

GEF IEO Terminal Evaluation Review form (retrofitting of APR2004 cohort)

This form is for retrofitting of the TERs prepared for APR2004. While several topics covered in this form had already been covered in the earlier form, this revised form adds several other performance and impact related concerns.

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		1430	
GEF Agency project ID		n/a	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-2	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNEP	
Project name		Support for the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants	
Country/Countries		Global	
Region		Global	
Focal area		Persistent Organic Pollutants	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		POPs-1: Draft Operational Program on Persistent Organic Pollutants	
Executing agencies involved		UNEP Chemicals	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Not involved	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		9/24/2001	
Effectiveness date / project start		1/10/2001	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		8/31/2002	
Actual date of project completion		12/30/2003	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0	0
	Co-financing	0	0
GEF Project Grant		0.58	0.76
Co-financing	IA/EA own	0.08	n/a
	Government	0.18	n/a
	Other*	0.64	n/a
Total GEF funding		0.58	0.76
Total Co-financing		0.89	n/a
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1.78	n/a
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		January 31, 2004	
TE submission date		January 31, 2004	
Author of TE		Arne Jernelöv	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) preparer		Antonio del Monaco	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) reviewer		Robert Varley	
Revised TER (2014) completion date		September 2014	
Revised TER (2014) prepared by		Shanna Edberg	
TER GEF IEO peer review (2014)		Joshua Schneck	

*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	HS	HS	n/a	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	n/a	L	n/a	ML
M&E Design	n/a	HS	n/a	S
M&E Implementation	n/a	HS	n/a	S
Quality of Implementation	n/a	HS	n/a	S
Quality of Execution	n/a	HS	n/a	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	n/a	n/a	n/a	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The global environmental objective of the project as stated in the project document (PD) is to “protect human health and the environment from persistent organic pollutants,” which are a major threat to human health and the environment (PD, page 6). The project was a global effort intended to support the widespread ratification of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, which was adopted in 2001 as part of an international effort to manage the production of POPs.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As stated in the PD (pages 6-7), the project’s development objectives are as follows:

1. Improve Government understanding of the Stockholm Convention, and the benefits of and the need to become a Party;
2. Improve Government understanding of the nature of the problems caused by POPs
3. Help countries understand what their obligations are under the Stockholm Convention;
4. Encourage and facilitate early ratification of the Convention;
5. Identify some of the legislative, capacity building, investment and other infrastructural measures needed to support the implementation of the Stockholm Convention and related instruments (Basel, Rotterdam, regional agreements);
6. Facilitate eligible countries’ access to GEF resources for enabling activities and NIP development and the implementation of the Convention;
7. Help Governments to begin the process of developing a National Implementation Plan (NIP) and other implementation/enabling activities under the Convention; and
8. Encourage co-operative partnerships among different sectors and stakeholders for the implementation of the Convention.

The objectives will be measured by the following indicators:

1. Increased number of signatories to the Stockholm Convention;
2. Better understanding by GEF-eligible countries of their commitments under the Stockholm Convention;

3. Early ratification of the Stockholm Convention by countries;
4. NIP funding proposals take into consideration legislative, capacity building, investment and other infrastructural needs assessment;
5. Consequent approaches to the GEF for support for NIP and implementation of the Convention; and
6. Number of countries that start developing their National Implementation Plan (NIP) for the Stockholm Convention.

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

No changes were mentioned in the TE.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

This project is aligned with the GEF’s Draft Operational Program on Persistent Organic Pollutants, in particular supporting: “Strengthening and harmonization of the policy and regulatory framework for integrated and cross-sectoral approaches to POPs management, as well as support for the inclusion of POPs-related issues as priorities in countries’ development strategies and assistance frameworks” (Operational Program on Persistent Organic Pollutants, page 4).

Country priorities are not applicable to the project, as it is global and designed to help countries adopt and comply with their obligations under the Stockholm Convention.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Satisfactory
--------------------------	-----------------------------

The project’s objectives were successfully accomplished through the use of workshops. The three project activities were: (1) the development of workshop training material, (2) organization and implementation of workshops covering all GEF-eligible countries, and (3) the dissemination of materials and follow-up after the workshops were held.

For the development of workshop training material, the target was to have the core and region-specific material distributed in the participants' languages to participants at least 3 weeks prior to each workshop. This was accomplished in most cases, but hindered in others due to the late nomination of participants by some countries, delays in Spanish translation, and late submissions of POPs reports by countries.

In the workshops themselves, the target was an average of 40 participants per workshop, including representatives from government, industry, and civil society. All GEF-eligible countries were invited to the workshops, and almost 90% sent representatives. NGOs participated in two out of every three workshops, but industry failed to attend any workshops. Each workshop was evaluated by the participants. The workshops received very favorable ratings; the mean scores of each workshop were between 4.4 and 4.8, out of a maximum of 5.

For post-workshop dissemination and follow-up, the target was to have all the workshop proceedings produced, translated as necessary, and distributed to the participants of later workshops. This target was accomplished, as was the target to update the UNEP website on POPs and the Stockholm Convention website with all of the workshop proceedings and translations.

Regarding the project's development objectives, it is difficult to ascertain the level of contribution that this project alone had on the ratification of the Stockholm Convention, as it was one among many initiatives at the time. According to the workshops' evaluations, understanding of the Stockholm Convention "increased considerably" as a result of the workshops, thus accomplishing objectives #1-2 (PIR 2003, page 2-3). Also, 55 signatures and 40 ratifications of the Convention occurred after the start of the project (per project objective #3), and 127 countries had applied for GEF funding for the National Implementation Plan at the time of writing of the TE. The 2003 PIR states that the National Implementation Plans that were submitted to the GEF demonstrated cooperation among various country stakeholders and an understanding of the country's needs and goals, as required in project objectives 4-7.

On the whole, the project succeeded in its objectives by furthering the understanding, ratification, and implementation of the Stockholm Convention. The only major weakness of the project's outcomes was the lack of industry involvement in the workshops, which is significant due to industry's role in producing and using POPs.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------	--

The efficiency of this project could have been improved. The project was extended from August 2002 to June 2003 due to the addition of a ninth workshop for representatives of The Alliance of Small Island States. The addition of this workshop caused an increase in the GEF budget of \$304,000, or a raise of 52% over the original GEF contribution. This ninth workshop "was largely a repetition, as most countries had already participated in earlier sub-regional workshops" (TE, page 15). Therefore the additional funds and time taken were not put to the most cost-effective use.

In addition, a workshop with the same goals and content was held in Anglophone Africa prior to the start of the project, with Swedish rather than GEF funding. The workshop for Anglophone Africa that this project executed later on was therefore a duplicate effort.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
--------------------	----------------------------------

Financial: Likely; GEF funding for the National Implementation Plans will assure that country-level POPs management initiatives are financially feasible. 127 countries had applied for GEF funding for their National Implementation Plans by the time of writing of the TE, so it is clear that countries are taking advantage of the funding.

Sociopolitical: Moderately Likely; stakeholder ownership is strong, as indicated by the number of countries with GEF-funded National Implementation Plans. Also, the content of the National Implementation Plans has demonstrated cooperation among various country stakeholders, according to the TE. The major concern for sociopolitical sustainability is the lack of private sector involvement in POPs reduction. Not only was the private sector absent from the project’s workshops, but the TE reports that private sector representation in POPs management “is still weak in most countries” (TE, page 7). Some POPs are primarily used by industry, so any management plan must involve the private sector. This risk is mitigated by a plan by UNEP Chemicals to arrange a workshop on PCB disposal as a start for further dialogue with the private sector.

Institutional: Likely; the Stockholm Convention and supporting National Implementation Plans will provide the governance framework and policies on POPs management for the ratifying countries. At the time of writing of the TE, 151 countries had signed the Stockholm Convention and 42 countries had ratified it.

Environmental: Not applicable.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Unable to assess. There is no accounting of finances in the TE.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project was extended from August 2002 to June 2003 due to the addition of a ninth workshop for representatives of The Alliance of Small Island States. This additional workshop caused an increase in the project’s budget and “was largely a repetition, as most countries had already participated in earlier sub-

regional workshops” (TE, page 15). This extension did not affect the project’s outcomes or sustainability, but the high cost and repetitious nature of the additional workshop harmed the project’s cost-effectiveness.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

Country ownership of this project and the Stockholm Convention is high, judging by the 127 countries that submitted requests for GEF funding for their National Implementation Plans. This is a positive signal for sustainability of the Stockholm Convention, as it assures GEF financing for country-level efforts to manage POPs.

6. Assessment of project’s Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Satisfactory
------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The M&E plan contained quarterly reports to UNEP and the GEF, as well as an evaluation following each workshop. The TE states that “no specific baselines were identified” for the project, but this has not significantly affected project outcomes or the functioning of the M&E system (TE, page 17). For the purposes of the project, the M&E design was practicable and sufficient, with practical indicators and targets for project activities.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE states that “the monitoring and evaluation system was fully adequate, and functioned as an effective management tool” (TE, page 3). Feedback from the project workshops was used to update the content of future workshops, demonstrating effective adaptive management. However, the TE believes that the process of updating future workshops could have occurred more rapidly in the face of changing conditions (e.g. awareness of the Stockholm Convention increased over time and less time was needed to explain POPs later on).

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
--	-----------------------------

Project design was adequate to support the ratification and implementation of the Stockholm Convention, and there were no problems reported with UNEP's supervision. However, in retrospect it is possible that the project proponents could have foreseen and attempted to address the lack of private sector participation. It is also unclear why it was deemed necessary to hold the final and largely redundant workshop, as well as the Anglophone Africa workshop that overlapped with previous efforts.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Satisfactory
---	-----------------------------

The TE states that the "project was well implemented," although faster adjustments to changing conditions would have been desirable in planning the workshops (TE, page 18). All project components were executed successfully and the objectives were reached.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

Not applicable.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

Not applicable.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) *Capacities*: The project was not explicitly intended to build capacity, but the workshops increased awareness of POPs, the Stockholm Convention, and the GEF’s role in the Convention. Information exchanges in the workshops also helped countries to develop their National Implementation Plans.

b) *Governance*: The governance impact of the project was the facilitation of the ratification of the Stockholm Convention and in the preparation of the National Implementation Plans, which will provide the governance framework and policies on POPs management. 151 countries had signed the Stockholm Convention and 42 countries had ratified it at the time of writing of the TE, while 127 countries had applied for GEF funding to execute their National Implementation Plans.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts were reported.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The TE states that “the project is fully replicable, should the need arise” but no replication has taken place (TE, page 17).

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

One of the lessons learned from project execution is to take advantage of existing UN infrastructure when making local administrative and practical arrangements.

The existence of the GEF funding mechanism for National Implementation Plans was a major motivating factor for countries to prepare for and ratify the Stockholm Convention, and the information on the GEF mechanism presented in the workshops was considered very important. “Whenever possible, such couplings should be made between implementation and funding possibilities” (TE, page 4).

The country reports that were written to chart progress and describe the difficulties encountered were a “strong stimulant...and a learning tool” which should be encouraged for future workshops (TE, page 4).

Workshop participants appreciated the presentation of the relationship between the Stockholm Convention and other related conventions, and such broader outlooks should be explained more often in workshops.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

Pay attention to document distribution and translation issues.

When providing technical assistance in workshops, countries with similar problems should be grouped together, and exchanges with more advanced countries should be arranged in order to learn from others’ progress.

Review and update POPs legislation, as three POPs categories are either not covered under existing legislation or the coverage is not comprehensive.

Trade, both licit and illicit, must be addressed, especially for countries that border non-Parties to the Convention. Law enforcement and border control should be trained to reduce illegal chemicals trade.

Unintentionally produced POPs such as dioxins are a special problem, and additional assistance is needed to set up monitoring and management mechanisms.

Incentives are needed for greater private sector participation in National Implementation plans. Collaboration with UNIDO and their industrial network would help in this regard.

It is necessary to establish and manage POPs stockpiles, and regional destruction units could be used as a cost-effective solution for this.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE faced a challenge in attempting to isolate the effect of the project compared to the parallel efforts being made to support the Stockholm Convention, but it leaves no doubt that the project was a positive contribution to the Convention.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent and the evidence is complete.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report does not have a dedicated sustainability section, but it adequately describes project sustainability and its ties to the Stockholm Convention throughout the report.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are comprehensive and derived directly from the project's experience and needs of the Stockholm Convention.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	No financial accounting is given in the TE.	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Adequate and descriptive.	S
Overall TE Rating		S

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

No other sources of information were used.