinerator in Izmit, Turkey by dioxins, PCBs and hexachlorobenzene
Bumerang, Arnika, and Greenpeace Mediterranean

3TUR Global day of action on POPs in Turkey
Bumerang, Arnika, and Greenpeace Mediterranean

4TUR Public awareness-raising on POPs in Turkey
Bumerang, Arnika, Greenpeace Mediterranean, International Society of Doctors for the Environment

5TUR Turkey country situation report on POPs
Bumerang, Arnika, and Greenpeace Mediterranean

Uganda

1UGA Identification of Activities or Practices that Releases POPs in Uganda
Environmental NGOs Lobby Group (ENGO-LOG)

2UGA Uganda country situation report
Climate and Development Initiatives (CDI) with contribution from NAPE, NUPAWU, ENGOLOG, UEEF and UCSD

3UGA Hotspot report for a contaminated site: Kawanda Agricultural Research Institute (KARI) Uganda
National Association of Professional Environmentalists (NAPE)

4UGA Non-POPs strategies for crop protection
National Union of Plantation and Agricultural Workers, Uganda (NUPAWU)

5UGA Global day of action on POPs in Uganda
NAPE and ENGOLOG

Ukraine

1UKR Partnerships between NGOs and research facilities for capacity building to reduce adverse health and environmental impacts of POPs
MAMA-86-Kharkov with the Environmental Charity Fund and Ukrainian Geographic Society

2UKR Country situation report on POPs in Ukraine
MAMA-86-Kharkov

3UKR Global day of action on POPs in Ukraine
MAMA-86-Kharkov with the Environmental Charity Fund and Ukrainian Geographic Society

4UKR Global day of action on POPs in Ukraine: Kiev University
MAMA-86-Kharkov with the Environmental Charity Fund and Ukrainian Geographic Society

5UKR Raising Public Awareness of the Stockholm Convention on POPs in Ukraine
MAMA-86-Kharkov with the Environmental Charity Fund and Ukrainian Geographic Society

Uruguay

1URU Egg sampling for by-product POPs in Uruguay
Red de Acción en Plaguicidas para América Latina (RAP-AL) and REDES-Amigos de la Tierra

2URU Global day of action on POPs in Uruguay
Red de Acción en Plaguicidas para América Latina (RAP-AL) and REDES-Amigos de la Tierra

Uzbekistan

1UZB Informing citizens of the Karakalpakstan Republic on the danger of POPs dumping located in the vicinity of their neighborhood
Women for Sustainable Development

Venezuela

1VEN Venezuela country situation report on POPs
Fundación Aguaclara

Yemen

1YEM Yemen country situation report and public awareness-raising campaign
Yemen Environment and Sustainable Development Society