



TOGETHER
for a sustainable future

OCCASION

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



TOGETHER
for a sustainable future

DISCLAIMER

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

FAIR USE POLICY

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

CONTACT

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

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

Independent Terminal Evaluation

Development of the Guidelines for updating of National Implementation Plans (NIPs) under the Stockholm Convention taking into account the new POPs added to the Convention

UNIDO Project Number: GF/GLO/11/013

GEF Project Number: 4410

Independent Terminal Evaluation

Development of the Guidelines for updating of National Implementation Plans (NIPs) under the Stockholm Convention taking into account the new POPs added to the Convention

UNIDO Project Number: GF/GLO/11/013

GEF Project Number: 4410



UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION
Vienna, 2013

Distr. GENERAL
ODG/EVA/12 R.22
October 2013

Original: English

The views and opinions expressed in this Evaluation Report are those of the authors based on their professional assessment of the evaluation subject. Those views and opinions do not necessarily reflect the views of UNIDO.

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Mention of company names and commercial products does not imply the endorsement of UNIDO.

This document has not been formally edited.

Contents

Acknowledgements	v
Abbreviations and acronyms	vi
Glossary of evaluation related terms	vii
Executive Summary	ix
1. Introduction	1
1.1: Purpose of the Project Evaluation	1
1.2: Information sources and availability of information	2
1.3: Methodological remarks and validity of the findings	3
2. Project Context	5
2.1: Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants	5
2.2: Sector specific issues of concern to the project	7
3. Project Summary	8
3.1: Project Fact Sheet	8
3.2: Project description	11
3.3: Project implementation modalities	13
3.4: Major changes to project implementation	15
3.5: Alignment of the Project with other initiatives	16
3.6: Partner Organizations	18
4. Project Assessment	20
4.1: Relevance	20
4.2: Effectiveness	23
4.3: Efficiency	29
4.4: Sustainability	31
4.5: Project coordination and management	34
4.6: Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems	39
5. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned	44
5.1: Conclusions	44
5.2: Recommendations	45
5.3: Lessons Learned	47

Annexes

Annex A: Terms of Reference	49
Annex B: List of People Interviewed	71
Annex C: Bibliography	73

Tables and Figure

Table 1: Project Fact Sheet	8
Table 2: Dates	9
Table 3: Project Framework	9
Table 4: Co-financing	10
Table 5: Project Costs Paid by UNIDO from GEF Funding (excl. agency support cost)	10
Table 6 : Achievement of Project Outputs and Outcomes based on Project Results Framework	23
Table 7: Comparison of co-funding indicated in Project Document and co- financing figure submitted to evaluation	37
Table 8: Budgeting and funding for M & E activities	40
Table 9: Overall Ratings	41

Acknowledgements

We would like express our gratitude and special thanks to all those persons involved in planning and realizing the evaluation. We also gratefully acknowledge the contributions of all those who made time free for interviews and provided comments, information and documents.

We hope that the presented conclusions and recommendations will contribute to the continuous improvement of the project and to the achievement of the expected results.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

BAT	Best Available Technologies
BEP	Best Environmental Practices
COP	Congress of the Parties
CSIR-NEERI	Council of Scientific and Industrial Research – National Environmental Engineering Research Institute
EU	European Union
GEF	Global Environment Facility
HQ	Headquarters
IA	Implementing Agent
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreement
MSP	Medium Sized Project
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development
OVI	Objectively Verifiable Indicator
POP-PBDE	Persistent organic pollutants-polybrominated diphenyl ethers
PFOS	Perfluorooctane Sulfonates
RCC	Regional Coordination Committees
RECETOX	Research Centre for Toxic Compounds in the Environment
SC	Stockholm Convention
SETAC	Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry
SMART	Specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time constrained
SQAM	Standardisation, Quality Assurance, Accreditation & Metrology
SSC	Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention
SCU	Stockholm Convention Unit
TOR	Terms of Reference
TPT	Technical Project Team
UNDP	United Nation's Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNITAR	United Nations Institute for Training and Research
UNS	United Nations System
UP-POPs	Unintentionally produced POPs
WEOG	WEOG Western European and Others Group

Glossary of Evaluation related Term

Term	Definition
Baseline	The situation, prior to an intervention, against which progress can be assessed.
Effect	Intended or unintended change due directly or indirectly to an intervention.
Effectiveness	The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention were or are expected to be achieved.
Efficiency	A measure of how economically inputs (through activities) are converted into outputs.
Impact	Positive and negative, intended and non-intended, directly and indirectly, long term effects produced by a development intervention.
Indicator	Quantitative or qualitative factors that provide a means to measure the changes caused by an intervention.
Intervention	An external action to assist a national effort to achieve specific development goals.
Lessons learned	Generalizations based on evaluation experiences that abstract from specific to broader circumstances.
Logframe (logical framework approach)	Management tool used to guide the planning, implementation and evaluation of an intervention. System based on MBO (management by objectives) also called RBM (results based management) principles.
Outcomes	The achieved or likely effects of an intervention's outputs.
Outputs	The products in terms of physical and human capacities that result from an intervention.
Relevance	The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donor's policies.
Risks	Factors, normally outside the scope of an intervention, which may affect the achievement of an intervention's objectives.
Sustainability	The continuation of benefits from an intervention, after the development assistance has been completed.
Target groups	The specific individuals or organizations for whose benefit an intervention is undertaken.

Executive Summary

Evaluation Scope

This project evaluation was originally commissioned by UNIDO as a mid-term evaluation in order to assess the project's adherence to the work plan and budget, to identify deviations from the project objectives and to identify 'course-correcting' actions to reorient remaining project activities, if necessary. When the evaluator undertook the evaluation work, it turned out that most of the project activities had been completed. It was then decided to undertake a terminal, instead of a mid-term, evaluation. The evaluation was undertaken by the independent evaluator, Mr. Jayanthi Aniruth, in accordance with the Terms of Reference in Annex A. The evaluation was based on the review of project documentation, followed by interviews conducted with key project stakeholders from various countries. A mission to Geneva and Vienna then enabled the evaluator to engage directly with the **Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention (SSC)** and a number of different stakeholders within UNIDO, the executing agency. Given the global nature of the project, the majority of the interviews were conducted via e-mail and/or via Skype. This methodology might have resulted in a positive bias in the results of the project evaluation since the evaluator was more successful in securing interviews with stakeholders who were more committed and integrally involved in the project (e.g. international consultants).

Project Description

In 2010 the Conference of the Parties added a further nine POPs to the Stockholm Convention, triggering the need for Parties to update their National Implementation Plans (NIPs) by 26 August 2012. The existing guidance documents available to assist Parties to develop NIPs revolved around the management of the original 12 POPs, mostly chemicals that were no longer actively in use. The listing of the new POPs means that Parties have to deal with greater levels of complexity in gathering information on, monitoring and regulating the use and disposal of POPs that are widely used as industrial chemicals. This project sought to provide Parties with a complete set of guidance documents in order to develop inventories of and management plans for POPs, including the new POPs.

The project sought to develop a first version of the guidelines and test these documents via a pilot project in a member country before the 5th congress of the parties (COP5). The revised documents were then to be submitted to the COP for consideration in April 2011. Further testing of the guidance documents was planned to be undertaken via pilot projects in two other countries after COP5 in order to test the applicability of the guidelines to different global regions. Training material, based on the guidance documents, were to be created as an output of the project and these materials were to be utilised within the pilot countries. Stakeholders involved in the pilot projects would provide comments on the guidance documents in order to allow the drafting organizations to improve the

usability and quality of the documents. The improved version of the guidance documents would then be translated into six official languages of the United Nations by March 2012 in order to allow Parties to update their NIPs the end of August 2012.

Main Findings and Conclusions

Project Design

The project was generally well designed. The logic of the project is robust, especially the model of developing materials (guidance documents and training material), testing these materials in the field and then improving the quality of these materials in light of the experience in the field and the feedback by stakeholders. However, the emphasis of the design was on outputs (materials & training), not on outcomes (improved capacities of local stakeholders).

A good element of the project was the use of an extensive peer review system as a quality control mechanism. The guidance documents were submitted to 44 experts and users in the chemicals management and POPs arena, for review. The documents were accompanied by a questionnaire to get reviewers to apply their minds to specific questions regarding the usability and quality of each guidance document reviewed. This questionnaire aided and structured the feedback process and maximised the usefulness of the peer review process.

Relevance

The Stockholm Convention (SC) is the means by which the global community has been able to mobilise international action in addressing the threat to the environment and human health posed by exposure to persistent organic pollutants. The Convention has secured commitment to its provisions by 178 Party countries. The NIP that each Party develops is the principal tool used by the SC in order to compel Parties to systematically address the issue of reducing POPs within their boundaries and is therefore vital to the reduction and eventual elimination of listed POPs internationally. Given the limited expertise available in the management of POPs, especially within developing countries, the guidance documents adopted by the COP are instrumental in guiding Parties in the process of developing useful NIPs that can be implemented. This project, which produced guidance documents to guide Parties in the development of inventories and action plans for the introduction of best alternative technologies (BATs) and best environmental practises in managing and reducing the use of new POPs was therefore highly relevant to the international management of the newly listed POPs.

Effectiveness

The project has been effective in producing guidance documents that are deemed to be robust and of good quality by stakeholders, despite the complexity of the subject matter. The project has also been effective in utilising the momentum of on-going processes in Nigeria, India and Serbia, to test the quality of the guidance documents and to add value to processes underway. The pilot project processes engaged with two SC Regional Centres, and two Basel Convention RCs, thereby building capacity within four regional centres for the management of NIP update processes. The late start of the project, combined with the deadline for the submission of updated NIPs to the SSC, called for a drastic compression of project activities and therefore necessitated trade-offs during project implementation. The SSC reported that they therefore made a conscious decision to focus on the development of high quality guidance documents, rather than the development of the approach to capacity building and the development of training material. The project has therefore been only partly effective in delivery of Outcome 2, as set out in the project document.

The guidance documents can be deemed to be *effective* only if they are used and properly guide the NIP update processes in Party countries. The impact of the guidance documents can therefore be measured only through the quality of the NIPs produced and the success of the NIP update process in mobilising sustained action in the management of POPs within Party countries. Reviewers/stakeholders within the pilot countries have indicated that the complexity of the subject matter and the consequent difficulty for laymen to follow the guidance documents would necessitate training for stakeholders in developing countries in order to enable them to properly utilise the guidance documents.

Efficiency

Stakeholders indicated that the time pressure faced by the project was the biggest challenge encountered during implementation. This time pressure was created by the delayed start of the project. A review of the work flow process indicates that almost 24 months lapsed between initial discussions about the project idea and the start of project implementation. Both UNIDO and GEF were responsible for these delays, but the larger part of the delay is attributable to UNIDO, both in the appointment of a consultant to prepare the project document, as well as the length of time taken in internal approval and financial processes that enables project initiation.

Stakeholders also reported delays at the beginning of the project implementation and attributed this delay to weak management of the project by UNIDO at the start of the project and indicated that the SSC therefore had to take a firmer hand in ensuring that project decisions were properly recorded and followed through. UNIDO attributed the initial lack of project momentum to difficulties in identifying lead authors with the requisite skills and experience in compiling chemical inventories and indicated that the experts originally hired could not give sufficient direction to the drafting process. Despite these challenges, the project

successfully produced the necessary guidance documents within very tight timeframes, with a relatively small delay of about six months.

Sustainability

The evaluation identified three risks that might adversely affect the sustainability of the project:

- (a) Risk that the guidance documents might quickly become outdated as the new field of POPs management develops and evolves. The guidance documents will require updating in order to remain current, especially on the issues of BET and BEP. Since current expertise in the field is limited to a fairly small group of people, many of whom have been engaged via this project; it is likely to be fairly easy to establish a Community of Practice, with practitioners focused on generating and sharing learning. Such a Community of Practice would allow UNIDO and SSC staff to stay abreast of current developments in the field and to update the guidance documents with the insertion of new links and references to new documents within the guidance documents, thereby extending the currency of the guidance documents and delaying the need for a formal update;
- (b) Risk that financial resources for the NIP updating process will be insufficient for the proper implementation of the methodologies contained in the guidance documents. GEF has limited the funding available for the NIP updates to a maximum of US\$ 250,000 per eligible country. UNIDO and the SSC expressed concerns that this quantum of funding might be insufficient to undertake the full extent of the work envisaged, especially with regard to developing inventories of the new POPs. Drafters of the guidance documents sensibly chose to mitigate this risk through the introduction of a tiered approach in the development of the inventories of new POPs. Parties may therefore decide, based on the availability of financial and human resources, whether they should undertake a tier I, II or III assessment for the inventories of new POPs;
- (c) Risk that Parties will not utilise guidance documents effectively: stakeholders involved in the pilot testing indicated that the guidance documents are technical in nature and that stakeholders in developing countries will require training in order to allow them to utilise the guidance documents properly. The documents are also copious and account for a collective 623 pages across the eight guidance documents since the complex content area did not allow for further simplification or shortening during the drafting. There is therefore a considerable risk that the guidance documents will not be effectively utilised by Parties if the SSC and UNIDO fail to build the capacity of stakeholders, thereby enabling the use of the documents.

Conclusions

This project was a well-designed intervention with a coherent underlying logic that focused on developing, field testing and improving guidelines for the updating of NIPs. However, the process of project development and funding application was delayed and the revised submission to GEF did not update project activities and timeframes, thereby establishing unrealistic timeframes for the delivery of the project. Project implementation started off slowly, with a rushed PSC meeting that did not adequately set up the project implementation framework in terms of the roles and responsibilities of different partners or an M&E plan to track project implementation. The slow start to project implementation was addressed by the SSC taking a more active role in supporting UNIDO in project management and by the new UNIDO project manager redirecting the discussions and work of the drafting groups. Despite this slow start, the project successfully compressed 24 months of project activity into 18 months and delivered a comprehensive set of guidance documents (Outcome 1) that are deemed to be of good quality by relevant stakeholders. The success of the project in developing these guidelines appears to be due largely to the personal commitment and the investment of a huge amount of time and effort by key project partners, including representatives of UNIDO, SSC and UNITAR as well as the experts contracted to develop these documents, rather than the use of an effective and articulated project management system. Some project partners reported that time constraints during project implementation led to a management decision to prioritize the development of the guidance documents (Outcome 1) rather than the delivery of Outcome 2, the development of a capacity building approach based on a gap analysis and appropriate training material and a manual for the training of stakeholders. While this decision was reasonable, given the time pressures faced by the project, the lack of appropriate training material is likely to compromise the effective use of the guidance documents by stakeholders within Party countries, and might therefore compromise the effectiveness of the project as well as realization of the environmental benefits to be gained by developing good quality NIPs with action plans that lead to a reduction in the use, generation and production of new POPs.

Recommendations to UNIDO

UNIDO (and SSC) should build the capacity of potential users in developing countries in order to further enable the effective utilisation of the necessarily complex and comprehensive guidance documents. While various capacity building activities are planned by UNIDO and SSC, these are not sufficient, a more programmatic approach to capacity building is necessary.

It might be feasible for UNIDO and/or the SSC to provide training for the staff of IAs and the fairly small pool of 'international/regional consultants' centrally, with one or more workshops (depending on the numbers of people involved) undertaken over several days. These workshops would have two objectives: (a) to train participants in the contents of the guidance documents, and (b) to train the participants in how to deliver training on the guidance documents to

stakeholders within Party countries. These trainers would then be responsible for training other stakeholders, as part of each NIP update project.

In order to safeguard the quality of the decentralised training (and to decrease the costs of the training) to be conducted within each NIP update process, UNIDO should develop a package of training material that can be utilised 'on the ground' within developing countries. The training methodology that underlies the training material should be as participatory as possible and should be appropriate for the profile of the target audience within Party countries.

Recommendations to the SSC

It is recommended that the SSC work with UNIDO in addressing the capacity building needs of stakeholders involved in the updating of NIPs, in line with the discussion above. The SSC and UNIDO should jointly consider these recommendations and the options available in order to expedite these capacity building interventions, so as not to delay the process of the NIP updates any further. These discussions should include a reflection and agreement on how the centrally delivered training for the project managers within IAs and the international/regional consultants can be funded. The SSC should consider the possibility of funding some or all of this training from the Stockholm Convention Voluntary Trust Fund.

It is recommended that the SSC establish a Community of Practice focused on generating and sharing learning about understanding and managing new POPs. The Community of Practice would include the drafters, collaborators and reviewers mobilised by this project and would allow SSC staff, as well as UNIDO, to stay abreast of developments in the field and to update the guidance documents with the insertion of new links and references to new documents within the guidance documents. This method of updating is likely to keep the documents current for longer and will delay the need for a formal review and updating of the guidance documents, a process that will require more time and funding¹.

Recommendations to GEF

As the risk that insufficient capacity building will undermine the effective use of the guidance documents produced by this project. It is therefore recommended that GEF consider the possibility of augmenting its contribution to the current project budget in order to co-fund the capacity building activities discussed above.

¹ It is accepted practice for the SSC to request comments from Parties on how to improve the usefulness of the guidance documents produced. See decisions SC-1/12, SC-2/7, SC-3/8, SC-4/9, SC-5/14. The SSC then updates the guidance documents based on comments received. The proposed Community of Practice would supplement this process.

Main Lessons Learned

This project successfully negotiated changing circumstances and time constraints in order to meet prioritised objectives. However, project decisions and priorities were not always recorded or shared. For example, the SSC reported that they made a management decision to focus on delivering high quality guidance documents, rather than the delivery of training material and capacity building. This decision was not recorded in any project documents or minutes and was not reflected in an amendment to the project results framework. Moreover, the project did not generate any annual reports or quarterly reports to report on project progress and therefore did not record this decision in these progress reports. The failure to record management decisions means that the project is unfavourably evaluated against the original project document and project results framework, rather than a more relevant updated document that reflects amendments to the project deliverables.

The delays reported at the beginning of project implementation were attributed by stakeholders to a lack of understanding about roles and responsibilities of organizations and individuals. Clarification of the roles and expectations of the different project partners at project outset might therefore have improved project delivery. It is interesting to note that the project document indicates that these very same issues would be clarified at the 'project inception workshop'. This did not occur and a project that was already very time-constrained was delayed further. It is therefore essential that these basic elements of good project management be properly observed rather than lightly included in documents tailored to please potential funders.

1.

Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Project Evaluation

This evaluation of the project to develop ‘Guidelines for the Updating of National Implementation Plans (NIPs) under the Stockholm Convention, taking into account the new POPs added to the Convention’ was commissioned by the implementing agent, UNIDO, and was undertaken by an independent evaluator, Jayanthi Aniruth. It was originally planned as a mid-term evaluation, as envisaged in the original project document, and was commissioned in order to safeguard the project’s adherence to the work plan and project budget, to identify deviations from the objectives of the project and to identify ‘course-correcting’ actions to reorient remaining project activities, if necessary. When the evaluator undertook the evaluation work, it turned out that most of the project activities had been completed. It was then decided to undertake a terminal, instead of a mid-term, evaluation. The specific purpose of this evaluation, as set out in the Terms of Reference for this evaluation, remains unchanged and is to allow project partners to:

1. Review project progress toward the achievement of the new POPs guidance on inventory, Best Available Techniques and Best Environmental Practice;
2. Review project activities, results and achievements through their indicators;
3. Review the relevance of project objectives and other design elements of the project;
4. Propose recommendations to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of project activities; and
5. Draw lessons to be learned from the process of drafting the new POPs guidance.

Please refer to Annex A for the full Terms of Reference for this project evaluation.

The evaluation was conducted in the period July-September 2012. The evaluation began with the review of project documentation from the UNIDO project management system, followed by interviews conducted via Skype with key project stakeholders from various countries in August 2012. A mission to Geneva and Vienna then enabled the evaluator to engage directly with the Secretariat for the Stockholm Convention, a key partner in project implementation and the ultimate client of the project; as well as a number of different role-players within UNIDO, the executing agency.

1.2 Information sources and availability of information

The project evaluation accessed and reviewed project documents from the project manager within UNIDO's Stockholm Convention Unit, part of the Environmental Management Branch. This included, among others, the project document approved by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and UNIDO, minutes of various telephonic conferences, project correspondence, the financial snapshot of the project with regard to the expenditure of GEF funds transferred to UNIDO, job descriptions for the various experts recruited by UNIDO, the sub-contract with UNITAR and the copy edited version of the guidance documents produced.

In addition, interviews with stakeholders pointed to the availability of other project-related documentation that was then submitted into the evaluation process for review by the relevant stakeholders. Through this process, the evaluation gained access to the following types of documents:

- Training material prepared by the project, including presentations on each guidance document and an overview of the new Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) added to the Stockholm Convention;
- Factsheets based on the new POPs and factsheets on each of the guidance documents;
- Progress reports submitted by UNITAR to UNIDO as part of UNITAR's obligations in terms of the sub-contract between the two organizations;
- Documentation outlining the proceedings and outcomes from the pilot testing of the guidance documents conducted in Nigeria, India and Serbia;
- Documents related to the pilot workshops, including agendas and attendance lists;
- Comments on guidance documents submitted by stakeholders in Serbia;
- Document summarising comments from the peer review process;
- Case studies based on the POP-PBDE inventory process in the transport sector and the electronic sector in Nigeria;
- Preliminary POP-PBDE Inventory in the Transport Sector in Nigeria; and
- Documents on the GEF Project and Programmatic Approach Cycles, Excerpts from the GEF Focal Area Results Framework and other documents regarding GEF project approvals and reporting.

The evaluation benefitted from twenty five open-ended interviews with key stakeholders. Fourteen of these interviews, with the following stakeholders were conducted via the medium of Skype:

- UNITAR project manager and drafter;
- Representative from the Secretariat for the Stockholm Convention, who was designated as a focal point for this project;
- Three international experts contracted as lead authors;
- One international expert who made input in the guidance document;

- Four UNIDO staff members who participated in the project in various capacities;
- Two representatives from pilot countries;
- One representative of a Stockholm Convention Regional Centre;
- One peer reviewer who reviewed and made comments on the quality of the guidance documents.

Eleven face-to-face interviews were conducted on the mission to Vienna and Geneva, two with representatives of the Secretariat for the Stockholm Convention, eight with key stakeholders within UNIDO and one with an industry representative who participated in the process of developing and reviewing the guidance documents. The large number of UNIDO staff members directly involved with this project, either as project co-ordination staff or participants in the drafting and reviewing process, testifies to the importance of the project to UNIDO as an organization as well as the intensity of work on the project.

Please refer to Annex B for a list of stakeholders who participated in the evaluation process.

1.3 Methodological remarks and validity of the findings

- The stakeholder interviews and the mission to Vienna and Geneva were conducted in the period mid-August 2012 to the end of the first week in September 2012. This period coincided with the 'summer vacation' period in Western Europe, making it difficult to access some stakeholders.
- The project was truly a global project in that it drew in expertise and stakeholders from around the world. It was therefore necessary that the larger number of stakeholder interviews be conducted via Skype, after the project evaluator contacted stakeholders via e-mail in order to schedule the interview.

The project evaluation was therefore highly dependent on stakeholders' professionalism and commitment to the project, as demonstrated by their response (or lack thereof) to electronic communication. This evaluation was therefore more successful in arranging and undertaking interviews with stakeholders who were more integrally involved in the project rather than those who had a more limited engagement in the project. For example, interviews with international consultants who were commissioned to write the guidance documents were easier to arrange than stakeholders from countries in which the pilots were conducted. This problem might therefore result in a positive bias in the project evaluation.

- The management process within this project evaluation called for the project evaluator to contact potential interviewees via e-mail, to introduce herself and the evaluation process and to request an interview. This process of 'cold-calling' stakeholders is likely to have resulted in a lower success rate in arranging interviews compared to a process in which a member of project staff, who is already known to a stakeholder, makes the request for the interview after explaining the need for the project evaluation and the process to be followed. Again, the process followed resulted in those with a greater involvement in the project being more likely to respond to the request for an interview and might therefore have led to a positive bias in the evaluation results.
- The project evaluator was unable to interview anybody who was directly involved in the project design phase within the three main partner organizations, UNIDO, UNITAR, and the SSC. This was due to the fact that some staff members had resigned from the organization, while others had moved to new positions or roles within their respective organizations. Staff members who were still within their organizations were contacted for an interview, with little success.

2.

Project Context

2.1 Stockholm Conference on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)

The Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants was adopted in 2001 in order to catalyse and co-ordinate global action on protecting human health and the environment from persistent organic pollutants (POPs). POPs are organic chemical substances that are resistant to environmental degradation through chemical, biological and photolytic processes. Their long-term stability in the environment and their ability to move through water, air, soil, and food chains allows POPs to pervade even those regions and ecosystems that have not had direct exposure to these chemicals. POPs are able to bio-accumulate and bio-magnify in human and animal fatty tissues and have the potential to adversely affect human and animal health². Exposure to high levels of POPs may cause cancer, damage to the nervous system, reproductive disorders, or disruption of the immune system³.

The Stockholm Convention entered into force in 2004 and has since been ratified by 178 Parties, who have committed themselves to abiding by the provisions of the Convention, thereby limiting the use, generation and production of the persistent organic pollutants listed in the Convention within their borders. The Stockholm Convention originally listed 12 POPs: aldrin, chlordane, DDT, dieldrin, dioxins, endrin, furans, heptachlor, hexachlorobenzene, mirex, polychlorinated biphenyls and toxaphene. In 2009, the COP added a further 9 chemicals to the Convention: chlordecone, lindane, alpha hexachlorocyclohexane, beta hexachlorocyclohexane, commercial pentabromodiphenyl ether, commercial octabromodiphenyl ether, hexabromobiphenyl, perfluorooctane sulfonic acid, its salts and perfluorooctane sulfonyl fluoride and pentachlorobenzene. COP5 approved the addition of endosulfan to the list of chemicals in April 2011.

Article 7 of the Stockholm Convention stipulates that each Party should develop a National Implementation Plan (NIP) in order to understand the extent and nature of the POP-related issues within their country and to develop an action plan to address these issues. Moreover, the annex to decision SC-1/12 of the COP stipulates that this plan should be reviewed and updated if new POPs are added to the Convention and that such updated NIPs should be submitted to the

²http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Persistent_organic_pollutant

³WHO (2010) Persistent Organic Pollutants: Impacts on Child Health. World Health Organization. Geneva, cited in UNIDO Evaluation Group (2010) Thematic Evaluation of UNIDO Work in the Area of Persistent Organic Pollutants, Draft Report.

Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention within two years of the amendments entering into force. Parties to the Stockholm Convention were therefore expected to submit updated NIPs that included action plans for addressing the production, use and generation of the newly listed POPs by 26 August 2012.

The following guidance documents were developed and adopted by the COP in order to guide Parties in the process of developing their original National Implementation Plans:

- Guidance for developing a National Implementation Plan;
- Guidance for the review and updating of national implementation plans;
- Elaborated process of reviewing and updating national implementation plans;
- Guidance on social and economic assessment in the development and implementation of their national implementation plans; and
- Additional guidance on the calculation of action plan costs, including incremental costs and action plans for specific persistent organic pollutants⁴.

While these documents assisted Parties in developing their National Implementation Plans for the original 12 POPs, they did not provide sufficient guidance to Parties in terms of new POPs, which include industrial chemicals that are still widely used in many sectors. The collection of information regarding the new POPs is therefore likely to be more complicated and more contested, given the complexity of current use and the number of diverse sectors, industries and individual players that have vested interests in the management and use of these chemicals.

Parties to the Stockholm Convention therefore requested guidance in the process of developing inventories of the new POPs and action plans to limit, and eventually eliminate, the use of these chemicals. The project currently under review represents the attempt by the Stockholm Convention Secretariat, together with the GEF Implementing Agency, UNIDO, to meet this demand for information and guidance from Parties.

⁴Project Document: Development of the Guidelines for updating of National Implementation Plans (NIPs) under the Stockholm Convention taking into account the new POPs added to the Convention.

2.2 Sector-specific issues of concern to the project

As noted above, the addition of the new POPs to the Stockholm Convention triggered the need for the review and update of the National Implementation Plans. The amendments to Annex A, B and C of the Convention entered into force on 26 August 2010, thereby necessitating that the vast majority of Parties transmit their amended NIPs to the SSC by 26 August 2012⁵.

The new guidance documents that would guide Parties in the updating of their NIPs therefore needed to be ready well in advance of this date, so as to be available for use in this process within Party countries. The project currently under review began in April 2011 and sought to have these guidance documents ready by March 2012, thereby allowing Parties a period of 6 months in which to update the NIPs. Unfortunately, this target proved to be unrealistic and the guidance documents were completed by September 2012.

Fortuitously for the relevance of these guidance documents, the NIP updating process within most Party countries has been delayed, with only eight Parties having submitted their updated NIPs to the SSC. Discussions with the SSC and UNIDO indicate that GEF has only recently approved funding for a first lot of Parties that are eligible for GEF funding for the process of NIP updating. While the SSC and UNIDO staff members attributed this delay in GEF funding approval to a lack of funds within GEF, the GEF Focal Point within UNIDO indicated that the delays were due to the late submission of project proposals due to the length of time it takes Parties to provide government 'endorsement' of the chosen GEF Implementing Agency (IA) and the length of time for the IA to then put together a project proposal for submission to GEF.

⁵ 19 of the 178 Parties to the Stockholm Convention declared that amendments to Annexes A, B and C will enter into force only upon their ratification of each amendment, so the date of the entry into force of the amendments will differ for these Parties.

3.

Project summary

3.1 Project Fact Sheet

Table 1: Project Fact Sheet⁶

Project Name	Development of the Guidelines for updating of National Implementation Plans (NIPs) under the Stockholm Convention taking into account the new POPs added to the Convention.
Project Objective	To develop a full set of consolidated guidance including new guidance tools and updated existing guidance and to validate them in order to ensure applicability of the guidance which will assist countries in the preparation and updating their NIPs under the Stockholm Convention, considering the new obligation Parties have to comply with the listing of the 9 new POPs. The developed guidance should enable countries to identify chemicals in products/articles, establish inventories and undertake national surveillance of imported products and products in the market to determine if they contain chemicals listed under the Stockholm Convention in order to ensure implementation of Article 3 and control illegal trafficking, to handle production and use, recycling and waste disposal of industrial chemicals including BDEs and PFOS.
Project's GEF ID Number	4410
GEF Agency Project ID	GF/GLO/11/013
Countries	Global
GEF Focal Area and Operational Program	Persistent Organic Pollutants – OP 14
Agency	UNIDO
Other Cooperating Agencies	UNITAR and Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention
Project Approval Date	March, 2011
Date of Project Effectiveness	April, 2011
Project duration	Two years
Total Project Cost	US \$ 1,741,700
GEF Grant Amount	USD 719,000
GEF Project Preparation Grant	US\$ 0

⁶Extracted from Terms of Reference.

Table 2: Dates

Milestone	Expected Date	Actual Date
Agency Approval date	March 2011	31 March 2011
Implementation start	April 2011	19 April 2011
Midterm evaluation	March 2012	July 2012
Project completion	April 2013	
Terminal evaluation completion	October 2013	
Project closing	December 2013	

Table 3: Project Framework

Project Components/ Outcomes	Activity Type	Co- financing (\$)	GEF (\$)	Total (\$)
1. Parties have appropriate guidance for updating their NIPs considering the new POPs added to the Convention	B	347,300	445,000	792,300
2. Strengthening of capacity and validation on the guidance for developing and updating a National Implementation Plan under the Stockholm Convention focusing on new POPs chemicals	B	523,400	214,000	737,400
3. Establishment of project management structure including monitoring and evaluation	B	152,000	60,000	212,000
Total		1,022,700	719,000	1,741,700

Activity types are:

- a) Expert researchers hired;
- b) Technical assistance, workshop, meetings or expert consultation, scientific and technical analysis, expert researchers hired;
- c) Promised co-financing refers to the amount indicated on endorsement/approval.

Table 4: Co-financing

Source of co-finance	Classification	Type	Amount (US\$)
European Commission	Inter-governmental organization	Cash	511,000
		In kind	0
Government of Norway	National Government	Cash	182,000
		In kind	0
Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention	Inter-governmental organization	In Kind	212,700
UNIDO	Implementing Agency	In Kind	95,000
UNITAR	Inter-governmental organization	In Kind	22,000
Sub-total Co-financing			1,022,700

Table 5: Project Costs Paid by UNIDO from GEF Funding (excl. agency support cost)

Budget line	Item	Executed Budget in 2011 US\$	Executed Budget in 2012 US\$	Total Expenditure US\$
1100	International consultants	105,659.59	33,447.71	139,107.30
1500	Travel of project staff	48,937.95	2,418.09	51,356.04
1700	Consultants	0	0	0
2100	Subcontracts	239,000	101,000	340,000
3300-3400	Training	0	0	0
3500	Meetings & Workshops	62,765.66	0	62,765.66
4500	Equipment	0	0	0
5100	Sundries	6,457.79	0	6,457.79
	TOTAL	462,820.99	136,865.8	599,686.79

Figures as of 16 Feb 2012

3.2 Project Description

At its fourth meeting in 2010, the Conference of the Parties (COP) agreed to add a further nine Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) to Annex A, B, and C of the Stockholm Convention. Another POP, endosulfan, was added to the Convention in 2011. The addition of these new POPs meant that Parties to the Convention were obliged to review and update their National Implementation Plans (NIPs) within two years of the amendments entering into force, i.e. by 26 August 2012.

In recent years, several guidance documents have been developed and adopted by the COP in order to assist parties to develop National Implementation Plans for the management of POPs. However, these guidance documents revolved around the management of the original 12 POPs listed in the Convention and therefore focused on the management of chemicals that were no longer actively in use. The addition of the new POPs to the Convention means that Parties have to deal with greater levels of complexity in gathering information on, monitoring and regulating the use and disposal of POPs that are widely used as industrial chemicals.

This project, the “Development of Guidelines for the Updating of National Implementation Plans (NIPs) under the Stockholm Convention, taking into account the new POPs added to the Convention” sought to provide a complete set of guidelines to Parties, in order to enable them to meet their obligations to update their NIPs. The project therefore set out to produce the following new guidance documents:

- Guidance for establishing inventory of products/articles containing new POPs and industrial processes using new POPs;
- General guidance for customs on use of commercial/trade names;
- Guidance for strengthening regulatory framework to enable regular monitoring of imported products/articles that may contain new POPs;
- Guidance on labelling of products/articles that contain new POPs or use new POPs during manufacture;
- Guidance for BAT and BEP for production and use of PFOS;
- Guidance for BAT and BEP for the recycling and waste disposal of articles containing POP-PBDEs;
- Database with readily accessible international information useful for development of NIPs.

The project also undertook to review and update the existing guidance documents for the development of NIPs:

- UNEP/POPS/COP.2/INF/7 “Guidance for developing a National Implementation Plan”;
- Annex to decision SC-1/12 “Guidance for the review and updating of national implementation plans”;

- Annex to decision SC-2/7 “Elaborated process of reviewing and updating national implementation plans”;
- UNEP/POPS/COP.3/INF/8 “Guidance on social and economic assessment in the development and implementation of their national implementation plans”;
- UNEP/POPS/COP.4/INF/11 “Additional guidance on the calculation of action plan costs, including incremental costs and action plans for specific persistent organic pollutants”.

According to the timelines established in the project document, the project sought to develop a first version of the guidelines and test these documents via a pilot project in a member country before COP5. The revised documents were then to be submitted to the COP for consideration in April 2011.

Further testing of the guidance documents was then planned to be undertaken via pilot projects conducted in another two countries after COP5 in order to test the applicability of the guidelines to different global regions. These pilot projects were supposed to test the practicality and usability of the methodologies proposed in the guidance documents in order to ensure that the documents would properly address the needs of all Parties, including developing countries and economies in transition.

The project document indicates that training material, based on the guidance documents would be created as an output of the project and that these materials would be utilised for the training to be undertaken within pilot countries, through participating Stockholm Convention Regional Centres. Stakeholders involved in the pilot projects would provide comments on the guidance documents in order to allow the drafting organizations to improve the usability and quality of these documents. The improved version of the guidance documents would then be translated into six official languages of the United Nations by March 2012 in order to allow Parties to review and submit their updated NIPs to the SSC by the end of August 2012.

3.3 Project implementation modalities

UNIDO acted as the GEF Implementing Agency (IA) for the project, accessed GEF funding for medium sized projects and was responsible for overall project management and delivery of the project. In addition, UNIDO commissioned, directed and managed international experts and Expert Working Group members to prepare the following guidance documents:

- Guidance for the inventory of perfluorooctane sulfonic acid (PFOS) and related chemicals listed under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants;
- Guidance for the inventory of polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs) listed under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutant;
- Guidelines on best available techniques and best environmental practices for the production and use of perfluorooctane sulfonic acid (PFOS) and related chemicals listed under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants;
- Guidelines on best available techniques and best environmental practices for the recycling and disposal of articles containing polybrominated diphenyl ethers (PBDEs) listed under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants.

UNITAR was subcontracted by UNIDO to act as Executing Agency for specific project deliverables:

- Guidance for Developing, Reviewing, and Updating a National Implementation Plan for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants;
- Guidance for the control of the import and export of POPs;
- Guidance for strengthening the regulatory framework/voluntary agreements regulating the monitoring of products/articles that contain or may contain new POPs;
- Guidance on labelling of products or articles that contain new POPs or use new POPs during manufacture;
- Testing the use of the guidelines in field by undertaking pilot projects in three countries;
- Develop approach for capacity strengthening to implement the guidance, including developing training materials and providing trainings to the Stockholm Convention Regional Centres.

The Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention provided technical support and policy guidance to the drafters of the guidance documents. As the ultimate client and 'owner' of the guidance documents produced, the SSC was responsible for ensuring legal compliance of the guideline documents with the provisions of the Stockholm Convention. The SSC was also responsible for co-ordinating the translation of the guidance documents.

Interviews with key stakeholders indicated that UNIDO and UNITAR adopted different modalities in developing the respective guideline documents for which they were responsible. UNITAR recruited two international experts, one of whom was given the responsibility for developing the guidance documents on the control of trade in new POPs and the labelling of articles containing new POPs, while the other was responsible for the development of the guidelines on the regulatory framework for the monitoring of products containing POPs.

The responsibility for the updating of the existing guidance documents on the development of NIPs was assigned to a UNITAR staff manager who also acted as UNITAR's project manager for this project. This group of three professionals worked independently on their respective documents and referred to relevant industry experts on a one-to-one basis, as necessary. Members of this three-member group reviewed and made inputs into the work done by the other two members and submitted their work for review by the broader team at the 'Experts drafting workshops', as well as peer reviewers.

The UNIDO approach differed, in that UNIDO used a much larger group of experts and convened meetings that drew together a number of experts from international organizations, academia and the private sector in order to make input into the process of drafting the guidance documents. Most of the people drawn together for discussions at two 'Expert Drafting Workshops'⁷ in the first eight months of the project were not contracted to the project or UNIDO, but had their costs associated with attending the workshops paid from the project budget.

This approach appears to have been necessary since the subject matter at hand, the creation of inventories of POPs that are still in wide use, as well as the identification of best available technologies and best environmental practises in dealing with these POPs is very complex and constitutes a new learning area for which expertise is not readily available, either within UNIDO or outside the organization. However, this mode of implementation slowed down the drafting process somewhat, since experts who were contributing to the guidance documents had other jobs that took precedence over this process.

UNIDO then identified four lead authors to lead the drafting of the different guidance documents, along with a number of other experts who were expected to contribute to different chapters of the guidance documents, for example, the management of PBDEs in the electrical and electronic equipment and related waste sector. For the next ten months of the drafting process, UNIDO used smaller groups for direct input into the drafting process and accessed wider expertise through the peer review process, in which identified experts were sent relevant guidance documents for review and comment.

⁷It should be noted that the UNITAR drafters also participated in these workshops and had input from the various experts convened by UNIDO; so the processes of the two organizations, while different, did overlap and share common points.

3.4 Major changes to project implementation

- The project did not submit Version 1 of the guidance documents to COP5 for consideration, as planned in the project document, since the guidelines had not been drafted at the time of the sitting of the COP.
- The activities involved in the testing of the guidelines through the three pilot projects were truncated in order to have the guidelines ready for use by Parties as soon as possible. The pilot projects therefore did not use the guidelines to undertake the review and updating of their NIPs or to fully address particular issues in the management of new POPs, for example the establishment of a monitoring system for products being produced or traded that might contain new POPs. The time constraints experienced by the project therefore limited the testing of the guidance documents prepared. For instance, interviewees estimated that an inventory process for new POPs would require between six and twelve months to undertake, time that was not available to the project.
- UNIDO and SSC agreed during project implementation that Output 1.6, the development of a “Database with readily accessible international information useful for developing and updating NIPs under the Stockholm Convention”, which was to include a list of available technology and vendors for recycling and disposal of new POPs, was not feasible within the ambit of the project. UNIDO and SSC feared that such a list would imply endorsement of the technologies used by the listed firms, even though the necessary due diligence could not be undertaken during the project timeframes.
- SSC and UNITAR agreed during project implementation that the project should focus on producing good quality and robust guidance documents rather than the production of training material, given the time and budget constraints experienced. UNITAR did produce presentations that were used in the workshops in the pilot countries, as well as factsheets on the new POPs and each of the guidance documents, but these do not constitute a package of participatory training material that can be used to enable stakeholders in developing countries to understand and use the guidance documents.
- The Stockholm Convention Regional Centres were not included in the implementation of the pilot projects to the full extent originally envisaged in the project document due to the fact that the time constraints rendered it unfeasible to involve a wider grouping of stakeholders in the implementation of the pilot exercises.
- The existing guidance document, the “Guidance on social and economic assessment in the development and implementation of their national implementation plans”, was not reviewed and updated by UNITAR, under instruction from the SSC, since the Secretariat received no comments from Parties reflecting on how the document could/should be improved.

3.5 Alignment of the Project with other Initiatives

The project document indicates that the listing of the new POPs gave rise to a number of initiatives in order to collect information on and provide guidance to Parties on how to restrict and eliminate these new POPs. The SSC produced a document that reflected on: (a) the possible health and environmental impacts of recycling articles containing POP-BDEs; (b) the long-term environmental desirability of the recycling of articles containing POP-BDEs and (c) the best available technology and best environmental practices for the recycling of articles containing POP-BDEs.

The project document also lists a number of other relevant guidance materials:

- Guidance on considerations related to alternatives and substitutes for listed persistent organic pollutants and candidate chemicals: 2009 (UNEP/POPS/POPRC.5/10/Add.1).
- Guidance on feasible flame-retardant alternatives to commercial pentabromodiphenyl ether: 2009 (UNEP/POPS/COP.4/INF24).
- Guidance on information collection for the 9 new POPs: Draft March 2010.
- Draft guidance document on alternatives to perfluorooctane sulfonic acid (PFOS) and its derivatives: POPRC6 in October 2010.
- Compilation of the Risk Management Evaluations of the 9 new POPs: 2005-2008 (POPRC1-POPRC4).
- Reviewing and reporting requirements for the use of lindane for human health pharmaceuticals for the control of head lice and scabies as a second line treatment: to be prepared by the COP5 in April 2011.

In their oversight role, the SSC actively worked to ensure complementarity between these different initiatives and to ensure that projects did not overlap and 'reinvent the wheel'. For example, the SSC has currently commissioned consultants to develop a Toolkit for the World Customs Organization that will reflect on the custom needs and considerations of all three conventions, the Stockholm Convention, the Basel Convention and the Rotterdam Convention. Interviews with the SSC indicated that staff worked with the UNITAR drafters in order to ensure that the documents reflecting on the monitoring of new POPs, as well as the guidance document on the control of the import and export of POPs went beyond the information provided in the Toolkit and added value to the process.

In addition, the drafters of the respective guidance documents within this project referred to the documents produced by the initiatives listed above and cited these documents as reference documents. It is interesting to note that three of the lead drafters working for UNITAR and UNIDO on the current project are also involved in the delivery of other initiatives underway, like the guidance document on alternatives to perfluorooctane sulfonic acid (PFOS), the guidance on alternatives and substitutes for listed POPs and a guidance document on the analysis of new POPs in products and articles. One of the lead authors is also working on the development of an e-based inventory of POPs within the European Union. The involvement of the same experts over a number of projects is due to the fact that only a very small pool of expertise is currently available on the management

of POPs, especially the new POPs. On the positive side, the presence of the same experts over a number of projects would allow for greater coherence and co-ordination between these initiatives.

As noted earlier, the addition of the new POPs to the Stockholm Convention has necessitated the review and updating of their NIPs by countries that are parties to the convention. The guidance documents that have been produced by this project will provide guidance to Parties on how to undertake this update. This project will therefore affect the implementation of a number of other projects that will seek to update the NIPs for different Parties. These updates are likely to be undertaken by a number of the GEF Implementing Agents, including UNIDO. UNIDO currently has a big pipeline of NIP update projects under preparation. UNIDO recently received GEF approval for 10 NIP update projects; while a further 10 project applications have been submitted to GEF for consideration. An estimated 30 NIP update project applications are still in the process of being prepared. The guidance documents prepared by the current project under evaluation will therefore feed directly into the implementation of a large number of UNIDO projects. This project was therefore a project of great importance for UNIDO, as demonstrated by the fact that the head of the Stockholm Convention Unit was first designated as the project manager for this project. Moreover, a large number of UNIDO staff has played a role on this project, either as co-ordinators of the drafting process, participants in the drafting meetings or as reviewers of the guidance documents. In mid-September 2012, UNIDO undertook training for staff members who will manage NIP updating project on the use of the guidance documents.

3.6 Partner Organizations

United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR)

UNITAR undertook the development of three new guidance documents:

- Guidance for the control of the import and export of POPs;
- Guidance for strengthening the regulatory framework/voluntary agreements regulating the monitoring of products/articles that contain or may contain new POPs;
- Guidance on labelling of products or articles that contain new POPs or use new POPs during manufacture.

UNITAR also updated a fourth document, the 'Guidance for Developing, Reviewing, and Updating a National Implementation Plan for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants'. In addition, they worked closely with the UNIDO consultants in preparing presentations on each guidance document, as well as factsheets on each of the new POPs and each guidance document. UNITAR also worked with the SSC in conducting the workshops in the three pilot countries, Nigeria, Serbia and India.

In addition, UNITAR also conducted an additional workshop in Algeria for customs officials, with funding from a different source. This workshop included training regulating the monitoring of products that might contain new POPs, the control of the import and the export of POPs and the development of inventories for new POPs. UNITAR was commended by UNIDO and other stakeholders the delivery of high quality outputs by a small number of people.

Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention (SSC)

The SSC was mainly responsible for quality control on the guidance documents prepared and ensured that the documents were compliant with the legal provisions of the Convention and that they would be useful to the Parties to the Convention. The SSC also took the lead in the implementation of the pilot workshops, the costs of which were covered from funding from the European Commission which was managed by the SSC. Since the SSC prepared the Small Scale Funding Agreements for these pilot projects, it made more sense that they take the lead in this process, rather than UNITAR. UNITAR did, however, maintain primary responsibility for delivering and conducting the content of the workshops. Overall, stakeholders indicated that they were satisfied with the role played by SSC even though the restructuring of the Secretariat meant that co-operation and inputs from the larger organization was sometimes delayed. At the beginning of the project, a formal letter had to be issued from UNIDO to the SSC formally requesting that the SSC send a representative to project meetings since the restructuring meant that individuals within the organization did not feel able to co-operate with the project without formal authorization from the Executive Director.

Stockholm Convention Regional Centres

The project document envisaged that three Regional Centres would collaborate with the project in the testing of the guidance documents in three pilot countries. RECETOX, the Stockholm Convention Regional Centre based in the Czech Republic was commissioned by the SSC to organise and manage the pilot workshops held in Serbia and India. The workshop in India involved the Indian Regional Centre and was also attended by the Regional Centre from Indonesia. The Regional Centre from China was also invited to attend the workshop in India, but was unable to attend due to delays in securing visas. Three Stockholm Convention Regional Centres out of fifteen were therefore exposed to the guidance documents produced by the project through their involvement in the pilot projects.

Global Environment Facility (GEF)

The GEF approved US\$719,000 for the funding of this medium sized project on 9 February 2011. Other than the approval and transfer of funding, the GEF has been markedly absent during the implementation of the project. The UNIDO project manager indicated that GEF requested a copy of the first draft of guidance documents produced and that these were submitted to GEF via the UNIDO GEF Co-ordination Unit in December 2011. However, UNIDO did not receive any input in response to this submission.

According to GEF reporting requirements, Implementing Agents are required to submit an overview on the implementation status of all funded projects within September of any given year. This overview reflects on the implementation of projects within GEF's preceding financial year, which runs from 1 July to 30 June. Implementing agents are expected to report on projects that were under implementation for at least six months during the course of the year. Since implementation of this project began in April 2011, the project was under implementation for only three months within the July 2010-June 2011 financial year and UNIDO was not required to submit an update on the project in September 2011. This means that the first project status update will be submitted to GEF in September 2012, 18 months after the start of project implementation and after all project activities have been completed, except for the translation of the guidance documents.

While this is in keeping with GEF's approach that Implementing Agencies take charge of project execution, while GEF manages their portfolio of projects, a reporting system that allows a project to go this long without reporting to a funder is very high risk from a funder's point of view. The UNIDO GEF Coordinator indicated that GEF recently started undertaking 'learning missions' that allow GEF to understand how their projects are implemented and operate 'on the ground' in order to inform future strategies and programme. Thus far, the GEF 'chemicals team' has undertaken one such mission to UNIDO projects in China and Vietnam.

4.

Project Assessment

4.1. Relevance

Relevance to International Management of POPs

The Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants is the means by which the global community has been able to mobilise and co-ordinate international action in addressing the threat to the environment and human health posed by exposure to persistent organic pollutants. The Convention has been able to secure commitment to its provisions by 178 Party countries, thereby ensuring an extensive international effort to reduce and eventually eliminate the use, production and generation of POPs.

The National Implementation Plan (NIP) that each Party is required to prepare represents the principal tool used by the Stockholm Convention in order to compel Parties to systematically address the issue of reducing the use and production of POPs within their boundaries. The process of preparing the NIPs involves research into and the quantification of the POP related problems and issues within a country; as well as the development of action plans to address these POP-related problems. The NIPs are therefore vital to the reduction and eventual elimination of listed POPs internationally.

Given the limited expertise available in the management of POPs, especially within developing countries and countries with economies in transition, the guidance documents adopted by the COP are instrumental in guiding Parties in the process of developing useful NIPs that can be implemented. This project, which produced guidance documents to guide Parties in the development of inventories and action plans for the introduction of best alternative technologies (BATs) and best environmental practises in managing and reducing the use of new POPs, was therefore highly relevant to the international control, management and eventual elimination of the newly listed POPs added to the Stockholm Convention in 2009.

Relevance to the Updating of NIPs in Response to Addition of New POPs

The addition of the new POPs to the Stockholm Convention triggered the need for Parties to review and update their NIP, in order to develop management plans for these new POPs. The amendments to Annex A, B and C of the Convention entered into force on 26 August 2010, thereby necessitating that the vast majority of Parties transmit their amended NIPs to the SSC by 26 August 2012.

The new guidance documents that would guide Parties in the updating of their NIPs therefore needed to be ready well in advance of this date, so as to be available for use in this process within Party countries. The project therefore sought to have these guidance documents ready by March 2012, thereby allowing Parties a period of 6 months in which to update the NIPs. Unfortunately, this target proved to be unrealistic and the guidance documents were completed only in September 2012.

Fortuitously for the relevance of these guidance documents to the current round of NIP updates, the NIP updating process within most Party countries has been delayed. Of the 178 Parties to the Convention, 19 members have declared that amendments to Annexes A, B and C will enter into force only upon their ratification of the amendments. Three of these 19 members have since ratified the amendments, while New Zealand has indicated that it is currently unable to accept the amendments. Currently therefore, 162 Parties are obliged to review and update their NIPs for resubmission to the SSC. Only eight of these 162 Parties have revised and submitted their NIPs to the SSC⁸, indicating that 154 Parties have yet to review and update their NIPs. Thus, the guidance documents developed through this project will be directly relevant and available for use in the 154 NIP update processes that are legally required and should therefore be imminent.

The project was therefore highly relevant to the objectives of the Stockholm Convention, the Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention and Parties to the Convention since it will enable Parties to meet their obligations in terms of the Convention, leading to the eventual reduction and elimination of POPs.

Relevance to GEF

According to GEF's Operation Programme on Persistent Organic Pollutants (OP #14), POPs was designated as one of the GEF's six focal areas at the meeting of the GEF Assembly in October 2002. This designation allows the GEF to provide financial assistance to developing countries and countries with economies in transition in order to develop and implement activities on POPs and on the management of chemicals. Operational Programme #14 defines eight principles that will guide GEF assistance to eligible countries. The first principle is articulated as follows:

“(a) Strong country commitment and ownership is essential for the effective implementation of POPs reduction/elimination activities. Priority policy and regulatory reforms, capacity building, and investment needs identified in a country's NIP will be the primary framework for GEF support.”

All the POP activities financed by GEF will therefore have been identified and contained within an eligible country's National Implementation Plan. The NIP

⁸<http://chm.pops.int/Implementation/NIPs/NIPSubmissions/tabid/253/Default.aspx>

document therefore represents the starting point for any POPs related activity that the GEF will finance within eligible countries. The NIP is therefore an integral instrument for both, the Party Country, as well as the GEF, in as much as it provides guidance to the GEF in the identification of POPs projects for financing within eligible countries. The updating of the NIPs in order to develop action plans for the management of the new POPs is therefore an essential step before the GEF is able to finance new POPs related projects within Party countries. This project, which developed guidelines to assist Parties in the process of updating their NIPs is therefore highly relevant to the work of the GEF.

Relevance to UNIDO

The work undertaken by UNIDO focuses on three main thematic areas, one of which is 'Energy and the Environment'. Under this thematic area, the three services provided by the organization are:

- (a) Cleaner and sustainable production;
- (b) Water management; and
- (c) Persistent Organic Pollutants and Persistent Toxic Substances.

The POPs related work undertaken by UNIDO is managed through the Stockholm Convention Unit (SCU). A large part of the work undertaken by this Unit is funded by GEF and involves assistance to eligible Party countries in developing their National Implementation Plans. For example, the UNIDO website lists 21 NIPs across five global regions that have been developed and submitted with the assistance of UNIDO.

UNIDO's involvement in the updating of the NIPS in order to take into account the new POPs is likely to be even larger. Discussions with UNIDO staff indicate that the GEF has just approved ten NIP update projects that will be managed by UNIDO, while UNIDO has another 50, or so, NIP project applications under development currently. The development of the guideline documents to guide the NIP update process is therefore highly relevant to UNIDO and to the Stockholm Convention Unit within UNIDO. The importance of this project for the SCU and UNIDO was demonstrated by the fact that the project was originally managed by the SCU Unit Chief even though this was only a medium-sized Project (MSP).

4.2 Effectiveness

Outputs and outcomes: The project document indicates that an M&E system with measurable OVIs would be established at the start of project implementation. However, this system was not established, so this evaluation uses the OVIs linked to activities in the Project Results Framework from the project document in order to assess this issue.

Table 6: Achievement of Project Outputs and Outcomes based on Project Results Framework⁹

	OVIs	Achieved
Outcome 1: Development of specific guidance on new POPs, updating existing guidance with the information related to new POPs and preparation of an integrated package		Yes
Output 1.1: “Guidance for establishing inventory of products/articles containing new POPs and industrial processes using new POPs” developed	Compilation of international information prepared	Yes
	List of known uses of products/articles containing new POPs	Yes
	List of wastes and stockpiles potentially containing new POPs	Yes
	Questionnaire for information collection developed	Yes
	Version 1 of Guidance for establishing inventory of products/articles containing new POPs prepared	Yes
Output 1.2: “General guidance for customs on use of commercial/trade names” developed	Current status of nomenclature, commercial/trade names used for new POPs reviewed	Yes
	Version 1 of the Guidance in English prepared	Yes
	Translation of revised version 1 of “General guidance for customs on use of commercial/trade names” translated in six UN languages	N/a ¹⁰
Output 1.3: “Guidance for strengthening regulatory framework to enable regular monitoring of imported products/articles that may contain new POPs” developed	Gaps on existing regulatory framework / voluntary agreements identified	Yes
	Decision tree and tool/manual	Yes
	Version 1 of the Guidance in English prepared	Yes
	Translation of revised version1 of “Guidance for strengthening regulatory framework/voluntary agreements for regular monitoring of imported products/articles that may contain new POPs” in English” in six UN languages	N/a ¹¹

⁹The information in this table is based on the assessment of the UNIDO & SSC project managers, and the judgement of the evaluator.

¹⁰Version 1 of the guidance documents was to be translated into the six UN languages in order to submit them to COP5 for review. Since Version 1of the documents were produced too late for submission to COP5, the translation of the documents was no longer necessary.

¹¹Please see footnote 4 above.

	OVI	Achieved
Output 1.4: "Guidance on labelling of products/articles that contain new POPs or use new POPs during manufacture" developed	Current practices on labelling of products / articles that contain new POPs assessed	Yes
	List of uses of new POPs during manufacturing process	Partly
	Version 1 of "Guidance on labelling of products/articles that contain new POPs or use new POPs during manufacture" prepared	Yes
	Translation of revised version 1 of "Guidance on labelling of products/articles that contain new POPs or use new POPs during manufacture" in six UN languages	N/a ¹²
Output 1.5: Guidance for best available technology and best environmental practices for industrial chemicals developed	Information on BAT/BEP for production and use of PFOS compiled	Yes
	Version 1 of "Guidance on BAT/BEP for production and use of PFOS" developed	Yes
	Version 1 of "Guidance for BAT/BEP of recycling and waste disposal of articles containing BDEs" developed	Yes
	Translation of revised version 1 of the two Guidance documents in six UN languages	N/a ¹³
Output 1.6: Database with readily accessible international information useful for developing and updating National Implementation Plans(NIPs) under the Stockholm Convention in place	List of available technology and vendors for recycling and disposal	No
	List of options for control measures to eliminate/restrict production and use of new POPs	Yes, outside project ¹⁴
	List of replacement to new POPs including alternative chemicals and processes prepared in due time	Yes, outside project
	Version 1 of a database and websites with cross-links prepared	Partly, outside project
Output 1.7: Updated and consolidated package of "Guidance for developing and updating a National Implementation Plan (NIP) under the Stockholm Convention" taking into account the new POPs added to the Convention, prepared	Version 2 of the guidance in English (listed above) prepared	Yes
	Publications in hard copies and electronic format available online	Underway ¹⁵
	Translation of updated and consolidated "Guidance for developing and updating National Implementation Plans (NIPs)" under the Stockholm Convention into Arabic, Chinese, French, Spanish, and Russian	Underway

¹²Please see footnote 4 above.

¹³ The project document foresaw that Version 1 of the guidance documents was to be translated and submitted to COP5 for review. In practise, since version 1 of the documents was prepared too late for submission to COP5, the translations were no longer necessary.

¹⁴Since the SSC had oversight over a number of projects related to the management of new POPs, they were able to make informed judgements about the generation/collection of information by other means and ensure that efforts were not duplicated.

¹⁵It is now SSC policy that documents will no longer be published in hard copies, given environmental concerns associated with this practise.

	OVIs	Achieved
Outcome 2: Strengthening of capacity and validation of the guidance documents for developing and updating a NIP under the Stockholm Convention focusing on new POPs chemicals		Partly¹⁶
Output 2.1: Approach for capacity strengthening to implement the updated and consolidated “guidance for developing a National Implementation Plan under the Stockholm Convention taking into account the new POPs added to the Convention” established	Gaps in existing capacity in establishing inventory/ conducting regular monitoring through Stockholm Convention Regional Centres identified	Partly ¹⁷
	Training package including instructional book, training programme, presentation slides prepared	Partly ¹⁸
	Number of participants; number of relevant institutions represented in the training	149 individuals from 77 institutions ¹⁹
Output 2.2: Feedback and lessons learned from pilot testing of version 1 of the guidance documents in three countries from different regions consolidated	Selection criteria for pilot testing of the version 1 of the guidance document established	Yes
	Terms of reference for pilot testing of Version 1 of the guidance documents prepared	Yes
	MOU with 3 countries selected for pilot testing initiated	Yes
	Consolidated list of pilot inventory of products / articles containing new POPs and processes using new POPs in 3 pilot countries prepared	Partly ²⁰
	Validation of updated and consolidated guidance for developing and updating a NIP and approach for capacity strengthening for implementation	Yes

¹⁶ The SSC indicated that they made a strategic decision to focus project resources on the preparation of quality guidance documents rather than the preparation of the training material and the capacity building approach, given the time and budget constraints faced by the project.

¹⁷ UNITAR and the SSC worked directly with two Stockholm Convention Regional Centres on this project, RECETOX in the Czech Republic and CSIR-NEERI in India. These two RCs were directly involved in the implementation of the pilot projects in Serbia and India. In addition, the Basel Convention Regional Centre in Indonesia attended the pilot workshop in India, while the Regional Centre for the Basel Convention undertook the PBDE inventories as part of the pilot project in Nigeria.

¹⁸ UNITAR prepared presentations and fact sheets on each of the guidance documents, as well as fact sheets on each of the new POP chemicals added to the Stockholm Convention. However, a full training package was not developed due to time and budget constraints.

¹⁹ These figures are based on documentation submitted to the SSC by the relevant SCRC that organised the workshop in each pilot country. However, in Serbia and possibly Nigeria, the list of names refers to participants who were invited to the workshop, rather than the actual attendance list.

²⁰ A preliminary POP-PBDE Inventory for the Transport Sector in Nigeria and a preliminary Inventory of POP-PBDEs in Electrical and Electronic Equipment and Related Wastes in Nigeria has been prepared. The pilot project in India focused on developing the capacity of the SC Regional Centre to undertake screening, sampling and analysis of PBDEs in articles. While the TOR for the Serbian pilot indicated that the SC Regional Centre for Central and Eastern Europe, would submit a report that included a strategic approach to the updating of Serbia’s NIP, as well as a national assessment of new POPs in Serbia and recommendations for their sound management, focussing on PFOS and BDEs, this report appears not to be available.

	OVIs	Achieved
	Feedback on the above guidance received	Yes
Outcome 3: Establishment of project management structure including monitoring and evaluation		Partly
Output 3.1: Project management structure established	PSC established including list of members	Yes
	TORs and contracts of technical experts and working groups prepared	Yes
Output 3.2: An M&E mechanism according to GEF M&E procedures designed and implemented	Updated impact indicators	No
	Annual reports and PIRs completed	Still to be under-taken ²¹
	Annual PSC meetings held	Yes
	Audit reports result prepared in due time	Still to be under-taken as part of UNIDO audit
	Mid-term evaluation completed	Yes
	Final evaluation held	Still to be under-taken
	Project terminal report completed	Still to be under-taken
	Financial audit completed	Still to be under-taken as part of UNIDO audit
	Dedicated MIS established and information disseminated	UNIDO & SSC websites to be used

²¹ According to GEF reporting procedures the first Project Implementation Report for this project is due in December 2012. See section 5 on 'Partner Organizations' for more detail.

A review of the table above indicates that the project has been effective in producing guidance documents that are deemed to be robust and of good quality by stakeholders, despite the complexity of the subject matter and the difficulty of making the guidance documents relevant to very different countries in the developed and developing worlds. The project has also been effective in utilising the momentum of on-going processes in three countries, Nigeria, India and Serbia, to test the quality of the guidance documents and to add value to processes underway in the pilot countries. The pilot projects and the peer review process has led to extensive feedback from experts as well as different user groups, like stakeholders working in the chemical management field who do not have a technical background in chemistry. This feedback process has improved the quality of the guidance documents and improved their usability.

The pilot project processes engaged two Stockholm Convention Regional Centres, RECETOX, the Regional Centre for Central and Eastern Europe and CSIR-NEERI, the Regional Centre for India in the implementation of the pilot projects and in building awareness around processes to manage the new POPs. In addition, the pilot projects involved the Basel Convention Regional Centres for Nigeria and South-East Asia in the pilot workshops and in some associated activity. The pilot projects therefore built capacity within four regional centres for the management of NIP update processes and the management of new POPs.

In accordance with the project document, the project sought to produce the necessary guidance documents by March 2012, which would have allowed Parties five months in which to update their NIPs and transmit it to the SSC by the due date at the end of August 2012. Since the implementation of this project began on 19 April 2011, this called for a drastic compression of project activities and called for trade-offs during project implementation. The SSC reported that they therefore made a conscious decision to focus on the development of high quality guidance documents, rather than to undertake capacity building activities included in the project document at that time. The project has therefore been only partly effective in capacity building and the creation of training material to facilitate the use of the guidelines.

Despite the fact that a number of stakeholders and peer reviewers have judged the guidance documents to be of good quality, the guidance documents would be deemed to be *effective* only if they are used and provide proper guidance to the NIP update processes in Party countries. The impact of the guidance documents can therefore be measured only through the quality of the NIPs produced using the guidance documents and the success of the NIP update process in mobilising sustained action in the management and elimination of POPs within Party countries. Reviewers/stakeholders within the pilot countries have indicated that the complexity of the subject matter and the consequent difficulty for laymen to follow the guidance documents would necessitate training for stakeholders in order to enable stakeholders in the developing context to properly utilise the guidance documents.

It is therefore necessary that the SSC and UNIDO invest in the development of adequate training material and capacity building activities in order to ensure that the guidance documents are properly used in the process of updating the NIPs and that the guidance documents are therefore effective in guiding Parties in

developing good quality NIPs and in properly managing and eventually eliminating the production, use and generation of POPs within their borders. It is expected that each NIP update project managed by UNIDO will undertake a terminal project evaluation, according to normal UNIDO practise. The terminal evaluations of the NIP update projects should all include questions that:

- Reflect on whether, how and which of the guidance documents were used in the NIP update process;
- Reflect on the usefulness of the guidance documents utilised;
- Reflect on the effectiveness of the capacity building and training activities undertaken within the Party country; and
- Reflect on how the guidance documents could be improved.

After a significant number of NIP update projects have been evaluated UNIDO should review the results of these evaluations in order to determine whether the guidance documents have been effective in guiding Parties in producing high quality NIPs and in catalysing sustained action to manage POPs within Party countries. The results of this review should be used in order to improve the guidance documents.

The findings of the terminal evaluations of each individual NIP update project will be reported to the GEF as a matter of course, since these projects are being funded by GEF. The findings of the review of these NIP update evaluations should also be shared with GEF since it speaks to the issue of whether the GEF funded project on the development of the guidelines was effective.

Catalytic Effect: The addition of the new POPs to the Stockholm Convention has triggered the need for the review and update of the National Implementation Plans. Of the 178 Parties to the Convention, 19 members have declared that amendments to Annexes A, B and C will enter into force only upon their ratification of the amendments. Three of these 19 members have since ratified the amendments, while New Zealand has indicated that it is currently unable to accept the amendments. Currently therefore, 162 Parties are obliged to review and update their NIPs for resubmission to the SSC. Only eight of these 162 Parties have revised and submitted their NIPs to the SSC²², indicating that 154 Parties have yet to review and update their NIPs. Thus, the guidance documents developed through this project will be directly relevant and available for use in the 154 NIP update processes that are legally required and should therefore be imminent.

²²<http://chm.pops.int/Implementation/NIPs/NIPSubmissions/tabid/253/Default.aspx>

4.3 Efficiency

The project document includes a very detailed project budget that reflects the costs to be incurred in the delivery of each output. These costs are then added together in order to arrive at a total budget cost for each of the three outcomes of the project. This kind of detailed results-based budgeting is not standard UNIDO practise and represents a case of good practise within the parameters of this project.

However, despite this results-based budgeting, the actual financial records of the project reflect the standard UNIDO line items and does not link costs to different outputs. It is therefore not possible to undertake a reflection on the efficiency of the project in turning inputs into project outputs. Such a reflection would have been particularly interesting in the context of this project, given the decision taken during project implementation to focus on the delivery of Outcome 1, the delivery of high quality guidance documents, rather than Outcome 2, the development of training material and capacity building.

Late Start of the Project

The implementation of this project has been late, in that the outputs (guidance documents) have become available later than expected and required, given real world timeframes for related activities, i.e. the updating and submission of Parties' NIPs by 26 August 2012. Almost all stakeholders interviewed mentioned the time pressures faced by the project as the biggest challenge faced during project implementation. This time pressure was generally attributed to a 'delay in funding approval by the GEF'.

However, as indicated previously, the idea for the project was first mooted in discussions between UNIDO and the SSC in May 2009, at COP4, and was based on the COP4 decision SC-4/9 on National Implementation Plans, requesting the Secretariat to identify any additional guidance that might be required to assist Parties in the updating and implementing their NIPs. However, a UNIDO appointed consultant began the preparation of the project document only in July 2010, 15 months later. The evaluator was unable to interview anyone within UNIDO, SSC or UNITAR that was directly involved in the project preparation phase of the project and is therefore unable to advance a reason for this delay.

The project document was submitted to GEF on 28 October 2011 and the GEF Review of the project document was received by UNIDO within 11 working days, on 15 November 2011. This review asked that the project document be revised to exclude the development of methods to analyse new POPs in products/articles. UNIDO undertook the revision of the project document and resubmitted the revised document to GEF on 10 January 2011, almost two months after being informed of the need for the revision. The project was approved by GEF on 9 February 2011, but UNIDO received the commitment letter from the GEF

Trustees a full month later, on 9 March 2011. So, GEF approval of the revised project document took a full two months.

UNIDO then approved the project internally on 31 March 2011 and the Project Allotment Document (PAD) was issued on 19 April 2011, accounting for a further six-week delay before the start of project implementation.

Thus, a review of the work process involved in the preparation of the project document and the approval of project funding indicates that almost 24 months lapsed between initial discussions about the project idea and the start of project implementation. This delay in the start of the project is attributable to both UNIDO and GEF, but the larger part of the delay is attributable to UNIDO, both in the appointment of a consultant to begin the preparation of the project document, but also in the internal approval and financial processes that enables the initiation of a project.

Project Implementation

The project document that was resubmitted to GEF in January 2010 did not revise the original project timeline or activities contained in the first version of the project document and therefore set up totally unreachable targets like the development of the guidance documents and pilot testing in one country to be taken within a month of project initiation, so that the documents could be submitted to COP5 for review. This oversight by UNIDO, as the developers of the project document, and GEF, as the funders of the project document, meant that the project started implementation 'on the back foot' from the outset.

Nonetheless, given the fact that the first deliverable (submission of Version 1 to COP5) was patently unachievable, the project worked toward the finalisation of the guidance documents by March 2012, as envisaged in the project document. Stakeholders reported delays at the beginning of the project but attributed this delay to different causes. Some stakeholders attributed the delay to weak management of the project by UNIDO at the start of the project and indicated that the SSC had to take a firmer hand in ensuring that project decisions were properly recorded and followed through.

UNIDO, on the other hand, attributed the initial lack of momentum on the project to the fact that it was difficult to identify lead authors with the appropriate academic skills and experience in compiling chemical inventories and indicated that the experts originally hired could not give sufficient direction to the drafting process, as originally envisaged. UNIDO indicated that they therefore had to take a more hands-on approach in directing the discussions of the Expert Drafting Group and had to play a bigger role in managing the process, than originally planned. Comments from other stakeholders support the view that UNIDO experienced a challenge in finding the right expertise, especially in terms of experts from developing countries.

Despite these challenges, the project successfully produced the necessary guidance documents within very tight timeframes, with a relatively small delay of

about six months. Given the late start of the project, the project team compressed 24 months of activity into 18 months in order to try to meet the project deadline and so allow project stakeholders time to utilise the guidance documents for the updating of their NIPs.

4.4 Sustainability

Risk that the Guidance Documents will become Outdated

Since the benefits of this project are limited primarily to the documents/outputs (i.e. the guidance documents, related workshop presentations and factsheets), these benefits are by nature fairly stable and long-lasting. However, given the fact that the field of new POPs management is new and incipient, there is a risk that the guidance documents will quickly become outdated, as the field develops and evolves. It is therefore foreseen that the guidance documents will require updating in order to remain current, especially on the issues of best alternative technologies and best environmental practises. The frequency of this updating process will depend on the rate of change in the field of new POPs management, and is hard to predict upfront, but runs the risk of becoming a costly exercise that needs to be repeated often.

However, given the fact that current expertise in the field is limited to a fairly small group of people, many of whom have been engaged via this project, either as drafters, collaborators or as reviewers, it is likely to be fairly easy to establish a Community of Practice, with practitioners focused on generating and sharing learning. Such a Community of Practice would allow UNIDO and SSC staff to stay abreast of current developments in the field and to update the guidance documents with the insertion of new links and references to new documents within the guidance documents. This method of updating is likely to keep the documents current for longer and will delay the need for a formal review and updating of the guidance documents, a process that will require funding²³.

Financial Risks

As noted earlier, the real effectiveness of this project can only be judged by the extent to which the guidance documents are used by Parties in updating their NIPs and by the quality of the NIP documents and the NIP processes thus generated. Developing countries and countries with economies in transition, who are Parties to the Stockholm Convention, are eligible for NIP update funding from the Global Environment Facility. GEF limits the funding that is available for the NIP update process to a maximum of US\$ 250,000. UNIDO and the SSC expressed concerns that this quantum of funding might be insufficient to

²³ This issue was identified by COP 5 and paragraph 3 of its decision 5/12 adopts the procedure for updating the guidelines. This procedure suggests the establishment of expert panels on different issues. These panels will meet annually in order to consider necessary amendments, but would work electronically between sessions. The recommendation regarding a community of practise would supplement this procedure.

undertake the full extent of the work required in the NIP update process, especially with regard to developing inventories of the industrial chemicals that have been listed as new POPs.

Drafters of the guidance documents gave consideration to this risk during the development of the documents and sensibly chose to mitigate this risk through the introduction of a tiered approach in the development of the inventories of new POPs. Parties may therefore decide, based on the availability of financial and human resources, whether they should undertake a tier I, II or III assessment for the inventories of new POPs.

The guidance documents envisage that Parties would undertake an initial assessment (tier I) to get an overview of the key sectors that are implicated in the use, generation and production of new POPs within the country. This initial assessment would be based on desk studies of existing information, workshops, and interviews. This assessment would be quick and would guide the process of undertaking the inventory, wither at the same time or later when resources become available.

The initial assessment could then be followed by a preliminary inventory (tier II) when resources allowed. The preliminary inventory generates data to fill in missing and/or incomplete data sets, often using qualitative methods like questionnaires to obtain more specific data. Data in this tier is based on estimations of known levels/quantities of new POPs used, total production volumes in production processes and the manufacture of products and articles. Workshops and interviews (that are based on a legal requirement for industries to disclose information) may also be helpful in obtaining data at this stage.

If needed, and when resources are available, a more in-depth inventory (tier III) could be undertaken after evaluation of the data gathered in the preliminary inventory. A tier III inventory will provide accurate and specific numerical information and should be carried out by experts in the relevant fields. This advanced stage of the inventory should include site inspections, sampling and analysis. The extensive investigations in this phase are labour intensive and costly, as is the necessary chemical analysis to be conducted on articles/products.

The tiered approach to inventories, as set out in the guidance documents, should therefore assist Parties in scoping and managing the problem posed by new POPs within the constraints of their resources, thereby diminishing the risk that financial constraints will immobilise Parties and delay action on the issue of eliminating new POPs.

Risk that Parties will not utilise Guidance Documents Effectively

As noted earlier, stakeholders involved in the pilot testing indicated that the guidance documents are technical in nature and that stakeholders in developing countries will require training in the use of the methodologies suggested in order to allow them to utilise the guidance documents properly. In addition to the technical nature of the documents, it is worth noting that the guidance documents are copious, accounting for a collective 623 pages across the eight guidance documents and that none of the stakeholders interviewed in the evaluation process, including members of the drafting team and the peer reviewers, had read all of the guidance documents.

Even though the drafters of the guidance documents gave consideration to the issue of how the documents could be simplified and shortened and even though these questions were posed to the peer reviewers, the content area covered by these documents did not allow further simplification or shortening. Given these factors, there is a considerable risk that the guidance documents will not be effectively utilised by Parties if the SSC and UNIDO fail to build the capacity of stakeholders, thereby enabling the use of the documents. Both these organizations have recognised the need for capacity building and have planned certain activities to address this issue.

For example, the SSC carried out a webinar in June 2012 in order to build awareness of the guidance documents prepared by UNIDO among other GEF Implementing Agents that are likely to be involved in NIP update projects. The SSC plans to repeat this webinar and to undertake webinars on the other guidance documents prepared by UNITAR during September and October 2012. These webinars will target the other Implementing Agents (other than UNIDO) that service GEF as well as government and other stakeholders from Party countries. SSC will also undertake a workshop in Brazil during November or December 2012. This workshop will target Spanish and English speaking countries that have requested GEF funding for NIP updates. A separate workshop for French speaking Parties will be conducted in 2013. The SSC has also located a small pool of funds that will be used to fund a contract to design and present the guidance documents in a more user-friendly way for the website.

In September 2012 UNIDO undertook a training workshop based on the guidance documents for internal staff who are to be involved in the NIP updating projects, as well as some international and regional consultants who are likely to be involved in servicing NIP update projects within Party countries. This two-day workshop also included a few government representatives from Parties whose NIP update projects have been approved for funding by GEF.

While these initiatives represent important steps in disseminating information and raising awareness about the material within the guidance documents; it does not seem to be sufficient for the task of equipping stakeholders with the capacity to properly utilise the guidance documents. For this, a more programmatic approach is necessary; one that maps the work process to be undertaken in the course of updating the NIP and meets the capacity building needs of the variety of stakeholders to be engaged in this work process.

4.5 Project coordination and management

Project Coordination

As noted in other sections of this report, the project compressed 24 months of work into 18 months and successfully created guidance documents of a high quality in order to guide the NIP update process. This success was achieved despite the fact that the stakeholders and contributors were spread across various regions of the globe, including Norway, Canada, Austria, Switzerland, Germany, Nigeria, India, South Africa, Serbia and Japan.

Given the very global nature of the project, co-ordination occurred primarily through teleconferences and e-mails that were copied to various parties. Project Steering Committee meetings and lead author conferences were also undertaken via Skype or the use of other teleconference technologies. Co-ordination between the two main agencies producing guidance documents, UNIDO and UNITAR was enhanced by the fact that these agencies used a common international consultant who participated in the drafting process underway at UNIDO, as well as on the small three-person drafting team used by UNITAR. This consultant, was therefore party to discussions in each organization and could share information across these organizations and encourage a greater level of coherence and co-ordination across these two organizations.

A stakeholder, who has worked on many projects undertaken by organizations in the UN family, commended UNITAR and UNIDO on the high level of co-operation and co-ordination achieved by these agencies on this project. This stakeholder noted that this co-operation was atypical of the UN system which is usually beset by competition and the lack of co-operation between agencies, which has given rise to the One UN initiative. This stakeholder attributed this commendable performance in coordinating work between these agencies to the fact that the project managers designated by each of these agencies are very good communicators on a personal level.

Indeed, the personal drive and commitment of the project managers as well as the key consultants involved in the drafting of the guidance documents was seen to be the main reason for the success of the project in achieving the outcomes it did. This personal commitment manifested in the investment of a large amount of time beyond the commitments stipulated in consultant and employment contracts.

Project Management

This personal commitment to the success of the project and to co-ordination and communication appears to be responsible for the eventual success of the project, rather than the establishment of a good project management and communication system to serve the project.

Stakeholders indicated that the first PSC, which took place on 27 April 2011, on the fringes of COP5, was very short and did not get into a detailed discussion about how the project would be implemented or what the respective roles of

UNIDO, the SSC and UNITAR would be. The SSC attributed the delay at the start of the project to this lack of clarity from UNIDO as the project managers. Indeed, one individual, who participated as a member of the PSC, indicated that the project management systems were not entirely clear even to him as a member of the Project Steering Committee. He reported that he saw the PSC as consisting of two representatives from UNIDO and three representatives from the SSC. It is worth noting that the 'Report of the project inception meeting' indicates that three representatives of UNITAR were also members of the PSC.

At the end of the project, this lack of clarity regarding the roles of the SSC *vis-a-vis* UNIDO, manifested in confusion about which organization's branding should take precedence and what the layout and format of the guidance documents should look like, an issue that then necessitated a considerable waste of time in the reformatting of documents.

Another interesting issue pertinent to the management of the project relates to the management of the UNITAR sub-contract. UNIDO, as the Implementing Agent, took control of GEF funds and sub-contracted UNITAR to undertake the production of particular project deliverables. However, during project implementation, UNITAR referred primarily to the SSC for guidance and management input. UNITAR indicated that the clear division of responsibility for outputs between UNITAR and UNIDO meant that they were able to refer to the SSC, as the ultimate client and the managers of the Stockholm Convention, for direction without compromising deliverables. UNIDO and the SSC indicated that they were happy with this arrangement since the SSC was the ultimate client being serviced by UNIDO and UNITAR. UNIDO depended on the SSC's opinion in order to assess whether the outputs developed by UNITAR were of sufficient quality and whether payment should therefore be released. Even though this system worked well, *de facto* during project implementation, these circumstances appear to have arisen by default, rather than design.

This *de facto* management of the UNITAR contract led to a situation in which the SSC reported that it made a management decision to focus on the delivery of high quality guidance documents (Outcome 1) rather than on the production of training material and a capacity building framework (Outcome 2). The interviews with the UNIDO project management team indicate that they did not entirely share this interpretation of events within the project. While UNIDO was cognizant of the fact that certain capacity building activities had not taken place, they did not report these omissions as being management decisions. Consequently, the project results framework was not amended in order to reflect the changes/decisions made during project implementation.

Co-financing

According to the project document, USD 1,022,700 was expected to be contributed to the project budget as co-financing. USD 329,700 or 32.3% of this co-financing was expected to be contributed by UNIDO, UNITAR and the SSC as in-kind contributions through the contribution of staff time. These in-kind contributions were not tracked by project participants and therefore have not been quantified.

According to the project document, USD 693,000 in cash was expected to be contributed to the project budget from the Government of Norway and the European Commission, via the SSC's Voluntary Fund. Upon request for information regarding these cash contributions to the project, the SSC submitted the information contained in the table below. As can be seen, there is a shortfall of USD 35,765 between the expected cash contributions reflected in the project document compared to the co-financing figures submitted by the SSC. The shortfall in co-funding is small at 5.16% of projected co-funding at the time of constructing the project budget. The issue of concern relates to the failure to properly record and monitor the co-funding commitments and the absence of agreed financial protocols between the main partners implementing the project. This was evidenced by the lack of information around the in-kind co-funding and fact that the information about the cash contributions to the project budget had to be collated by the SSC over a period of eight weeks when requested by the evaluator.

Table 7: Comparison of co-funding indicated in Project Document and co-financing figures submitted to evaluation²⁴

Funding Partner	Project Budget (\$)	Details reflected on Project Budget	Details of Expenditure	Amount (\$)
Co-funding from Norway				
Co-funding from Norway	108,000	SVFT through a grant by the government of Norway: Activities to support work on the evaluation of alternatives and other work related to the restriction and elimination of new POPs.	MOU with Ministry of Environmental Protection (MEP), China on “national workshop on implementation of nine new POPs of the SC in China.	46,000
			LOA with Thailand on new POPS.	48,000
Co-funding from Norway	74,000	SVFT through a grant by the government of Norway: Technical assistance to enable implementation of the Stockholm Convention for newly listed POPs in Nigeria.	MOU with Federal Ministry of Environment of Nigeria on the “nine new POPs and the implementation of the SC in Nigeria”.	59,700
			Consultant – nine new POPS Nigeria.	18,140
Subtotal	182,000	Subtotal		171,840
		Programme Support Cost (13%)		22,339
Co-funding from European Commission				
Co-funding from European Commission	511,000	SVFT through a grant by the European Commission for the updating of NIP guidance; information exchange and awareness raising in all UN Regions; and new POPs out-reach and training activities.	Pilots- India	75,000
			Pilots – Nigeria	55,000
			Pilots – RECETOX support to Serbia and India.	85,000
			Translations – Spanish & French	33,000
			Translations – Chinese	16,000
			MOU Armenia –national workshop. ²⁵	15,000
			Consultant – new POPs (Mr. Weber) (monitoring guidance).	14,000
			Consultant – NIP guidance documents.	16,985

²⁴ This table includes commitments on activities yet to be undertaken, e.g. the translation of the guidance documents.

²⁵ In general, the work in China, Thailand and Armenia dealt with the first part of the process of NIP updating, where countries need to be clear on the understanding of the newly listed POPs and the things they need to do to comply with Article 7 on NIPs. These activities helped identify main issues and concerns regarding NIP updates and provided input on priorities that the guidance documents should focus on.

Funding Partner	Project Budget (\$)	Details reflected on Project Budget	Details of Expenditure	Amount (\$)
			Consultant – collecting information on NIPs.	26,000
			Consultant (translation)	10,278
			MOU Nigeria on assessment of new POPs.	34,000
			Consultant Clearing House Mechanism.	25,000
			Consultant Clearing House Mechanism. ²⁶	27,500
Subtotal	511,000	Subtotal		432,763
		Programme Support Cost (7%)		30,293
Total	693,000			657,235

²⁶ The funds associated with the Clearing House Mechanism relate to services utilized in order to facilitate online availability of the guidance documents as part of the Clearing House Mechanism for information on POPs. In order to have the guidelines available online, these consultants worked on establishing baselines/modules for the different clearing-house functions. Furthermore they worked on technical documentation and reports concerning the developed modules, user tests, bug fixes, collection of user feedback, development and deployment of the website modules and pages for hosting a network platform.

4.6 Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems

M&E Design

According to the project document, the project was supposed to have set up a project monitoring and evaluation plan during project inception. This M&E plan would establish updated project impact indicators, using the objectively verifiable indicators listed in the projects results framework as the starting point. In addition, the project reporting framework would be established with a detailed work plan and budget for year one being adopted. This system was also supposed to have included a “detailed narrative on the institutional roles, responsibilities, coordinating actions and feedback mechanisms” (Project Document, pg. 51). The project management system and the M&E framework for the project were supposed to have been discussed and/or adopted at a Project Inception Workshop. As indicated in the previous section, the first Project Steering Committee meeting, which seems to have substituted for Project Inception Workshop, was a hurried affair conducted on the fringes of COP5. These issues were therefore not addressed at this meeting and were not remedied thereafter.

M&E implementation

While an M&E system was not established for this project, UNIDO and the SSC did track progress toward project objectives (mainly the production of the guidance documents) and took corrective action when needed. This is evidenced by the SSC reportedly taking a firmer hand in the management of the project after what they perceived to be several months of inactivity at the beginning of the project in 2011. The SSC reported that they reflected on the lack of progress and decided to ‘push UNIDO’ by taking, for example, a hand in the production of minutes after teleconferences, so as to ensure follow-up on agreed actions. UNIDO also reported that they were required to take corrective action in order to redirect the discussions of the Drafting Groups after they discerned that the lead drafters appointed at the time were not able to lead the discussions productively.

This ‘tracking’ of project deliverables is also implied by the SSC’s decision to prioritise the project’s development of high quality guidance documents within the project timeframes, over the development of the capacity building framework and the production of training material. Despite this evidence of the monitoring and tracking of project deliverables, the project failed to keep records of project progress. As noted in previous sections of this report, according to GEF reporting requirements, the project is not required to submit an annual report to GEF until December 2012, however, the project document indicates that “UNIDO and SSC will be responsible for the production of the Quarterly Project Review including Financial Reports” (Project Document, pg. 51). These quarterly reports on project progress were not prepared.

Moreover, strategic decisions taken during project implementation, like the SSC’s decision to focus on Outcome 1 rather than Outcome 2, was not recorded and did not amend the project deliverables, as indicated on the project results framework.

Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities

The project document includes a table that reflected on the budget associated with the following M&E activities:

Table 8: Budgeting and funding for M & E activities

Activity	Responsible	Total	
Measure impact indicators on an annual basis	SSC, UNIDO, UNITAR	9,000	Annually
Prepare Annual Project Reports and Project Implementation Reviews	SSC, UNIDO, UNITAR	2,400	Annually
Hold annual Project Steering Committee meetings	SSC, UNIDO, UNITAR	6,000	Annually
Carry out mid-term external evaluation	M&E Consultant, UNIDO	7,300	At mid-point of the project implementation
Carry out final external Evaluation	M&E Consultant, UNIDO	7,300	Within 6 months of completion of project implementation
Complete the Terminal Report	SSC, UNIDO, UNITAR	2,000	Within 6 months of completion of project implementation
Carry out annual project financial audits	UNIDO, financial audit Firm	1,500	Annually
Total		35,500	

The budget allocation of USD 35,500 appears to be sufficient for the M&E activities envisaged especially in light of the simple outputs and outcomes of the project. Unfortunately, the financial records for the project do not reflect M&E costs in accordance with the activity-focused budget contained in this table. Instead, project expenditure is listed against the following budget line items: International experts/consultants; Travel of project staff; Sub-contracts; Non-UNDP Meeting and Sundries. It is therefore not possible to reflect on how much of the budget has actually been spent on M&E activities.

Monitoring of Long-Term Changes

Given the nature of the project, which sought primarily to develop guidance documents and training materials, the suggested M&E activities in the project document did not include the development of a baseline and the measurement of long-term impacts.

Table 9: Overall Ratings

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating).Sub criteria (below)		Satisfactory ²⁷
Effectiveness	High quality guidance documents produced. Project produced some presentations and factsheets on guidelines but not adequate training material.	Satisfactory ²⁸
Relevance	Guidance documents are directly relevant and available for use in the 154 outstanding NIP updates still to be undertaken.	Highly Satisfactory ²⁹
Efficiency	Project successful in compressing 24 months of project activity into 18 months, despite initial delay.	Satisfactory ³⁰
Sustainability of Project outcomes (overall rating).Sub criteria (below)		Moderately unlikely ³¹
Financial	Stakeholders articulated concerns that GEF funding for NIP update projects might be inadequate. However, the guidance documents have introduced a tiered approach to inventory development that manages this risk.	Moderately likely ³²
Socio Political	No socio-political risks were identified by stakeholders.	Likely ³³
Institutional framework and governance	The project did not develop an adequate	Moderately unlikely ³⁵

²⁷Satisfactory (S): The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of effectiveness and efficiency.

²⁸Satisfactory (S): The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of effectiveness.

²⁹Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance.

³⁰Satisfactory (S): The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of efficiency.

³¹Moderately Unlikely (MU): There is a significant risk that the guidance documents will not be effectively utilised if capacity building is not undertaken for stakeholders within Party countries.

³² Moderately Likely (ML): There are moderate risks that affect the financial dimension of sustainability.

³³ Likely (L): There are no risks affecting the socio-political dimension of sustainability.

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
	capacity building approach to enable the effective use of the complex and technical guidance documents ³⁴ .	
Ecological	Stakeholders did not identify any ecological risks that would undermine use of the guidance documents.	Likely
Monitoring and Evaluation (overall rating). Sub criteria (below)	Despite the failure of the project to establish an M&E system, project deliverables were not overly compromised, given the concrete nature of project deliverables.	Moderately satisfactory
M&E Design	The project did not produce the foreseen M&E framework based on the OVIs included in the project document.	Unsatisfactory ³⁶
M&E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)	Decisions and remedial actions taken during project implementation indicate <i>de facto</i> monitoring of project deliverables and circumstances.	Moderately satisfactory ³⁷
Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities	The project document linked budget to M&E activities.	Highly satisfactory ³⁸
UNIDO specific ratings		Satisfactory
Quality at entry	The revised project document contains improbable programming deadlines, due to the fact that UNIDO failed to review project activities and timelines before resubmission.	Unsatisfactory

³⁵ Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks affecting the institutional framework and governance dimension of sustainability.

³⁴ The SSC indicates that this is being done as part of the technical assistance programme, in response to a mandate to the SSC by the COP.

³⁶ Unsatisfactory (U): There were major shortcomings in the project's M&E system.

³⁷ Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were moderate shortcomings in the implementation of the project M&E system.

³⁸ Highly Satisfactory (HS): There were no shortcomings in the project M&E budget reflected in the project document.

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
Implementation approach	UNIDO overcame initial problems in project management and delivered the project within 18 months; largely due to the personal commitment and effort of the UNIDO project manager and support staff.	Satisfactory
UNIDO Supervision and backstopping	A new UNIDO project manager took over management of the project partway through implementation and was able to successfully redirect work and 'rescue' the project.	Satisfactory ³⁹
Overall Rating		Satisfactory

³⁹ Satisfactory: Well above average.

5.

Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

5.1 Conclusions

This project was a well-designed intervention with a coherent underlying logic that focused on developing, field testing and improving guidelines for the updating of NIPs, so as to enable the undertaking of inventories and action plans for decreasing the use, generation and production of the new POPs added to the Stockholm Convention⁴⁰. However, the emphasis of the design was on outputs (materials & training), not on outcomes (improved capacities of local stakeholders).

While the project was well-designed, the process of project development and application for funding was delayed and the final revised submission to GEF did not review and update the activities and timeframes of the project, leading to the establishment of very tight and unrealistic timeframes for the delivery of the project⁴¹.

Project implementation started off slowly, with a rushed PSC meeting that did not adequately set up the project implementation framework in terms of the roles and responsibilities of different partners or an M&E plan⁴² to track the implementation of the project. The slow start to project implementation was addressed by the SSC taking a more active role in supporting UNIDO in project management and by the new UNIDO project manager redirecting the discussions and work of the drafting groups. Despite this slow start, the project successfully compressed 24 months of project activity into eighteen months and delivered a comprehensive set of guidance documents (Outcome 1) that are deemed to be of good quality by relevant stakeholders and peer reviewers. The success of the project in developing these guidelines appears to be due largely to the personal commitment and the investment of a huge amount of time and effort by key project partners, including representatives of UNIDO, SSC and UNITAR as well as the experts contracted to develop these documents, rather than the use of an effective and articulated project management system⁴³.

Some project partners reported that time constraints during project implementation led to a management decision to prioritize the development of the guidance documents (Outcome 1) rather than the delivery of Outcome 2, the development of a capacity building framework and appropriate training material

⁴⁰See Section IV A. Design

⁴¹See Section IV A. Project Design Process

⁴²See Section IV G. Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems and project management

⁴³See Section IV D. Efficiency and Section IV F. Project Co-ordination and Management

and a manual for the training of stakeholders⁴⁴. While this decision was reasonable, given the time pressures faced by the project, the lack of this training material is likely to compromise the effective use of the guidance documents by stakeholders within Party countries, and might therefore compromise the effectiveness of the project as well as realization of the environmental benefits to be gained by developing good quality NIPs with action plans that lead to a reduction in the use, generation and production of new POPs⁴⁵.

5.2 Recommendations

Recommendations for UNIDO

- (a) UNIDO (and SSC) should build the capacity of potential users in developing countries in order to enable the effective utilisation of the necessarily complex and comprehensive guidance documents. While various capacity building activities are planned by UNIDO and SSC, these are not sufficient to the task of equipping stakeholders with the necessary capacity to properly utilise the guidance documents.

For this purpose, a more programmatic approach to capacity building is necessary – e.g. UNIDO should map the work process to be undertaken in the course of a Party updating its NIP and should identify the stakeholders who will need capacity building at each stage of this work process. UNIDO should then develop a strategy to meet these capacity building needs.

The evidence suggests that the following stakeholders, at the minimum, would need training based on the information contained in the guidance documents:

- Project managers within the GEF Implementing Agencies, who will oversee a suite of NIP update projects in different countries;
- Project managers from the 154 Party countries that have yet to update their NIPs, who will manage the NIP update process within their country;
- International consultants/regional consultants⁴⁶ who will assist Parties in the process of updating their NIPs;
- National consultants within the Party countries, who will undertake the work associated with the updating of the NIPs;
- Stakeholders within government, industry and civil society in Party countries, that will participate in the NIP update process;
- Government organizations and agencies in Party countries that will participate in the NIP update process and will to oversee the implementation of the action plans contained within the NIP; etcetera.

⁴⁴See Section IV C. Effectiveness

⁴⁵See section IV E. Sustainability

⁴⁶Discussions with UNIDO indicate that UNIDO would attempt to use international consultants to support Parties within their own global regions, so as to more cost effectively manage travel budgets on the NIP update projects.

Each of the six groupings listed above would, of course, contain multiple organizations and multiple individuals within each of these organizations that should have access to training in the contents of some or all of the guidance documents. The programme for capacity building would therefore be a sizeable endeavour.

Costs and logistic feasibility will obviously have to be taken into consideration in deciding how best to provide the necessary training and associated capacity building activities. It might be feasible for UNIDO and/or the SSC to provide training for the staff of Implementing Agencies and the fairly small pool of 'international/regional consultants' centrally, with one or more workshops (depending on the numbers of people involved) undertaken over several days. These workshops should have two objectives: (a) to train the participants in the contents of the guidance documents, and (b) to train the participants in how to deliver training on the guidance documents to stakeholders within Party countries, as part of the NIP updating process.

The trainers who are trained centrally would then be responsible for training the other stakeholders listed above, as part of each NIP update project. Training of stakeholders within Party countries would be included in the project budget for the individual NIP update process and would be undertaken by the international/regional consultant commissioned by the project and/or the project manager from the IA responsible for the project.

- (b) In order to safeguard the quality of the decentralised training (and to decrease the costs of the training) that will be conducted within each NIP update process, UNIDO should, as a matter of priority, develop a package of training material that can be utilised 'on the ground' within developing countries. The training methodology that underlies the training material should be as participatory as possible and should be appropriate for the profile of the target audience within Party countries.
- (c) Some stakeholders involved in the initial drafting group indicated that they did not have sight of the revised documents. This evaluation recommends that the UNIDO project manager send a copy of the updated documents or the website links to the final documents uploaded to the website to all individuals involved in the working groups and the peer review process.

Recommendations for the SSC

- a) It is recommended that the SSC work with UNIDO in addressing the capacity building needs of stakeholders involved in the updating of NIPs, in line with the discussion above. The SSC and UNIDO should jointly consider these recommendations and the options available in order to expedite these capacity building interventions, so as not to delay the process of the NIP updates any further. These discussions should include a reflection and agreement on how the centrally delivered training for the project managers within IAs and the international/regional consultants can be funded. The SSC

should consider the possibility of funding some or all of this training from the Stockholm Convention Voluntary Trust Fund.

- b) It is recommended that the SSC establish a Community of Practice⁴⁷ focused on generating and sharing learning about understanding and managing new POPs. The Community of Practice would include the drafters, collaborators and reviewers mobilised by this project and would allow SSC staff, as well as UNIDO, to stay abreast of developments in the field and to update the guidance documents with the insertion of new links and references to new documents within the guidance documents. This method of updating is likely to keep the documents current for longer and will delay the need for a formal review and updating of the guidance documents, a process that will require more time and funding.

Recommendations for GEF

As the risk of insufficient capacity building will undermine the effective use of the guidance documents produced by this project. Given these findings, it is recommended that GEF consider the possibility of augmenting its contribution to the current project budget in order to co-fund the capacity building activities discussed above.

5.3 Lessons Learned

This project successfully negotiated changing circumstances and time constraints in order to meet prioritised objectives. However, project decisions and priorities were not always recorded and shared, thereby undermining a shared understanding of project status and direction. For example, the SSC reported that they made a management decision to focus on delivering high quality guidance documents, rather than Outcome 2, the delivery of training material and capacity building. This decision was not recorded in any project documents or minutes and was not reflected in an amendment to the project results framework. Moreover, the project did not generate any annual reports or quarterly reports to report on project progress and therefore did not record this decision in these progress reports. The failure to record management decisions means that the project is unfavourably evaluated against the original project document and project results framework, rather than a more relevant updated document that reflects amendments to the project deliverables.

Given the fact that this was a medium sized project with three components that are easily tracked, a complex monitoring and evaluation system was not necessary. The implementation of the project therefore did not suffer greatly by

⁴⁷ This issue was identified by COP 5 and paragraph 3 of its decision 5/12 adopts the procedure for updating the guidelines. This procedure suggests the establishment of expert panels on different issues. These expert panels will meet annually in order to consider necessary amendments, but would work electronically between sessions. The recommendation regarding a community of practice would supplement this procedure.

the failure of the IA to establish an M&E system. However, a more conscious use of the Project Results Framework as a means to track the project's progress in delivering planned outputs and outcomes, would have enabled more conscious decision making that was clear and transparent to all stakeholders, i.e. UNIDO would have been more consciously tracking the delivery of outputs by UNITAR and the SSC and would have made enquiries that would have resulted in SSC sharing their 'management decision' regarding the prioritisation of Outcome 1 above Outcome 2.

The delays reported at the beginning of project implementation were attributed by stakeholders to a lack of understanding about roles and responsibilities, of organizations and individuals. Clarification of the roles and expectations of the different project partners at project outset might therefore have improved project delivery. It is interesting to note that the project document indicates that these very same issues would be clarified at the 'project inception workshop'. This did not occur and a project that was already very time-constrained was delayed further. It is therefore essential that these basic elements of good project management be properly observed rather than lightly included in documents tailored to please potential funders.

This lack of clarity about the roles of respective project partners manifested at the end of the project in confusion about the branding and formatting of the guidance documents produced. An agreement at the beginning of project on who 'owned' the guidance documents, on whose branding and whose stylistic and formatting needs took precedence would have avoided much reworking of documents.

Annex A: Terms of Reference

Independent Mid-Term Evaluation of the UNIDO Project

UNIDO Project Number: GF/GLO/11/013

GEF Project Number: 4410

Development of the Guidelines for updating of National Implementation Plans (NIPs) under the Stockholm Convention taking into account the new POPs added to the Convention.

CONTENTS:

I. Project background and overview	50
II. Objectives and scope of the evaluation	52
III. Methodology	52
IV. Project evaluation parameters	53
V. Evaluation team and timing	57
VI. Reporting	58
Annex 1: Required Project Identification and Financial Data	59
Annex 2: GEF Minimum requirements for M&E	61
Annex 3: Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report	62
Annex 4: Checklist on evaluation report quality	65
Annex 5: Overall Ratings Table	66
Annex 6: Job Descriptions	69
.	

I. Project background and overview

A. Project summary

At its fourth meeting, the Conference of the Parties (COP) agreed to amend the Stockholm Convention to list nine (9) new POPs in Annex A, B, and C of the Convention.

One of the immediate actions that Parties need to take is to review and update their National Implementation Plans (NIPs) in light of inclusion of these nine new POPs in accordance with paragraph 1 (c) of Article 7 of the Convention. The updated NIPs should be transmitted to the COP within two years of the date of the entry into force of the amendments which is August 2012 for the nine new POPs.

“Guidance for developing a National Implementation Plan” has been developed and used to assist countries in the process of developing a NIP for the initial 12 POPs. The COP has also adopted “Guidance for the review and updating of national implementation plans” and “Elaborated process of reviewing and updating national implementation plans”, which provides steps to be followed when reviewing and updating national implementation plans. Other related guidance include “Guidance on social and economic assessment in the development and implementation of their national implementation plans” and “Additional guidance on the calculation of action plan costs, including incremental costs and action plans for specific persistent organic pollutants”. The existing guidelines however do not provide sufficient and specific guidance to Parties necessary to fulfill their obligations under the Convention with regards to the nine new POPs.

The main difficulty indicated by Parties is how to obtain information on the new POPs especially concerning three groups of widely used industrial chemicals – commercial mixtures of pentabromodiphenyl ether and octabromodiphenyl ether (BDEs), and perfluorooctane sulfonates (PFOS), due to the complexity of the use and the many sectors of society involved in the use of these chemicals.

B. Project objective

The objective of the project is to provide a full set of guidance that will enable Parties to develop, review and update their NIP in a timely manner with the information relating to the new POPs added to the Stockholm Convention. The set of guidance to be developed under the proposed project would become part of the updated and consolidated “Guidance for developing a National Implementation Plan for the Stockholm Convention”.

The developed guidance will enable countries to identify chemicals in products/articles, establish inventories, undertake national surveillance of

imported products or products in the market whether they contain chemicals listed under the Stockholm Convention in order to ensure implementation of Article 3 and control illegal trafficking, and to handle production and use, recycling and waste disposal of industrial chemicals including BDEs and PFOS. Such guidance will be useful for all countries globally both Parties and non-Parties for environmental sound life-cycle management as well as sound trade of chemicals.

An initial set of guidance (ver.1) will be made available at the COP5 in April 2011. A pilot testing will be performed to validate and evaluate the applicability of the guidance and revise to produce a final version (ver.2) of the guidance in six official languages of the United Nations by March 2012 to warrant that Parties have sufficient and suitable guidance for updating the NIP and transmitting it in a required time frame.

C. Budget Information

Table 1a: Overall Cost and Financing (including co-financing)

Project Component/Outcomes	Co-financing (\$)	GEF (\$)	Total (\$)
1. Parties have appropriate guidance for updating their NIPs	347,300	445,000	792,300
2. Strengthening of capacity and validation on the guidance for developing and updating a National Implementation Plan under the Stockholm Convention	523,400	214,000	737,400
3. Establishment of project management structure including	152,000	60,000	212,000
Total	1,022,700	719,000	1,741,700

as of 16 Feb 2012

Table 1b: UNIDO expense (GEF funding excluding agency support cost in USD)

Budget Line	Item	Executed Budget In 2011	Executed Budget In 2012	Total Expenditure
1100	International consultants	105,659.59	33,447.71	139,107.30
1500	Travel of project staff	48,937.95	2,418.09	51,356.04
1700	Consultants	0	0	0
2100	Subcontracts	239,000	101,000	340,000
3300-3400	Training	0	0	0
3500	Meetings & Workshops	62,765.66	0	62,765.66
4500	Equipment	0	0	0
5100	Sundries	6,457.79	0	6,457.79
	TOTAL	462,820.99	136,865.8	599,686.79

II. Objectives and scope of the evaluation

The purpose of the mid-term evaluation is that the GEF, UNIDO and other partners of the project:

1. Review:

- Project advances to the achievement of the new POPs guidance on inventory and Best Available Technique and Best Environmental Practice.
- The activities and project results and achievements through their indicators.
- The relevance of objectives and other design elements of the project.

2. Propose recommendations that would increase efficiency and effectiveness of project activities.

3. Draw lessons learned in the process to draft the new POPs guidance.

III. Methodology

The evaluation will be conducted by UNIDO accordingly to the guidelines and policies of the GEF in an independent manner, wherever appropriate considering this is a mid-term evaluation. This evaluation will take a participatory approach in which project staff will be kept informed and regularly consulted during the evaluation.

The methodology is based on:

1. A review of project documents, including but not limited to: The original project document, **monitoring reports**, **GEF tracking tool**, progress and financial conciliatory monthly reports of UNIDO and GEF PIR and annual progress reports, guidance drafts, workshop minutes and relevant correspondence. Other related materials prepared by the project.

2. Interviews with, at least, two Project Coordination Unit (PCU), two personnel associated with project management, two partner country focal points, two project beneficiaries, and other surveys, reviews of documents deemed necessary by the evaluator and/or UNIDO.

3. Interviews with, at least, four project partners and drafters, in particular those that have been selected for co-financing as shown in the corresponding sections of the project documents.

IV. Project evaluation parameters

The ratings for the parameters described in the following sub-chapters A to E will be presented in the form of a table with each of the categories rated separately and with brief justifications for the rating based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given. The rating system to be applied is specified in [Annex 5](#).

A. Project relevance and design

Relevance to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements. See possible evaluation questions under “country ownership/drivenness” below

Relevance to target groups: relevance of the project’s objectives, outcomes and outputs to the different target groups of the interventions (e.g. companies, civil society, beneficiaries of capacity building and training, etc.).

Relevance to the GEF and UNIDO: Are the project’s outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies of GEF? Are they in line with the UNIDO mandate, objectives and outcomes defined in the Programme & Budget and core competencies? Ascertain the likely nature and significance of the contribution of the project outcomes to the wider portfolio of the GEF Operational Programme (OP) #14 (or CHEM-1)

Is the project’s design adequate to address the problems at hand?

Was a participatory project identification process applied and was it instrumental in selecting problem areas and national counterparts?

Does the project have a clear thematically focused development objective, the attainment of which can be determined by a set of verifiable indicators?

Was the project formulated based on the logical framework approach?

Was the project formulated with the participation of national counterpart and/or target beneficiaries?

B. Effectiveness: attainment of objectives and planned results (progress to date).

Assessment of project outcomes should be a priority:

- What outputs and outcomes has the project achieved so far (both qualitative and quantitative results)? Has the project generated any results that could lead to changes of the assisted institutions? Have there been any unplanned effects?
- Are the actual project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives? If the original or modified expected results are merely outputs/inputs, the evaluators should assess if there were any real outcomes of the project and, if there were, determine whether these are commensurate with realistic expectations from such projects.
- To what extent have the expected outputs and outcomes been achieved or are likely to be achieved? How do the stakeholders perceive their quality? Were the targeted beneficiary groups actually reached?
- Identify the potential longer-term impacts or at least indicate the steps taken to assess these (see also below “monitoring of long term changes”). Wherever possible, evaluators should indicate how findings on impacts will be reported to the GEF in future.
- Catalytic or replication effects: the evaluation will describe any catalytic or replication effect of the project. If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out. No ratings are requested for the project’s catalytic role.

C. Efficiency

Is the project cost effective? Is the project the least cost option? Is the project implementation delayed, and, if it is, does that affect cost effectiveness? Have the donor, UNIDO and Government/counterpart inputs been provided as planned and have they been adequate to meet requirements? Is the quality of UNIDO inputs and services as planned and timely?

D. Assessment of sustainability of project outcomes

Sustainability is understood as the likelihood of continued benefits after the GEF project ends. Given the uncertainties involved, it may be difficult to have a realistic a priori assessment of sustainability of outcomes. Therefore, assessment of sustainability of outcomes will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. This assessment should explain how the risks to project outcomes will affect continuation of benefits after

the GEF project ends. It will include both exogenous and endogenous risks. The following four dimensions or aspects of risks to sustainability will be addressed:

- ✓ **Financial risks.** Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once GEF assistance ends? (Such resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors or income-generating activities; these can also include trends that indicate the likelihood that, in future, there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project outcomes.)
- ✓ **Sociopolitical risks.** Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?
- ✓ **Institutional framework and governance risks.** Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? Are requisite systems for accountability and transparency, and required technical know-how, in place?
- ✓ **Environmental risks.** Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? The evaluation should assess whether certain activities will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project.

E. Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems and project outcomes

- **M&E design.** Does the project have an M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives? The Evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for the application of the Project M&E plan (see Annex 2).
- **M&E implementation.** The evaluation should verify that an M&E system was in place and facilitated timely tracking of progress toward project objectives by collecting information on chosen indicators continually throughout the project implementation period; annual project reports were complete and accurate, with well-justified ratings; the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve performance and to adapt to changing needs; and projects had an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure that data will continue to be collected and used after project closure.
- **Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities.** In addition to incorporating information on funding for M&E while assessing M&E design, the evaluators will determine whether M&E was sufficiently budgeted for at

the project planning stage and whether M&E was funded adequately and in a timely manner during implementation.

- **Monitoring of Long-Term Changes.** The monitoring and evaluation of long-term changes is often incorporated in GEF-supported projects as a separate component and may include determination of environmental baselines; specification of indicators; and provisioning of equipment and capacity building for data gathering, analysis, and use. This section of the evaluation report will describe project actions and accomplishments toward establishing a long-term monitoring system. The review will address the following questions:
 - a. Did this project contribute to the establishment of a long-term monitoring system? If it did not, should the project have included such a component?
 - b. What were the accomplishments and shortcomings in establishment of this system?
 - c. Is the system sustainable—that is, is it embedded in a proper institutional structure and does it have financing?

- **Project management.** Are the national management and overall coordination mechanisms efficient and effective? Does each partner have specific roles and responsibilities from the beginning? Does each partner fulfill its role and responsibilities (e.g. providing strategic support, monitoring and reviewing performance, allocating funds, providing technical support, following up agreed/corrective actions...)? Are the UNIDO HQ based management, coordination, quality control and technical inputs efficient, timely and effective (problems identified timely and accurately; quality support provided timely and effectively; right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix and frequency of field visit).

F. Assessment of processes affecting attainment of project results

The evaluation will consider, but need not be limited to, the following issues that may have affected project implementation and attainment of project results:

- a. **Preparation and readiness.** Are the project's objectives and components clear, practicable, and feasible within its time frame? Are counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?
- b. **Country ownership/drivenness.** Is the project concept in line with the sectoral and development priorities and plans of the country—or of participating countries, in the case of multicounty projects? Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? Are the relevant country representatives from government and civil society involved in the project? Does the recipient government maintain its financial commitment to the project? Has the government—or

- governments in the case of multicounty projects—approved policies or regulatory frameworks in line with the project’s objectives?
- c. **Stakeholder involvement.** Does the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information sharing and consultation? Does the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns? Are the relevant vulnerable groups and powerful supporters and opponents of the processes properly involved?
 - d. **Financial planning.** Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allowed management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for timely flow of funds? Are there due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits? Does promised co-financing materialize?
 - e. **UNIDO supervision and backstopping.** Does UNIDO staff identify problems in a timely fashion and accurately estimate their seriousness? Does UNIDO staff provide quality support and advice to the project, approve modifications in time, and restructure the project when needed? Does UNIDO provide the right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix, and frequency of field visits for the project?
 - f. **Co-financing and project outcomes and sustainability.** If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and the co-financing actually realized, what are the reasons for the variance? Does the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project outcomes and/or sustainability, and, if so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?
 - g. **Delays and project outcomes and sustainability.** If there have been delays in project implementation and completion, what are the reasons? Do the delays affect project outcomes and/or sustainability, and, if so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

V. Evaluation team and timing

Considering the scale of the project (mid-sized project) and that this is a mid-term evaluation, the evaluation will be carried out by one international evaluation consultant

UNIDO evaluation group will be responsible for the quality control of the evaluation process and report. It will provide inputs regarding findings, lessons learned and recommendations from other UNIDO evaluations, ensuring that the evaluation report is useful for UNIDO in terms of organizational learning (recommendations and lessons learned) and its compliance with UNIDO evaluation policy and these terms of reference.

The evaluator will be able to provide information relevant for follow-up studies, including evaluation verification on request to the GEF partnership up to two years after completion of the evaluation. The consultant will be contracted by UNIDO. Her/his tasks are specified in the job descriptions attached to these terms of reference. Members of the evaluation team must not have been directly involved in the design and/or implementation of the programmed/projects.

Timing

The evaluation is scheduled to take place in the period March 2012 to May 2012. The interviews with counterparts, co-financers, and drafters should be carried out over the phone or e-mail except a mission to UNIDO in Vienna to carry out interviews with the project manager and the project staff based in the UNIDO's headquarters in Vienna.

The evaluator will present preliminary findings to project- and UNIDO staff. The draft evaluation report will be submitted several weeks after the presentation of preliminary findings at the latest.

VI. Reporting

Evaluation report format and review procedures for mid-term evaluations

The evaluation report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain the purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated and the methods used. The report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should provide information on when the evaluation took place, the places visited, who was involved and be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. The report should include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report to facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons. Evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete and balanced manner. The evaluation report shall be written in English and follow the outline given in annex 3.

Review of the Draft Report: Draft reports are shared with the corresponding Programmed or Project Officer for initial review and consultation. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. The consultation also seeks agreement on the findings and recommendations. The evaluators will take the comments into consideration in preparing the final version of the report.

Quality Assessment of the Evaluation Report: All evaluations are subject to quality assessments in accordance with the quality criteria established by UNIDO Evaluation Group. The quality assessments are used as a tool for providing structured feedback to the evaluators. The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed and rated against the criteria set forth in the Checklist on evaluation report quality (annex 4).

The draft report will be delivered to UNIDO and circulated to UNIDO staff associated with the project, including the UNIDO office in Beijing, China.

Annex 1 of Terms of Reference: Required Project Identification and Financial Data

The evaluation report should provide information on project identification, time frame, actual expenditures, and co-financing in the following format, which is modeled after the project identification form (PIF).

I. Project general information

Project Name:	Development of the Guidelines for updating of National Implementation. Plans (NIPs) under the Stockholm Convention taking into account the new POPs added to the Convention.
Project's GEF ID Number:	4410
GEF Agency Project ID	GF/GLO/11/013
Countries:	Global
GEF Focal Area and Operational Program:	Persistent Organic Pollutants – OP 14
Agency:	UNIDO
Other Cooperating Agencies:	UNITAR and Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention
Project Approval Date:	March, 2011
Date of Project Effectiveness:	April, 2011
Project duration:	Two years
Total Project Cost:	US \$ 1,741,700
GEF Grant Amount:	USD 719,000
GEF Project Preparation Grant Amount (if any):	US\$ 0

II. Dates

Milestone	Expected Date	Actual Date
Agency Approval date	March 2011	31 March 2011
Implementation start	April 2011	19 April 2011
Midterm evaluation	March 2012	10 April 2012
Project completion	April 2013	
Terminal evaluation completion	October 2013	
Project closing	December 2013	

III. Project framework

Project Component	Activity Type	GEF Financing (in \$)		Co financing (in \$)	
		Approved	Actual	Promised	Actual
1. Appropriate guidance for NIP update	B	445,000		347,300	
2. Strengthened capacity and validation of the guidance	b	214,000		523,400	
3. Project management	b	60,000		152,000	
Total		719,000		1,022,700	

Activity types are:

- a) Experts researches hired;
- b) Technical assistance, workshop, meetings or experts consultation scientific and technical analysis, experts researches hired;
- c) Promised co-financing refers to the amount indicated on endorsement/approval.

IV. Co-financing

Co-financing Sources				
Name of co-financier (source)	Classification	Type	Amount (\$)	Status
European Commission	Inter-governmental organization	Cash	511,000	Confirmed
		In Kind	0	Confirmed
Government of Norway	National Government	Cash	182,000	Confirmed
		In kind	0	Confirmed
Secretariat of the Stockholm	Inter-governmental organization	In Kind	212,700	Confirmed
UNIDO	Implementing Agency	In Kind	95,000	Confirmed
UNITAR	Inter-governmental organization	In Kind	22,000	Confirmed
Sub-total co-financing			1,022,700	

Expected amounts are those submitted by the GEF Agencies in the original project appraisal document. Co-financing types are grant, soft loan, hard loan, guarantee, in kind, or cash.

Annex 2 of Terms of Reference: GEF Minimum requirements for M&E⁴⁸

Minimum Requirement 1: Project Design of M&E

All projects will include a concrete and fully budgeted monitoring and evaluation plan by the time of work program entry for full-sized projects and CEO approval for medium-sized projects. This monitoring and evaluation plan will contain as a minimum:

- SMART indicators for project implementation, or, if no indicators are identified, an alternative plan for monitoring that will deliver reliable and valid information to management;
- SMART indicators for results (outcomes and, if applicable, impacts), and, where appropriate, indicators identified at the corporate level;
- Baseline for the project, with a description of the problem to be addressed, with indicator data, or, if major baseline indicators are not identified, an alternative plan for addressing this within one year of implementation;
- Identification of reviews and evaluations that will be undertaken, such as mid-term reviews or evaluations of activities; and
- Organizational set-up and budgets for monitoring and evaluation.

Minimum Requirement 2: Application of Project M&E

Project monitoring and supervision will include implementation of the M&E plan, comprising:

- SMART indicators for implementation are actively used, or if not, a reasonable explanation is provided;
- SMART indicators for results are actively used, or if not, a reasonable explanation is provided;
- The baseline for the project is fully established and data compiled to review progress reviews, and evaluations are undertaken as planned; and
- The organizational set-up for M&E is operational and budgets are spent as planned.

⁴⁸http://gefco.org/uploadedFiles/Policies_and_Guidelines-me_policy-english.pdf

Annex 3 of Terms of Reference: Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report

Executive summary

- Must provide a synopsis of the storyline which includes the main evaluation findings and recommendations;
- Must present strengths and weaknesses of the project;
- Must be self-explanatory and should be 3-4 pages in length.

I. Evaluation objectives, methodology and process

- Information on the evaluation: why, when, by whom, etc.;
- Scope and objectives of the evaluation, main questions to be addressed;
- Information sources and availability of information;
- Methodological remarks, limitations encountered and validity of the findings.

II. Countries and project background

- Brief countries context: an overview of the economy, the environment, institutional development, demographic and other data of relevance to the project ;
- Sector-specific issues of concern to the project⁴⁹ and important developments during the project implementation period;
- Project summary:
 - a. Fact sheet of the project: including project objectives and structure, donors and counterparts, project timing and duration, project costs and co-financing;
 - b. Brief description including history and previous cooperation;
 - c. Project implementation arrangements and implementation modalities, institutions involved, major changes to project implementation;
 - d. Positioning of the UNIDO project (other initiatives of government, other donors, private sector, etc.);
 - e. Counterpart organization(s).

III. Project assessment

This is the key chapter of the report and should address all evaluation criteria and questions outlined in the TOR (see section III Evaluation Criteria and Questions). Assessment must be based on factual evidence collected and analyzed from

⁴⁹ Explicit and implicit assumptions in the logical framework of the project can provide insights into key-issues of concern (e.g. relevant legislation, enforcement capacities, government initiatives, etc.)

different sources. The evaluators' assessment can be broken into the following sections:

- A. Design
- B. Relevance
- C. Effectiveness
- D. Efficiency
- E. Sustainability
- F. Project coordination and management

At the end of this chapter, an overall project achievement rating should be developed as required in Annex 5. The overall rating table required by the GEF should be presented here.

IV. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons Learned

This chapter can be divided into three sections:

A. Conclusions

This section should include a storyline of the main evaluation conclusions related to the project's achievements and shortfalls. It is important to avoid providing a summary based on each and every evaluation criterion. The main conclusions should be cross-referenced to relevant sections of the evaluation report.

B. Recommendations

This section should contain few key recommendations. They should:

- Be based on evaluation findings;
- Realistic and feasible within a project context;
- Indicate institution(s) responsible for implementation (addressed to a specific officer, group or entity who can act on it) and have a proposed timeline for implementation if possible;
- Be commensurate with the available capacities of project team and partners;
- Take resource requirements into account.

Recommendations should be structured by addressees:

- UNIDO
- Drafting Group
- Counterpart Organizations
- Donor

C. Lessons Learned

- Lessons learned must be of wider applicability beyond the evaluated project but must be based on findings and conclusions of the evaluation;
- For each lessons the context from which they are derived should be briefly stated.

Annexes should include the evaluation TOR, list of interviewees, documents reviewed, a summary of project identification and financial data, and other detailed quantitative information. Dissident views or management responses to the evaluation findings may later be appended in an annex.

Annex 4 of Terms of Reference: Checklist on evaluation report quality

Rating system for quality of evaluation reports

Report quality criteria	UNIDO Evaluation Group Assessment notes	Rating
A. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives?		
B. Were the report consistent and the evidence complete and convincing?		
C. Did the report present assessment the sustainability of outcomes or did it explain why this is not (yet) possible?		
D. Did the evidence presented support the lessons and recommendations?		
E. Did the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity)?		
F. Quality of the lessons: Were lessons readily applicable in other contexts? Did they suggest prescriptive action?		
G. Quality of the recommendations: Did recommendations specify the actions necessary to correct existing conditions or improve operations ('who?' 'what?' 'where?' 'when?'). Can they be implemented?		
H. Was the report well written? (Clear language and correct grammar)		
I. Were all evaluation aspects specified in the TOR adequately addressed?		
J. Was the report delivered in a timely manner?		

A number rating 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly Unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = 0.

Annex 5 of Terms of Reference: Overall Ratings Table

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating)		
Sub criteria (below)		
Effectiveness		
Relevance		
Efficiency		
Sustainability of Project outcomes (overall rating)		
Sub criteria (below)		
Financial		
Socio Political		
Institutional framework and governance		
Ecological		
Monitoring and Evaluation (overall rating)		
Sub criteria (below)		
M&E Design		
M&E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)		
Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities		
UNIDO specific ratings		
Quality at entry		
implementation approach		
UNIDO Supervision and backstopping		
Overall Rating		

RATING OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS

- Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- Satisfactory (S): The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

- Unsatisfactory (U) The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Please note: Relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. The overall rating of the project for achievement of objectives and results **may not be higher** than the lowest rating on either of these two criteria. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes a project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.

RATINGS ON SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability will be understood as the probability of continued long-term outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits beyond project completion. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, i.e. stronger institutional capacities, legal frameworks, socio-economic incentives /or public awareness. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes.

Rating system for sustainability sub-criteria

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows.

- Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.
- Moderately Likely (ML). There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an Unlikely rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than Unlikely, regardless of whether higher ratings in other dimensions of sustainability produce a higher average.

RATINGS OF PROJECT M&E

Monitoring is a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an

ongoing project with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds. Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, its design, implementation and results. Project evaluation may involve the definition of appropriate standards, the examination of performance against those standards, and an assessment of actual and expected results.

The Project monitoring and evaluation system will be rated on ‘M&E Design’, ‘M&E Plan Implementation’ and ‘Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities’ as follows:

- Highly Satisfactory (HS): There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Satisfactory(S): There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Unsatisfactory (U): There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The Project had no M&E system.

“M&E plan implementation” will be considered a critical parameter for the overall assessment of the M&E system. The overall rating for the M&E systems will not be higher than the rating on “M&E plan implementation.”

All other ratings will be on the GEF six point scale.

HS	= Highly Satisfactory	Excellent
S	= Satisfactory	Well above average
MS	= Moderately Satisfactory	Average
MU	= Moderately Unsatisfactory	Below Average
U	= Unsatisfactory	Poor
HU	= Highly Unsatisfactory	Very poor (Appalling)

Annex 6 of Terms of Reference: Job Descriptions

Job Description

Post title	International Evaluation Consultant
Duration	18 work days including 4 day travel to Vienna and 2 day Geneva over the period of 2 months
Started date	11 June 2012
Duty station	Home based and travel to Vienna and Geneva
Duties	The consultant will evaluate the projects according to the Terms of Reference. S/he will be responsible for preparing the draft and final evaluation report, according to the standards of the UNIDO Evaluation Group. S/he will perform the following tasks:

Main duties	Duration/ location	Deliverables
Review project documentation and relevant background information including decisions of the Conference of the Parties of the Stockholm Convention and related documents; determine key data to collect and prepare key instruments to collect these data through interviews and/or surveys	3 work days	List of detailed evaluation questions to be clarified; questionnaires/ interview guide; logic models; list of key data to collect, draft list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions
Conduct field mission to Vienna in June or July in 2012	4 days	Presentations of the evaluation's initial findings, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders and drafters in Vienna at the end of the missions.
Conduct field mission to Geneva in June or July in 2012	2 days	Presentations of the evaluation's initial findings, draft conclusions and recommendations to stakeholders and drafters in Geneva at the end of the missions.
Prepare the evaluation report according to TOR and template provided by UNIDO	6 days	2 Draft evaluation report
Revise the draft project evaluation reports based on comments from UNIDO Evaluation Group and	3 days	Final evaluation report

Main duties	Duration/ location	Deliverables
stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards		
TOTAL	18 days	

Qualifications and skills:

- ✓ Advanced degree in environmental science, development studies or related areas;
- ✓ Knowledge of and experience in chemicals management, POPs and new POPs or related areas (e.g. pollution management, chemicals risk management, clean production, clean energy);
- ✓ Knowledge and experience in the field of evaluation (of development projects);
- ✓ Experience in GEF projects and knowledge of UNIDO activities an asset;
- ✓ Working experience in developing countries.

Language: English

Absence of Conflict of Interest:

According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project (or theme) under evaluation. The consultant will be requested to sign a declaration that none of the above situations exists and that the consultants will not seek assignments with the manager/s in charge of the project before the completion of her/his contract with the Evaluation Group.

Annex B: List of people interviewed

Name	Job title/Position in company/organization	Name of company/organization
Brandon Turner	UNITAR Project Manager. Also updated 'Guidance for Developing, Reviewing, and Updating a National Implementation Plan for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants'	UNITAR
Reiner Arndt	Consultant, drafted 'Guidance for the control of the import and export of POPs' and 'Guidance on labelling of products or articles that contain new POPs or use new POPs during manufacture'	UNITAR
Roland Weber	Consultant, UNIDO Lead Author on PBDE BAT/BEP; Drafted 'Guidance for strengthening the regulatory framework/voluntary agreements regulating the monitoring of products/articles that contain or may contain new POPs'	UNITAR and UNIDO
Maren Mellendorf	Consultant in the SCU) (Assisted with Project Co-ordination)	UNIDO
Stefan Posner	Lead Author on PFOS BAT/BEP	UNIDO Consultant
Radnaa Ariunbileg	Peer Reviewer	UNIDO Project Coordinator
Mathias Schleup	Inputs regarding E-Waste Sector	UNIDO Consultant
Hassan Malik	Certified Project Finances	UNIDO, Financial Management for Technical Cooperation
Melissa Lim	Oversaw development of guidance documents produced by UNIDO	Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention
Jacqueline Alvarez	Project Manager for SSC; Oversaw development of guidance documents produced by UNITAR	Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention
Tatiana Terekhova	Reviewed guidance document with a view to co-ordinating work on e-waste management	Secretariat of the Basel Convention

Name	Job title/Position in company/organization	Name of company/organization
Fukuya Lino	Project Manager	UNIDO
Sarah Ovuike	Consultant in the SCU, Assisted with Project Co-ordination	UNIDO
Alfredo Cueva	Assisted with review of guidance documents on customs and labelling produced by UNITAR	UNIDO
Elizabeth Herbeck	Cleaner Production Unit	UNIDO
Ganna Onysko	GEF Co-ordination Group	UNIDO
Jerome Stucki	Will be using guidelines to manage newly funded NIP Update Project in Algeria	UNIDO
Carmela Centeno	Stockholm Convention Unit	UNIDO
Johannes Dobinger	Evaluation Unit	UNIDO
Z. Peng	Stockholm Convention Unit	UNIDO
Chris Slijkhuis	Private Sector Participant in UNIDO Drafting Meetings	MBA Polymers
Ivan Holoubek	Organised Pilot in Serbia and made inputs into Pilot in India, Acted as Peer Reviewer	RECETOX
Oladele Osibanjo	Participated in Nigerian Pilot	Basel Convention Regional Centre in Nigeria
Erlinda Galvan	Stockholm Convention Unit	UNIDO

Annex C: Bibliography

Global Environment Facility. Operational Program on Persistent Organic Pollutants (OP#14) Washington D.C. (2003).

Global Environment Facility Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations. Evaluation Document No. 3. GEF Evaluation Office. Washington, D.C. (2008).

Global Environment Facility GEF Project and Programmatic Approach Cycles. Washington D.C. (2010).

Global Environment Facility Guidelines for Reviewing and Updating the NIP under the Stockholm Convention on POPs. Washington D.C. (2010).

Secretariat for the Stockholm Convention. Ridding the World of POPs: A Guide to the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants. UNEP. Geneva. (2005).

Secretariat for the Stockholm Convention. Stockholm Convention (amended 2009): Text and Annexes. UNEP. Geneva. (2009).

Secretariat for the Basel Convention. The Basel Convention At A Glance. UNEP. Geneva. (2011).

UNEP & GEF Lessons Learned and Good Practices in the Development of National Implementation Plans for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants: Global Report: A Contribution of the GEF Full-Size Project: Development Of National Implementation Plans for the Management Of Persistent Organic Pollutants. Geneva. (2006).

UNIDO Thematic Evaluation of UNIDO Work in the Area of Persistent Organic Pollutants: Draft Report. UNIDO Evaluation Group. Vienna. (2012)

