



**TOGETHER**  
*for a sustainable future*

## OCCASION

This publication has been made available to the public on the occasion of the 50<sup>th</sup> 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](mailto:publications@unido.org) for further information concerning UNIDO publications.

For more information about UNIDO, please visit us at [www.unido.org](http://www.unido.org)

23527

## TERMINAL REPORT

Implementing Organization: UNEP and UNIDO

Project No.: GF/GLO/03/012

Project Title: Fostering Active and Effective Civil Society Participation in Preparations for Implementation of the Stockholm Convention Short name for Project: International POPs Elimination Project or IPEP

### 1. Project Needs and Results

**Needs:** 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.

**Results:** IPEP successfully met its three objectives.

- 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.

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).

2. Project activities

Describe the activities actually undertaken under the project, giving reasons why some activities were not undertaken, if any.

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.<sup>1</sup>

***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.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Available at the IPEP portion of the IPEN website [www.ipen.org](http://www.ipen.org)

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.

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 Petrlik, 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, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, 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.

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.

3. Project outputs

Compare the outputs generated with the ones listed in the project document.  
List the actual outputs **produced but not included in previous Progress Reports** under the following headings

<b>Project Outputs:</b>	<b>IPEP Results</b>
<p><b>Output 1: Produce and disseminate POPs information</b> Solid POPs-related, country-relevant information is prepared by national NGOs and made available to governments and society in countries where the Project is active.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 <a href="http://www.ipen.org">www.ipen.org</a>. IPEN has secured the support needed to maintain and update this website.</p>

<p><b>Output 2: Participation in National Implementation Plans</b></p> <p>NGO participation in the National Implementation Plan (NIP) preparation processes and/or NGO-prepared informational and policy inputs to NIP preparations takes place in most countries where the Project is active. These make positive contributions to NIP preparations.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p><b>Output 3: Increased awareness</b></p> <p>Increased level of awareness, understanding, and knowledge within the national NGO community and society as a whole concerning the effects of POPs on human health and the environment and the measures required to reduce and eliminate them.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The above enumerated IPEP awareness-raising activities, as well as other IPEP activities, have significantly boosted the understanding among NGOs and the public about what POPs are, including their</p>

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



	<p>and increase stakeholder participation.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p><b>Output 4: Increased NGO capacity</b>  NGOs and civil society in most countries where the Project has been active have expanded their interest, capacity and competence in POPs-related issues, leading to their ongoing involvement in Stockholm Convention implementation efforts and other efforts that address persistent toxic substances.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p><b>Output 5: Increased NGO support mechanisms</b>          NGO facilitation and support mechanisms (global, regional and national) enhanced and/or developed during the Project will successfully find the resources to continue in operation after completion of</p>	<p>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</p>

<p>the Project.</p>	<p>and its implementation have inspired a great deal of enthusiasm and energy on the part of many NGOs in all regions.</p> <p>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. <i>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.</i></p> <p>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.</p>
---------------------	--

(Please tick appropriate box)

(a) **MEETINGS** (UNEP-convened meetings only)  
 The Project did not support any UNEP-convened meetings  
 Inter-governmental (IG) Mtg.  Expert Group Mtg.  Training Seminar/Workshop  Others  
 Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Venue \_\_\_\_\_ and  
 dates \_\_\_\_\_  
 Convened by \_\_\_\_\_ Organized by \_\_\_\_\_  
 Report issued as doc. No/Symbol \_\_\_\_\_ Languages \_\_\_\_\_  
 Dated \_\_\_\_\_  
 For Training Seminar/Workshop, please indicate: No. of participants \_\_\_\_\_ and attach annex giving names and nationalities of participants.

(b) **PRINTED MATERIALS**  
 The project produced more than 290 reports and other printed materials. These can be found on the project web site ([www.IPEN.org](http://www.IPEN.org), click IPEP). See Annex 1 for a list of the projects that produced publications.  
 Report to IG Mtg.  Technical Publication  Technical Report  Others  
 Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Author(s)/Editor(s) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Publisher \_\_\_\_\_  
 Symbol(UN/UNEP/ISBN/ISSN) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_ publication  
 (When technical reports/publications have been distributed, attach **distribution list**)

(c)  **TECHNICAL INFORMATION**  **PUBLIC INFORMATION**  
 Description \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**(d) TECHNICAL COOPERATION**

Grants and Fellowships                       Advisory Services

Staff Missions                                       Others (describe)

Purpose \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Place \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ duration \_\_\_\_\_

For Grants/Fellowships, please indicate:

<u>Beneficiaries</u>	<u>Countries/Nationalities</u>	<u>Cost(in US\$)</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

**(f) OTHER OUTPUTS/SERVICES**

For example, Networking, Query-response, Participation in meetings etc.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**4. Use of outputs**  
State the use made of the outputs.

<b>Output</b>		<b>Use</b>
<b>Output 1, Produce and disseminate Information</b>		
	<b>44 Country POPs Situation Reports prepared and disseminated</b>	Country POPs situation reports were disseminated somewhat differently in each country (see project web site for details). In general, both the preparation and the dissemination of these reports served as a basis for POPs awareness-raising within the

		national NGO and CSO community and with sectors of the public at large. They enabled NGOs to establish their own priority issues of concern relative to Stockholm implementation and informed NGO participation in NIPs, NGO policy advocacy, and other NGO interventions in support of POPs minimization and elimination.
	<b>108 POPs Hotspot Reports prepared and disseminated</b>	POPs hotspot reports were disseminated in a variety of ways depending on the country including to government bodies, NGOs, and communities living near contaminated sites. The reports were used to raise public awareness, propose cleanup or prevention policies in the country, and promote Stockholm Convention policies at the global level. The reports made 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 reports also helped 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. Hotspot reports 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.
	<b>109 POPs Policy Briefs and Recommendations</b>	The policy briefs covered a wide variety of topics including

	<b>prepared and disseminated</b>	Convention implementation guidelines, medical waste, material substitution, zero waste, malaria and DDT, POPs and Indigenous Peoples, and dioxin inventories. In addition, many hotspot reports contained NGO policy recommendations. Recommendations were submitted to appropriate government officials and disseminated widely through public awareness-raising activities.
<b>Output 2, NGO Participation in NIPS</b>	<b>NGOs Participated in NIP preparations with project support in 53 Countries</b>	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.
<b>Output 3, Increased POPs Awareness</b>	<b>150 POPs public awareness activities</b>	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. 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:

		<p>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. 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.</p>
	<p><b>53 NGO POPs information and training</b></p>	<p>Workshops in IPEP regions provided venues for interaction between NGOs</p>



	workshops	<p>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. 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.</p>
<p><b>Output 4, Increased NGO Capacity</b></p>		<p>The eight NGOs serving as project regional facilitation hubs are all continuing to play important NGO regional coordination functions post-</p>

		project in support both of ongoing Stockholm Convention implementation efforts as well as support for other efforts aimed at enhancing national foundational capacity for sound chemicals management.
		NGOs in 65 countries who participated in project have indicated they plan to continue working on POPs post-project
		NGOs in 27 countries who participated in project have indicated they have already secured funding to enable them to continue working on POPs post-project

5. Degree of achievement of the objectives/results

On the basis of facts obtained during the follow-up phase, describe how the project document outputs and their use were or were not instrumental in realizing the objectives/results of the project.

The project document outputs and their use were fully instrumental in realizing the project objectives.

<b>Project Objective</b>	<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Indicative Facts</b> (illustrating how project outputs and their use were instrumental in realizing the objective).
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	The project over-fulfilled this objective. It encouraged and enabled NGOs in 65 developing and transitional countries to engage in activities that contributed to national preparations for Stockholm Convention implementation including:  1) Preparation and dissemination of: 44 Country POPs Situation Reports; 108 POPs Hotspot Reports; 109	1) 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

	<p>POPs Policy Briefs and Recommendations;</p> <p>2) NGOs Participation in NIP preparations in 53 Countries;</p> <p>3) Increased public awareness from 150 public awareness activities and 53 information and training workshops</p>	<p>NIPs and other governmental policies and strategies on chemicals.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Review Committee.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>2) 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. In some countries, IPEN NGOs were given important roles in the NIP preparation process including membership on the national coordinating</p>
--	--	--

		<p>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.</p> <p>3) 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,</p>
--	--	--

		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>
--	--	---

	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
--	---

<p>Objective 2: Enhance the skills and knowledge of NGOs to help build their capacity as effective stakeholders in the Convention implementation process;</p>	<p>All the outputs described above contributing to the realization of Objective number 1 also contributed to enhancing NGO skill and knowledge and helped to build their capacity as effective Convention stakeholders based on the project's methodology of learning by doing. In addition, the project encouraged and enabled 150 POPs awareness-raising activities and 53 POPs-related information and training workshops that further contributed to the realization of Objective 2.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>
---	--	---



		<p>first time about the roles of UN agencies in POPs elimination and chemical safety including UNIDO, UNEP, UNDP, WHO, UNITAR, FAO, and others.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>
--	--	--

		<p>can now train co-workers on issues related to POPs and the Stockholm Convention.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>
--	--	---

		<p>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.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The eight NGOs serving as project regional facilitation hubs all continue to play important NGO regional coordination roles post-project in support both of Stockholm Convention implementation as well as support for other efforts to enhance national foundational capacity for sound chemicals management. The regions for which these NGOs play a coordination role are: English-speaking Africa; French-speaking Africa; Middle-East Arabic-speaking countries; Central and Eastern Europe (for NGOs who work in English); Eastern Europe, the Caucuses and Central Asia (for NGOs who work in Russian); South Asia; Southeast and East Asia and the Pacific; and Latin America (for NGOs working in Spanish)</p> <p>NGOs in 65 countries who</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

	<p>participated in the project have indicated they intend to continue as national stakeholders working on POPs minimization and elimination post-project. NGOs in 27 countries have indicated they already have secured needed funding to enable this.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Uganda. Most of these are new countries for IPEN work.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>
--	--	---

		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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,</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Moldova, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan. The IPEP project in the EECCA region involved the participation of more than 200 NGOs.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>
--	--	--



		<p>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.</p> <p>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. Approximately 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</p>
--	--	--

		<p>funding to working in the area. The Stockholm Convention and its implementation have inspired a great deal of enthusiasm and energy on the part of many NGOs in all regions.</p> <p>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.</p>
--	--	--

6. Conclusions

Enumerate the lessons learned during the project execution. Concentrate on the management of the project, indicating the principal factors which determined success or failure in meeting the objectives set down in the project document.

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 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.

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.

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.

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.

## 7. Recommendations

Make recommendations to:

- (a) Improve effect and impact of similar projects in the future;

IPEP illustrated the benefits of engaging NGOs in activities to prepare their countries for Stockholm Convention implementation. The project and its methodology worked very well with a few exceptions listed below. Key successful components of the project methodology included:

- **The employment of NGOs as regional facilitation hubs.** Hubs were selected in an open and transparent process involving NGOs in their region. They were given full responsibility (in consultation with other NGOs in the region) for identifying NGOs in the region to undertake project activities; helping these NGOs define the activities they wish to undertake; and helping them complete the work as agreed. This created substantial regional buy-in and ownership. It contributed to the project's ability to support a total of 290 project activities with not a single default from any participating NGO.
- **An emphasis on learning by doing.** When the project started, in many countries NGO capacity in the fields of POPs and chemical safety was very low, and many of the NGOs with the greatest interest in these issues often possessed only rudimentary organizational capacity and sometimes had little or no past experience in preparing and executing projects. The hubs worked with NGOs in their region to jointly develop Project Activity Memoranda (PAM). Each PAM included a description of the work to be performed; the intended outputs; a timeline, a work plan, and a payment schedule. Once the PAM was approved by global project management, the NGOs were encouraged and helped by the hubs (with support from global project management) to carry out the agreed work plan. In countries (like, for example, Russia) where many NGOs have strong, relevant technical and scientific capabilities and have close contacts with a large and advanced academic community, project outputs were generally very sophisticated and the activity's main outcomes often made important direct contributions to national knowledge about POPs. In countries where the NGOs started out with a less sophisticated understanding and capabilities; the increase in NGO understanding and capability achieved through learning by doing was sometimes as important an outcome as any other. The NGO engaged in the project often started at a relatively low level of knowledge and were enabled by

their project activities to greatly increase their expertise and knowledge in areas such as, inter alia: chemical policy, hotspot characterization, health effects, alternatives, clean production, PRTR, analytical laboratories, media, and interaction with other stakeholders (government, NGO, and private sector) etc.

- **Encouraging NGOs to seek opportunities to work with their government as Stockholm Convention national stakeholders; and helping facilitate, as appropriate, Convention implementation partnerships between NGOs and their government.** Many of the NGOs engaged in the project had little prior experience in productive collaboration with national or district government agencies. Governments in some project countries had little experience cooperating with public interest NGO stakeholders. The project promoted partnerships in both directions and achieved substantial, although not perfect mutually beneficial results.
- **A global project, self-managed by NGOs.** This global project was conceived, prepared and managed exclusively by NGOs. This was possible because the project was initiated and operated on behalf of a capable and well-respected global NGO network – the International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN). The GEF Implementing Agencies – UNEP and UNIDO – accepted that the project was NGO self-managed, and played constructive supporting roles. The result of this arrangement was full ownership and buy-in on the part of project participants in all global regions. Organizing and managing the project on a global basis enabled a sharing of experiences and capabilities between NGOs from different regions. It enabled efficient mobilization and dissemination of organizational, technical and scientific resources, and helped set standards that NGOs from different regions could aspire to. Overall, a globally managed and coordinated project, with regional initiation and management of all project activities contributed greatly to increased NGO capabilities at regional, national and district levels.

The above features of the project were highly successful and should be utilized in similar projects in the future.

The project had a few areas of difficulty.

### **Fund Transfers**

All GEF funds were held by UNIDO and were distributed directly by UNIDO to NGOs as payment for undertaking discrete project activities. Project activities were based on Project Activity Memoranda (PAMs) agreed between regional hubs and the NGO or NGOs carrying out the activity subject to approval by the global project coordinator based on an assessment that the PAM is consistent with project guidelines. Following the approval of a PAM or the receipt of an accepted mid-term or final report, the global

project manager submitted a payment invoice to UNIDO. UNIDO then distributed funds directly to NGOs by bank transfer or through UNDP country offices.

Initially, UNIDO expressed concerns that NGOs would receive funds but not do the agreed work. In order to address this concern, UNIDO initially insisted on a schedule of three payments for each PAM: \$500 upon PAM approval; 20% upon completion; and the balance upon receipt of a mid-term progress report. This resulted in a very large number of small transfers. After nearly a year of experience, and at the advice of the Project Steering Committee, UNIDO agreed to a revised payment schedule that would give more flexibility to the judgment of the hubs. For project activities whose total budget was no more than \$5,000, the hub was given discretion to determine the number of payments – including the possibility of a single, up-front payment if the hub had sufficient confidence in the reliability of the NGO. This improved the workload associated with transfers. The hubs, evidently, were able to exercise very good judgment and all work for which NGOs received payment under the project was completed.

Nonetheless, the project was plagued from start to finish with payment transfer problems. Some NGOs were in countries where the banking systems are not fully functional or where there existed other barriers to bank transfers. In these cases, funds were transferred through the national UNDP office. This was sometimes easy and sometimes very difficult requiring the NGO to make many trips to the UNDP office.

A good number of bank transfers failed for various reasons. It became a laborious and time-consuming effort for both UNIDO and project management to determine that a transfer failure occurred; to track down the problem; and to reissue the transfer (on some occasions multiple times). Agreed payments to NGOs were sometimes delayed as long as 6 months and more; in some cases causing severe distress to an NGO that had advanced funds from its own meager resources; and in some cases, severely delaying completion of project activities.

These transfer problems undermined project efforts to build-up NGO skills in working to an agreed plan and timeline since the project, itself, too often set a bad example by failing to meet its own promised schedule of payments as spelled out in the PAM.

Despite all these problems, however, in the end it became evident that the financial transfer services provided by UNIDO were far superior to any available alternative approach. UNIDO executed approximately 500 fund transfers directly to NGOs, mostly in the \$500 to \$5,000 range. In cases where the project used other vehicles to transfer funds derived from co-finance sources, we experienced complications and problems that were, on balance, far greater than those experienced when UNIDO took responsibility for fund transfers. In the end, the project learned to highly value the financial services UNIDO provided us, and would welcome the opportunity to work in the same way with UNIDO in the future.

We recognize that there exists no silver-bullet solution to transferring funds under conditions where: some recipient countries have less than efficient banking systems;

some erect difficult, bureaucratic barriers: some recipient NGOs are based in remote locations; and many of the recipient NGOs, themselves, have little experience with maintaining bank accounts and efficiently doing the necessary paperwork associated with receiving a bank transfer.

The ability to transfer funds through UNDP country offices was a very useful and sometimes an essential alternative to the use of bank transfers. However, each UNDP office has its own policies and procedures and has its own attitude toward NGOs. Some UNDP offices do see themselves in the role of serving as an alternate banking system, but rather, prefer direct involvement in projects associated with the funds they transfer. Given the small size of the individual IPEP project activities and payments, however, it was sometimes difficult or inappropriate for the UNDP offices to undertake this role.

### **Expert Teams**

As described above in Section 2, Project Activities the IPEP UNEP Document included provisions for establishing and maintaining five issue-focused NGO expert teams to provide support and assistance to NGOs in specific issue areas. Project planners thought that several NGOs in North America and/or Europe would be willing and able to raise most of the funds needed to establish and maintain these expert teams based on the assumption that funding these teams would be viewed both by these NGOs and their donors as a highly leveraged investment. This planning assumption proved false. Some of these NGOs did provide expert assistance on an ad hoc basis to developing country NGOs working on project activities, but the resources needed to establish formal expert teams did not prove to be forthcoming.

In the end, the function of the expert team was implemented somewhat differently from what was originally imagined, and budgeted resources for the expert teams were also disbursed somewhat differently than anticipated. Instead of a centralized global team responding to requests, NGOs developed relationships with experts in their own countries and regions (and sometimes shared this expertise with NGOs in other regions). Overall, the expert team functions were carried out in a less formal and institutional way than planned. This change produced some benefits, in that it contributed to building and strengthening NGO relationships with experts in their countries and regions. On the other hand, project outputs could have, overall, been technically better and more professional if functioning international NGO expert teams could have been established.

We learned from this and other similar experiences that donor communities do not sufficiently recognize the value of providing funds to enable NGOs in the developing world to secure the services of international experts they trust in support of initiatives of their own choosing.

## Total Resources Available

The project was able to accomplish a great deal over a two-year period with the generous USD \$1 million support from the GEF, and with \$750,000 in cash co-finance support. However, this truly was a global project. We originally planned to support activities in approximately 40 countries in all regions. In the end, the project supported activities in 65 countries and this was inadequate.

In the end, given the opportunities and the need, the project should have been at least three times as large as it was. Funding availability was only one of the limiting factors. Another limiting factor was NGO capacity. Given the organizational and administrative capacity of IPEN at the start of the project, it may have been difficult initially for the network to manage a substantially larger effort. However, the project and its successful implementation enabled a large leap in IPEN's capacity.

(b) Indicate what further action might be needed to meet the project objectives/results.

The project's overall objective, as reflected in its formal title was: *Fostering Active and Effective Civil Society Participation in Preparations for Implementation of the Stockholm Convention*. The original project concept was to support NGO efforts parallel to GEF-funded Stockholm Convention Enabling Activities projects and government Stockholm NIP preparations. The Stockholm Convention period of enabling activities is largely coming to an end. The important challenges associated with effective Convention implementation still lie in the future. While the project was very successful, additional similar support from the GEF, co-funders and UN agencies would be very useful and would contribute greatly to help maximize the contributions of NGOs and civil society to effective Convention implementation.

In 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 most 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 of the NGOs who participated are still learning how to work effectively with government agencies and with international institutions. Some now may have the capacity to develop and implement useful GEF Small Grants Projects, but most do not.

For the past decade, GEF and also a great many international donors and international environmental organizations have dedicated enormous resources to support developing and transition country NGO projects and campaigns aimed at preserving bio-diversity; and also, projects and campaigns to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to alleviate negative consequences of climate change. As a result, there exist large numbers of NGOs throughout the world who now have the capability to on their own develop and implement good GEF SGP projects addressing these issues. On the other hand, there has



been rather little support in the same period for NGOs efforts in the developing world to minimize releases to the environment of POPs and other persistent toxic substances; and more generally little support for NGO and civil society contributions to chemical safety initiatives and the establishment of foundational sound chemicals management capacity. In many cases, good NGO and CSO projects aimed at minimizing POPs releases and building related foundations chemicals management capacity require sophisticated specialized knowledge.

The IPEP project contributed greatly to helping transfer chemicals-related specialized knowledge to NGOs in the developing world – but it was only a first step. The next steps should be follow-up efforts to foster effective civil society participation in the actual implementation of the Stockholm Convention. An ideal approach would be to follow-up IPEP with three Medium Size Projects: one for NGOs in GEF-eligible countries in Central Europe, Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia; one for NGOs in Africa and the Arabic-speaking countries; and one for NGOs in Asia, Latin America and the Pacific.

Ideally, these three projects would build on and possibly extend the global and regional management structures established during IPEP. They would utilize a similar approach and methodology. The content, however, would build on what was achieved during IPEP and would go beyond it. IPEP supported facilitating NGO and CSO engagement in preparations for Convention implementation; the follow-up projects would support NGO and CSO engagement in actual convention implementation and in the establishment of the needed national foundational chemicals management capacity and infrastructures. The follow-up project would also work closely in cooperation with the GEF Small Grants Program to undertake targeted efforts to help prepare NGOs in up to 60 countries to prepare good POPs-related GEF SGP proposals and to assure that these NGOs have the needed capability to implement them.

The concept of three distinct projects is based on experiences gained during IPEP.

1. On balance, NGOs in the CEE region have the greatest access to specialized knowledge and can carry out the most complex and technical POPs-related project activities. This region, on the other hand, is faced with some of the most profound POPs contamination and related problems. Of all the regions covered by IPEP, this region can produce the most sophisticated outputs, but also faces the most severe mismatch between latent demand and the availability of resources.
2. The African region, on the other hand, has the greatest concentration of least developed countries. It has the least access to specialized knowledge including scientific, technical and organizational expertise. With the exception of South Africa, it is not a chemical producing region. However, on balance, its countries have the greatest weaknesses in foundational chemicals management capacity. Given that the Arabic-speaking countries are split between the Africa and Asia; given that for language and cultural reasons it is most effective not to split them between projects; and given that within SAICM a natural working relationship

has evolved between the African region the Arabic-speaking countries as a whole, it is better to coordinate this region jointly with Africa than any other division.

3. A third project covering Asia, Latin America and the Pacific would include countries at very different levels of development in both Asia and Latin America. In general, however, the level of foundational NGO and government capacity and access to specialized information and knowledge in these regions tends to be intermediate between those identified in items 1 & 2 above.

While three closely linked projects, covering different regions as described above would be ideal, some practical issues would need to be resolved before determining the potential to achieve this ideal. From the NGO side, the biggest challenge we would face would be to raise sufficient cash co-finance to support three MSPs.

IPEP mobilized about \$750,000 in cash co-finance and about \$1 million in-kind co-finance. Presently, it appears, donor government enthusiasm for the Stockholm Convention implementation in the developing world may have since declined not grown, and the amounts required for global projects are beyond the capacity of other donors with whom we are in dialogue. Therefore, in the end, the limiting factor in determining whether to pursue one, two or three new MSPs will be strongly influenced by the amount of likely cash co-finance we can identify and secure.

8. Non-expendable equipment (value over US\$1,500)  
None

## **Annex 1. IPEP Projects Producing Publications or Printed Materials**

**Table1. Country situation reports by country (44)**

<b>Country</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>NGO</b>
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

**Table 2. Hotspot reports by country (108)**

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	Association pour la Protection de

		environmental, socio-economic and health impacts of POPs use and contamination in contaminated areas: Ouesse and Nkanyi	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 near Lampertice and its neighborhood	Arnika Association
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	Day Hospital Institute for

		produced in the impact zone of Helwan cement and steel plants	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 production (formerly DDT producing)	Egypt Suns Association for Development and Environmental Protection
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 Eastern-Kazakhstan region: monitoring and inventories of PCB sources and ways to address the problem	Greenwomen
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	Centre for Public Health and

		study on current practices in Nepal	Environmental Development (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 <sup>rd</sup> 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	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	Women Network in Urals

		environment	
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 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	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

**Table 3A. Focused policy briefs by country (21)**

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-free future: Opportunities to move towards health care waste treatment without incineration in Latin America	Health Care Without Harm – 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	Balifokus (Indonesia).

		Proposal for a POPs-Free Alternative to Managing Municipal Discards in Indonesia, Malaysia and The Philippines	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 Mauritania: Case study in Nouakchott	Agir pour une Gestion Rationnelle pour l'Environnement en Mauritanie (AGREEM)
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-	Earthlife Africa – eThekweni

Tanzania	5URT	products 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 5. Public awareness campaigns by country (150)**

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 awareness on POPs pollution and associated health impacts	Ecotox
Armenia	6ARM	Global day of action; Yerevan University and State Museum Natural History	Khazer
Armenia	7ARM	Empowering the Armenian	Armenian Women for Health and Healthy

		public to take actions towards environmentally sound waste management	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 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)
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

Colombia	1COL	Global day of action in Colombia	una Mejor Calidad de Vida (RAP-Chile) 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 Ouesso	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	11NS	Awareness Campaign on the Danger of POPs and Other Pesticides to Human Health	Farmer's Initiatives for Ecological Livelihoods and Democracy (FIELD)



		and Environment through Action Research Activity by a Rural Community	
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 Analisis 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	Chisinau 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	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
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	Center for Public Health and Environment Development

		through Interaction Programs	
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 civil society in awareness-raising on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)	Altervida
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	Ecowaste Coalition in cooperation with

		Management Demonstration Project at the 23 <sup>rd</sup> Southeast Asian Games to Prevent and Reduce Wasting, Dumping and Burning	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