GLOBAL ALLIANCE FOR HEALTH AND POLLUTION (GAHP)
Mid-term Evaluation (2011-2014)

Prepared
By
Patterson Consulting
For
The Blacksmith Institute
February 10, 2015

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AFD	Agence Français de Développement
AFR	Africa (World Bank region)
DALYs	Disability Adjusted Life Years
DFID	UK Agency for International Development
EAP	East Asia and the Pacific (World Bank region)
EC	European Commission
ECA	Europe and Central Asia (World Bank region)
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIP	Global Inventory Project (Blacksmith's and now called Toxic Sites Identification Program (TSIP))
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
HRS	Hazard Ranking System
ISA	Initial Site Assessment (Blacksmith's)
ISS	Initial Site Screening (Blacksmith's revised ISA)
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean region
LCR	Latin America and the Caribbean (World Bank region)
NTAPs	National Toxics Action Plans
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MNA	Middle East and North Africa (World Bank region)
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NTAP	National Toxic Action Planning (Blacksmith's)
NGO	Non-governmental organization
POPs	Persistent Organic Pollutants
QALYs	Quality Adjusted Life Years
SAICM	Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management
SAR	South Asia (World Bank region)
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
TAB	Technical Advisory Board (Blacksmith's)
TSIP	Toxic Sites Identification Program (Blacksmith's and formerly Blacksmith's Global Inventory Project)
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
WB	World Bank
WB DGF	World Bank Development Grant Facility

CONTENTS

PROGRAM AT A GLANCE: GLOBAL ALLIANCE FOR HEALTH AND POLLUTION iv

GLOSSARY vii

PREFACE x

FUTURE POTENTIAL FOR THE GAHP IN THE EMERGING INTERNATIONAL AGENDA FOR POLLUTION AND HEALTH xi

1. THE MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE GLOBAL ALLIANCE FOR HEALTH AND POLLUTION 1

- 1.1 Background 1
- 1.2 Purpose of the Evaluation 1
- 1.3 Evaluation Criteria 2
- 1.4 Methodology for the Evaluation 2

2. THE GLOBAL ALLIANCE FOR HEALTH AND POLLUTION 4

3. THE EVALUATION OF THE GLOBAL ALLIANCE FOR HEALTH AND POLLUTION 6

- 3.1 Relevance 6
- 3.2 Effectiveness or Efficacy 14
- 3.3 Efficiency 23
- 3.4 Governance and Management 30
- 3.5 Sustainability 37

4. LESSONS 39

Annex 1. STAKEHOLDER MAP 42
Annex 2. GLOBAL ALLIANCE FOR HEALTH AND POLLUTION MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS AS OF AUGUST 2014 46
Annex 3. SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE FOR "DONOR" STAKEHOLDERS 47
Annex 4. SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES FROM "BENEFICIARY" STAKEHOLDERS 51
Annex 5. EUROPEAN COMMISSION LOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROJECT: BLACKSMITH UNIDO "REDUCTION OF TOXIC POLLUTION THREATENING THE ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTH OF VULNERABLE COMMUNITIES IN AFRICA, SELECTED COUNTRIES OF EASTERN EUROPE, LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN" 55
Annex 6. WORLD BANK DEVELOPMENT GRANT FACILITY RESULTS FRAMEWORK 59
Annex 7. DETAILS OF THE PROGRESS BY GAHP TO ACHIEVE THE FUNDING OBJECTIVES 2011-2014 65
Annex 8. FORMAT USED BY GAHP TO MONITOR FINANCIAL EXPENDITURES 80
Annex 9. GUIDELINES FOR CALCULATION OF IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS 82

PROGRAM AT A GLANCE: THE GLOBAL ALLIANCE FOR HEALTH AND POLLUTION

Start Date	The Global Alliance for Health and Pollution (GAHP) was launched at the Bellagio Center conference at its first face-to-face meeting at Bellagio, Italy in July 2012.
Time Period Reviewed	2011 to 2014
Host Agency	Blacksmith Institute
Mission[1]	GAHP is a collaborative body that facilitates the provision of technical and financial resources to governments and communities to reduce the impacts of pollution on health in low- and middle-income countries. GAHP: • Advocates for solutions that address pollution broadly – indoor and outdoor air, wastewater, and contaminated soils and water; • Initiates activities that reduce adverse health impacts caused by contaminated sites; • Works to help actively polluting small-scale industries and activities move to cleaner production practices; and • Measures project performance based on health and economic outcomes.
European Commission Contribution	Through a contract with the UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) (Blacksmith Institute as the Implementing Agency), the European Commission (EC) provided €5 million for a period of 40 months from 2011 for the reduction of toxic pollution threatening the environment and health of vulnerable communities.
World Bank Contributions	The World Bank Development Grant Facility (DGF) provided to Blacksmith to support the *Design of a Global Partnership to Address Legacy Pollution and its Health Impacts Affecting Poor Communities in Priority Countries*[2] the following grants: US$ 700,000 from the Bank's FY2012 DGF Window 2, US$ 700,000 from the Bank's FY2013 DGF Window 2 and US$ 600,000 from the Bank's FY2014 DGF. The World Bank grants constitute the EC matching grant requirement.
Funding Objectives[3]	*European Commission Contract* *Overall objective*: Assist governments and communities heavily impacted by legacy toxic pollution in Africa and select countries of Eastern Europe (former Soviet Union), Latin America and the Caribbean to take locally-led action to improve the health of those communities by breaking pollution exposure pathways and preventing future toxic emissions. *Specific objectives:* 1. Expand and reinforce the current review of toxic pollution in countries in Africa, Eastern Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean, and create an inventory of pollution hotspots in those regions;

[1]Global Alliance for Health and Pollution website. http://www.gahp.net/new/what-is-gahp/working-with-gahp/

[2] As the Global Alliance for Health and Pollution (GAHP) was established during the 2nd Year of the DGF, the title of the DGF grant has been changed from "*Design of Global Partnership to Address Legacy Pollution and its Health Impacts Affecting Poor Communities in Priority Counties*" to "*Design and Establishment of a Global Alliance on Health and Pollution Supporting Poor Communities in Priority Countries*" for the 3rd Year of the DGF.

[3]The Objectives listed here are those listed in the contracts established by the two donors: the European Communities and the World Bank. The Contracts are: Contract EuropeAid/ DCI-ENV/2011/261448 and World Bank Development Grant Facility: Design of a Global Partnership to Address Legacy Pollution and its Health Impacts Affecting Poor Communities in Priority Countries.

	2. Build national and local capacity in Africa, and select countries in Eastern Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean to develop national toxics action plans and implement remediation/cleanup interventions to improve the health of those populations directly affected by legacy or active pollution; and 3. Promote awareness regarding the scope of toxic pollution and the need to address the issue globally and assist in the development of an international response. *World Bank Development Grant Facility (DGF)* The main purpose is to design a formal mechanism on an international scale that would deal with toxic legacy pollution and its health effects in low and middle income countries, and would assist local communities to protect and improve their health and livelihoods. *The specific activities of the Grant include:* Activity 1: Design of the partnership facility with a clear mandate for its work within the broader development mandates of participating agencies. Activity 2: Expansion of the inventory database of toxic hotspots to regions for which gaps still exist (such as Africa region) and use of data in research on global health and development impacts of legacy pollution. Activity 3: Definition of selection criteria and identification of sites for three pilots to test the potential designs of the partnership.
Major Results of the GAHP 2011-2014[4]	1. The GAHP was created in 2012 with a Constitutive Document, 32 members by 2014, an Executive Committee, Secretariat and Technical Advisory Group. 2. Contributions of at least US$ 15.8 million were committed to support the GAHP. 3. Rapid risk assessments using a revised Initial Site Screening (ISS) protocol were conducted throughout Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean and integrated into the existing Global Inventory now called the Toxic Sites Identification Program (TSIP). 4. The TSIP has been expanded to more than 3,200 sites. Summary TSIP data is available on a preliminary website www.pollutionproject.org. 5. 13 Country-level reports of TSIP data were presented to Governments in Armenia, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Peru, the Philippines, Tanzania, Uruguay and Vietnam. 6. Since 2012, training workshops in 19 countries trained more than 160 investigators and 120 government representatives how to identify and assess toxic sites. Technology transfer has been occurring in all pilot projects. Guidance documents are available such as “Regulatory Best Practices for Remediation of Legacy Toxic Contamination” for Latin America practitioners available in English and Spanish as well as GAHP Technical Advisory Group (TAG) guidance found on the GAHP website http://www.gahp.net/new/resources/technical-guidance/ . 7. 11 National Toxic Action Planning (NTAP) processes are underway in: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Peru, the Philippines, Tanzania, Uruguay and Vietnam. Azerbaijan has completed its draft for the proposed NTAP. NTAPs start with the current knowledge of contamination issues based on the TSIP database and incorporate possible intervention strategies that can be carried out by the country and potential funding mechanisms.

[4] Annex 7. DETAILS OF THE PROGRESS BY GAHP TO ACHIEVE THE FUNDING OBJECTIVES 2011-2014 compiles all of the results reported to the two agencies funding the GAHP.

	8. Awareness raising has occurred through publication of "accessible" reports such as "The Poisoned Poor" GAHP Poisoned Poor Report (Full Document, Updated Sept 2013) available in full in English, in summary in French, English, Spanish and Chinese. Through the #SpotlightPollution campaign, GAHP was supported by 38 agencies/organizations from 25 countries in a successful effort to have the target related to air pollution under the United Nations Health Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) broadened to include water and soil pollution/contamination. Jairam Ramesh, Member of Parliament in the Government of India and Janez Potocnik, former EC Commissioner for the Environment, were named as GAHP global ambassadors. Meetings with numerous global and regional international organizations, national governments, and through side events organized on the occasion of international conferences disseminated the pollution and health message. 9. The Global inventory data was cited in journals including in Environmental Monitoring and Health, Environmental Health Perspectives, Environmental Research; Blacksmith's Journal of Health and Pollution created and 6 issues published www.journalhealthpollution.org. Press coverage included articles in Scientific American, Lancet, Time, ScienceNews and PBS Newshour. 10. GAHP launched a competitive small grants program in 2012 for low- and middle-income countries to pilot innovative solutions to toxic pollution problems, and test how GAHP can cooperate to assist countries to mitigate the impacts of toxic pollution. Projects fit at least one of three categories: 1) Grassroots support to test how GAHP can support local grassroots/civil society efforts to take concrete action; 2) Government request to test how GAHP can respond to country needs; and 3) Health risk to enable GAHP to draw attention to particularly severe and commonly overlooked problems, such as disaster prevention. Seven pilot projects were chosen to be implemented[5]: 1. Indonesia Mercury-Free Artisanal Gold Mining Trials. GAHP Award amount: $260,000. Total population affected: 43,000. 2. Accra, Ghana E-waste. GAHP Award amount: $75,000. Total population affected: 50,000. 3. Buenos Aires, Argentina Soil Contamination. GAHP Award amount: $75,000. Total population affected: 1,000. 4. Montevideo, Uruguay Toxic Hotspots. GAHP Award amount: $80,000. Total population affected: 15,000. 5. Sumagayit, Azerbaijan Industrial Center. GAHP Award amount: $30,000. Total population affected: 10,000. 6. Akhtala, Armenia Mine Tailings. GAHP Award amount: $25,000. Total population affected: 5,000. 7. Peru, Used Lead Acid Battery Recycling. Award amount $40,000. Total population affected: 25,000. Dong Mai Village, Vietnam Mitigation of Acute Lead Exposures, is not a "GAHP Pilot" project but is being implemented like a pilot with local partners. Award amount: $25,000. Total population affected: 2,600.

[5] At the September 3, 2013 meeting of the GAHP Executive Committee, it was agreed that GAHP pilot projects will be funded by the EC and not by the World Bank DGF since the application of the World Bank safeguard policy is not feasible in the context of very small pilot projects such as those underway in the GAHP.

GLOSSARY

Exit strategy	A proactive strategy to change the design of a program, to devolve some of its implementation responsibilities, to reduce dependency on external funding, or to phase out the program on the grounds that it has achieved its objectives or that its current design is no longer the best way to sustain the results which the program has achieved.
Efficacy	The extent to which the program has achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, taking into account their relative importance.
Efficiency	The extent to which the program has converted or is expected to convert its resources/inputs (such as funds, expertise, time, etc.) economically into results in order to achieve the maximum possible outputs, outcomes, and impacts with the minimum possible inputs.
Evaluation	The systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing to completed policy, program, or project, its design, implementation, and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and achievement of its objectives, and its developmental effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability.
Governance	The structures, functions, processes, and organizational traditions that have been put in place within the context of a program's authorizing environment to ensure that the program is run in such a way that it achieves its objectives in an effective and transparent manner. It is the framework of accountability and responsibility to users, stakeholders and the wider community, within which organizations take decisions, and lead and control their functions, to achieve their objectives.
Impacts	Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.
Independent evaluation	An evaluation that is carried out by entities and persons free from the control of those involved in policy making, management, or implementation of program activities. This entails organizational and behavioral independence, protection from interference, and avoidance of conflicts of interest.
Indicator	A quantitative or qualitative factor or variable that provides a simple and reliable means to measure achievement, to reflect the changes connected to an intervention, or to help assess the performance of a development actor.
Legitimacy	As a criterion for assessing governance and management, the way in which governmental and managerial authority is exercised in relation to those with a legitimate interest in the program — including shareholders, other stakeholders, implementers, beneficiaries, and the community at large.
Logical framework or Logframe or	A management technique that is used to develop the overall design of a program or project, to improve implementation monitoring, and to strengthen evaluation, by presenting the essential elements of the program

Results Framework	or project clearly and succinctly throughout its cycle. It is a "cause and effect" model which aims to establish clear objectives and strategies based on a results chain, to build commitment and ownership among the stakeholders during the preparation of the program or project, and to relate the program's or project's interventions to their intended outcomes and impacts for beneficiaries.
Management	The day-to-day operation of a program within the context of the strategies, policies, processes, and procedures that have been established by the governing body.
Monitoring	The continuous assessment of progress achieved during program implementation in order to track compliance with a plan, to identify reasons for noncompliance, and to take necessary actions to improve performance. Monitoring is usually the responsibility of program management and operational staff.
Outcomes	The achieved or likely short-term and medium-term effects of the outputs of a development intervention.
Oversight	One of the core functions of the governing body of a program: Monitoring the performance of the program management unit, appointing key personnel, approving annual budgets and business plans, and overseeing major capital expenditures.
Partners	Partners are understood as stakeholders who are involved in the governance or financing of the program (including the members of the governing, executive, or advisory bodies).
Public goods	Goods which produce benefits that are non-rival (many people can consume, use, or enjoy the good at the same time) and non-excludable (it is difficult to prevent people who do not pay for the good from consuming it). If the benefits of a particular public good accrue across all or many countries, then the good is deemed a global or international public good.
Relevance	The extent to which the objectives and design of the program are consistent with (a) the current global/regional challenges and concerns in a particular development sector and (b) the needs and priorities of beneficiary countries and groups.
Shareholders	The subset of donors that are involved in the governance of the program. Therefore, this does not include individual (particularly anonymous) donors who choose not to be so involved, or who are not entitled to be involved if their contribution does not meet the minimum requirement, say, for membership on the governing body.
Stakeholders	The parties who are interested in or affected, either positively or negatively, by the program. Stakeholders are often referred to as "principal" and "other", or "direct" and "indirect". While other or indirect stakeholders — such as taxpayers in both donor and beneficiary countries, visitors to a beneficiary country, and other indirect beneficiaries — may have interests as well, these are not ordinarily considered in evaluations

	unless a principal stakeholder acts as their proxy.
Sustainability	When the term is applied to the activities of a program, the extent to which the benefits arising from these activities are likely to continue after the activities have been completed. When the term is applied to organizations or programs themselves, the extent to which the organization or program is likely to continue its operational activities over time.
Transparency	As a criterion for assessing governance and management, the extent to which a program's decision-making, reporting, and evaluation processes are open and freely available to the general public. This is a metaphorical extension of the meaning used in physical sciences — a "transparent" objective being one that can be seen through.

Source: Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs: Indicative Principles and Standards. Independent Evaluation Group – World Bank, 2007.

PREFACE

The Global Alliance for Health and Pollution (GAHP) was launched at the Bellagio Center conference at its first face-to-face meeting at Bellagio, Italy in July 2012. GAHP is a collaborative body that facilitates the provision of technical and financial resources to governments and communities to reduce the impacts of pollution on health in low- and middle-income countries. In doing so, GAHP: 1)Advocates for solutions that address pollution broadly – indoor and outdoor air, wastewater, and contaminated soils and water; 2) Initiates activities that reduce adverse health impacts caused by contaminated sites; 3) Works to help actively polluting small-scale industries and activities move to cleaner production practices; and 4) Measures project performance based on health and economic outcomes.

The World Bank (WB) Development Grant Facility (DGF) and European Commission (EC) have provided financial support for the Global Alliance for Health and Pollution (GAHP) and its activities since 2011. Under the terms of the European Commission contract, an independent mid-term evaluation is required. Given the fact that the Global Alliance for Health and Pollution is still at an early stage in its establishment and operation, this mid-term evaluation can be an appropriate opportunity to look at the program design and to review governance and management arrangements. An evaluation at this stage can also identify where the program is successful and where there may be constraints that might make achievement of the program objectives difficult and recommend adjustments if necessary.

With this in mind, the purposes of the evaluation are twofold:

1. To review the initial progress of implementation, in the context of outcomes expected over the three years from 2011 to 2014 as specified in the WB DGF agreements and in the EC contract; and
2. To assess the strengths of the ongoing programme and identify areas where additional attention may be required in order to achieve the outcomes.

Patterson Consulting would like to gratefully acknowledge the advice, information and assistance of the GAHP Secretariat, the Task Manager for the Evaluation, Bret Ericson, all of the stakeholders who completed the questionnaires, the residents of Dong Mai, Vietnam who provided advice during the site visit and the Mayor and officials of Montevideo, Uruguay who gave of their valuable time and advice for the evaluators during our teleconference.

FUTURE POTENTIAL FOR THE GAHP IN AN EMERGING INTERNATIONAL AGENDA FOR POLLUTION AND HEALTH

ISSUE

With the completion of the mid-term evaluation of the Global Alliance on Health and Pollution (GAHP), it is clear that, as the GAHP moves from its design phase into the implementation phase, there are opportunities to position the Alliance within the current and emerging international agenda for pollution and health.

BACKGROUND

The GAHP outlined a vision and challenges statement and a five-year plan at the GAHP Annual meeting 4-6 September 2014, where agreements on the GAHP priorities for the next five years were reached. The priorities are:

1. Promote scientific research about the scope of toxic pollution, its negative impacts on health, poverty and the environment, cost-effective solutions and successful models to help raise awareness about the need for action, and develop performance-based metrics to measure change.
2. Raise awareness about all types of pollution and their human health and environmental impacts to catalyze support and technical and financial resources for on-the-ground action in low- and middle-income countries and GAHP activities.
3. Assist low- and middle-income countries to take concrete action to prioritize and address toxic pollution from legacy and Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSME) sites and reduce associated health impacts.

THE EMERGING INTERNATIONAL AGENDA FOR POLLUTION AND HEALTH

There is a growing awareness internationally that pollution of all kinds is a significant threat to human health. The full extent and scope of the pollution threat to health is not yet known, however, because of a lack of data to describe the issue of pollution and health. Based in part on its Toxic Sites Identification Program, the Global Alliance on Health and Pollution calculated in 2012 that an estimated 9 million people died from air, water and land pollution.

Pollution and health are inextricably linked to poverty. The World Bank Brief on POLLUTION of February 2, 2015 highlighted that the world's poor, who can't afford to protect themselves from the negative impact of pollution, end up suffering the most. The United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development sustainable development goals (SDGs) are, for the first time, acknowledging the linkage. The proposal for the Sustainable Development Goal 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all sets the goal to: "by 2030, substantially reduce the number of deaths and illnesses from hazardous chemicals and air, water and soil pollution and contamination."

The United Nations has recognized that funding chemicals and waste management must be addressed particularly in relation to the global conventions and agreements in place including the Stockholm, Basel, Rotterdam and Minamata Conventions and SAICM. The Governing

Council of the UNEP at its 27th session in Nairobi, 18-22 February 2013 made decisions (**UNEP/GC.27/17)** with respect to financing chemicals and wastes management that:

1. financing the sound management of chemicals and wastes should include mainstreaming, industry involvement and dedicated external finance;
2. a terms of reference should be developed for a special programme to fund chemicals and wastes;
3. the special programme should be developed within an existing funding mechanism to prevent duplication and proliferation of funding mechanisms; and
4. a report on the implementation of the special programme should go to the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum within 3 years and an evaluation of the implementation within 6 years.

In 2014, the World Bank established a Pollution Management and Environmental Health (PMEH) program that will build upon experiences in urban and rural pollution reduction from around the world to promote more systematic and effective responses to rampant and deadly pollution.

The UNEP led consultative process on financing chemicals and waste compared administrative structures and procedures among funding mechanisms in the chemical and waste area.[6] Key conclusions from that review that relate to the chemicals and waste funding mechanisms are:

- Funding for chemicals and waste is not distributed evenly among developing countries. For instance, under the Global Environment Facility (GEF), twenty countries received 84% of the GEF-4 funding for persistent organic pollutants and ozone depleting substances (POP/ODS) with the rest of the eligible countries receiving 16%. Over the life of the Montreal Protocol Multilateral Fund, in terms of total funds approved, 20 countries have received $2 billion in assistance including support costs and the remaining 176 Parties have received less than $400 million including support costs.
- Institutional strengthening – or capacity building is seen by developing countries as a very valuable tool to achieving results.
- Some funding mechanisms have administrative procedures that are sufficiently cumbersome that timeliness of project implementation is affected. At the same time, all of the funding mechanisms have established project cycle procedures to ensure reporting on the effectiveness of fund expenditures.

POTENTIAL POSITIONING FOR THE GAHP IN THE EMERGING INTERNATIONAL POLLUTION AND HEALTH AGENDA

1. The GAHP is aligned with the growing attention to pollution and health in the emerging international agenda on pollution and health.

[6] See A Proposal for an Integrated Approach to Financing the Sound Management of Chemicals and Wastes. Annex III: Comparison of the Structure and Operating Procedures for Four Financial Institutions http://www.unep.org/delc/Consultativeprocessonfinancing/tabid/6734/Default.aspx.

2. Project work: A gap exists in the international chemicals and waste agenda with respect to projects in low- and middle-income countries on toxic pollution from legacy and Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSME) sites. The GAHP has developed valuable expertise and experience in addressing projects of this kind in low-and middle-income countries. With simple project cycle and reporting procedures in place, the GAHP could be uniquely positioned to continue and expand its work on projects to help fill this gap.
3. Data on pollution and health: There is a lack of data on the scope and extent of toxic pollution and its effects on health. The adage "what can be measured can be managed" underpins the importance of developing basic inventories and scientific research on the scope of toxic pollution and its negative impacts on health, poverty and the environment. The GAHP has developed the Toxic Sites Identification Program (TSIP) and expanded it to more than 3,200 sites. At the same time, training workshops in 19 countries trained more than 160 investigators and 120 government representatives on how to identify and assess toxic sites. With this experience and expertise, the GAHP has a unique advantage in the emerging agenda on chemicals and waste to continue and expand in the area of data collection on toxic pollution.
4. Attention to the issue of pollution and health. Although the emerging international agenda on chemicals and wastes is beginning to recognize the importance of pollution and health, much more attention is needed to effectively address the issue. The GAHP has shown its ability to raise awareness and gain support for the issue through a range of methods including the creation of GAHP global ambassadors, meetings with numerous global and regional international organizations, national governments, and through side events organized on the occasion of international conferences disseminated the pollution and health message, the publication of "accessible" reports such as "The Poisoned Poor" GAHP Poisoned Poor Report (Full Document, Updated Sept 2013), the #SpotlightPollution campaign for the SDGs, the creation of the Journal of Health and Pollution (www.journalhealthpollution.org), press coverage in Scientific American, Lancet, Time, ScienceNews and PBS Newshour as well as the Authoraid program for developing country scientists. The GAHP has the expertise and experience to continue its efforts in raising awareness on the importance of reducing pollution and health issues from chemicals and waste problems in the context of the emerging international agenda.

1. THE MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE GLOBAL ALLIANCE FOR HEALTH AND POLLUTION

1.1 Background

The World Bank (WB) Development Grant Facility (DGF) and European Commission (EC) have provided financial support for the Global Alliance for Health and Pollution (GAHP) and its activities since 2011. The GAHP is now established as an organizational structure with members from the public and private sectors, a governance structure and an operational program covering a range of activities from a toxic site inventory, capacity building, remediation projects to awareness raising.

The WB DGF Agreement set out the main objective for the Blacksmith Institute which was to design a formal mechanism on an international scale that would deal with toxic legacy pollution and its health effects in low and middle income countries and would assist local communities to protect and improve their health and livelihoods. Specific aims were threefold: (i) to establish the partnership, ii) to expand the toxic inventory and raise awareness, (iii) to mobilize support for the partnership.

The European Commission contract had an overall objective to assist governments and communities that have been badly affected by legacy toxic pollution to take locally led action to improve the health of those communities by reducing exposure to pollution. The geographical scope for the EC support was Africa, Eastern Europe and Latin America and the Caribbean.

1.2 Purpose of the Evaluation

Under the terms of the European Commission contract, an independent mid-term evaluation is required. Given the fact that the Global Alliance for Health and Pollution is still at an early stage in its establishment and operation, this mid-term evaluation can be an appropriate opportunity to look at the program design and to review governance and management arrangements. An evaluation at this stage can also identify where the program is successful and where there may be constraints that might make achievement of the program objectives difficult and recommend adjustments if necessary.

With this in mind, the purposes of the evaluation are twofold:

3. To review the initial progress of implementation, in the context of outcomes expected over the three years from 2011 to 2014 as specified in the WB DGF agreements and in the EC contract; and
4. To assess the strengths of the ongoing programme and identify areas where additional attention may be required in order to achieve the outcomes.

1.3 Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation addresses the following five aspects of the GAHP and makes conclusions with respect to each evaluation criterion.

1. Relevance
   - Overall relevance to the broad development agenda and to the specific objectives of the supporting organizations;
   - Relevance to the beneficiaries (communities and their governments); and
   - Complementarity (or competition) with other programs and activities, both at the global level and within governments.

2. Effectiveness or Efficacy
   - Consistency of activities with defined objectives and effectiveness in moving towards them;
   - Clear monitoring of activities, response to challenges and cooperative solutions; and
   - Linkage to other relevant activities and exploitation of synergies.

3. Efficiency
   - Clear management and tracking of sources of funds and control of administrative costs; and
   - Mobilisation of additional or matching funds to support objectives of program.

4. Governance and Management
   - Defined roles and relationships and integrating inputs/feedback from all parties;
   - Transparency and openness of programs and activities; and
   - Responsibility and accountability of various participants and partners.

5. Sustainability

1.4 Methodology for the Evaluation

A Task Manager for the Evaluation from within the Blacksmith Institute has been the point of contact for the Evaluation Consultants. The Evaluation Consultants have reported to and been directed by the Task Manager.

The evaluation is based on the principles outlined in the IEG World Bank Independent Evaluation Group Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs: Indicative Principles and Standards. 2007 (http://www.worldbank.org/ieg/grpp) and the European Commission Evaluation Standards (http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/evaluation/index_en.htm).

The mid-term evaluation has been supported by the following sources of information:

- reports and documents provided by the Task Manager;
- meetings with the Task Manager as well as responses to queries and comments by the evaluators;
- a stakeholder map created in consultation with the Task Manager (See Annex 1);
- a questionnaire that was developed for and sent to 32 donor and GAHP member stakeholders out of which 11 responded; (See Annex 3 for the questionnaire and a summary of the responses.)
- a questionnaire designed for "beneficiaries" involved in GAHP projects out of which 16 stakeholders responded; (see Annex 4 for the questionnaire and a summary of the responses.)
- presentations and discussions during a site visit to the GAHP project located in Dong Mai, Vietnam; and
- presentations made and responses to questions during a video conference held with stakeholders involved with the Montevideo GAHP pilot project.

2. THE GLOBAL ALLIANCE FOR HEALTH AND POLLUTION

Toxic pollution is estimated to impact as many as 200 million people worldwide, making it a public health issue comparable to other major health issues such as malaria and HIV. The impact of toxic pollution tends to fall on poor and vulnerable communities in low- and middle-income countries and communities who are least equipped with the resources or capacity to tackle the problem.[7]

A website has been created for the Global Alliance for Health and Pollution (GAHP) (see http://www.gahp.net/new/what-is-gahp/working-with-gahp/) which provides an introduction to the GAHP that captures well the essence of the program being evaluated.

Vision

The vision of the GAHP is a world where the health of present and future generations, especially children and pregnant women, is safe from toxic pollution.

Mission

The GAHP is a collaborative body that facilitates the provision of technical and financial resources to governments and communities to reduce the impacts of pollution on health in low- and middle-income countries.

GAHP:

- *Advocates for solutions that address pollution broadly – indoor and outdoor air, wastewater, and contaminated soils and water;*
- *Initiates activities that reduce adverse health impacts caused by contaminated sites;*
- *Works to help actively polluting small-scale industries and activities move to cleaner production practices;*
- *Measures project performance based on health and economic outcomes.*

Challenges

To attain its goals, five major barriers to achieving GAHP's vision in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) need to be overcome:

- *General lack of awareness of the health effects of pollution. Achievement of GAHP's vision is hampered by lack of international, national government and public awareness that pollution is the single, largest cause of death and disease in LMICs – bigger than malaria, TB and HIV combined. After two centuries of industrialization, developed countries have dealt effectively with pollution, while manufacturing and mining in poorer countries has grown rapidly with few environmental controls. LMICs, in turn, have other competing priorities and scarce resources, neglecting pollution at great cost to health and the economy.*

[7] GAHP Annual Report 2013. (p.7) http://www.gahp.net/new/what-is-gahp/gahp-documents/

- *Misconceptions of the cost of solutions. Lack of awareness is compounded by misconceptions that:*
    - *pollution cleanup and prevention is generally prohibitively expensive: affordable, low-cost solutions, including simply breaking exposure pathways, often exist;*
    - *multinational corporations are responsible and should foot the bill: local, small-scale operators are the main culprits; and*
    - *pollution is an inevitable cost of economic development: the growing movement for green growth says otherwise, and new technology can be used to avoid mistakes made in developed countries.*
- *Fragmentation of the environmental agenda. Although environmentalism began with the brown agenda, pollution challenges have fragmented into separate issues, such as outdoor air pollution, wastewater, chemicals, food safety. Overall, combating pollution has lost ground to climate change and biodiversity.*
- *Lack of prioritization in the development agenda. At present there are no internationally agreed development targets that prioritize combating pollution.*
- *Insufficient technical, financial and human resources. This lack of demand means financial institutions and aid donors do not supply funding to combat pollution. LMICs have many competing priorities and very limited budgets with which to address pollution problems.*

3. THE EVALUATION OF THE GLOBAL ALLIANCE FOR HEALTH AND POLLUTION

3.1 Relevance

In an evaluation context, relevance is the extent to which the objectives and design of the program are consistent with (a) current global/regional challenges and concerns in a particular development sector and (b) the needs and priorities of beneficiary countries and groups.

For the mid-term evaluation of the Global Alliance for Health and Pollution, the following three areas are being assessed:

A. Overall relevance to the broad development agenda and to the specific objectives of the supporting organizations.
B. Relevance to the beneficiaries (communities and their governments).
C. Complementarity (or competition) with other programs and activities, both at the global level and within governments.

A. Overall relevance to the broad development agenda and to the specific objectives of the supporting organizations

In terms of the overall relevance of the GAHP to the broad development agenda, it is important to establish what the broad development agenda entails. First is the United Nations effort to set eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to be met by 2015 which range from halving extreme poverty rates to halting the spread of HIV/AIDS and providing universal primary education, all by 2015. These are leading to the preparation of new goals for post-2015 development. Second and related are the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) which are being developed now as a result of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development which took place in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in June 2012. The SDGs are intended to build on the Millennium Development Goals and to converge with the post 2015 development agenda.

The MDGs do not include any reference to the health effects of toxic pollution. To ensure that the SDGs are drafted with pollution and health as an integral concept, GAHP developed a campaign - #SpotlightPollution - focussed on the country delegations and donor and country governments responsible for negotiating the SDGs. The campaign sought to raise support for inclusion of all types of pollution and its health impacts in the Health SDG and/ or the SDG on Sustainable Consumption and Production. A position paper on the scope of pollution was created to make the case along with a target and indicator document for a possible target under the Health SDG.

Through the campaign, GAHP secured support from a variety of government agencies, NGOs, academia and donors, including 38 different agencies/organizations from 25 countries. Altogether, government agencies from 19 countries sent verbal, email or letters of support to GAHP and/or the Open Working Group (OWG) of the SDG process. A complete set of these

letters of support and the position and target/indicators documents was also provided to the Chair and co-Chairs of the OWG. The campaign, in addition to the efforts of GAHP members and observers to present the GAHP position at the 7th Session in 2013 and the 12th Session in 2014 of the OWG for the SDGs in 2013, resulted in the target related to air pollution under the Health SDG being broadened to include water and soil pollution/contamination.[8]

The value to the GAHP of the integration of the concept of health effects of toxic pollution in the SDGs is twofold. First, integration in the SDGs will provide a development agenda mandate for both donor and low and middle-income countries to work on the issues of reducing the negative impacts of toxins on human health, the environment, economic development and poverty reduction. Second, having a place within the SDGs will help GAHP when seeking financial support in an economic environment where competition for scarce resources is high.

The other aspect of this relevance criterion relates to whether the GAHP fits with the specific objectives of the supporting organizations. First is the fact that the establishment of the GAHP is supported by the financial support from two GAHP members - the European Commission and the World Bank.

Second is the GAHP membership. There are 32 agencies currently supporting the GAHP through their membership. (See Annex 2 for the list of GAHP members as of August 2014.) They include three multilateral development banks, two bilateral agencies, twelve national government Ministries of Environment, one national Ministry of Health, two municipal governments, four NGOs, three UN agencies, the Basel Convention Regional Centre for the South American Region, three universities, and one private sector center. This level of support was also clear in the questionnaire responses where international organizations like the UNDP, GIZ, and Suez University believed that the GAHP very much supports their organizations agendas. Interestingly, three national government questionnaire respondents from developing countries who are also GAHP members stated that the GAHP only "somewhat" supported their country's agenda. (See Annex 3 for a summary of the Questionnaire responses from Donors and GAHP Members.) The GAHP Secretariat believes that this response may reflect the fact that developing countries have priorities other than working on toxic pollution. The GAHP Secretariat also provided contextual information that participants have indicated that their participation is hampered by language and translation facilities barriers. Finally participation by developing countries can be challenged by a lack of connection technology – something that the Secretariat is attempting to address so that solutions are found that better enable developing country participation.

[8] Blacksmith Institute. Design of Global Partnership to Address Legacy Pollution and its Health Impacts Affecting Poor Communities in Priority Countries. Year 3 Interim Report to the World Bank. Grant period: July 1, 2013 to Dec 31, 2014. reporting period: January 1-June 30, 2014. Page 9.

B. Relevance to the beneficiaries (communities and their governments)

The "beneficiaries" in the case of the GAHP have been listed in the stakeholder map in Annex 1. These are the stakeholder names provided by the Task Manager in consultation with members of the Blacksmith Institute team for this mid-term evaluation.

The GAHP projects have demonstrated that those who are benefitting from the implementation of the remediation projects cover a range of groups from the residents of the areas whose exposure to contamination is being reduced when a toxic site is remediated, to community stakeholders who have learned the impact of pollution on health and know that steps can be taken to improve their environment, to municipal, regional and provincial or state officials who have been trained to identify toxic contamination and to remediate it, through to community leaders who have become more knowledgeable concerning practical and affordable techniques available to remediate toxic contamination.

The following highlights of the "beneficiary" questionnaire responses summarized in Annex 4 shows that they are very supportive of the GAHP and the GAHP projects in which they have been involved.

- The projects received political support.
- Projects received both in-kind and private sector support.
- Communities were all supportive of the projects.
- All stakeholders were already aware of the health impacts and risks to the community before Blacksmith/GAHP.
- A high number of the stakeholders had requested assistance before Blacksmith/GAHP came along.
- Governments were also mostly aware of the problems.
- As a result of these GAHP projects there is a sense that governments will be giving a higher priority to toxic pollution and health issues.
- There is a strong sense that all of the projects are replicable and sustainable.

Although the list of "beneficiaries" included in the Stakeholder Map in Annex 1 reflects a good cross-section of the stakeholders involved in the eight GAHP projects, they only tell part of the story with respect to where the operation of the GAHP is benefitting communities and their governments. Among other beneficiaries of the GAHP and its activities are the following.

- National Governments that are developing National Toxic Action Planning (NTAP) processes are developing their capacity to prepare documents that set out the evidence of toxic contamination in their territories and make the case for financial assistance to address these sites. Agencies within the governments of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Peru, the Philippines, Tanzania, Uruguay and Vietnam are in the process of preparing their National Toxic Plans and all those involved are benefiting from the capacity building that the process brings with it to increase knowledge of toxic contamination and to prepare strategic policies and plans.

- Developing country scientists and researchers through support GAHP has been providing to publish their work related to toxic pollution. In 2013, GAHP hosted two AuthorAid courses in which 74 environmental health researchers participated, and awarded eight small research grants (~$2,500 each) for developing country scientists to complete their research related to toxic chemical pollution, health impacts, environmental control and remediation. In addition, the Journal of Health and Pollution, formed in 2011 by the Blacksmith Institute as an online, public access peer-reviewed journal, released a series of papers focused specifically on toxic pollution and its health impacts, many of which were authored by developing country researchers.
- Developing country practitioners in Latin America who are able to make use of the GAHP published report "Regulatory Best Practices for Remediation of Legacy Toxic Contamination" which is available in English and Spanish and highlights policies and practices in Latin America that work to facilitate the cleanup of toxic pollution, and offers six governing principles as models.
- Developing country practitioners who can take advantage of the technical guidelines that have been developed and made available by the Technical Advisory Committee of the GAHP. Among the guidance documents available are:
    - *Establishing a Remediation Program* which addresses the main elements of a program for identification and prioritization of remediation interventions.
    - *Implementation of Remediation Projects*, which addresses processes for implementation of remediation projects, from the point of view of the implementing agent or authority.
    - GUIDANCE ON SCREENING LEVELS Version 1 Dec 2013 which addresses the selection and use of “screening levels” in prioritizing contaminated sites for remediation efforts. It responds to requests from agencies for advice for situations where there are no national screening levels to apply.
    - GUIDANCE notes on onsite containment of lead, 19 Aug 2013 which addresses the appropriate use and the key design elements of onsite engineered containment systems, where this is an option for lead-bearing material collected during the process of remediating lead contaminated sites.
    - CLU-IN Contaminated Site Clean-Up Information. Contaminated Site Clean-Up Information (CLU-IN) provides information about innovative treatment, characterization, and monitoring technologies to the hazardous waste remediation community. Developed by the U.S. EPACLU-IN is intended as a forum for all waste remediation stakeholders.

C. Complementarity (or competition) with other programs and activities, both at the global level and within governments

There are a large number of global level and multilateral regional international public and private organizations, programs and activities that address one or more of the components of the GAHP including chemicals, waste, pollution, health, sound management and/or capacity

building in developing countries. A partial list of key global and regional programs and activities follows along with a brief description of the overall aim of each.

- The World Bank's 2010 Environment Strategy Analytical Background Paper "Managing Pollution for Poverty Reduction and Green Development" has a pollution and health focus and is the analytical underpinning of discussion within the World Bank Group of policy and strategy on how to address the issue.
- The Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) is a policy framework to promote chemical safety around the world. SAICM has as its overall objective the achievement of the sound management of chemicals throughout their life cycle so that, by 2020, chemicals are produced and used in ways that minimize significant adverse impacts on human health and the environment. This "2020 goal" was adopted by the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002 as part of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation.
- The Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC) was established in 1995 to strengthen cooperation and increase coordination in the field of chemical safety. The IOMC is the pre-eminent mechanism for initiating, facilitating and coordinating international action to achieve the WSSD 2020 goal for sound management of chemicals. Members of the IOMC are the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), International Labour Organization (ILO), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), World Health Organization (WHO), World Bank, and Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).
- The Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants is a global treaty, adopted in 2001 and entered into force in 2004, to protect human health and the environment from chemicals that remain intact in the environment for long periods, become widely distributed geographically, accumulate in the fatty tissue of humans and wildlife, and have harmful impacts on human health or on the environment. The Stockholm Convention requires its parties to take measures to eliminate or reduce the release of persistent organic pollutants into the environment
- The Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal was adopted in 1989 and entered into force in 1992. Its overarching objective is to protect human health and the environment against the adverse effects of hazardous wastes. Its scope of application covers a wide range of wastes defined as "hazardous wastes" based on their origin and/or composition and their characteristics, as well as two types of wastes defined as "other wastes" - household waste and incinerator ash.
- The Rotterdam Convention was adopted on 10 September 1998 and entered into force on 24 February 2004. The objectives of the Convention are twofold: 1) to promote shared responsibility and cooperative efforts among Parties in the international trade of certain hazardous chemicals in order to protect human health and the environment from potential harm; and 2) to contribute to the environmentally sound use of those hazardous chemicals, by facilitating information exchange about their characteristics, by

providing for a national decision-making process on their import and export and by disseminating these decisions to Parties. The Convention creates legally binding obligations for the implementation of the Prior Informed Consent (PIC) procedure.

- The Minamata Convention on Mercury is a global treaty to protect human health and the environment from the adverse effects of mercury. It was agreed 19 January 2013. The major highlights of the Minamata Convention include a ban on new mercury mines, the phase-out of existing ones, control measures on air emissions, and the international regulation of the informal sector for artisanal and small-scale gold mining.
- The Global Environment Facility (GEF) which, in addition to its chemicals program, is focusing on GEF-funded projects that address toxic chemical pollution at toxic chemical project sites in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Like the GAHP, the projects aim to use local initiative aided by international funding. The GEF is now the financial mechanism for both the Stockholm and Minamata Conventions, and has arranged funding and co-funding for hundreds of chemicals projects totaling over US$ 4 billion.
- National governments in both developing and developing countries house programs and activities that complement the GAHP and its activities.

The GAHP has addressed the complementarity (or competition) with other programs and activities, both at the global level and within governments by successfully bringing into its membership representatives of related global and regional organizations and national governments. The list of organizations that have membership in the GAHP as of August 2014 is found in Annex 2. Strategic synergies among these organizations on issues of policy are occurring now within the GAHP as demonstrated by minutes of GAHP meetings[9] and the number of awareness raising events and presentations on pollution and health that have taken place in multilateral organizations, international meetings and with national governments since 2011.

In addition to the synergies that are occurring within the GAHP itself, two examples of national governments that have modified their own mandates or activities to integrate the GAHP's focus of pollution and health are provided below. Whether these changes are because of GAHP's or Blacksmith's efforts or not is not clear. Further efforts to encourage more synergies is a challenge for the future.

- VIETNAM: Vietnam is not a GAHP member currently but the country participates as an observer. GAHP has worked with Vietnam since 2010 on projects including Dong Mai. See Vietnam's 2011-2020 strategy for sustainable development: - "To carry out sustainable production and consumption; To intensify mass application of cleaner production in order to increase the efficiency of natural resources, materials, energy, water while reducing emissions and pollution rate, protect the quality of the environment, people's health for sustainable development". (http://www.chinhphu.vn/portal/page/portal/English/strategies/strategiesdetails?categoryId=30&articleId=10050825)

[9] GAHP website. http://www.gahp.net/new/what-is-gahp/gahp-documents/

- Peru: MINAM is a GAHP member. D.S.002-2014-MINAM released in 2014, clearly talks about pollution and health. This law sets out standards for soil contamination levels. "Que, según el artículo I del Título Preliminar de la Ley Nº 28611, Ley General del Ambiente, toda persona tiene el derecho irrenunciable a vivir en un ambiente saludable, equilibrado y adecuado para el pleno desarrollo de la vida y el deber de contribuir a una efectiva gestión ambiental y de proteger el ambiente, así como a sus componentes asegurando particularmente la salud de las personas en forma individual y colectiva, la conservación de la diversidad biológica, el aprovechamiento sostenible de los recursos naturales y el desarrollo sostenible del país;"

Competition for funding among the GAHP and related organizations is occurring. The progress reports to the WB DGF indicate that challenges exist in terms of obtaining financial support for the GAHP and this is supported by the GAHP Secretariat that has indicated that there is not enough funding to do the work GAHP wants to do and on the scale required to have a large impact. Commitments have been made to fund GAHP activities by a number of international and national organizations including Green Cross Switzerland, the Asian Development Bank, the GEF, the US National Institute for Health, the FAO, UNITAR, the China Delegation of the European Union (EU), the Bolivia Delegation of the European Union, EU/Sweden, Denmark, HSBC and the International Council of Chemicals Association. These grants, however, have been for categories not necessarily related to pollution, such as Non-State Actors or Environmental Governance. GAHP activities, therefore, may have to be limited in order to meet the conditions of the funding which often bring the activities within the definition of "development" activities – where there can be a great deal of competition for funds.

D. Findings

In conclusion, with regard to relevance and the extent to which the objectives and design of the program are consistent with (a) current global/regional challenges and concerns in a particular development sector and (b) the needs and priorities of beneficiary countries and groups, the following is clear:

1. The GAHP, although almost alone in its focus on health and pollution within the broad development agenda, has made significant progress in bringing pollution and health into the Sustainable Development Goals which will set the foundation for the issue's relevance to the broad development agenda.
2. The GAHP has strong, even enthusiastic support among many, if not all of its beneficiaries including among stakeholders and their governments.
3. The GAHP has made efforts to ensure complementarity with other programs and activities at the global, multilateral levels and with national governments. Synergies are occurring now in the GAHP organization. As the GAHP matures and its impact widens, related organizations and national governments may further integrate into their mandates a pollution and health focus.
4. Competition for financial resources is occurring with other programs and activities. Although the GAHP has been successful in securing substantial commitments, there are

conditions on the grants procured and these conditions limit and refine the work that GAHP is able to undertake thereby reducing the overall impact of the program on pollution and health.

3.2 Effectiveness or Efficacy

According to the Independent Evaluation Group–World Bank, Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs Indicative Principles and Standards[10] effectiveness (or efficacy) is the extent to which the program has achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, taking into account their relative importance.

In the context of the mid-term evaluation of the Global Alliance for Health and Pollution, the following three areas are being assessed:

A. Consistency of activities with defined objectives and effectiveness in moving towards them.
B. Clear monitoring of activities, response to challenges and cooperative solutions.
C. Linkage to other relevant activities and exploitation of synergies.

The objectives for the GAHP are specified in the European Commission (EC) contract and in the World Bank Development Grant Facility (WB DGF) contracts.

European Commission Contract

Overall objective: Assist governments and communities heavily impacted by legacy toxic pollution in Africa and select countries of Eastern Europe (former Soviet Union), Latin America and the Caribbean to take locally-led action to improve the health of those communities by breaking pollution exposure pathways and preventing future toxic emissions.

Specific objectives:

1. Expand and reinforce the current review of toxic pollution in countries in Africa, Eastern Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean, and create an inventory of pollution hotspots in those regions;
2. Build national and local capacity in Africa, and select countries in Eastern Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean to develop national toxics action plans and implement remediation/cleanup interventions to improve the health of those populations directly affected by legacy or active pollution; and
3. Promote awareness regarding the scope of toxic pollution and the need to address the issue globally and assist in the development of an international response.

World Bank Development Grant Facility Grant

The main purpose is to design a formal mechanism on an international scale that would deal with toxic legacy pollution[11] and its health effects in low and middle income countries, and would assist local communities to protect and improve their health and livelihoods.

[10] Independent Evaluation Group–World Bank. Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs Indicative Principles and Standards. 2007. Washington, D.C. (item 10.1) http://www.worldbank.org/ieg/grpp

[11] Throughout the WB DGF agreement, the term "legacy pollution and related active pollution" is used as experience from the First years of the DGF-funded activity shows that most legacy pollution sites include active pollution sites and that their remediation has to be approached jointly.

The specific activities of the Grant include:

Activity 1: Design of the partnership facility with a clear mandate for its work within the broader development mandates of participating agencies.

Activity 2: Expansion of the inventory database of toxic hotspots to regions for which gaps still exist (such as Africa region) and use of data in research on global health and development impacts of legacy pollution.

Activity 3: Definition of selection criteria and identification of sites for three pilots to test the potential designs of the partnership.

Results expected and timeframes for achievement of the EC and WB DGF objectives and activities were specified in both contracts through the EC Logical Framework (see Annex 5) and the WB DGF Results Management Framework (see Annex 6).

Although only the WB DGF contract calls for the creation of the GAHP, there are significant similarities among the objectives and activities required by the two funding agencies and only three activities are specific to the EC contract. In fact, the similarities are such that the semi-annual progress reports to the World Bank have reported results for all of the required activities from both donors – with the exception of the three activities that are only found in the EC contract, which have been monitored through the annual reports to the EC.

Annex 7. DETAILS OF THE PROGRESS BY GAHP TO ACHIEVE THE FUNDING OBJECTIVES 2011-2014 is a compilation of the results reported in the progress reports to the WB DGF in 2011[12], 2012[13], 2013[14] and 2014[15] and to the EC in 2012[16] and 2013[17].

The outcomes against which the results are reported are the following:

The Development Outcomes to be met by December 31, 2014 are:

Development Outcome – Indicator 1: Partnership facility that aims to address legacy pollution is designed and financing identified.

[12] Blacksmith Institute. Design of Global Partnership to Address Legacy Pollution and its Health Impacts Affecting Poor Communities in Priority Countries. Interim Progress Report to the World Bank. Grant period: July 1, 2011 to Dec 31, 2012. Reporting period: Activities July 1, 2011 to December 31, 2011.

[13] Blacksmith Institute. Design of Global Partnership to Address Legacy Pollution and its Health Impacts Affecting Poor Communities in Priority Countries. Year 1 Progress Report to the World Bank. Grant period: July 1, 2011 to Dec 31, 2012. Reporting period: Activities July 1, 2011 to December 31, 2012.

[14] Blacksmith Institute. Design of Global Partnership to Address Legacy Pollution and its Health Impacts Affecting Poor Communities in Priority Countries. Year 2 Annual Report to the World Bank. Grant period: July 1, 2012 to Dec 31, 2013. Reporting period: January 1 - Dec 31, 2013.

[15] Blacksmith Institute. Design and Establishment of a Global Alliance on Health and Pollution Supporting Poor Communities in Priority Countries. Year 3 Interim Report to the World Bank. Grant period: July 1, 2013 to Dec 31, 2014. Reporting period: January 1 - June 30, 2014.

[16] UNIDO PROJECT NUMBER: EEGLO11039 EC EuropeAid CONTRACT NUMBER: DCI-ENV/2011/261448/TPS ANNUAL REPORT Reduction of Toxic Pollution Threatening the Environment and Health of Vulnerable Communities. December 2012

[17] Blacksmith Institute. Annual Report 2013. Contract EuropeAid / DCI – ENV / 2011 / 261448/ TPS: Reduction of Toxic Pollution Threatening the Environment and Health of Vulnerable; and GAHP Annual Report (<http://www.gahp.net/new/what-is-gahp/gahp-documents/>)

Development Outcome – Indicator 2: National and international support and capacity to address legacy pollution in low- and middle-income countries is enhanced.

The intermediate outcomes defined for achievement by December 31, 2014 are as follows:

Intermediate Outcome - Indicator 1: Global inventory of polluted sites is expanded to and comprehensively covers all six regions (AFR, EAP, ECA, LCR, MNA, SAR).

Intermediate Outcome – Indicator 2: Number of dissemination and awareness raising events.

Intermediate Outcome – Indicator 3: Number of citations of the global inventory in journal or other press articles, media programs, or other articles/reports, produced using its data.

Intermediate Outcome – Indicator 4: Number of agencies/organizations with whom the constitutive document is shared and discussed.

Intermediate Outcome – Indicator 5: Number of agencies/organizations becoming members of the Partnership Board.

Intermediate Outcome – Indicator 6: Funds are identified and mobilized.

Intermediate Outcome – Indicator 7: Pilot projects test the design of the partnership and are conducted in at least two different regions. (This activity is funded by the EC.)

The three activities that are unique to the EC contract taken from the Activities section of the Logical Framework in Annex 1.7 to the EC contract [18] are:

A. Inventory and Assessment: Assessments using Blacksmith's Initial Site Assessment (ISA) protocol.
B. Ranking and Prioritizing Sites: Review Blacksmith Index values for assessed sites; Rank sites according to the Index value.
C. Engage the Private Sector: Engage the private sector; Explore potential links to the private sector.

A. Consistency of activities with defined objectives and effectiveness in moving towards them

The progress reports prepared semi-annually for the WB DGF list the activities undertaken from 2011 to June 2014. Activities during the final six months of the mid-term evaluation period had not been reported at the time of the preparation of this report and they are, therefore, not included in Annex 7.

[18] Annex 1.7 Logical Framework for the Project: Blacksmith UNIDO "Reduction of toxic pollution threatening the environment and health of vulnerable communities in Africa, selected countries in Eastern Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean" to the Contract EuropeAid / DCI – ENV / 2011 / 261448/ TPS: Reduction of Toxic Pollution Threatening the Environment and Health of Vulnerable Communities.

There can be no doubt that the activities being undertaken are consistent with the defined objectives and that the activities are, for the most part, effective in moving toward achievement of the objectives.
Examples from Annex 7 that demonstrate this consistency and effectiveness include the following excerpts from the Progress Reports to the WB DGF and the EC:

- DGF Development outcome 1 - The establishment, pilot operations, and sustainable financing of a global partnership that aims to address legacy pollution in priority low- and middle-income countries.
    - The GAHP was created, with a constitutive document and a 7 member Executive Committee in 2012. Seven pilot projects are underway in seven different countries to test GAHP principles.
- EC Activity 1.1 Inventory and Assessment: Assessments using Blacksmith's Initial Site Assessment (ISA) protocol.
    - National investigators from the environment or health departments in government or from a national university are trained to identify and assess contaminated sites using a rapid assessment tool called the Initial Site Screening (ISS) protocol. The ISS has been adapted from the US EPA's Hazardous Ranking System. The ISS identifies major elements of a contaminated site, including estimated population at risk, key pollutant information, human exposure pathway data and sampling data. As part of the training, a field visit is made by the group to demonstrate the methodology for assessing the human health impact of toxic sites. Since 2012, GAHP has held training workshops in nineteen countries, and trained more than 160 investigators and 120 government representatives how to identify and assess toxic sites. Expansion of the Toxic Sites Identification Program (TSIP) has resulted in more than 3,200 sites being identified so far, and more than 1,800 screened on site. These sites alone represent a potential health risk to more than 80 million poor people.
- **Intermediate Outcomes – Indicator 3:** Number of citations of the global inventory in journal or other press articles, media programs, or other articles/reports produced using its data. By December 31, 2013, two peer reviewed journal articles cite data or reports on global inventory; Blacksmith reports and press articles; Website designed and launched with access to summary inventory data.
    - The Journal of Health and Pollution was created by the Blacksmith Institute and 6 issues have been released. www.journalhealthpollution.org
    - A 3rd major article was published in Environmental Health Perspectives, using inventory data to determine regional burden of disease of multiple toxins in 3 SE Asian countries.
    - GAHP members drafted a joint report entitled "The Poisoned Poor" linking toxic pollution and implications for health, poverty, economic growth, sustainable development and many other areas.
    - GAHP published a report "Regulatory Best Practices for Remediation of Legacy Toxic Contamination" to highlight policies and practices in Latin America that facilitate the cleanup of toxic pollution, and to offer six governing principles as models. Available in English and Spanish.

- The 2013 report on "The World's Top 10 Toxic Threats in 2013: Cleanup, Progress and Ongoing Challenges" was released to update the top ten list of world's worst polluted places previously identified in 2006 and 2007, removing sites that have made progress, and adding new sites identified.
- Press coverage included articles in Scientific American, Lancet, Time and ScienceNews.org.
- The GAHP website (www.gahp.net) was redesigned and populated with resources and important links for country governments and GAHP members/observers.
- Summary TSIP data has been made available on www.pollutionproject.org.

The effectiveness of some of the projects was demonstrated in a videoconference between the evaluators and stakeholders from the Montevideo pilot project. The Mayor of the municipality of Montevideo took part in the videoconference and spoke about her strong support for the GAHP Pilot Project underway there. In particular, the Mayor expressed the fact that the GAHP project has been effective in increasing the capacity of the Montevideo municipal government to identify and remediate toxic hotspots on their own within their own territory. She also said that the municipality intends to bring what it has learned to other municipalities in Uruguay.

The site visit to the Dong Mai Village in Vietnam and the participation in the meeting: ``Reducing Environmental Health Threats in Craft Villages`` demonstrated, among other things, how effective the stakeholder participation model has been in that particular GAHP project[19]. The fact that GAHP hired local coordinators and experts and was able to successfully engage the owners of the industrial facilities where the pollution is being created were, without a doubt, key ingredients to the success of the project. The number of active participants in the project from local, regional and national levels and from public and private sectors of society was large. Further, the extent to which these stakeholders cooperated to develop positions was significant even when their traditional roles would normally suggest conflicting views.

A second important point that the Dong Mai project demonstrated was that practical toxic remediation, if it is affordable – and completed with local and available resources may be more important than knowledge of levels of toxic pollution and its effects on children in empowering people and organizations to act. When the GAHP project was put in place, the villagers in Dong Mai had been aware for some time that blood lead levels in the children of the village were elevated. But, according to the reports of several stakeholders, the fact that practical, affordable remediation is possible through local efforts was key to remediation finally being started. The willingness of the local villagers to help with the work of the remediation – and to do some of the work on their own - was striking. Government officials at the Dong Mai meeting indicated that the GAHP project has had the impact of reinvigorating the government's intention to address toxic pollutants in Dong Mai and other villages like Dong Mai in Vietnam.

[19] This project is not an official "GAHP pilot" project, as it did not go through the competitive "GAHP pilot" project selection process. But, like the pilot projects, it is being implemented with local partners.

The effectiveness of the GAHP projects is not only based on whether there has been successful support and remediation. For instance, there are some lessons from the Akhtala pilot project located in the Lori marz/province in the north of Armenia that may be important for the effectiveness of projects in other eastern European countries[20]. The Akhtala pilot project has found that community willingness to act improves with the continuous presence in the community of a multi-year project that provides the foundation for trust and capacity building. The support of local private sector and state officials is also important and this has not been forthcoming in Akhtala so far. The state Governor's Office has refused to discuss the local action plan for Akhtala or to have a dialog with industry representatives. The Ministry of Nature Protection has also rejected to help the Akhtala community. The Akhtala Mining Company has not been willing to engage. It will be interesting to see whether information on the blood lead level results for children in Akhtala will influence support among state officials to engage the private sector or whether other drivers must be found to create the impetus for toxic cleanup in cultures like that found in Armenia.

B. Clear monitoring of activities, response to challenges and cooperative solutions

The issue of monitoring of activities in relation to the objectives established by the WB DGF and the EC is one that is clearly being met, demonstrated by the progress report results compiled in Annex 7.

In relation to the GAHP projects, however, there may be more that could be done to report and monitor the projects and their progress. From the information available for the evaluation, it is apparent that systematic project cycle is not being used at this time – a fact that may be explained by the fact that the GAHP projects are still being implemented. In terms of funding, monitoring is available from the GAHP Secretariat Finance Department on demand /request. In relation to progress reporting, while there are clearly enthusiastic reports of progress on many of the projects, because there are not necessarily distinct project milestones or goals to be achieved, the progress reports do not monitor progress against goals and milestones. A potential result of the lack of a project cycle along with goals and milestones is that it may not always be clear to stakeholders when a GAHP project has completed its mission laying the GAHP open to possible pressure from stakeholders to continue working past the end of a project.

Response to challenges and cooperative solutions is an area where the GAHP deserves to be congratulated. For an organization that is less than 3 years old, it has had some important successes in the face of significant challenges.

[20] American University of Armenia, Center for Health Services Research and Development. School of Public Health. **Akhtala Pilot Project Final Report.** Prepared for Blacksmith Institute. Armenia 2014.

The GAHP website clearly lays out what are considered the important challenges as far as GAHP is concerned.

- *General lack of awareness of the health effects of pollution.*
- *Misconceptions of the cost of solutions including:*
    - *pollution cleanup and prevention is generally prohibitively expensive: affordable, low-cost solutions often exist;*
    - *multinational corporations are responsible and should foot the bill: local, small-scale operators are the main culprits; and*
    - *pollution is an inevitable cost of economic development: new technology can be used to avoid pollutions.*
- *Fragmentation of the environmental agenda.*
- *Lack of prioritization in the development agenda.*
- *Insufficient technical, financial and human resources.*

To address the issue of the general lack of awareness of pollution and health, several "accessible" publications have been developed for the general public and to raise awareness among government and political officials.

- The Poisoned Poor. http://www.gahp.net/new/resources/pollution-and-health/gahp-poisoned-poor/ available as a full document and as a one page summary in English, Spanish, French and Chinese.
- GAHP Pollution and Health – The Global Picture of Death from Pollution (Global General and Sample Country data), Sept 2014 A summary of global deaths from pollution.
- Toxics Sites Identification Program. TSIP research. Approaches to Systematic Assessment of Environmental Exposures at hazardous waste sites in the Developing World.
- Knowns and unknowns on burden of disease due to chemicals:A Systematic Review.

The challenge of the misconceptions is also being addressed by the GAHP primarily through the remediation projects where increased knowledge at the ground level is challenging the entrenched views that may have been prevented remediation from occurring in the past. In addition to the GAHP projects however have been the trainings, site assessments and reports to governments that have occurred throughout the world in the three years since 2011.

- By December 31, 2012:
    - 14 regional/subregional investigator trainings held: LCR: Mexico, Chile, Peru, Argentina Uruguay, ECA: Azerbaijan, Armenia, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia; AFR: Ghana, Nigeria, Tanzania and Kenya.
    - 314 sites were screened and added to TSIP database, 268 of which were in LAC, ECA and AFR regions.
    - 3 Country-level reports presented to Governments.
- By December 31, 2013:
    - 4 regional/subregional investigator trainings held: LCR: Bolivia; ECA: Kazakhstan; AFR: Senegal; ECA/SAR: Mongolia.
    - 313 sites were screened and added to TSIP database, 291 of which were in LAC, ECA and AFR regions.

- 9 Country-level reports presented to Governments: Armenia, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Peru, the Philippines and Uruguay.
- Global report presented in meetings and published in the Poisoned Poor joint GAHP member report.

- By June 30, 2014:
  - 5 regional/subregional investigator trainings held in: Armenia, Georgia, Belarus, Madagascar and Kyrgyzstan.
  - 140 sites were screened and added to database; 128 of which were in LAC, ECA and AFR regions.
  - 2 more Country-level government reports presented to: Tanzania and Vietnam.

The GAHP's #SpotlightPollution campaign that resulted in the Health SDG being broadened to include water and soil pollution/contamination illustrates an innovative and effective approach to the challenge of the lack of focus on toxic pollution and health in the international development agenda.[21]

The recent announcements of Jairam Ramesh**,** Member of Parliament in the Government of India, and Janez Potocnik, former EC Commissioner for the Environment, joining GAHP as global ambassadors to seek support for mitigating pollution problems around the world are important steps to meet several challenges: lack of awareness, fragmentation of the environmental agenda and lack of prioritization in the development agenda.

Finally, the challenge of insufficient technical, financial and human resources is being met, at least to some degree, through the GAHP projects where technology transfer, awareness raising and capacity building is occurring, where training is a result of the site assessments and remediation and where co-financing, both financial and in-kind, has supported the cost of the projects. For instance, the technical expertise that was transferred to the Dong Mai project by Brian Wilson of the International Lead Management Center Inc. was very important to the resulting improvements in the local smelting industrial processes and in improving the health and safety of the workers and their families. Another example is the use by the GAHP of the XRF machine to do spot testing for pollutants. The widespread use of this machine and other rapid assessment equipment has made identification of contaminated hotspots fast and cheap. Local project participants have also reported that getting/loaning the XRF and other rapid assessment equipment has been a very useful and pragmatic way to build capacity.

C. Linkage to other relevant activities and exploitation of synergies

The GAHP is an emerging organization. It is making real inroads into linking with other relevant activities by having members from many other organizations whose mandates are similar to

[21] Blacksmith Institute. Design of Global Partnership to Address Legacy Pollution and its Health Impacts Affecting Poor Communities in Priority Countries. Year 3 Interim Report to the World Bank. Grant period: July 1, 2013 to Dec 31, 2014. Reporting period: January 1-June 30, 2014. Page 9.

that of the GAHP. There are synergies occurring within the GAHP itself now but it may be too early to see the integration of the GAHP focus of pollution and health in other organizations and governments.

D. Findings

In conclusion, with respect to effectiveness or efficacy and the extent to which the program has achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives:

1. The Global Alliance for Health and Pollution is undertaking activities that are consistent with the defined objectives set out by the World Bank DGF and the EC. It is clear that these activities are effective in progressing toward the achievement of the objectives.
2. While the GAHP is monitoring its activities in relation to the objectives established by the WB DGF and the EC, monitoring of GAHP projects through some kind of systematic project cycle procedure that incorporates milestones and goals to be achieved is an area for further work by GAHP.
3. With respect to responding to challenges and finding cooperative solutions, the GAHP, despite its short time in existence, has successfully met a number of challenges with innovative solutions.
4. As an emerging organization, the synergies among related organizations and governments are occurring within the GAHP organization and relationships with other key related organizations and governments may lead to further integration into their mandates of the health and pollution focus.

3.3 Efficiency

The Independent Evaluation Group–World Bank, Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs Indicative Principles and Standards introduces efficiency as the extent to which the program has converted or is expected to convert its resources/inputs (such as funds, expertise, time, etc.) economically into results in order to achieve the maximum possible outputs, outcomes, and impacts with the minimum possible inputs. [22]

The original financial support for the Global Alliance for Health and Pollution (GAHP) came mostly from the World Bank's Development Grant Facility through a US$ 2 million grant with disbursements made from 2011 to 2013. The European Commission's contribution was made through UNIDO with Blacksmith as the Implementing Agency, and was a €5 million grant disbursed from 2011 to 2014. The goal of the World Bank DGF funding was to create the GAHP with a clear mandate for its work within the broader development mandates of participating agencies, to expand the inventory database of toxic hotspots and use the data in research as well as to define criteria and select sites for pilot projects to test the GAHP design. The EC goals, while not calling for the creation of the GAHP, are otherwise very similar to those of the DGF support.

Based on the discussion in section 3.1 on relevance and 3.2 on efficacy, it is apparent that the GAHP is converting the funds it has received into the results that were defined for it. In terms of the number of people who have been targeted through the GAHP projects and who may be living in less contaminated sites as a result of the remediation of the sites, there is also evidence that the GAHP is achieving "real" results on the ground – i.e. being efficient in the use of the resources it has received. For instance, blood lead level monitoring of children in Dong Mai village before and after the site remediation showed substantial decreases in the levels among most of the children.

It is beyond the scope of this mid-term evaluation, however, to assess whether the use of the resources is achieving economically the maximum possible results with the minimum possible inputs. For the purposes of this evaluation, there are two areas of interest in terms of efficiency:

A. Clear management and tracking of sources of funds and control of administrative costs; and
B. Mobilisation of additional or matching funds to support objectives of program.

In the short period of the GAHP's existence, a significant level of financial support has been committed to the GAHP as an organization and to its activities. The following is a timeline of resource mobilization for the GAHP and its activities.

[22] Independent Evaluation Group–World Bank. Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs Indicative Principles and Standards. 2007. Washington, D.C. (page 65) http://www.worldbank.org/ieg/grpp

2011

- Three-year EC grant for €5 million to UNIDO (Blacksmith Institute is the implementing agency) which was directly leveraged from the WB DGF grant of US$ 2 million over the three years from 2011 to 2014. The EC scope of work parallels the WB grant closely. Its finalization was a major indication of EC support for addressing toxic pollution around the world.
- The Rockefeller Foundation confirmed provision of the Bellagio Center in Italy for the first official meeting of the Partnership, scheduled for July 2012.
- Green Cross Switzerland grant was finalized for US$ 100,000 to expand the inventory in Southeast and Central Asia, reconfirming Green Cross Switzerland's support of this work.
- The GEF awarded UNIDO and Blacksmith US$ 1 million over three years for work on artisanal gold mining and mercury exposures in West Africa. Blacksmith subsequently withdrew from this project.
- Swedish International Development Corporation (SIDA) and the EU Delegation in Ukraine both granted UNIDO and Blacksmith €200,000 each, for a total of €400,000 to conduct remediation of TNT contamination at an abandoned chemical weapons plant in the city of Gorlovka in the Ukraine.
- Blacksmith also won US$ 145,000 in support and additional technical assistance from International Council of Chemicals Associations (ICCA).

2012

- A US$ 90,000 grant from the EC (via FAO) was obtained for inventory work on pesticides sites in Vietnam.
- Green Cross Switzerland donated US$ 100,000 for inventory expansion in SE Asia.
- The Rockefeller Foundation provided its Bellagio Centre in Italy for the July 2012 conference to establish GAHP.
- The EU Delegation in China approved a two-year €420,000 grant to Blacksmith to promote improved environmental good governance during site remediation.

2013

- A US$ 460,000 grant was secured from the EC (via the UN Food and Agriculture Organization - FAO) for work to identify obsolete pesticides sites in Central Asia.
- The ADB released a call for US$ 1,500,000 in technical assistance for work on toxic site contamination in Indonesia and the Philippines, a fruit of the 2012 Bellagio meeting.
- Green Cross Switzerland approved a US$ 200,000 grant for TSIP work.
- UNITAR approved a US$ 25,000 grant to Blacksmith's partner in Tajikistan, NGO Youth of the 21st Century, to start an NTAP process in 2014. Blacksmith is a subgrantee.
- The Rockefeller Brothers Fund donated their Pocantico Conference Center for the internal GAHP staff meeting.
- GAHP members WB and Blacksmith have approached bilateral agencies (EC, DFID, Norway, South Korea and China) to include the GAHP scope of work within a larger, broader agenda on pollution management and environmental health (PMEH) related to a potential multidonor trust fund. ADB has been exploring including GAHP work under the umbrella of green growth and sustainable cities initiatives. There is good indication

from the EC that the 2015-2018 program of work for the Global Public Goods will include a significant amount of funding for GAHP. Also, the WB Africa program plans to submit a GEF project with Blacksmith for GAHP work in Africa. In addition, Blacksmith worked with contacts in the US Congress to insert a line item in the US Foreign Appropriations Bill to recommend a competitive granting process to begin to deal with toxic pollution in low- and middle-income countries.

- The EU Delegation of China and Mongolia approved a two-year €390,000 grant for a project to eliminate mercury use in the artisanal gold mining sector in Mongolia. The project will be lead by Blacksmith Institute in collaboration with two local partners, the Environment and Security Center of Mongolia and a local mining organization.
- The EU Delegation in China approved a two-year €980,000 grant for a project on the Prevention and Control of Heavy Metal Pollution in the Lead-Acid Battery Sector in China. The project will be led by Zhejiang University, in partnership with Blacksmith and the Zhejiang Industry Association of Lead Acid Batteries. Other partners include the Environmental Protection Bureau of Zhejiang Province and Changxing County (in Zhejiang), UNIDO (a GAHP member) and the International Copper Association in Beijing, among others. The project will demonstrate effective approaches to heavy metal pollution prevention and control in industries with a focus on lead-acid battery companies in Changxing County.
- The EU Delegation in Bolivia approved a one-year €100,000 grant, with €30,000 in match from the Danish Embassy in Bolivia for a project to identify mercury contaminated hotspots in Bolivia caused by artisanal gold mining activities, and to test the mercury-free borax method. The project will be led by Bolivian NGO Plagbol in partnership with Blacksmith, the Geological Survey of Denmark and Greenland (GAHP TAG member), Danish health NGO Dialogos and the Philippines NGO, the Workers Cooperative of Emerald Mountain.
- HSBC approved US$ 750,000 over five years to Blacksmith for work to clean up heavy metal contamination in the Meycauayan-Marilao-Obando River system in collaboration with the Government of the Philippines and the University of the Philippines Los Baños Foundation.

2014

- A contract from ADB was secured for US$ 1,500,000 in technical assistance for work on toxic site contamination in Indonesia and the Philippines.
- A grant from GEF was secured for US$ 838,000 in technical assistance for work on toxic site contamination in Indonesia and the Philippines in partnership with UNDP.
- The Rockefeller Brothers Fund approved donation of their Pocantico Conference Center for the 2nd GAHP annual meeting mentioned above.
- The EC approved €5,000,000 under its 2015-2018 program of work for the Global Public Goods for GAHP. The funding will be for 2015-2017 (3 years) and will be in collaboration with UNIDO.

- GAHP members WB and Blacksmith have discussed with bilateral agencies (EC, DFID, Norway, South Korea and China) the proposed Pollution Management and Environmental Health (PMEH) multidonor trust fund, which could fund GAHP activities.
- The US National Institute for Health (NIEHS) awarded Blacksmith US$ 15,000 in July 2014 to hold a workshop on toxic pollution and children's environmental health in Vietnam.
- Two additional grants were awarded in September 2014 for Peru: US Dept of State $990,099 and Inter American Foundation (via local partner CREEH) for $236,000.

The commitments made to support the GAHP and its activities are compiled in Table 1.

Table 1: Sources of GAHP Financing, 2011-2014 (US Dollars)[23] [24]

Source	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total
European Commission	€456,575 *($609,984)	€1,447,343 *($1,916,426)	€1,369,725 *($1,874,331)	€1,063,820 *($1,313,604)	€4,337,463
World Bank DGF	700,000	700,000	600,000		2,000,000
Green Cross Switzerland	100,000	100,000	200,000		
Asian Development Bank				1,500,000	
GEF	1,000,000			838,000	
US National Institute for Health (NIEHS)				15,000	
EC/FAO		90,000	460,000		
UNITAR			25,000		
EU, China delegation		€420,000 *($556,122)	€1,370,000 *($1,874,708)		
EU, Bolivia delegation			€100,000 *($136,840)		
Denmark			€30,000 *($41,052)		
HSBC			750,000		
EU, Ukraine delegation	€200,000 *($267,340				
Swedish International	€200,000 *($267,340)				

[23] Euro conversion rate taken from the average exchange of the last six months of the contributing year:
2011= 1.3367 U.S.
2012= 1.3241 U.S.
2013= 1.3684 U.S.
2014= 1.2348 U.S.

[24] All of the sources of GAHP Financing in this Table are reported in either the 2011 Interim Report to the World Bank, the 2012 Interim Report to the World Bank, the 2013 Interim Report to the World Bank or the 2014 Interim Report to the World Bank.

Development Corporation (SIDA)					
International Council of Chemicals Association (ICCA)	145,000				
Total	2,822,324	3,362,548	5,961,931	3,666,604	15,813,407

A. Clear management and tracking of sources of funds and control of administrative costs

The semi-annual progress reports to the World Bank DGF include reporting that monitors expenditures against funds received including co-financing, Blacksmith Institute Co-Financing and Administrative costs. Annex 8 replicates the table for these reports. Expenditures are detailed against the following three activity areas:

1. Design the partnership facility with a clear mandate for its work within the broader development mandates of participating agencies;
2. Expand the inventory database of toxic hotspots to regions for which gaps still exist and use data in research on global health and development impacts of legacy pollution; and
3. Define selection criteria and select sites for three pilots to test the potential designs of the partnership.

The semi-annual financial reports demonstrate that there is tracking of sources of funds from the World Bank and the EC as well as of the co-financing from the Blacksmith Institute. Administrative costs at 10% are tracked in the financial reports as well. In addition the GAHP accounting system tracks all expenses and their funding source. Although the WB and EC do not require a break down in their reports according to funding sources other than WB, EC, external sources and Blacksmith, this information can be provided on request.

As mentioned in the discussion of monitoring of GAHP projects in section 3.2, there could be room for improvement with respect to management and tracking of funds in the GAHP projects. While information is available on request for all expenses and their funding sources with respect to projects, the tracking of in-kind contributions would also be valuable.

Further, guidelines for expenditures or costs may not yet have been developed for GAHP operations. While flexibility in spending in GAHP projects may be important in order to deal with differing circumstances in each country's context or to ensure that unusual or unforeseen situations encountered can be addressed quickly with minimum administrative bureaucracy, certain kinds of standardized administrative guidelines might prove helpful. Guidelines for expenditures could assist decision-makers "on the ground" and would be useful in monitoring and tracking of funds.

B. Mobilisation of additional or matching funds to support objectives of program

If the short time that the GAHP has existed is taken into consideration, Table 1 demonstrates that the GAHP has had significant success in attracting funding to support the objectives of the program. Based on the US$ 2 million DGF grant, the GAHP has leveraged close to US$ 14 million in commitments – assuming that all have been disbursed.

In addition to these commitments are the many smaller donations that have occurred either as financial or in-kind contributions to the GAHP projects. For instance, the Marilyn S. Broad Foundation contributed US$ 10,000 which initiated the Dong Mai, Vietnam project discussion and in–kind contributions by the International Lead Management Center, the University of Washington and the Blacksmith Institute helped to implement the project. In an interim report on the project, these in-kind contributions were estimated to be worth US$ 23,750. Based on the reports from all of the seven pilot projects, it is clear that if all of the contributions of in-kind support to the GAHP were listed and quantified, the total of additional or matching funds to support the objectives of the program would be substantially more than they appear to be in Table 1.

The lack of a formal listing and quantification of in-kind contributions represents a missed opportunity for the GAHP to illustrate the level of leveraging that is occurring to support the program. Both current and potential donors would be interested to know the success that the GAHP has had in its funds mobilization.

Finally, while funds have been mobilized for the activities of the GAHP, it is not clear that funds are being mobilized at a sufficiently high level to cover the costs of the GAHP organization, its Secretariat, staff and administrative operations.

C. Findings

In conclusion, the GAHP is converting its resources into the expected outputs including “real” improvements for some people where site remediation is occurring in GAHP projects. In addition, the following statements can be made concerning the program’s efficiency:

1. The systematic reporting to the World Bank DGF meets the efficiency criterion for clear tracking of the WB DGF and EC funds and control of administrative costs. Other sources of funding are tracked and reported and can be available on request from the GAHP Secretariat.
2. Guidelines for operational expenditures could assist GAHP decision-makers “on the ground” and would be useful in monitoring and tracking of funds.
3. In-kind contributions are not being included as co-financing and quantified in a systematic way and this represents a lost opportunity for the GAHP to show current and potential future donors the success it has had in leveraging resources.

4. Resources for the GAHP organization itself may be more difficult to attract than resources for GAHP activities and priorities.

3.4 Governance and Management

The Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs Indicative Principles and Standards of the World Bank's Independent Evaluation Group explains governance and management in the following way.

> *Governance concerns the structures, functions, processes, and organizational traditions that have been put in place within the context of a program's authorizing environment "to ensure that the [program] is run in such a way that it achieves its objectives in an effective and transparent manner." It is the "framework of accountability to users, stakeholders and the wider community, within which organizations take decisions, and lead and control their functions, to achieve their objectives." Good governance adds value by improving the performance of the program through more efficient management, more strategic and equitable resource allocation and service provision, and other such efficiency improvements that lend themselves to improved development outcomes and impacts. It also ensures the ethical and effective implementation of its core functions.*
>
> *Management concerns the day-to-day operation of the program within the context of the strategies, policies, processes, and procedures that have been established by the governing body. Whereas governance is concerned with "doing the right thing," management is concerned with "doing things right."*
>
> *The boundary between governance and management is not hard and fast. In particular, both the maturity and the size of the program will influence the dividing line and the degree of separation between the program's governance and management structures. Less mature programs may take time to establish formal governance mechanisms. Smaller programs with limited staffing and financial resources may tend to blend responsibilities between those who govern and those who manage, and to call on governing body members to be more involved in specific day-to-day management decisions. The extent of governance should be proportionate to the size of the program in order not to result in an over-governed and under-performing program.*[25]

For this mid-term evaluation, there are three areas that are being assessed:

A. Defined roles and relationships and integrating inputs/feedback from all parties;
B. Transparency and openness of programs and activities; and
C. Responsibility and accountability of various participants and partners.

[25] Independent Evaluation Group–World Bank. Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs Indicative Principles and Standards. 2007. Washington, D.C. (page 71) http://www.worldbank.org/ieg/grpp

The Global Alliance for Health and Pollution came into being in 2012 and established its administrative and governance structure through the Constitutive Document[26]. While the GAHP is a community of members and observers or associates, the administrative structure is made up of an Executive Committee, a Secretariat and a Technical Advisory Group. Roles of each administrative component are defined for the design phase of the GAHP which is the period up to 2015 and the implementation phase which is post 2015.

GAHP Members

In January, 2013 when the GAHP Constitutive Document was finalized, the membership in GAHP included the 16 agencies. As of August, 2014, the membership had expanded to include 32 agencies: three multilateral development banks (Asian Development Bank (ADB), Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) and the World Bank (WB)), two bilateral agencies (the European Commission (EC) and the German Agency for International Cooperation - Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), twelve national government Ministries of Environment (Cameroon, Indonesia, Ghana, Madagascar, Mali, Mexico, Nigeria, Peru, the Philippines, Senegal, Togo and Uruguay), the Ministry of Health of Tajikistan, two city governments (Buenos Aires and Montevideo), four NGOs (Blacksmith Institute, the Indonesian NGO Komite Penghapusan Bensin Bertimbel (KPBB), The Earth Institute of Columbia University and Fundación Chile), three UN agencies (the UN Development Program (UNDP), the UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the UN Environment Program (UNEP), the Basel Convention Regional Centre for the South American Region, three universities (Suez Canal University, Harvard School of Public Health and The Children's Environmental Health Center of The Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai and one private sector agency, the Cyrus R. Vance Center for International Justice. (See Annex 2.)

GAHP Associates

A variety of organizations are observing GAHP, including the World Health Organization (WHO), the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the US Environmental Protection Agency, the US Agency for International Development, the International Council of Chemicals Associations and the Japanese International Cooperation Agency.

Executive Committee

The Constitutive Document states that, during the design phase, the Executive Committee will:

- provide leadership and strategic direction to GAHP activities in developing an international response to legacy pollution in low- and middle-income countries, particularly with regards to what type of mechanism would be best able to deliver training, capacity and/or remediation support, and how it would be managed, implemented and financed;
- provide administrative and fiduciary oversight, including review and approval of annual operations, expenditures, audits and evaluations (at least until a formal mechanism is established);

[26] GAHP Constitutive Document. January, 2013. http://www.gahp.net/new/uncategorized/gahp-constitutive-document-2/

• approve GAHP strategies, policies, annual workplan and fundraising plan;
• coordinate with GAHP members and ensure that the deliverables of the Secretariat (see below) are consistent with members' broader development objectives;
• assist with raising/mobilizing technical and financial resources for the mechanism and Secretariat; and
• review and approve terms of reference for the governance structure, Secretariat and Advisory Group and additional members to the GAHP.

The Executive Committee, currently comprised of eight members, governs the GAHP and is responsible for setting strategy and activities. Current members include a representative from the Asian Development Bank, the World Bank, Blacksmith Institute, GIZ, European Commission, UNIDO, the Department of the Environment and Natural Resources of the Philippines, and the Ministry of Environment of Madagascar. The World Bank has taken the role of chair of the Executive Committee for the first three years. Decisions taken by the Executive Committee require consensus. A quorum is five representatives. Executive Committee member organizations are not required to make a financial contribution in order to participate.

The Executive Committee convenes quarterly via tele/videoconference or in person, at events such as the WB Annual meeting which may also serve as a venue for GAHP annual meetings or an independent venue pending availability of resources. The Executive Committee convenes more often if necessary.

According to the Constitutive Document, the intention is that, during the implementation phase, the Executive Committee role would remain one of strategy and guidance. It would also review and approve pilot implementation projects to test the design of the GAHP and future projects pending availability of resources.

Secretariat

- During the design phase and under the leadership and direction of the Executive Committee, the Constitutive Document outlines the following functions for the Secretariat. The Secretariat, which is being provided by the Blacksmith Institute during the Design Phase:
    - develops the design and structure of the GAHP in coordination with GAHP members;
    - implements GAHP activities in accordance with Executive Committee decisions;
    - develops annual work plans, expenditure schedules, selection criteria for pilot projects to test the design of the GAHP, and nomination and selection criteria for Technical Advisory Group members (for approval by Executive Committee);
    - explores long-term financing options and develop a fund mobilization plan; and
    - evaluates progress and compile programmatic and financial reports of GAHP activities.

- During the Implementation Phase, the Secretariat is expected to:
    - review grants applications;

- coordinate and manage grant implementation, including disbursement of funds;
- conduct performance-based monitoring and evaluation of projects; and
- manage global information and outreach on the program, standards, models, lessons learned.

Blacksmith Institute has served as the interim Secretariat for the GAHP during the design phase. The Executive Committee is expected to determine a permanent arrangement for the Secretariat for the implementation phase.

Technical Advisory Group

The Technical Advisory Group (TAG) provides technical advice and comment to the GAHP and responds to issues and queries from GAHP members. Within GAHP's broad mandate, TAG activities are being identified and the details of these are expected to evolve as GAHP increases its scope of operations.

The TAG has *organizational members*, where the organization is represented by a key contact person who can provide access to the organization's specific experience and expertise and *individual members* selected for their expertise in relation to specific topics. Initial TAG members were nominated by the member organizations of the GAHP, with additional members being added or co-opted as appropriate, with the intention to have balance in geographical and technical coverage. The make-up of the TAG and the active involvement of different members vary depending on interests, availability and the topics under consideration.

The procedures of the TAG are informal. The TAG typically operates electronically and may convene as a group every few months. It may establish working groups to address specific questions or requests. The TAG provides information, opinions and advice, based on the experience and information available with the members.

In particular the TAG identifies existing materials and lessons which are of relevance to the matter at hand and translates the material into formats that accessible to the identified users, taking into account institutional and cultural differences. The TAG acknowledges the different institutional and regulatory systems in place among GAHP members and recognises the budgetary and technical issues faced by countries. The key outputs of the TAG are guidance on Principles and Good Practice for Remediation.[27]

A. Defined roles and relationships; integrating inputs/feedback from all parties

The structure of the GAHP is in place with respect to roles and responsibilities. Based on the minutes of GAHP meetings of the Executive Committee, the management arrangements and administrative procedures reflect a new program with a relatively small budget and an

[27] Global Alliance for Health and Pollution. What is TAG? http://www.gahp.net/new/what-is-tag/

enthusiastic staff whose focus is on the mission. There appears to be a level of flexibility and cooperation within the staff that suggests that roles and relationships are being understood. While it was difficult to see how inputs and feedback from all parties are being integrated by the GAHP program, there is considerable evidence that this is occurring. The results of the program in only three years and the level of satisfaction with the GAHP among all of those with whom the evaluators had contact - through questionnaire responses, through videoconference or face-to-face discussions as well as through reports – demonstrates that parties of all kinds who have had the opportunity to work with the GAHP believe that their input and feedback has been integrated.

B. Transparency and openness of programs and activities

Transparency of the GAHP is demonstrated by the development of the GAHP website http://www.gahp.net/new/. The website provides information and reports on the GAHP organization and on administrative documents including minutes of meetings of the Executive Committee, sub-committees on communication, projects, fundraising, annual meetings and pilot projects. In addition, news, technical guidance, the Toxic Sites Identification Program searchable database and information about certain toxic substances are available on the website.

Evidence of the effort being taken by the GAHP to operate in an open way is found in a number of places in the GAHP program. First, in responses to the "donor and GAHP member" questionnaire, most respondents reported that they had the opportunity to provide feedback through their involvement in the GAHP and that they could see that it was taken into account. They also indicated that the programs and activities are sufficiently open.

Second, the governance structure appears to have been created with openness in mind. For instance, the GAHP Executive Committee has no financial contribution requirement for membership which likely encourages parties to join that would otherwise find a financial contribution to be a barrier. If this facilitates membership from developing countries, their participation goes a long way to establishing a good balance between developed and developing country members in the GAHP.

Third is the Technology Advisory Committee's structure and operating model where there is explicit recognition of differing institutional and regulatory systems among GAHP members and an acknowledgement that there may be budgetary and technical issues faced by countries. This openness sets the foundation for the TAG developing guidance that is accessible to a wide range of users.

There is an aspect of the GAHP's operations that may put the program's openness at risk. There appear to be a considerable number of technical experts and researchers who provide valuable expertise to the GAHP activities – and who offer their services as in-kind contributions.

Their participation in the GAHP is probably one of the reasons that the program has been effective in the short time it has been in existence. However, a disproportionate number of these "volunteers" come from the United States or Europe. To counter this is the south-south technology transfer occurring in one of the GAHP pilot projects (Indonesia ASGM) where Philippino mining expertise was brought to Indonesia. This technology is now in the process of being brought to Mongolia, Bolivia and Peru. Another example of the south-south technology transfer occurring is the Madagascar TSIP training, which used national experts from Senegal to train the Malagasy investigators. To ensure there is balance between developed and developing country participants and perspectives - and to maintain an appearance of that balance – these efforts could be continued and enhanced by encouraging researchers or technical experts from developing countries to participate and by providing wherever possible, and as resources allow, support to overcome language or connection technology barriers where they exist.

C. Responsibility and accountability of various participants and partners

The GAHP organization is a new organization with responsibilities and accountabilities clarified in the Constitutive Document. The Secretariat is responsible for managing GAHP programs on behalf of the Executive Committee on a day to day basis. The Constitutive Document states that: "The Secretariat, which is being provided by the Blacksmith Institute during the Design Phase: implements GAHP activities in accordance with Executive Committee decisions; and evaluates progress and compile programmatic and financial reports of GAHP activities."

Based on the information shared with the evaluators, the GAHP staff appear to take on roles and responsibilities commensurate with their abilities and willingness to act. This opportunistic attitude to responsibility and accountability appears to be working well at this stage of the GAHP's organizational development particularly in light of staff and partners – both salaried and voluntary – who are enthusiastic, creative and dynamic.

D. Findings

In conclusion, the GAHP is a small program with a limited staffing and financial resource base that appears to blend responsibilities between those in the Executive Committee who "govern" and those who are involved in specific day-to-day management decisions. The GAHP is not at this stage in its development an over-governed and under-performing program.

1. There appears to be a level of flexibility and cooperation that suggests that roles and relationships are being understood despite the emerging nature of the organization and an apparent lack of a formal organizational structure.
2. According to all of the sources of information for the evaluation, there appears to be widespread agreement that parties of all kinds who have had the opportunity to work with the GAHP believe that they are able to provide input and that their input is being integrated.

3. Transparency of the GAHP is demonstrated by the development of the GAHP website http://www.gahp.net/new/.
4. Although there is clear evidence of the effort being taken by the GAHP to operate in an open way, it would be worthwhile to continue to encourage developing country participation in GAHP activities including among technology and scientific experts. Support to overcome language and connection technology barriers may be necessary as resources permit.
5. The current approach to responsibility and accountability in the GAHP program appears to be based on making the most of who is willing and available – an approach that appears to be working well at this stage of the organization's maturity.

3.5 Sustainability

Sustainability, when applied to organizations or programs, refers to the likelihood that the organization or program will be able to continue its operational activities over time. This may depend on a number of factors, such as the continued relevance and legitimacy of the program, its financial stability, its continuity of effective management, and its ability to withstand changing market or other conditions.[28]

In the context of this mid-term evaluation, the issue of sustainability is one that is not directly relevant. When the final evaluation takes place at the end of the implementation phase of the GAHP, it will be possible to assess sustainability.

There is already a funding base for the GAHP of €5,000,000 for the period 2015-2017 (3 years) through the EC approved program of work under its Global Public Goods program. The funding will be in collaboration with UNIDO.

In addition, the *World Bank Pollution Management and Environmental Health (PMEH) m*ultidonor trust fund (MDTF) is moving forward. It was officially established 21 November, 2014 although two more donors are needed for the program to be implemented. It lists Pollution Management and Environmental Health as one of its five key priority areas, directly mentions GAHP and will fund some of the GAHP activities. The PMEH will complement the EC support to the GAHP.

The GAHP outlined a vision and challenges statement and a five-year plan at the GAHP Annual meeting 4-6 September 2014, where agreements on the GAHP priorities for the next five years were reached. Activities and indicators/targets supporting these objectives will be detailed in a 2015-2020 logical framework to support the new EC financial support for 2015-2017. The priorities are:

1. Promote scientific research about the scope of toxic pollution, its negative impacts on health, poverty and the environment, cost-effective solutions and successful models to help raise awareness about the need for action, and develop performance-based metrics to measure change.
2. Raise awareness about all types of pollution and their human health and environmental impacts to catalyze support and technical and financial resources for on-the-ground action in low- and middle-income countries and GAHP activities.
3. Assist low- and middle-income countries to take concrete action to prioritize and address toxic pollution from legacy and MSME sites and reduce associated health impacts.

[28] Independent Evaluation Group–World Bank. Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs Indicative Principles and Standards. 2007. Washington, D.C. (pages 87-88) http://www.worldbank.org/ieg/grpp

Finally, the GAHP is taking steps to become an independent, legal entity. Proposed statutes and bylaws, and a formal governance structure are under discussion. The incorporation is anticipated to occur in mid-to late 2015, but may take longer.

4. LESSONS

The purpose of this mid-term evaluation of the Global Alliance for Health and Pollution was to review the initial progress of the implementation of the program, in the context of outcomes expected over the three years from 2011 to 2014 as specified in the WB DGF and EC contracts and to assess the strengths of the ongoing programme and identify areas where additional attention may be required in order to achieve the outcomes.

The Strengths of the Global Alliance for Health and Pollution

Using the discussion and findings in Section 3, the following characteristics reflect strengths that are apparent in the GAHP and its operations since 2011.

5. The GAHP members come from global and national organizations with mandates and activities that are complementary to the focus of the GAHP thereby setting a foundation for synergies ranging from activity level cooperation to support within the broad development agenda.

6. The GAHP is able to work quickly and respond to opportunities. This may be due to the fact the organization is small with a relatively informal organizational and management structure. There are a number of experts who volunteer their time and talents to support the GAHP and these individuals along with a dynamic, capable core staff are likely an important element behind the GAHP having met and, in many cases, exceeded the objectives defined by the World Bank DGF and the European Commission.

7. Innovative ways to address some of the challenges the GAHP has recognized have resulted in some important successes. For instance the integration of all types of "pollution" in the Health Sustainable Development Goal should help to move the issue of pollution and health onto the broad development agenda. Another example of the innovative approach being taken in the GAHP is the range of awareness raising vehicles that have been developed and used to address the challenge of the lack of awareness of the issue of pollution and health.

8. "Real" on the ground changes have occurred in the three year evaluation period as a result of the GAHP program. People living where there are GAHP projects are, in some cases, better off. And several of the projects may be replicated by the governments at other contaminated sites because the remediation techniques that the pilot projects have developed are affordable and can be carried out by local people.

9. Even where remediation has not yet been completed in GAHP projects and toxic levels have not changed, there are lessons being learned on how to work effectively in different cultures and situations so that, for instance, drivers to lever action on toxic contamination are being learned among other important aspects for successful toxic remediation.

10. The GAHP has developed a strong, enthusiastic support base in many of the locations it has implemented GAHP projects. This support comes from the way the GAHP projects have been developed and carried out. First, the GAHP has taken action when, in most cases, no other organization or government would act – despite knowledge that toxic contamination was a problem. Second, the way stakeholders have been engaged in the projects has engendered strong "ownership" among local community stakeholders and, in some cases, even within local governments.

11. The GAHP has monitored and tracked in a systematic way the results it has achieved and has reported on these results against the objectives defined by the World Bank DGF and the EC. This monitoring and tracking has been accomplished despite a small staff and a very full work agenda.

12. The flexibility in the GAHP's organizational structure and the opportunistic approach of the management style has facilitated the development of important guidance such as the legal guidance for Latin America and the Authoraid program to help developing country scientists get ready to publish in scientific peer reviewed publications.

13. Language is an issue when working with developing countries and there are clearly significant efforts being made by GAHP to have staff that can work in languages where GAHP projects are underway and to publish material in languages that enable a wide range of people to access the information.

Areas where the GAHP could make improvements

While many aspects of the GAHP have created the foundations for success, there are a number of areas where improvements could be useful during the implementation phase.

1. Monitoring and Tracking is an area where more may need to be done.
   - Reports on all expenditures in relation to the funds from other than the WB DGF and the EC and other sources are available on request. A simple annual report of all sources of funds might be useful in demonstrating the success that GAHP is having in obtaining financial support and in encouraging further support for areas where there are gaps or where more financial support would be useful.
   - Systematic monitoring and tracking of the funds supporting GAHP projects would be useful in showing current and future donors how effectively the projects are being implemented.
   - In-kind contributions from people and organizations appear to be an essential source of support for the GAHP. These contributions should be recognized as sources of funding and quantified in a systematic way. Their inclusion in the financial reports would help to show how successful the GAHP has been in leveraging co-financing support. Annex 9 provides an example of the way in-kind contributions can be quantified.

2. Management issues that could be addressed.
    - Guidelines for operational expenditures could assist GAHP decision-makers "on the ground" and would also be useful in monitoring and tracking of funds.
    - Despite the efforts being made by the GAHP to be an inclusive organization, it may be worthwhile to watch that there is a balance between developing and developed country participation in GAHP activities including with respect to voluntary participation of experts – many of whom may currently be from developed countries.

3. A simple project cycle could be developed.
    - Although important not to create onerous administrative processes that take up valuable staff time and resources, it may be worthwhile for future projects under the GAHP to have a simple proposal cycle process to follow that provides a sense of the management and administrative practices of the GAHP. The project cycle would also be useful for reporting to the project donors whose contributions have different conditions attached to each of them.

    - **Project Proposal**: a simple template could be developed to provide a minimum level of information on the project to be undertaken in terms of size, budget, milestones and timeline. A list of potential partners as well as stakeholders should be included.

    - **Project reporting**: a simple template could be developed that reviews the project implementation, budget, consultation with stakeholders and reviews and adjusts milestones if necessary. It is important that progress reports are shared with stakeholders to ensure that everyone is aware of their responsibility in progressing on the project.

    - **Completion reports**: this could be a straightforward summary that brings together the results of the project in terms of what was originally set out in the project proposal document, any adjustments and the reasons for these, the budget allocated, participation of partners, their roles and contributions in-kind and financial. Milestones achieved or not and the reasons why and judgements on whether the project is sustainable would also be in the completion report. It is important to share a completion report with the stakeholders to demonstrate the importance that GAHP attaches to its projects.

ANNEX 1. STAKEHOLDER MAP [29]

"STAKEHOLDERS WHO ARE DONORS and GAHP MEMBERS/OBSERVERS"

Argentina – City of Buenos Aires	• Luciana Setti
Asian Development Bank (ADB)	• Naomi Chakwin, Resident Director General, European Representative Office • Amy Leung
Basel Convention Regional Centre for the South American Region	• Dr. Leila Devia, Director, Basel Convention
Blacksmith Institute (GAHP Secretariat)	• Rachael Vinyard • Richard Fuller • Karti Sandilya, Senior Advisor
Cameroon Ministry of Environment	• Mr. Enoh Peter Ayuk,
Children's Environmental Health Center of the Icahn School of Medicine, Mount Sinai	• Dr. Phil Landrigan, (212) 824-7018
Chile	• Lilian Veas, Fundación Chile • Angela Oblasser, Directora Gestión de Riesgo Ambiental
Cote D'Ivoire Ministry of Environment, Urban Health and Sustainable Development (OBSERVER NOT YET MEMBER OFFICIALLY)	• Kouamé Georges, Kouadio, General Director of Environment
Cyrus R. Vance Center for International Justice	• Clea Bowdery Staff Attorney, Environment Program
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH	• Helmut Krist
Earth Institute, Columbia University	• Dr. Robert Chen
European Commission	• Jill Hanna, Delegated Representative, DG Environment
Ghana EPA	• John Pwamang
Harvard School of Public Health	• Dr. Jack Spengler
Inter American Development Bank (BID)	• Juan Alfredo Rihm
Indonesia Ministry of Environment	• Harri Gunawan • Achmad Gunawan
Komite Penghapusan Bensin Bertimbel (KPBB)	• Ahmad Safrudin
Madagascar Ministry of Environment	• Ms. Marthe Rahelimalala
Mali Ministry of Environment	• Oumar Diaouré Cisse
Mexico	• Luis Eduardo De Avila Rueda, Director General

[29] This table is a Stakeholder Map and not a comprehensive list of the GAHP members and observers. It constitutes the list of the stakeholders that the evaluators were provided by the GAHP Secretariat in order to undertake the evaluation.

Ministry of Environment, Government of Mexico (SEMARNAT)	de Gestión Integral de Materiales y Actividades Extractivas, Dirección General de Gestión Integral de Materiales y Actividades Riesgosas,
Nigeria	• Kasimu Bayero, Director, Department of Pollution Control and Environmental Health • Ms. Oluwatoyin Ajala (Oluwatoyin Olabanji), Federal Ministry of Environment
Perú Ministry of Environment, Government of Perú (MINAM)	• Ing Juan Narciso Chavez, Director General de Calidad Ambiental • Ing Vilma Morales, Dirección General de Calidad Ambiental, Coordinadora – Gestión Riesgos Ambientales y Sustancias Químicas
Philippines	• Neric Acosta, Presidential Advisor on Environmental Protection • Manuel Gerochi, Undersecretary for Policy and Planning and Foreign Assisted Programs, Department of Environment and Natural Resources
Republic of Tajikistan Ministry of Health	• Dr. Azamdjon Mirzoev
Suez Canal University	• Mohamed Tawfic Ahmed
Senegal Ministry of Environment	• Ms. Aita Seck, Directorate of Environment and Classified Establishments
Togo Ministry of Environment and Forest Resources	• Matiyou Tchala • Mr. Thiyu Essobiyou
Uruguay Ministry of Housing, Territory and Environment City of Montevideo	• Raquel Lejtreger, Vice Minister of Environment, DINAMA (Ministerio de Vivienda, Ordenamiento Territorial y Medio Ambiente, Uruguay) • Fernando Lugris, Ministry of Foreign Affairs • Gabriela Feola, City of Montevideo
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	• Jacques Van Engel
United Nations Environment Program (UNEP)	• Jacob Duer
United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)	• Heinz Leuenberger
US EPA (a GAHP OBSERVER)	• Mathy Stanislaus, Assistant Administrator for the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response
World Bank (WB)	• Jostein Nygard, Senior Environment Specialist

"STAKEHOLDERS WHO ARE BENEFICIARIES" OF GAHP PROJECTS[30]

MONTEVIDEO GAHP PILOT PROJECT: via video conference

Intendencia de Montevideo:

- Prof. Ana Olivera, Intendenta (Mayor, Intendencia de Montevideo)
- Sr. Ricardo Prato, Secretario General (General Secretary, Intendencia de Montevideo)
- Sr. Juan Canessa, Director General del Departamento de Desarrollo Ambiental (General Director - Department of Environmental Development, Intendencia de Montevideo)
- Arq. Enrique Ruzo, Coordinador del Programa Montevideo Sustentable (y coordinador general del proyecto) - (Coordinator of the "Montevideo Sustentable" program, Intendencia de Montevideo & Lead Coordinator for the GAHP project)*
- Quím. Gabriella Feola, Directora del Servicio de Evaluación de la Calidad y Control Ambiental - Departamento de Desarrollo Ambiental (y coordinadora técnica del proyecto) (Head of the Environmental Quality and Control Services, Intendencia de Montevideo, Technical Leader GAHP Project)*

Blacksmith Uruguay

- Dr. Amalia Laborde - Blacksmith Country Coordinator, Uruguay & Head of the Pediatric Environmental Unit - Hospital de Clinicas, Montevideo (GAHP project local core team member)

ARGENTINA- BUENOS AIRES GAHP PILOT PROJECT

- Dr. Guillermo D. Galli - Gerente Operativo de Residuos Peligrosos, Patogénicos y Desechables – Agencia de Proteccion Ambiental de la Ciudad de Buenos Aires (DGET – APRA)
- Luciana Setti, ACUMAR authorities (Matanza-Riachuelo Bain Authorities): Gerente Operativo, Gerencia Operativa Cuenca Matanza Riachuelo, Gerencia Operativa Cuenca Matanza Riachuelo, Agencia de Protección Ambiental, Gobierno de la Ciudad de Buenos Aires, Environmental Protection Agency, Argentina

INDONESIA – CINANGKA GAHP PROJECT

- Ahmad Safrudin, Executive Director, Komite Penghapusan Bensin Bertimbel (KPBB)
- Bapak Ronny Sukmana, Head, Environmental Agency of Bogor District

INDONESIA - ASGM GAHP PILOT PROJECT

- Sumali Agrawal, Technical Director, Yayasan Tambuhak Sinta, Jl. Rajawali VII, Srikandi III, No.100 Bukit Tunggal, Kalimantan Tengah, Indonesia

ARMENIA - AKHTALA PILOT PROJECT

- Ms. Varduhi Petrosyan, School for Public Health, American University of Armenia
- An official from the Akhtala Mayor's office

[30] There were 7 GAHP pilot projects, and several other projects implemented with EC funding that weren't official "GAHP pilot projects". The 7 GAHP pilot projects went through an application, review and selection process with approval from the GAHP Executive Committee.

AZERBAIJAN - SUMGAYIT ORGANIC SYNTHESIS PLANT

- Rovshan Abbasov, PhD, Environmental Research Centre, Khazar University, Baku, Azerbaijan

GHANA - AGBOGBLOSHIE E-WASTE PILOT PHASE 1

- Yaw Amoyaw-Osei, Green Advocacy Ghana (GreenAd)
- John Pwamang, Director, Ghana Environmental Protection Agency
- Felix Adjoteye, Organization: Ecobank Ghana Limited, South Industrial Area (Agbogbloshie
- Mohammed Ali, Greater Accra Scrap Dealers Association
- Theophilus Anaman-Mensah, National Youth Authority

VIETNAM - DONG MAI PROJECT

- Tôn Thị Tần, Chỉ Đạo Commune People's Committee
- Nguyen Xuan Loi, Dong Mai village, Chi Dao commune, Hung Yen, Vietnam
- Le Van Le, Chi Dao People's Committee, Van Lam District, Hung Yen Province, Vietnam
- Le Duc Lanh, Hung Yen Environment Protection Agency under Provincial Department of Natural Resources and Environment
- Nguyen Van Bi, Dong Mai, Chi Dao, Van Lam, Hung Yen
- Le Huy Ghong, Dong Mai, Chi Dao, Van Lam, Hung Yen
- Dao Do Doc, Hung Yen Environment Agency (Provincial Department of Natural Resources & Environment)
- Bui Duy Thao, Cong ty TNHH NGOC Thien

ANNEX 2.
GLOBAL ALLIANCE FOR HEALTH AND POLLUTION MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS AS OF AUGUST 2014[31]

Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs)
Asian Development Bank (ADB)
Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)
World Bank (WB)
Bilateral Agencies
European Commission (EC)
German International Development (GIZ)
International Organizations
Basel Convention Regional Center of South America
UN Development Program
UN Environment Program
UN Industrial Development Organization
Recipient Country Organizations
Government of Argentina, City of Buenos Aires
Government of Cameroon, Ministry of Environment
Government of Ghana, Environmental Protection Agency
Government of Indonesia, Ministry of Environment
Government of Madagascar, Ministry of Environment and Forests
Government of Mali, Ministry of Environment
Government of Mexico, Ministry of Natural Resources (SEMARNAT)
Government of Peru, Ministry of Environment (MINAM)
Government of Nigeria, Ministry of Environment
Government of Senegal, Ministry of Environment
Government of the City of Montevideo, Uruguay
Government of the Philippines, Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)
Government of Tajikistan, Ministry of Health
Government of Togo, Ministry of Environment
Government of Uruguay (MVOTMA)
Non-governmental Organizations
Blacksmith Institute
Earth Institute, Columbia University
Fundación Chile
Komite Penghapusan Bensin Bertimbel (KPBB)
Academia/Private Sector
Cyrus R. Vance Center for International Justice
Children's Environmental Health Cetner of the Icahn School of Medicine at Mt Sinai
Harvard School of Public Health
Suez Canal University

[31] http://www.gahp.net/new/what-is-gahp/members/

ANNEX 3.
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE FOR "DONOR" STAKEHOLDERS

In summary:

- No donor to the GAHP responded to the questionnaire. All respondents were members of the GAHP, members of the Executive Committee or a subcommittee of the GAHP.
- **Relevance.** All members responded that the GAHP is relevant to the development agenda and supports the objectives of their organizations although three African national government stakeholders answered "somewhat".
- **Health and Pollution Awareness.** Everyone said that health and pollution is a priority for their organization for now and in the future
- Most of them had read and shared GAHP material with a number of them being specific on what they had read.
- On the **Efficacy** issue everyone seemed to be very supportive of the activities and their effectiveness. Most felt that the interventions were achieving specified outcomes.
- In terms of the **Secretariat** there was a strong support that it reports in a transparent manner and is efficient in monitoring and reporting.
- On **Governance** most of them said that they had the opportunity to provide feedback and that they could see that it was taken into account. They also felt that the programs and activities are sufficiently open and transparent with responsibilities clearly defined.
- The **Sustainability** issue was split down the middle in terms of future planning and future financing with half of the respondents saying they are aware of a plan for after current support ends and almost half not able to respond regarding whether GAHP activities being sufficiently integrated into global and national programs and processes to ensure longer term sustainability.

ISSUE BEING EVALUATED	Not at all	Somewhat	Very Much	Cannot respond
RELEVANCE OF GAHP				
1. To what extent is GAHP relevant to the broad development agenda?		3	7	1
2. Does GAHP support your organization's objectives?		5	6	
3. Do you see GAHP complementing your organization's programs and or activities?		2	9	
HEALTH AND POLLUTION AWARENESS	Not at all	Somewhat	Very much	Cannot respond
4. Do you see Health and Pollution as a priority for your organization now or in the future?			11	
5. Have you read any of the GAHP materials sent out?	Yes 9		No 1	

a. If so which and to what extent were they useful? b. Did you share these materials with anyone else in your agency or outside the agency? c. Did you request any materials or specific information? d. If so what type and was the product you received helpful.	• *News, updates, info relating to efforts to include health and pollution in post 2015 SDGs* • *Overview of ongoing activities, identification of potential synergies* • *GAHP documents on the impact of pollution on health and development are very useful* • *Read the LAC regulatory report* • *All* • *Information about the impact on pollution in developing (poor) countries* • *Info documents and intermediate and annual reports related to the GAHP activities* • *Training documents were made available and explained by GAPH experts with practice in Madagascar for TSIP implementation* • *Sites contaminated*			
	B.Yes 9	No 11		
	C . yes	No 9		
	• Not yet, field of cooperation still to be identified			
EFFICACY OF GAHP	Not at all	Somewhat	Very much	Cannot respond
1. Are the GAHP activities consistent with GAHP's defined objectives?		1	9	1
2. Are the GAHP activities effective in moving toward the defined objectives?		3	8	
3. If you have seen or reviewed any interventions by GAHP, are the interventions achieving the specified outcomes?		1	6	4
4. Do you feel that GAHP Secretariat is reporting on its activities in a transparent fashion?			10	1
5. Do you feel that the GAHP Secretariat is efficient at monitoring and reporting to its membership?		1	5	1
GOVERNANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION	Not at all	Somewhat	Very much	Cannot respond

1. Have you had or do you feel you have had the chance to provide input and feedback into GAHP activities?	1		7	1
2. If you have provided input/feedback, do you feel it has been integrated or taken into account?		1	6	
3. Are GAHP programs and activities sufficiently open and transparent?		2	7	
4. Are the responsibilities and accountabilities of participants and partners defined clearly?		2	5	2
SUSTAINABILITY	Not at all	Somewhat	Very much	Cannot respond
1. Are you aware of a GAHP plan for achieving its goals after the current support ends?	Yes 5		No 6	
2. Has there been sufficient integration of GAHP activities with programs and processes both globally and nationally for longer term sustainability?	1	4	1	4 (still too soon to evaluate)
3. If you are a donor to GAHP, has an "exit strategy" for GAHP been discussed with you?	Yes N/A,		No N/A,	

Please include here any other issues or comments you wish to mention.

Madagascar:

When filling the questionnaire I put "Very much" in most of them because of the following:

- *GAHP is the first entity known to take concrete action against toxic sites problems that impact for a long time health and environment around the world, especially in low and middle income countries like Madagascar;*
- *Looking at the date of the GAHP creation which is 2012, this entity has made an enormous technical effort and also a very good countries collaboration with Government, regional experts and national investigators to identify more than 3000 toxic sites and to screened 1800 of them in a few time.*
- *For Madagascar, such big effort should be continued regarding the increased number of toxic sites and to contribute to the global effort to combat poverty ,due to the toxic disease and the development disability;*

*It is important to stress that **t**hese efforts could have not been achieved without financial support from Donors and funders that are deeply thanked and are still requested to continue their financial support involvement into the GAHP activities to face the growing demand for pollution cleanup around the world to reduce health and environment problems.*

Issues :

For now, very few of low- and middle-income countries have technical experts to take concrete action about toxic site remediation. It would be good if GAHP raised the number of regional experts to face the increased number of identified toxic site problem in these countries.

Senegal: I think that it is good to reinforce the means of GAHP

Togo: it is important to organize the members of GAHP in "francophone members" and "Anglophone members" that it goes to facilitate the communication and information exchange.

ANNEX 4.
SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES FROM "BENEFICIARY" STAKEHOLDERS

Highlights of the questionnaire responses from these stakeholders shows that they are very supportive of the GAHP and the GAHP projects in which they have been involved.

- The projects received political support
- Projects received both in-kind and private sector support
- Communities were all supportive of the projects
- A high number of the stakeholders had requested assistance before Blacksmith/GAHP came along
- All stakeholders were already aware of the health impacts and risks to the community before Blacksmith/GAHP
- Governments were also mostly aware of the problems
- As a result of these GAHP projects there is a sense that governments will be giving a higher priority to toxic pollution and health issues
- There is a strong sense that all of the projects are replicable
- There is a strong feeling that the projects are all sustainable.

	Yes	no	Comment
A. Ownership in the project i.e. Support from the community and government agencies			
1. To what extent has the project received political support?	14		
2. Has local financial support been added to this project?	5	10	
3. What if any in-kind local support was given to this project?	9	6	
4. Is there any indication of indifference from the local community?		15	
5. Has any stakeholder refused to engage?	2	12	
6. Who were the key participants who ensured implementation of the project?			
7. Are there any other issues related to support for or ownership of the project	9	3	

	Yes	no	Comment
that should be considered? Please explain.			
B. PRE-PROJECT SITE IDENTIFICATION			
1. Was this site/project already in a community plan?	7	6	
2. Was the site/project already identified by someone before Blacksmith got involved? By whom?	4	9	
3. Was this site identified through the toxic inventory activity being developed by Blacksmith?	6	3	
4. Did the community request help on this issue before Blacksmith's work? To whom was this addressed?	9	2	
5. Are there any other pre-project issues worth noting? Please explain.	5	8	
C. PREPROJECT HEALTH IMPACTS			
1. Was there awareness that the site was polluted and had health impacts or risks to the community?	15		
2. Who was aware that there were health impacts? – Government? Community?	8		
3. What groups were considered to be having their health affected?	5		
4. Was the number of people affected or potentially affected known?	3	9	
5. Are there any other issue relating to health impacts at the preparatory stage worth noting? Please specify.	7	4	
D. PRE-PROJECT PLANNING			
1. Was there any discussion	13		

	Yes	no	Comment
about the type of intervention/remediation required, possible or feasible?			
2. Were there any legal/regulatory obstacles to the intervention/remediation discussed?	8	6	
3. Were government authorities consulted for approval permitting processes?	9	4	
4. Are there any other pre-project planning issues worth considering? Please specify.	5	6	
E. PROJECT BUDGETING			
1. Was there discussion of budgets?	11	2	
2. Was there discussion of financing and resource identification including in-kind support?	11	2	
3. Did the community or government provide resource $ or in-kind support? How much?	7	5	
4. Was there any other financing issue that should be considered? Please specify.	5	6	
F. COUNTRY DEVELOPMENT AGENDA			
Does this project support any of the national/international/local development agendas? Please specify.	11	1	
G. RESULTS: AWARENESS OF TOXIC POLLUTION			
1. Has the project resulted in changes to the local or national plans, priorities, or projects on toxic pollution	12	3	

	Yes	no	Comment
and health issues?			
2. Are there any other results of the project that should be considered? Please specify	8	4	
H. REPLICABILITY			
1. In your opinion, would it be possible to replicate this project somewhere else in your country?	13	1	
2. Are there any other issues related to the project's replicability? Please specify.	8	4	
I. SUSTAINABILITY			
1. In your opinion, did the project eliminate the source of the problem that the project dealt with?	**9**	**3**	
2. Are there any other activities or issues that should be considered related to long term sustainability of projects like this one? Please specify.	**8**	**1**	
J. PARTNERSHIPS			
Who from among the following participated in the project from within the country? • Community leaders • Impacted populations (women/children/others) • Industry • NGOs (local) • Others – please specify			

ANNEX 5.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION LOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROJECT: BLACKSMITH UNIDO "REDUCTION OF TOXIC POLLUTION THREATENING THE ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTH OF VULNERABLE COMMUNITIES IN AFRICA, SELECTED COUNTRIES OF EASTERN EUROPE, LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN"[32]

Objective 1. The expanded and reinforced inventory of toxic pollution in Africa, Eastern Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean is used to prioritise sites for intervention, and design effective responses that will reduce current human health risks and prevent future toxic exposures			
Activity	Activity Elements	*Timeframe*	*Results*
1.1 Inventory and Assessment	• Expand the work on conducting rapid site risk assessments of toxic hotspots • Assessments using Blacksmith's Initial Site Assessment (ISA) protocol • Assessments uploaded into an online database	Blacksmith expects investigators to complete at least 150 new site risk assessments each year in all three years	1. Comprehensive country data on polluted sites for Africa, Eastern Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean. 2. Expanded existing Global Inventory. *3.* Increased capacity in countries to prioritise and select sites for intervention.
1.2 Conduct regional investigator trainings	• Conduct eight sub-regional three-day intensive session trainings in Africa, Eastern Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean to familiarise investigators with sampling techniques, recording methods, and other site assessment protocols	Blacksmith proposes to conduct eight trainings in the first two years of the contract	1. 50 new investigators: ~20-25 new investigators in Africa, ~5-10 in Eastern Europe, and ~20-25 in Latin America and the Caribbean. 2. Local and national capacity increased to identify toxic hotspots and conduct rapid site risk assessments.
1.3 Ranking and Prioritising Sites	• Review Blacksmith Index[33] values for assessed sites	150 new site risk assessments each year in all three years will mean index	1. The Blacksmith Index value for each site allows for ranking and

[32]Adapted from the Activities section of Annex 1.7 **Logical Framework for the Project: Blacksmith UNIDO "Reduction of toxic pollution threatening the environment and health of vulnerable communities in Africa, selected countries in Eastern Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean"** to the **Contract EuropeAid / DCI – ENV / 2011 / 261448/ TPS:** Reduction of Toxic Pollution Threatening the Environment and Health of Vulnerable Communities. Results are taken from Blacksmith Institute. Contract EuropeAid / DCI – ENV / 2011 / 261448/ TPS: Reduction of Toxic Pollution Threatening the Environment and Health of Vulnerable . Annual Report 2013 and from GAHP Annual Report (<http://www.gahp.net/new/what-is-gahp/gahp-documents/>)

	• Rank sites according to the Index value	values input into the database, using a set formula. The values are reviewed during the quality control process. Detailed and summary data country analyses, listing the Index as the primary means for assessing priority will be regularly extracted.	prioritisation of toxic hotspots on national, regional and global levels. 2. Ranking information increases the capacity of national governments to make decisions about toxic pollution and prioritize sites for remediation/intervention.
Objective 2. Increased national and local capacity in Africa, and selected countries in Eastern Europe, Latin America, and the Caribbean leads to the development of national toxics action plans and implementation of remediation/cleanup interventions to improve the health of those populations directly affected by legacy or active pollution.			
Activity	*Activity Elements*	*Timeframe*	*Results*
2.1. Promote awareness nationally regarding the scope of toxic pollution and its human health impacts	• Prepare summary report of national toxic data for each participating country • Disseminate and present results to relevant government agencies.	Engagement with these agencies will occur throughout the project life.	1. Government agencies have access to their country's data, and are able to use it to guide decision-making.
2.2 Design National Toxics Action Plans	• Three national governments to design an effective response at the national level (national toxics action plans) via a series of detailed workshops and meetings	One workshop per year will be held in each of the three countries, with the first workshop being held late in the third quarter or fourth quarter of the first year.	1. Three national toxics action plans are developed. 2. Three countries are able to address toxic pollution strategically, roles and responsibilities assigned, and implementation begun.
2.3 Select three	• Review priority site list with	The first site should be selected in the	1. Three sites will be selected for

[33] The Blacksmith Index was developed by members of Blacksmith's pro-bono Technical Advisory Board from Johns Hopkins University, Harvard School of Public Health and Mt. Sinai School of Medicine. It is a modification of the Hazard Ranking System (HRS) first developed by the MITRE Corporation for the Superfund Program in the United States. The Blacksmith Index was developed to permit a simple calculation of human health risk. The Index allows for identification of a key pollutant at a site (although other pollutants are recorded), and determines the severity of dose of that pollutant against USEPA or local standards. Exposed populations are also estimated, and these two figures then form the basis for the Index. Each site is ranked with a Blacksmith Index score from 1 to 10, which indicates the severity of the problem at the site (a "1" representing a lower risk, and a "10" indicating an extreme risk). The Index is logarithmic; i.e. an increase by a factor of ten in the number of people exposed or in the severity of the toxin increases the Index rating by one.

sites for intervention	relevant government agencies • Select sites for intervention • Conduct in-depth site reviews	third or fourth quarter of the first year. It is anticipated that one in-depth site review will have begun by the end of the first year.	remediation/intervention, one per country.
2.4 Organise and convene Stakeholder Groups[34] at each selected site	• Ensure all relevant stakeholders are contacted and engaged • Convene monthly stakeholder meetings.	Blacksmith will convene stakeholder group meetings once per month from the start to end of the intervention, shortly after site selection. The first stakeholder group meeting is expected in the fourth quarter of the first year.	1. Stakeholders from each selected site are engaged. 2. Monthly meetings are convened to implement site projects.
2.5 Design and implement site interventions	• Design three intervention solutions in collaboration with the Stakeholder Groups.	The majority of remediation activities for all three sites are expected to take place in years two and three.	1. Three site remediation intervention projects are designed and implemented with local stakeholders. 2. Site projects result in reduced toxic exposure and emissions to local communities. 3. Local and national stakeholders have improved capacity to implement pollution intervention remediation projects (i.e. learning through doing). 4. Successful projects serve as models for replication nationally and regionally.
2.6 Engage the private sector	• Engage the private sector • Explore potential links to private investors	Significant engagement is expected to begin in the third or fourth quarter of the first year.	1. The private sector is engaged in efforts to deal with toxic chemicals.

[34] A typical Stakeholder Group is comprised of representatives from the affected community (leaders, teachers, doctors, business owners, or others), local government (local mayor's office, Ministry for Health/Environment, local environment management authority), a local university, local NGOs, and one Blacksmith representative. The Stakeholder Group functions to help build consensus amongst all actors, and ensures distribution of information to all relevant parties. It is also responsible for implementing project activities. Extremely important to project sustainability and effectiveness, the Stakeholder Group ensures buy-in from all stakeholders, and guarantees the project works closely with the communities and local officials and adheres to local regulations.

Objective 3. International awareness is raised about the scope of toxic pollution and the need to address the issue globally, and support for an international response is developed			
Activity	*Activity Elements*	*Timeframe*	*Results*
3.1. Publicise data and results	• Design and launch and keep up-to-date a website on toxic pollution on a global level to provide public access to summary information.	Blacksmith expects to test and launch the public data website in year two, although design will begin in the third or fourth quarter of year one.	1. Summary data on global toxic pollution is available publically, and contributes towards greater international awareness of the issues.
3.2 Research	• Using data from the Global Inventory and experience from this project, present research or publish in peer-reviewed journals.	Blacksmith expects to produce two articles before the end of the first year, with several other articles by the end of year two and three.	1. A body of work promotes a greater understanding of toxins among policy and decision-makers in the fields of health and environment.
3.3 Promote international awareness	• Meetings and side events to share data and results from the Global Inventory and published research papers will increase international awareness and focus on bilateral and multilateral agencies, UN agencies, international chemical industry groups, international conferences like UN governing council meetings or multi-donor/agency events.	Awareness raising efforts will be conducted throughout the life of the project, with international meetings approximately every three months.	1. Awareness about toxic pollution is increased within bilateral and multilateral agencies, the UN and chemical industry groups. 2. International willingness to address toxic pollution issues, especially the human health impacts will increase.
3.4 Promoting an international response	• Encourage governments to share toxic management plans • Collaborate with the UN system and agencies to find financing • Coordinate with industry groups and relevant corporations	National governments to share their toxics management plans with donors in year two and three. Donor agencies will be invited to attend the yearly workshops. Collaboration with the UN and bilateral/multilateral agencies throughout the life of the project.	1. Three governments share national toxics action plans with bilateral/ multilateral agencies and request international financial or technical support to implement the plans. 2. Private sector/industry groups are interested to engage on toxic pollution issues, implement cleaner production methods and/or finance remediation efforts.

ANNEX 6.
WORLD BANK DEVELOPMENT GRANT FACILITY RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Development Outcomes: Indicators at the End of the Implementation Period covered by this Contract

Development Outcome - Indicator 1: The establishment, pilot operations, and sustainable financing of a global partnership that aims to address legacy pollution in priority low- and middle-income countries.

Baseline Values/Conditions: No such partnership exists and legacy pollution is addressed on an individual basis by separate partners.

Date measured: January 31, 2011

Target Values/Conditions: Partnership to address toxic pollution in priority low- and middle-income countries is designed and initial steps undertaken towards its operation.

- Start up team is formed to prepare for the partnership
- Draft constitutive document describing the partnership mission, objectives and purpose, membership, governance structure, and roles and responsibilities is prepared
- Draft constitutive document is shared and discussed with potential partners
- Partnership is adopted by potential partners;
- Three pilot projects or more to test the partnership are implemented (funded by EU).
- Results and lessons learned from those pilot projects are published
- Design of the partnership is modified and adapted in response to pilot results and lessons learnt.

Target Measurement Date: December 31, 2014

Development Outcome - Indicator 2: Demonstration of progressively stronger national and international support and capacity to address legacy pollution in the selected priority low- and middle-income countries.

Baseline Values/Conditions: Global and national understanding of the scope of legacy pollution is limited, and low- and middle-income countries have limited capacity in terms of resources and expertise to be able to address pollution effectively. International support to address toxic pollution at the community and national level has been piecemeal and on a site-by-site basis.

Date measured: January 31, 2011

Target Values/Conditions:

- Understanding of scope of legacy pollution enhanced by expansion of inventory and supported by scientific publications; Results presented nationally and internationally;
- At least three countries (preferably substantive have developed national toxics action plans and requested international support for implementation;
- At least two new donors have earmarked funding for toxic pollution at the community or national level;
- Pilot projects build national capacity to address legacy pollution, specifically by implementing example remediation projects and to reduce human health exposure risks.

Target Measurement Date: December 31, 2014

Intermediate Outcomes: Indicators During Implementation

Intermediate Outcomes - Indicator 1: Global inventory of polluted sites is expanded to and comprehensively covers all six regions (AFR, EAP, ECA, LCR, MNA, SAR)

Link to Development Outcome Indicator(s) from 2.4: Expansion of the inventory to regions where there are still gaps is necessary to develop an accurate understanding of the global scope of legacy pollution and its human health effects, as well as build a body of research on the development impacts of pollution, and raise awareness and demand on national and international levels for addressing the health effects of legacy pollution.

Baseline Values/Conditions: The global inventory has started, and currently has assessed 1300 sites in about 50 countries a large percentage of which are located in EAP and ECA regions. Gaps exist particularly in AFR, ECA, LCR and MNA regions.

Date Measured: January 31, 2011

Target Values/Conditions: Global inventory covers 80 countries in all six regions, including at least 1750 sites assessed in total:

- 8 regional/sub-regional investigator trainings held in regions with gaps by December 2013.
- 150 new sites in regions with gaps assessed each year (150 by December 2012, 300 by December 2013, 450 by December 2014).
- 1750 sites in total assessed globally by December 2014.
- 15 national-level reports total (5 each year) presented to relevant government agencies across at least 3 regions.

Expected Timetable for Achieving Targets:

Year	Outputs	Measurement Dates
1	• 4 regional/subregional workshops; • 150 new site assessments incorporated into database; • 1 global and 5 national-level reports of priority sites for intervention.	December 31, 2012;
2	• 4 regional/subregional workshops; • 150 new sites incorporated into database. • 1 global and 5 national-level reports of priority sites for intervention.	December 31, 2013;
3	• 150 new site assessments incorporated into database; • 1 global and 5 national-level reports of priority sites for intervention. • Reports for all regions show comprehensive data (# of sites assessed, # of approved sites, # of people estimated affected, # of countries participating);	December 31, 2014

Intermediate Outcomes – Indicator 2: Number of dissemination and awareness raising events

Link to Development Outcome Indicator(s) from 2.4: Raising awareness about the scope of legacy pollution in a given country, as well as internationally is necessary in order to (a) make decisions about priority areas and sites for intervention; (b) build support to address priority toxic pollution including raising awareness on incentives and policy instruments for addressing legacy pollution; and (c) raise support for partnership participation and fund mobilization.

Baseline Values/Conditions: The partial inventory was presented at a conference attended by several main stakeholders in September 2010 organized by Blacksmith Institute.

Date Measured: January 31, 2011

Target Values/Conditions: Inventory data is presented in 15 events: 2 in each region, and at least 2 conferences or events per year that are regional or international in nature.

Expected Timetable for Achieving Targets:

Year	Outputs	Measurement Dates
1	• Two presentations at international / regional events (such as UNEP Governing Council, Basel Convention COP, Global Mercury Partnership, 2012 Bellagio Conference); • Three national-level workshops in at least 2 regions with gaps; • Reports and packages of sites • Start consultations on NTAPs	December 31, 2012
2	• Two presentations at international / regional events (such as UNEP Governing Council, Basel Convention COP, Global Mercury Partnership, 2013 Bellagio Conference); • Three national workshops in at least 2 regions; • Reports and packages of sites • Continue consultations on NTAPs	December 31, 2013
3	• Two presentations at international / regional events (such as UNEP Governing Council, Basel Convention COP, Global Mercury Partnership); • Three national-level workshops in at least 2 regions; • Updated reports and packages of sites. • Consult and prepare NTAPs	December 31, 2014

Intermediate Outcomes – Indicator 3: Number of citations of the global inventory in journal or other press articles, media programs, or other articles/reports produced using its data,

Link to Development Outcome Indicator(s) from 2.4: A body of scientifically sound, peer-reviewed research and literature will help build credibility towards this issue, which in turn would contribute towards enhancing the fund mobilization effort.

Baseline Values/Conditions: Zero, as summary information from the global inventory is not yet completed.

Date Measured: January 31, 2011

Target Values/Conditions: At least 10 articles cite data or reports on the global inventory, especially research related to the impacts of pollution in peer-reviewed journals. At least 3 countries cite data / reports on the global inventory in their draft policy related documents by June 2014.

Expected Timetable for Achieving Targets:

Year	Outputs	Measurement Dates
1	• Reports on results of inventory; • Press/media articles	December 31, 2012
2	• 2 peer reviewed journal articles cite data or reports on global inventory • Blacksmith reports and press articles; • Website designed and launched with access to summary inventory data;	December 31, 2013
3	• 8 peer reviewed journal articles cite data or reports on global inventory	December 31, 2014

	• Blacksmith reports and press/media articles • Draft policy related documents in 3 countries cite data / reports on the global inventory.	

Intermediate Outcomes – Indicator 4: No. of agencies / organizations with whom the constitutive document is shared and discussed.

Link to Development Outcome Indicator(s) from 2.4: The draft constitutive document will form basis for discussion and consultation with potential partners. Providing opportunity early on for potential partners to contribute towards the design of the partnership by sharing the draft constitutive document will contribute towards ensuring that the partnership design is responsive to the needs of the multiple stakeholders and their engagement in its future activities.

Baseline Values/Conditions: None

Date Measured: January 31, 2011

Target Values / Conditions: Draft constitutive document is shared and discussed with at least two multilateral development agencies, one bilateral agency, two UN agencies, one developing country government, two international NGOs, one national NGO and one private sector organization by July 2012.

Expected Timetable for Achieving Targets:

Year	Outputs	Measurement Dates
1	• Gap assessment of international efforts; • Partnership constitutive document detailing function, governance structure and mechanism options drafted and serves as platform for discussion with potential partners; • Meetings and consultations with potential partners/ board members; • 2012 Bellagio conference held to serve as an international working group for establishment of partnership, and technical conference; • Presentation of draft governance structure and partnership constitutive document to potential partners at 2012 Bellagio conference; • Adoption of partnership governance structure;	December 31, 2012
2	• Meetings and consultations with potential partnership members;	December 31, 2013
3	• Meetings and consultations with potential partnership members;	December 31, 2014

Intermediate Outcomes – Indicator 5: Number of agencies/organizations becoming members of the Partnership Board.

Link to Development Outcome Indicator(s) from 2.4: The Partnership Board (PB) would provide leadership and direction to GPP activities, and monitor implementation of plans and activities, provide oversight of fiduciary aspects, ensure coordination, and ensure that Secretariat's deliverables are consistent with partners' broader development objectives. Moreover, by involving key stakeholders during the early design stage of the partnership would contribute

towards securing buy in from a variety of agencies and organizations from developing countries and the international community.

Baseline Values/Conditions: None

Date Measured: January 31, 2011

Target Values/Conditions: At least two multilateral development agencies, one bilateral agency, two UN agencies, two developing country government, two international NGOs, two developing country NGOs and one private sector organization are members of the Partnership Board.

Expected Timetable for Achieving Targets:

Year	Outputs	Measurement Dates
1	• Same as indicator 4; • 2 multi-lateral development agencies, and UNEP are members of the Partnership Board; • Fully functional Secretariat with documentation detailing its responsibilities and structure. • 2 advisory group meetings.	December 31, 2012
2	• Meetings and consultations with partnership board members; • 2013 Bellagio conference held as a second international technical, pledging and partnership conference; • At least 1 bilateral representative, 1 developing country government representative, and 1 developing country NGO join Partnership Board.	December 31, 2013
3	• Meetings and consultations with partnership board members; • 2014 conference held as a third international technical, pledging and partnership conference that also presents results of pilot projects and recommendations for the partnership; • Fully functional Partnership Board that includes 2 UN agencies, 2 multilateral agencies (WB +1), 1 bilateral representatives, 2 developing country government representatives, 2 international NGOs (Blacksmith +1), and 2 developing country NGOs.	December 31, 2014

Intermediate Outcomes – Indicator 6: Funds are identified and mobilized.

Link to Development Outcome Indicator(s) from 2.4: Identifying and securing funding is key to ensuring the sustainability of the partnership following the exit from DGF and to reducing the impact of legacy pollution on local communities.

Baseline Values/Conditions: At least 4 different donors have contributed or are contributing to the initial goal of designing the partnership (including ADB, EC, WB, Rockefeller Foundation).

Date Measured: January 31, 2011

Target Values/Conditions: At least two new bilateral donors and two private sector representatives commit funds towards the partnership.

Expected Timetable for Achieving Targets:

Year	Outputs	Measurement Dates
1	• Action plan for fund mobilization.	December 31, 2012
2	• Fund mobilization activities as per action plan.	December 31,

	• Commitment / pledge from 2 private sector representatives to commit resources towards the partnership.	2013
3	• Fund mobilization activities as per action plan. • Commitment / pledge from 2 new bilateral donor for funds towards partnership for legacy pollution	December 31, 2014

Intermediate Outcomes – Indicator 7: Pilot projects test the design of the partnership and are conducted in at least two different regions. (This activity is funded by EC).

Link to Development Outcome Indicator(s) from 2.4: In order to ensure the optimal design of the partnership, three pilot projects will test its design. Lessons learned from the pilot projects will be reflected in the design of the partnership.

Baseline Values/Conditions: Zero pilot projects have been conducted to test the partnership.

Date Measured: January 31, 2011

Target Values/Conditions: At least three pilot projects in three separate countries within two different regions are conducted to test the design of the partnership. Results of the pilot projects are published, including lessons learnt and their implications for the design of the partnership. Partnership design is modified as necessary based on experience from the three pilot projects. Pilot projects result in reduction in toxic exposures to local communities at the selected sites.

Expected Timetable for Achieving Targets:

Year	Outputs	Measurement Dates
1	• Selection criteria for sites developed, shared with partnership board and sites selected; • Preliminary reviews started in at least one selected site	December 31 2012
2	• Three in-depth site reviews completed and site interventions designed. • Stakeholder group meetings conducted at each site; • Site interventions implemented.	December 31, 2013
3	• Stakeholder group meetings; • Site interventions implemented; • Measurably reduced contamination and risk of toxic exposure at sites; • Report summarizing the results, recommendations and lessons learned from pilot projects and implications on the design of the partnership. • Revised partnership arrangements document.	December 31, 2014

ANNEX 7.
DETAILS OF THE PROGRESS BY GAHP TO ACHIEVE THE FUNDING OBJECTIVES 2011-2014

The 2011-2014 World Bank DGF contracts establish a Results Framework for the Blacksmith Institute that specifies 2 Development Outcomes and 7 Intermediate Outcomes to be achieved in the 2011-2014 time period. Because of the similarity between the objectives set by the WB DGF contract and the European Commission contract, the GAHP Secretariat reported on progress for both the DGF and EC contracts using the DGF results framework. With respect to three activities that are unique to the EC Contract, the two annual reports on the EC contract and the GAHP Report 2013 report on progress[35].

A compilation is provided in this Annex of all of the progress reported by the GAHP Secretariat in relation to the World Bank DGF results framework for the time between July, 2011 and June 2014 when the Interim report on the FY2014 DGF contract was due. The final report for the FY2014 covering the final 6 months of 2014 had not been written when the mid-term evaluation was prepared.

But first, the three activities that are unique to the EC contract taken from the Activities section of the Logical Framework in Annex 1.7[36] are reported on here based on the two annual reports on the EC contract and the GAHP Report 2013 referenced above.

Activity	*Activity Element*	Progress
Inventory and Assessment	• Assessments using Blacksmith's Initial Site Assessment (ISA) protocol	National investigators, often from the environment or health departments in government or from a national university, are trained to identify and assess contaminated sites using a rapid assessment tool called the Initial Site Screening (ISS) protocol.[37] The ISS has been adapted from the US EPA's Hazardous Ranking System. The ISS identifies major elements of a contaminated site, including estimated population at risk, key pollutant information, human exposure

[35] 1. Blacksmith Institute. Annual Report 2013. Contract EuropeAid / DCI – ENV / 2011 / 261448/ TPS: Reduction of Toxic Pollution Threatening the Environment and Health of Vulnerable.
2. GAHP Annual Report (<http://www.gahp.net/new/what-is-gahp/gahp-documents/>).
3. UNIDO PROJECT NUMBER: EEGLO11039 EC EuropeAid CONTRACT NUMBER: DCI-ENV/2011/261448/TPS ANNUAL REPORT Reduction of Toxic Pollution Threatening the Environment and Health of Vulnerable Communities. December 2012.

[36] Annex 1.7: Logical Framework for the Project: Blacksmith UNIDO "Reduction of toxic pollution threatening the environment and health of vulnerable communities in Africa, selected countries in Eastern Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean" to the Contract EuropeAid / DCI – ENV / 2011 / 261448/ TPS: Reduction of Toxic Pollution Threatening the Environment and Health of Vulnerable Communities.

[37] For more details see UNIDO PROJECT NUMBER: EEGLO11039 EC EuropeAid CONTRACT NUMBER: DCI-ENV/2011/261448/TPS ANNUAL REPORT Reduction of Toxic Pollution Threatening the Environment and Health of Vulnerable Communities. December 2012. Pages 6-7.

		pathway data and sampling data. As part of the training, a field visit is made by the group to demonstrate the methodology for assessing the human health impact of toxic sites. Since 2012, GAHP has held training workshops in nineteen countries, and trained more than 160 investigators and 120 government representatives how to identify and assess toxic sites.
Ranking and Prioritising Sites	• Review Blacksmith Index[38] values for assessed sites • Rank sites according to the Index value	• Refinement of Risk Screening Methodology has resulted in the rapid risk assessment methodology called the Initial Site Screening (ISS). The ISS relies heavily on environmental sampling and comparison with international standards to assess risk. During the period covered by this report, the set of standards utilized in the ISS was reviewed and refined by a panel of experts. See Ericson B, Caravanos J, Chatham-Stephens K, Landrigan P, Fuller R. 2012. Approaches to systematic assessment of environmental exposures posed at hazardous waste sites in the developing world: the Toxic Sites Identification Program. Environ Monit Assess 185(2):1755–1766; doi:10.1007/s10661-012-2665-2 • Expansion of the Toxic Sites Inventory Program has resulted in more than 3,200 sites being identified so far, and more than 1,800 screened on site. These sites alone represent a potential health risk to more than 80 million poor people.
Engage the private sector	• Engage the private sector • Explore potential links to private investors	• Blacksmith has held meetings about GAHP, the scope of toxic pollution worldwide and how the private sector can get involved with the following private sector groups: the International Lead Association (ILA), CLSA India, International

[38] The Blacksmith Index was developed by members of Blacksmith's pro-bono Technical Advisory Board from Johns Hopkins University, Harvard School of Public Health and Mt. Sinai School of Medicine. It is a modification of the Hazard Ranking System (HRS) first developed by the MITRE Corporation for the Superfund Program in the United States. The Blacksmith Index was developed to permit a simple calculation of human health risk. The Index allows for identification of a key pollutant at a site (although other pollutants are recorded), and determines the severity of dose of that pollutant against USEPA or local standards. Exposed populations are also estimated, and these two figures then form the basis for the Index. Each site is ranked with a Blacksmith Index score from 1 to 10, which indicates the severity of the problem at the site (a "1" representing a lower risk, and a "10" indicating an extreme risk). The Index is logarithmic; i.e. an increase by a factor of ten in the number of people exposed or in the severity of the toxin increases the Index rating by one.

		Council of Chemicals Association (ICCA), Confederation of Indian Industry, COWI Engineering, HSBC, Indian Institute of Technology, the India Lead Zinc Development Association (ILZDA) and the International Council of Mining and Minerals (ICMM). • Of significant result was the award of a $750,000 five-year grant to Blacksmith by HSBC for a project dealing with heavy metal contamination in the Maycauayan-Marilao-Obando river system in the Philippines.

Development Outcome - Indicator 1: The establishment, pilot operations, and sustainable financing of a global partnership that aims to address legacy pollution in priority low- and middle-income countries.

Baseline Values/Conditions: No such partnership exists and legacy pollution is addressed on an individual basis by separate partners.

Date measured: January 31, 2011

Target Values/Conditions: Partnership to address toxic pollution in priority low- and middle-income countries is designed and initial steps undertaken towards its operation.

- Start up team is formed to prepare for the partnership
- Draft constitutive document describing the partnership mission, objectives and purpose, membership, governance structure, and roles and responsibilities is prepared
- Draft constitutive document is shared and discussed with potential partners
- Partnership is adopted by potential partners;
- Three pilot projects or more to test the partnership are implemented (funded by EC).
- Results and lessons learned from those pilot projects are published
- Design of the partnership is modified and adapted in response to pilot results and lessons learnt.

Target Measurement Date: December 31, 2014

Progress as of December 31, 2012: The Global Alliance on Health and Pollution (GAHP) was established at the first meeting of potential partners in July 2012; the GAHP constitutive document was adopted. The GAHP administrative structure was established (Executive Committee, Secretariat and Technical Advisory Group). The GAHP Strategy & Business plan, the pilot project selection criteria document and a fund mobilization plan were drafted, shared, feedback received, and adopted by the Executive Committee. A pilot project was selected to test the GAHP and contracts with project partners signed. It will begin January 1, 2013.

Progress as of December 31, 2013: Co-financing for the DGF has been secured from the European Commission and Green Cross Switzerland, and several cofinancing opportunities for post-DGF support are under development. Several remediation/pollution intervention projects have been financed (i.e. leveraged financing for GAHP related activities) from various donors

including the EU Delegations of Bolivia, China & Mongolia, and Ukraine, the Swedish International Development Agency, the Danish Embassy in Bolivia, ICCA and HSBC.

Progress as of June 30, 2014: The Global Alliance on Health and Pollution (GAHP) has 31 members. Seven pilot projects were approved by the Executive Committee to test the GAHP. Each pilot project is progressing well, and scheduled to finish by December 2014.

Development Outcome - Indicator 2: Demonstration of progressively stronger national and international support and capacity to address legacy pollution in the selected priority low- and middle-income countries.

Baseline Values/Conditions: Global and national understanding of the scope of legacy pollution is limited, and low- and middle-income countries have limited capacity in terms of resources and expertise to be able to address pollution effectively. International support to address toxic pollution at the community and national level has been piecemeal and on a site-by-site basis.

Date measured: January 31, 2011

Target Values/Conditions:

- Understanding of scope of legacy pollution enhanced by expansion of inventory and supported by scientific publications; Results presented nationally and internationally;
- At least three countries (preferably substantive have developed national toxics action plans and requested international support for implementation;
- At least two new donors have earmarked funding for toxic pollution at the community or national level;
- Pilot projects build national capacity to address legacy pollution, specifically by implementing example remediation projects and to reduce human health exposure risks.

Target Measurement Date: December 31, 2014

Progress as of December 31, 2012: A methodology for assisting country governments to develop multi-year plans for identification, screening and remediation of toxic hotspots was developed and shared with the Executive Committee; GAHP awareness raising efforts contributed to the adoption of a resolution on the social and environmental impacts of mining in African Caribbean and Pacific states by the Joint Parliamentary Assembly of the European Commission and the Africa Caribbean and Pacific Group of States; Eleven presentations on toxic sites data and the GAHP were given at international events; National toxic action planning processes commenced in Uruguay and Argentina, and several more countries are anticipated to start in 2013; Grants approved to Blacksmith: Green Cross Switzerland approved a $200,000 grant for toxic sites identification program expansion in Southeast and Central Asia. Two research articles have been published using inventory data.

Progress as of December 31, 2013: A further dozen presentations on toxic sites data and the GAHP were given at international/regional events. National toxic action planning processes are ongoing in nine countries. Co-financing for the DGF has been secured from the European Commission. Several remediation/pollution intervention projects have been financed (i.e. leveraged financing for GAHP related activities) from various donors including the EU Delegations of Bolivia, China & Mongolia, and Ukraine, the Swedish International Development

Agency, the Danish Embassy in Bolivia, ICCA and HSBC. Three major research articles using inventory data have been published in preeminent peer-reviewed scientific journals, as well as publication of several others in the Journal of Health and Pollution, a peer-reviewed scientific journal launched by Blacksmith in 2012. A joint GAHP member report was issued called the "Poisoned Poor" and GAHP members are participating in the process to develop the Sustainable Development Goals.

Progress as of June 30, 2014: A #SpotlightPollution campaign resulted in the inclusion of the broad scope of pollution (air, water and soil pollution) into the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) for Health, and the SDG on Sustainable Consumption and Production. National toxic action planning processes are ongoing in 11 countries. Co-financing for the DGF has been secured from the European Commission, Green Cross Switzerland, and FAO. Several cofinancing opportunities for post-DGF support are under development. Several remediation/pollution intervention projects have been financed (i.e. leveraged financing for GAHP related activities) from various donors including the ADB, GEF, EU Delegations of Bolivia, China & Mongolia, and Ukraine, the Swedish International Development Agency, the Danish Embassy in Bolivia, ICCA and HSBC. A further major research article using inventory data has been published in a preeminent peer-reviewed scientific journals, as well as publication of several others in the Journal of Health and Pollution, a peer-reviewed scientific journal launched by Blacksmith in 2012. GAHP issued its first Annual Report.

Intermediate Outcomes - Indicator 1: Global inventory of polluted sites is expanded to and comprehensively covers all six regions (AFR, EAP, ECA, LCR, MNA, SAR)

Link to Development Outcome: Expansion of the inventory to regions where there are still gaps is necessary to develop an accurate understanding of the global scope of legacy pollution and its human health effects, as well as build a body of research on the development impacts of pollution, and raise awareness and demand on national and international levels for addressing the health effects of legacy pollution.

Baseline Values/Conditions: The global inventory has started, and currently has assessed 1300 sites in about 50 countries a large percentage of which are located in EAP and ECA regions. Gaps exist particularly in AFR, ECA, LCR and MNA regions.

Date Measured: January 31, 2011

Target Values/Conditions: Global inventory covers 80 countries in all six regions, including at least 1750 sites assessed in total:

- 8 regional/sub-regional investigator trainings held in regions with gaps by December 2013.
- 150 new sites in regions with gaps assessed each year (150 by December 2012, 300 by December 2013, 450 by December 2014).
- 1750 sites in total assessed globally by December 2014.
- 15 national-level reports total (5 each year) presented to relevant government agencies across at least 3 regions.

Expected Timetable for Achieving Targets:

Year	Outputs	Measurement Dates	Reported Results

1	• 4 regional/ subregional workshops; • 150 new site assessments incorporated into database; • 1 global and 5 national-level reports of priority sites for intervention.	December 31, 2012;	• 14 regional/subregional investigator trainings held: LCR (Mexico, Chile, Peru, Argentina, Uruguay), ECA: Azerbaijan, Armenia, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia; AFR: Ghana, Nigeria, Tanzania and Kenya. • 3 investigator trainings scheduled for early 2013 in Mongolia, Kazakhstan and Senegal. • 314 sites were screened and added to database; 268 of which were in LAC, ECA and AFR regions. • 3 Country-level reports presented to Governments
2	• 4 regional/ subregional workshops; • 150 new sites incorporated into database. • 1 global and 5 national-level reports of priority sites for intervention.	December 31, 2013;	• 4 regional/subregional investigator trainings held: LCR: Bolivia, ECA: Kazakhstan, AFR: Senegal: ECA/SAR: Mongolia. • 313 sites were screened and added to database; 291 of which were in LAC, ECA and AFR regions. • 9 Country-level reports presented to Governments: Armenia, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Peru, the Philippines and Uruguay. Global report presented in meetings and published in the Poisoned Poor joint GAHP member report.
3	• 150 new site assessments incorporated into database; • 1 global and 5 national-level reports of priority sites for intervention. • Reports for all regions show comprehensive data (# of sites assessed, # of approved sites, # of people estimated affected, # of countries participating);	December 31, 2014 Progress reported as of June 2014	• 5 regional/subregional investigator trainings held in: Armenia, Georgia, Belarus, Madagascar and Kyrgyzstan. • 140 sites were screened and added to database; 128 of which were in LAC, ECA and AFR regions. • 11 Country-level government reports presented to: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Peru, the Philippines, Tanzania, Uruguay and Vietnam.

Intermediate Outcomes – Indicator 2: Number of dissemination and awareness raising events

Link to Development Outcome: Raising awareness about the scope of legacy pollution in a given country, as well as internationally is necessary in order to (a) make decisions about priority areas and sites for intervention; (b) build support to address priority toxic pollution including raising awareness on incentives and policy instruments for addressing legacy pollution; and (c) raise support for partnership participation and fund mobilization.

Baseline Values/Conditions: The partial inventory was presented at a conference attended by several main stakeholders in September 2010 organized by Blacksmith Institute.

Date Measured: January 31, 2011

Target Values/Conditions: Inventory data is presented in 15 events: 2 in each region, and at least 2 conferences or events per year that are regional or international in nature.

Expected Timetable for Achieving Targets:

Year	Outputs	Measurement Dates	
1	• Two presentations at international / regional events (such as UNEP Governing Council, Basel Convention COP, Global Mercury Partnership, 2012 Bellagio Conference); • Three national-level workshops in at least 2 regions with gaps; • Reports and packages of sites • Start consultations on NTAPs	December 31, 2012	• 10 Presentations of toxic sites data at international events: UNEP INC3 Mercury Convention, INC4, GRULAC, Stockhom+40, UNEP INC4 Mercury Convention, SAICM ICCM3, UNEP Chemicals Financing Initiative Mexico; ICCL and Engineers Without Borders in Washington DC; ISWA in Chile, Bellagio 2012. • National-level workshops (or technical review workshops) held in 16 countries. LCR (Mexico, Chile, Peru, Argentina, Uruguay), ECA: Azerbaijan, Armenia, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia; SAR Pakistan; 1 in EAP: Vietnam; AFR: Ghana, Nigeria, Tanzania and Kenya. • 3 Inventory data reports (Africa, Pakistan, Russia) presented to a Member of European Parliament, ACP Secretariat, USAID/Pakistan and at the Russia Nature Without Borders meeting. • A case study on successful mainstreaming of toxic pollution issues in India and the Philippines was produced and sent to MoE Norway, and MoE Germany. • Basic GAHP website created. (www.gahp.net).
2	• Two presentations at international / regional events (such as UNEP Governing Council, Basel Convention COP, Global Mercury Partnership, 2013 Bellagio Conference); • Three national workshops in at least 2 regions; • Reports and packages of sites • Continue consultations on NTAPs	December 31, 2013	• 15 Presentations of toxic sites data at international/regional events: Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia in Peru; an international mining conference held by the Collegium Ramazzini in Armenia; the MERCOSUR Chemical Agenda and Chemical Waste Management conference in Uruguay; the InterAmerican Congress on Residual Waste in Peru; the WHO Working Group on Ewaste and Children's Health in Switzerland; ILA biannual conference in Prague, and the International Conference on Contaminated Sites in Slovakia; The International Conference on Mercury as a Global Pollutant in Edinburgh, Scotland; the International Secondary Lead Conference and conference on used lead acid batteries in Singapore; the Sustainable Development International Conference on Sustainable Development Practice: Advancing Evidence-Based Solutions for the Post-2015 Sustainable Development Agenda at Columbia University, New York; a panel and general presentation to the EU Parliament in October; the Diplomatic Conference on the Minamata Mercury Convention in Minamata, Japan; a brownbag lunch to DFID and DEFRA in London; the International HCH and Pesticides Forum in Kiev, Ukraine (GIZ); the SAICM Africa Regional meeting in Pretoria, South Africa. • National-level toxics action planning processes/ mainstreaming processes (NTAP) workshops or technical

			review workshops held in 9 countries. LCR (Peru, Argentina, Uruguay), ECA: Azerbaijan, Armenia, EAP: Indonesia, Philippines; AFR: Ghana and Kenya. TSIP reports were presented to all 9 countries at the workshops.
3	• Two presentations at international / regional events (such as UNEP Governing Council, Basel Convention COP, Global Mercury Partnership); • Three national-level workshops in at least 2 regions; • Updated reports and packages of sites. • Consult and prepare NTAPs	December 31, 2014 Progress reported as of June 2014	• 7 presentations of toxic site data at international/regional events: side event at the 7th session of the Open Working Group of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); presentation to delegates of the 7th session of the Open Working Group of the SDGs; Permanent Missions of the UN; Aspen Institute of India; Africa Regional Meeting in Ghana (hosted by the World Bank); chemicals forum side event at the GEF Governing Body 5th Assembly meeting in Mexico; 12th session of the Open Working Group of the SDGs. • 11 National Toxic Action Planning (NTAP) processes are underway in: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Ghana, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Peru, the Philippines, Tanzania, Uruguay and Vietnam) during the reporting period. During these meetings, Blacksmith presented national level reports on TSIP data and raised awareness about toxic pollution in each country and its human health effects, as well as GAHP's efforts to assist countries to deal with their pollution problems. • Azerbaijan is currently working on the draft for their proposed NTAP.

Intermediate Outcomes – Indicator 3: Number of citations of the global inventory in journal or other press articles, media programs, or other articles/reports produced using its data.

Link to Development Outcome Indicator(s) from 2.4: A body of scientifically sound, peer-reviewed research and literature will help build credibility towards this issue, which in turn would contribute towards enhancing the fund mobilization effort.

Baseline Values/Conditions: Zero, as summary information from the global inventory is not yet completed.

Date Measured: January 31, 2011

Target Values/Conditions: At least 10 articles cite data or reports on the global inventory, especially research related to the impacts of pollution in peer-reviewed journals. At least 3 countries cite data / reports on the global inventory in their draft policy related documents by June 2014.

Expected Timetable for Achieving Targets:

Year	Outputs	Measurement Dates	
1	• Reports on results of inventory; • Press/media articles	December 31, 2012	• The 2011 Report the World's Top 10 Toxic Pollution Problems, and the 2012 Report on the World's Top Ten Sources of Pollution Problems by Global Burden of Disease released and picked up by 40 news outlets each. Press releases were issued for each. www.worstpolluted.org • Blacksmith's 2nd and 3rd issues of the Journal of Health and Pollution released with 7 articles, 4 of which used

			inventory data. www.journalhealthpollution.org • Press: the national TRW in Pakistan received press attention, as did the 2012 WWPP report. A key article was published in the Lancet, v380 i9853 pp 1532, 3 November 2012 • 2 major research articles (1 on the inventory screening protocol; 1 on lead exposures from toxic hotspots in 3 SE Asian Countries) published in peer-reviewed journals (the 1st in Environmental Monitoring and Health Journal, the 2nd in Environmental Research).
2	• 2 peer reviewed journal articles cite data or reports on global inventory • Blacksmith reports and press articles; • Website designed and launched with access to summary inventory data;	December 31, 2013	• The 4th and 5th issues of the Journal of Health and Pollution released. www.journalhealthpollution.org • A 3rd major article published in Environmental Health Perspectives, using inventory data to determine regional burden of disease of multiple toxins in 3 SE Asian countries. • GAHP members drafted a joint report entitled "The Poisoned Poor" linking toxic pollution and implications for health, poverty, economic growth, sustainable development and many other areas. • GAHP published a report "Regulatory Best Practices for Remediation of Legacy Toxic Contamination." To highlight policies and practices in Latin America that work to facilitate the cleanup of toxic pollution, and offers six governing principles as models. Available in English and Spanish. • The 2013 report on "The World's Top 10 Toxic Threats in 2013: Cleanup, Progress and Ongoing Challenges" released to update the top ten list of world's worst polluted places previously identified in 2006 and 2007, removing sites that have made progress, and adding new sites identified. • Press coverage including articles in Scientific American, Lancet, Time and ScienceNews.org. • The GAHP website (www.gahp.net) redesigned and populated with resources and important links for country governments and GAHP members/observers. • Summary TSIP data is available on a preliminary website www.pollutionproject.org.
3	• 8 peer reviewed journal articles cite data or reports on global inventory • Blacksmith reports and press/media articles • Draft policy related documents in 3 countries cite	December 31, 2014 Progress reported as of June 2014	• *The Pediatric Burden of Disease from Lead Exposure at Toxic Waste Sites in Low and Middle Income Countries* was published in part by Blacksmith staff in a peer reviewed journal (Environmental Research) utilizing TSIP data. • Blacksmith published a chapter titled "Hazardous Waste and Toxic Hotspots" in the *Textbook of Children's Environmental Health*. • The 6th issue of the Journal on Health and Pollution was released in March 2014. www.journalhealthpollution.org • GAHP issued its first annual report, which is available on www.gahp.net.

	data / reports on the global inventory.		• The GAHP Technical Advisory Group released two guidance documents for countries: *Establishing a Remediation Program*, and *Implementation of Remediation Projects.* Both available on www.gahp.net. • The GAHP website www.gahp.net now features a project section for GAHP projects. • Several publications focusing on pollution were featured in articles by Scientific American and PBS Newshour.

Intermediate Outcomes – Indicator 4: No. of agencies / organizations with whom the constitutive document is shared and discussed.

Link to Development Outcome: The draft constitutive document will form basis for discussion and consultation with potential partners. Providing opportunity early on for potential partners to contribute towards the design of the partnership by sharing the draft constitutive document will contribute towards ensuring that the partnership design is responsive to the needs of the multiple stakeholders and their engagement in its future activities.

Baseline Values/Conditions: None

Date Measured: January 31, 2011

Target Values / Conditions: Draft constitutive document is shared and discussed with at least two multilateral development agencies, one bilateral agency, two UN agencies, one developing country government, two international NGOs, one national NGO and one private sector organization by July 2012.

Expected Timetable for Achieving Targets:

Year	Outputs	Measurement Dates	
1	• Gap assessment of international efforts; • Partnership constitutive document detailing function, governance structure and mechanism options drafted and serves as platform for discussion with potential partners; • Meetings and consultations with potential partners/ board members; • 2012 Bellagio conference held to serve as an international working group for establishment of partnership, and technical conference; • Presentation of draft governance structure and partnership constitutive	December 31, 2012	• Meetings held with more than 60 GAHP members, observers and potential members, including: 18 bilateral agency HQ offices, 10 bilateral in-country missions; 4 multilateral HQ offices, 6 in-country multilateral offices; 2 multilateral organizations; and 15 country government agencies. • Partnership invitation letter drafted and sent to 30 potential members. • Draft constitutive document and implementation strategy presented to 30 agencies; feedback received by >15 agencies • Two Bellagio preparatory teleconference meetings held. • Bellagio conference held in 2-6 July 2012, constitutive/governance document presented and adopted. • Global Alliance on Health and Pollution (GAHP) established. A press release was issued.

	document to potential partners at 2012 Bellagio conference; • Adoption of partnership governance structure;		
2	• Meetings and consultations with potential partnership members;	December 31, 2013	• Meetings held with more than 70 GAHP members, observers and potential members, including: 11 bilateral agency HQ offices, 3 bilateral in-country missions; 4 multilateral HQ offices, 11 in-country multilateral offices; 9 offices of international/ multilateral organizations; and government agencies in 16 countries. • Partnership invitation letter sent to 18 potential members.
3	• Meetings and consultations with potential partnership members;	December 31, 2014 Progress reported as of June 2014	• Meetings were held with representatives of more than 60 agencies, including: 10 multilaterals (5 head offices and 5 in-country missions); 21 bilaterals (10 head offices and 11 in-country missions); 20 country government agencies; and 15 international organizations (6 head offices and 9 field/mission offices). • Partnership invitation letters sent to 15 countries.

Intermediate Outcomes – Indicator 5: Number of agencies/organizations becoming members of the Partnership Board.

Link to Development Outcome: The Partnership Board (PB) would provide leadership and direction to GPP activities, and monitor implementation of plans and activities, provide oversight of fiduciary aspects, ensure coordination, and ensure that Secretariat's deliverables are consistent with partners' broader development objectives. Moreover, by involving key stakeholders during the early design stage of the partnership would contribute towards securing buy in from a variety of agencies and organizations from developing countries and the international community.

Baseline Values/Conditions: None

Date Measured: January 31, 2011

Target Values/Conditions: At least two multilateral development agencies, one bilateral agency, two UN agencies, two developing country government, two international NGOs, two developing country NGOs and one private sector organization are members of the Partnership Board.

Expected Timetable for Achieving Targets:

Year	Outputs	Measurement Dates	
1	• Same as indicator 4; • 2 multi-lateral development agencies, and UNEP are members of the Partnership Board; • Fully functional Secretariat with	December 31, 2012	• Same as Indicator 4. • GAHP has 15 members: Asian Development Bank, Blacksmith Institute, Ministries of Environment for Indonesia, Mexico, Peru, the Philippines and Senegal; Indonesian NGO KPBB, Chilean NGO Fundación Chile, the International Lead Management Centre, UNEP, UNIDO and the World Bank.

	documentation detailing its responsibilities and structure. • 2 advisory group meetings.		• Executive Committee has 7 members: WB, ADB, UNIDO, DENR Philippines, GIZ, EC and Blacksmith. One Exec. Committee meeting was held. • Blacksmith has assumed Secretariat activities. • Two major GAHP new updates sent to members and observers. • Technical Advisory Group established and 1 preparatory Bellagio teleconference and 1 TAG group meeting held. Two TAG guidance documents are in draft on standards for acceptable levels of toxins in soil, air and water, and local disposal methods for contaminated soil.
2	• Meetings and consultations with partnership board members; • 2013 Bellagio conference held as a second international technical, pledging and partnership conference; • At least 1 bilateral representative, 1 developing country government representative, and 1 developing country NGO join Partnership Board.	December 31, 2013	• Same as Indicator 4. • GAHP has 24 members: 3 multilateral development banks (ADB, IADB and WB), 2 bilateral agencies (EC and GIZ), 9 Ministries of Environment (Cameroon, Indonesia, Ghana, Madagascar, Mexico, Peru, the Philippines, Senegal and Uruguay), 1 Ministry of Health (Tajikistan), 2 city governments (Buenos Aires and Montevideo), 4 NGOs (Blacksmith, KPBB, the Cyrus Vance Center for International Justice and Fundación Chile), and 3 UN agencies (UNDP, UNIDO, UNEP). • 3 Exec. Committee meetings held. • 4 subcommittees were established and meetings held. • First GAHP annual meeting held in April 2013. • 6 GAHP updates sent to members and observers. • 2 TAG group meeting held. Two TAG guidance documents
3	• Meetings and consultations with partnership board members; • 2014 conference held as a third international technical, pledging and partnership conference that also presents results of pilot projects and recommendations for the partnership; • Fully functional Partnership Board that includes 2 UN agencies, 2 multilateral agencies (WB +1), 1 bilateral representatives, 2 developing country government representatives, 2 international NGOs	December 31, 2014 <u>Progress reported as of June 2014</u>	• Same as indicator 4. • GAHP has 31 members in addition to dozens of observers (GEF, US EPA, SAICM, USAID, US Dept. of State, JICA, International Council of Chemicals Association, NORAD, AFD, WHO, etc. • The GAHP Executive Committee convened three times. • The four subcommittees (Fundraising, Projects, Government Coordination, and Communications) met in April 2014. • 2 GAHP updates/newsletters were sent to members and observers. • The GAHP Technical Advisory Group met virtually in April/May and has drafted two additional guidance documents.

	(Blacksmith +1), and 2 developing country NGOs.		

Intermediate Outcomes – Indicator 6: Funds are identified and mobilized.

Link to Development Outcome: Identifying and securing funding is key to ensuring the sustainability of the partnership following the exit from DGF and to reducing the impact of legacy pollution on local communities.

Baseline Values/Conditions: At least 4 different donors have contributed or are contributing to the initial goal of designing the partnership (including ADB, EC, WB, Rockefeller Foundation).

Date Measured: January 31, 2011

Target Values/Conditions: At least two new bilateral donors and two private sector representatives commit funds towards the partnership.

Expected Timetable for Achieving Targets:

Year	Outputs	Measurement Dates	
1	• Action plan for fund mobilization.	December 31, 2012	Cofinancing: • €5 million EC co-financing secured • US$ 100,000 secured from Green Cross Switzerland Other Financing: • Grants secured for remediation / technical assistance, including: US$ 1 million GEF secured (carried out by UNIDO not Blacksmith); €200,000 each from SIDA and EC Delegation in Ukraine; US$ 145,000 from ICCA; and €420,000 EC China. • Funding mobilization plan developed and shared with the Executive Committee. • Funding proposals submitted to ACP Secretariat, DFID, EC SWITCH, EC China, EC Bolivia, EC Russia, EC Philippines, EC DG Research, USAID and others are in development.
2	• Fund mobilization activities as per action plan. • Commitment / pledge from 2 private sector representatives to commit resources towards the partnership.	December 31, 2013	Cofinancing: • US$ 460,000 received from EC (via FAO) • US$ 200,000 secured from Green Cross Switzerland • US$ 45,000 secured from UNITAR (via Peshsaf – Tajik NGO) • EC has indicated it will renew funding to GAHP in 2015-2018. • Significant progress made toward gaining support with donors (Norway, UK, China and S. Korea) to establish a multidonor trust fund housed at the WB on Pollution Management and Environmental Health (PMEH). Other Financing: • Grants secured for remediation / technical assistance, including: □100,000 from EC Delegation in Bolivia and □30,000 in match from Danish Embassy in Bolivia (Blacksmith is a subgrantee); €980,000 from EC Delegation in China (also

			subgrantee); $750,000 from HSBC for 5 year grant in the Philippines; and €390,000 from the EU Delegation in China/Mongolia for a 2 year project in Mongolia. • Funding proposals submitted to ADB, EC China/Mongolia, EC DG Research, EC Mexico, EC Peru, SAICM, NORAD, US DoS, USAID and others are in development.
3	• Fund mobilization activities as per action plan. • Commitment / pledge from 2 new bilateral donor for funds towards partnership for legacy pollution	December 31, 2014	Co-financing: • A $1,500,000 contract with the ADB was secured. • $838,000 from GEF secured. • The Rockefeller Brothers Fund donated for the 2nd GAHP annual meeting. • The EC approved €5,000,000 of funding over the course of 3 years (in collaboration with UNIDO). • WB and Blacksmith have approached other bilateral agencies to garner support for PMEH. Other financing: • The NIEHS has given a grant of US$ 15,000. Proposals have been submitted to EC Mexico, EC Bolivia, US DoS, USAID, and others.

Intermediate Outcomes – Indicator 7: Pilot projects test the design of the partnership and are conducted in at least two different regions. (This activity is funded by EC).

Link to Development Outcome: In order to ensure the optimal design of the partnership, three pilot projects will test its design. Lessons learned from the pilot projects will be reflected in the design of the partnership.

Baseline Values/Conditions: Zero pilot projects have been conducted to test the partnership.

Date Measured: January 31, 2011

Target Values/Conditions: At least three pilot projects in three separate countries within two different regions are conducted to test the design of the partnership. Results of the pilot projects are published, including lessons learnt and their implications for the design of the partnership. Partnership design is modified as necessary based on experience from the three pilot projects. Pilot projects result in reduction in toxic exposures to local communities at the selected sites.

Expected Timetable for Achieving Targets:

Year	Outputs	Measurement Dates	
1	• Selection criteria for sites developed, shared with partnership board and sites selected; • Preliminary reviews started in at least one selected site	December 31 2012	• Selection criteria for sites developed, shared with 30 potential members (comments received from >5 potential members), and adopted by the Executive Committee. • Governments of Uruguay and Pakistan expressed interest to participate in the pilot projects. • 1 pilot project in Indonesia (Grassroots Support theme) has been selected, contracts signed. Work begins Jan 1, 2013. The remaining 2 pilot projects will be selected in the first quarter of 2013.
2	• Three in-depth site reviews completed and	December 31, 2013	• The Executive Committee approved 6 additional pilot projects under the government request and

	site interventions designed. • Stakeholder group meetings conducted at each site; • Site interventions implemented.		health risk themes in April and September. • All 7 pilot projects are in implementation phase and progressing well. Project updates presented to the Executive Committee in January 2014. • In-depth pilot project site reviews for all the sites were completed.
3	• Stakeholder group meetings; • Site interventions implemented; • Measurably reduced contamination and risk of toxic exposure at sites; • Report summarizing the results, recommendations and lessons learned from pilot projects and implications on the design of the partnership. • Revised partnership arrangements document.	December 31, 2014 Progress reported as of June 2014	• 1 pilot project (Akhtala, Armenia) has completed all phases of implementation and results are being compiled for final reporting. • 1 pilot project (Montevideo, Uruguay) is progressing well; similar clean-up activities will be completed in the area. • 1 pilot project (Sumgayit, Azerbaijan) is conducting additional sampling before a remediation strategy is chosen. • All other pilot projects are progressing well.

ANNEX 8.
THE FORMAT USED BY GAHP TO MONITOR FINANCIAL EXPENDITURES

Particulars	Budget	Yr 1 Cumulative Expenditure	Yr 2 Expenditure	Yr 2 Expenditure	Yr 2 Cumulative Expenditure Jul 2012 - Dec 2013	Total Commitment Settled	Total (in US$ and as a % of total grant)	External Co-Financing	External Co-Financing	Blacksmith Institute Co-Financing	Total Co-Financing
Opening Balance											
Received from the World Bank											
Interest received on Grants (row 5+6)											
Total receipts (A)											
Operational Expenses											
1. Design the partnership facility with a clear mandate for its work within the broader development mandates of participating agencies											
International technical staff/consultants											
Travel and subsistence											
Supplies and Communications (ADDED)											
Media and publications											
Conferences / Workshops											
Sub-total (1)											
2. Expand the inventory database of toxic hotspots to regions for which gaps still exist and use data in research on global health and development impacts of legacy pollution											
International technical staff/consultants											
Local staff / consultants											

Travel and subsistence											
Equipment (ADDED)											
Supplies and Communications (ADDED)											
Conferences / Workshops / Training											
Maintenance of inventory database											
Media and publications											
Sub-total (2)											
3. Define selection criteria and select sites for three pilots to test the potential designs of the partnership											
Technical staff / consultants											
Local staff / consultants											
Technical assistance											
Travel and subsistence											
Supplies and Communications (ADDED)											
Media and publications											
Conferences / Workshops											
Sub-total (3)											
Total: Operational Expenses											
4. Administrative Cost (10%)											
Total Expenditures (B)											
Closing Balance (A-B)											

ANNEX 9.
GUIDELINES FOR CALCULATION OF IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS

Rationale: in-kind contributions to projects are as important as cash contributions for a number of reasons as follows:

- in-kind contributions when factored as part of a project budget give the real total cost of a project;
- in-kind contributions are frequently the only contributions non-governmental organizations (NGO) or community based organizations (CBO) can make to a project. Therefore, accurately valuing these contributions are very important in determining the real contribution of an organization to a project;
- in-kind contributions demonstrate to donors that CBOs and NGOs are significant contributors to projects and their real contribution may sometimes exceed the contribution of the donor.

For these reasons all planning documents and project proposals should show the amount of in-kind contribution to a project. It also means that during project implementation each grantee would use a standard method in documenting all in-kind contributions. Activities that do not qualify as in-kind contribution include passive attendance on training courses, meetings, seminars, etc. (i.e., attendance with no input, as a member of the audience or group); and provision of pre-existing (i.e. not generated within the duration of the project) data, expertise or knowledge tools which are publicly available free of charge.

Calculating in-kind Contributions: Valuation of in-kind contributions should be based on average commercial prices applicable in a country or a region. For the results to be accurate the grantee will have to find ways of estimating and documenting in-kind contributions as part of project preparation and project implementation.

Estimating and Documenting In-kind Contributions: All relevant supporting documents which certify the value of in-kind contributions (e.g. above US$ 100) should be presented with project proposals and project reports. These documents should include the following:

Part 1: Documents for Certifying In-kind Contributions

Documents with Project Proposals and Documents with Project Reports

- Letter from co-funder stating value and how it was determined.
- Voluntary assistance accountability sheets.
- Official land evaluation documents.
- Letters or contracts from donors, Governments or the private sector confirming the type and kind of in-kind contribution.
- Statistical or market research data.
- In-kind confirmation sheet signed by the President of a group or the leader of a community.

- Person-power cost rates.
- Confirmation from an organization that it provided office space, equipment, materials etc.
- The amount and method of calculation should be included.

Part 2: Ways of Calculating In-kind Contributions

Activity Calculation of In-Kind Contribution

Person-power Costs (professionals; experts; etc.)

Use person-day market rates in the country or district at the relevant level of input, calculated per day or month. (e.g. Number of days X Market value per day.)

Use of Office Equipment

Calculate straight-line depreciation of full cost of equipment over 5 years and factor down according to usage on the project, e.g., A $5,000 piece of equipment over 5 years = $1,000 per year or $5,00 for six months or part thereof.

Use of Software

Use either:

- Cost of software license for period of use , if available
- Cost depreciated over 3 years.

Use or provision of materials or components where cost is nonrecoverable (i.e. product will not be resold)

Use market price of materials/ components as supplied.

Use or provision of data/licence/patent to NGO/CBO

Where data is pre-existing, but not in the public domain, use one of the following:

- Time/person power costs required to produce the data.
- Equivalent commercial cost of purchasing data.
- Treat data as 'on-loan' to project and calculate straight –line depreciation value over 3 years.

Use of land

- If land is given or donated for project activities for the period that is sufficient to fully reach planned results and impact, the full price of the land plot may be shown, supported by official document or data proving the price (Land Registration Certificate; Department of Statistics or other official institutional document).

- If land is given or lent for the project activities only for project duration, use the official rent price per month multiplied by amount of months. Price calculation should be supported by official documents and/or rent agreement.

Use of Construction/buildings

- If construction/buildings are given/donated to the project activities for the period that is sufficient to fully reach planned results and impact, and will remain as property of NGO afterwards, the full price of the building/s may be shown, supported by official document or data proving the price (Real Estate Register; Department of Statistics or other official institutions) or by the document signed by the owner/donator.
- If contribution/buildings are given or lent for the project activities only for time of project duration, use the official rent price per month multiplied by amount of months. Price calculation should be supported by official document and/or rent agreement.

Use of vehicles

If vehicle is lent for the project needs, use one of the following:

- An average cost per month or day of the official rent price specific for that locality multiplied by days/months used.
- Amortisation of the lent vehicle is calculated as follows:
  1. Subtract the fuel cost per Km from the UN Official rate used for private travel in that country per Km.
  2. Multiply the number by approximate amount of KMs to be driven during the project.
  3. If fuel is also shown as in-kind (not funded by the project or other donors, and not receipts are present), use the full cost of the UN official rate for private travel per Km multiplied by the total distance driven during the project.

Part 3: ACTIVITY CALCULATION OF IN-KIND CONTRIBUTION

Volunteer Input

Voluntary input may be calculated on a daily or monthly basis, by filling in a "voluntary assistance sheet". Use one of the following:

- Voluntary work input calculated based on the official rate of such work, if available.
- An average appropriate person-day rate used in the country or district at the relevant level of input.
- Official minimal levels of salary per month (divide by 22, and multiply by number of days worked).