

## 1. Project Data

GEF Project ID	1520
IA/EA Project ID	GF/IND/07/004
Focal Area	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)
Project Name	Development of a National Implementation Plan in India as a First Step to Implement the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants
Country/Countries	India
Geographic Scope	National
Lead IA/Other IA for joint projects	United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)
Executing Agencies involved	Ministry of Environment and Forests (MOEF)
Involvement of NGO and CBO	Not involved
Involvement of Private Sector	No- Not Involved
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	OP14- Persistent Organic Pollutants
TER Prepared by	Nelly Bourlion
TER Peer Review by	Neeraj Kumar Negi
Author of TE	Dr Tom Batchelor and Dr Kurian Joseph
Review Completion Date	
CEO Endorsement/Approval Date	06/09/2007
Project Implementation Start Date	06/11/2007
Expected Date of Project Completion (at start of implementation)	31/12/2009
Actual Date of Project Completion	31/12/2010
TE Completion Date	30/05/2011
IA Review Date	17/10/2012
TE Submission Date	10/1/2012

## 2. Project Financing

Financing Source	At Endorsement (millions USD)	At Completion (millions USD)
GEF Project Preparation Grant	0.32	0.32
Co-financing for Project Preparation	0.14	0.14
Total Project Prep Financing	0.46	0.46
GEF Financing	3.07	3.24
IA/EA own	0.20	0.20
Government	6.88	6.88
Other*		
Total Project Financing	10.15	10.32
Total Financing including Prep	10.61	10.78

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

## 3. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF Evaluation Office TE Review
Project Outcomes	S	U	MU	MU
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	MS	ML	U
Monitoring and Evaluation	S	U	U	U
Quality of Implementation and Execution	N/A	U	U	U
Quality of the Evaluation Report	N/A	N/A	HS	HS

#### 4. Project Objectives

##### 4.1. Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The overall objective of the project is "to develop the NIP for India to implement the Stockholm Convention". To stand by this commitment, the Project is designed to:

- (1) Establish inventories on POPs production, use, trade, stockpiles, wastes, and contaminated sites;
- (2) Develop strategies and action plans for the reduction and elimination of POPs;
- (3) Assess infrastructural capacity and propose institutional arrangements, regulatory frameworks and requirements for capacity building;
- (3) Raise stakeholder and public awareness to ensure the effective and sustainable implementation of newly proposed strategies and Action Plans;
- (4) Build sustainable capacity sufficient to prepare the NIP and its component inventories, strategies and action plans and to fulfill ongoing reporting requirements of the Convention;
- (5) Formulate and gain stakeholder endorsement for the NIP, including priorities and objectives with the aim of estimating the total costs and the incremental costs likely to be incurred for introduction into development and assistance planning;
- (6) Develop and demonstrate practical and feasible methodologies for priority actions that enable India to meet its Convention obligations;
- (7) Promote sustainable capacity at the national, state and district levels to build on the POPs inventories and enhance the management systems for POPs in a way that was attractive for future donor funding.

The main expected outcome of the full project is "the identification of the requirements for the formulation of the NIP for implementing the Convention in India in accordance with the requirements provided in Article 7 of the Convention".

The expected principal impact as described in the Project Document is the endorsement of the NIP by the Government of India and the submission of it to the Convention.

4.2. *Development Objectives of the project:*

The long term objective of this project is "to protect human health and the environment from persistent organic pollutants – the principal objective of the Convention". The purpose of the project is to enable India to take the first steps towards implementation of the Convention.

As per the Project Document, the key project outcomes include:

- (1) Convention implementation infrastructure at national and state levels,
- (2) Measures in relation to DDT – the only POP pesticides produced and used in India,
- (3) Measures in relation to polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs),
- (4) Measures in relation to unintentionally produced POPs,
- (5) Measures in relation to wastes and contaminated sites,
- (6) Project management and monitoring & evaluation.

No changes in the project were reported in the PIRs or in the TE.

4.3. *Changes in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities:*

Criteria	Change?	Reason for Change
Global Environmental Objectives	No	
Development Objectives	No	
Project Components	No	
Other activities	No	

5. **GEF EO Assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability**

5.1. *Relevance – Satisfactory*

The Project is relevant to the central role of India’s environmental policies and sustainable development policies, the need for attainment of Agenda 21 targets and the need to integrate the POPs issues and implementation of the NIP within the national policy of India. The GOI considered that its effort toward compliance in the Stockholm Convention would serve as a model for other developing countries. The NIP was also considered relevant for deciding on the most appropriate post-NIP projects that address the management, reduction and ultimately the elimination of POPs.

The relevance of the Project can also be seen in the context of:

- (1) The Stockholm Convention;
- (2) The GEF’s Strategies and Focal Areas;

- (3) UNIDO's Thematic Priorities;
- (4) The Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action;
- (5) India's UN Development Assistance Framework 2008-2012.

The Project on the development of the NIP is consistent with the sectoral and developmental priorities and plans of India, and India's goal of strengthening its capacity to manage, reduce and eliminate toxic chemicals in an environmentally sound manner. India is a strong participant in activities at the international level, as evidenced by the Government's accession to the Vienna Convention in 1991, ratification of the Basel Convention in 1992, the Stockholm Convention in 2006, and accession to the Rotterdam Convention in 2005.

The Project was also consistent with the goals and objectives of SAICM and the WSSD Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, and with India's steps toward devolution of its decision-making from central government to the State and other levels. And consistent with India's commitment to the Stockholm Convention which requires the submission of a NIP as evidence of how it plans to implement its obligations on POPs. The NIP Project was therefore part of a catalogue of activities that collectively aimed to minimize the adverse impact of chemicals on the environment and human health. The NIP is relevant for deciding on the most appropriate post-NIP projects that address the management, reduction and ultimately the elimination of POPs.

## 5.2. *Effectiveness – Moderately Unsatisfactory*

According to the Terminal Evaluation, the quality of the NIP was low due to a range of project management problems such as poor contract formulation, selection of the applied methodologies, limited consultations that were undertaken, ineffective monitoring and evaluation, and slow progress on legislation that targeted POPs as well as a range of other issues.

The only expected outcome of this Project is a NIP endorsed by the GOI and submitted to the Convention. This outcome was not achieved at the time of the terminal evaluation in January 2011. The NIP and its Annexes failed to use common scientific methods such as statistical analyses to assist with the development of the inventory of POPs; survey methodologies were inadequate; and there was limited information on alternatives to DDT. The quality of the NIP was reduced when these aspects were not optimized.

Objectives 1 (MOEF) and 5 (NEERI) contain the greatest number of outputs that were assessed in the Terminal Evaluation as "not yet delivered". These two objectives were the responsibility of organizations that had the highest value contracts and the most objectives to complete. The outputs considered delivered exceeded those that were yet to be delivered in Objectives 3, 4, and 6. According to the Terminal Evaluation, about 26% of the outputs were assessed as "delivered", 22% "partly delivered" and 52% "not yet delivered".

The Terminal Evaluation assessed the objectives and sub-objectives that led to the planned outputs as realistic and achievable, provided the work was well-directed, managed and planned. However, the lack of modern project management, monitoring and review methods prevented the Project achieving the contracted tasks in a timely manner.

### 5.3. *Efficiency – Unsatisfactory*

The efficiency of this project is rated unsatisfactory for the following reasons:

#### (1) significant project delays:

The agreement was signed in November 2007 for a two year period that was scheduled to end in November 2009. However, the Project has lasted more than three years (it was extended to 31 December 2010). At the time of Terminal Evaluation it has not been completed and produced all the expected results. According to the Terminal Evaluation, India has decentralized government with regional policies and structures and therefore more time can be expected for decision-making and technology transfer in India.

#### (2) work plans poorly developed and implemented:

None of the work plans had SMART objectives or indicators. None of the Work Plans were assessed as useful for helping to engage focus, action, feedback, and learning. The Work Plans were not reported to be used as a guide by the Project management in performance review discussions with these organizations. Moreover, there was no Work Plan for MOEF.

#### (3) poor cost-effectiveness:

CPCB reported in June 2010 that almost 90% of the payments remained unspent despite having increased the number of surveys. According to the Terminal Evaluation, CPCB's contract appears to be about 93% more expensive than is required to undertake the work, which indicated that the cost-effectiveness of the interventions for the GEF and donors in this case was very poor.

The cost of dioxins and furans analysis was estimated in 2004 by the Project Brief PDF-B report as \$600-800 per sample. By comparison, the cost of dioxin or PCB analysis in Europe is €150 to €190 (retail price) per sample for 10 to 15 day response, respectively. The cost of staff time and equipment depreciation was about 50% of the retail price.

CPCB was paid \$175,000 for the work on dioxins, which also included surveys sent to about 600 sources for data that was subsequently added to the UNEP Toolkit. According to the Terminal Evaluation, the estimates of cost indicated that analysis of dioxins in this Project was not cost-effective, and that analysis of relatively few samples in this Project (36) took 52-times longer than would be expected.

### 5.4. *Sustainability – Medium/Significant Risks*

Although the outcome of this project (NIP) was not yet delivered at the time of Terminal Evaluation, there are some financial, socio-political and institutional framework /governance risks that were evaluated to determine their ability to impact on the outcomes and sustainability of the Project.

Financial risks: No/negligible risks

Even if the majority of the outputs were categorized as “not yet delivered”, the funds are available and sufficient to deliver the outcome of endorsement of the NIP and submission to the Stockholm Convention.

Socio-political risks: Medium/Significant risks

There is a risk that the NGOs will not support the NIP because they had not been consulted by UNIDO and MOEF in the development of the NIP. The lack of a working relationship between UNIDO/MOEF and other stakeholders (including relevant ministries and civil society organizations) may reduce or even eliminate stakeholder support for the NIP and its long term objectives.

Institutional framework and governance risks: Medium/significant risks

The lack of legislation and or lack of enforcement of existing legislation reduced the prospects for post-NIP projects being able to manage, reduce and eliminate POPs in an efficient and environmentally sound manner. For example, even though emissions limits are set by the legislation, CPCB reported that there was no enforcement of these requirements over the period of the Project. There were gaps between theory and practice for the management of pollutants.

Environmental risks: No/negligible risks

There were no environmental or health risks that were assessed as likely to jeopardize the results of the Project.

## **6. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes**

### **6.1. Co-financing**

6.1.1. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by co-financing well integrated into the project?

Ranging from 23 to 91%, co-financing was integrated into all the project outcomes / components. Co-finance contributed to about 70% of the total funding in the Project and it was therefore an important indicator of the GOI’s commitment to the current and future work on POPs, as well as being necessary for achieving many of the key outputs.

According to the Project Document, a range of activities were to be funded by India's co-finance, such as the establishment of an Information Management System (\$200,000), public awareness and education (\$100,000), exposure risk assessment studies and modeling (\$415,000), development of measures to eliminate production, use and trade of DDT (\$231,800), collection of national information on the import and use of PCB and PCB-containing equipment (\$736,000), development of measures to identify sites contaminated by POPs (\$1,080,000), and the establishment a Technical Coordination Group in MOEF including the engagement of five institutions specialized in the field of pesticides, PCBs, dioxins and furans, monitoring and analysis of unintentionally produced POPs and legal, policy and regulations (\$1,605,100) and others.

Moreover, UNIDO intended the \$200,000 promised in co-finance to be used for project management and M&E.

- 6.1.2. 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Many of the activities cited above were not delivered at the time of the Terminal Evaluation, which suggested that the funds had not been used. Moreover, most of the M&E was not carried out, therefore most of the \$200,000 promised by UNIDO remained unspent.

In addition, there was no information provided by the GOI that showed how much of the \$6,880,000 that was promised in co-finance, as well as \$750,000 as 'seed money' to identify and evaluate the potential for post-NIP projects, had been spent and on which objectives.

## 6.2. Delays

- 6.2.1. 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Several delays occurred during project preparation, implementation, and completion. There were delays in preparing the contracts, obtaining equipment, training staff to use the equipment, obtaining responses to the surveys, and implementing management procedures.

(1) Four months before the start of the Project, MOEF considered switching from UNIDO to another implementing agency because of UNIDO's delay in formulating the Project,

(2) CPCB had still not signed the contract on 23 September 2008, almost one year after the UNIDO – GOI agreement was signed. At the same time, CPRI had also not signed as it was requesting more funding. MOEF’s contract was delayed to September 2009 because MOEF was not able to accept and disburse funds for the Project.

(3) Once the Project had started in November 2007, there were delays getting equipment in place and sufficient trained staff to operate the equipment.

(4) Much of the work on the objectives did not start until late 2008 and in the first part of 2009. It took more than a year after the UNIDO-India agreement was signed for counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities) to be in place.

Finally, the NIP Project was initially planned for two years but was granted an extension of one year until 31 December 2010. And then, UNIDO had submitted “statements of extension” from 31 December 2010 to May 2011 for several contracts that covered half of the objectives in the Project, or according to the Terminal Evaluation equivalent to 47% of the financial value of the Contracts.

### 6.3. Country ownership

6.3.1. 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:

Despite the consistencies with many chemical projects in the international and national plans of India, the country ownership was assessed as low for MOEF and HIL, but high for CPRI, CPCB, NEERI and NIIST.

MOEF ownership was low because of the categorization of many of the outputs from the Project as “yet to be delivered”; the appointment of inexperienced, junior staff for a short period of time who could not contribute significantly to the Project; the inadequate quality of MOEF’s Progress Report which failed to meet the performance criteria in the MOEF contract; contracting out the role of the Project Coordinator to UNIDO rather than maintaining this position within the MOEF; a lack of analysis of the legislative and policy requirements that could assist with the management, reduction and elimination of POPs.

The evidence to suggest that the commitment and motivation was high for CPRI, CPCB, NEERI, and NIIST came from the funds that these organizations had spent on the NIP Project from their own budgets and that was additional to the funds received from the Project; and the extent of their financial, staff, and equipment preparation for future work on POPs.

Overall, a National Steering Committee headed by the Secretary, Moe of the Government of India with its senior members from different ministries, NGOs, and



institutions were formed. The GoI designated a national focal point to facilitate or undertake information exchange on the reduction or elimination of the production, use and release of POPs and alternatives to POPs.

A Technical Review Committee has been constituted under the NSC to review and monitor continuously the progress of work under the project. This Committee was headed by the Joint Secretary and the POPs National Focal Point, GoI.

However, according to the terminal Evaluation no documentary evidence is available to ascertain the follow up actions taken at different levels of governance to support sustenance of and building up on project's achievement.

## **7. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system**

### **7.1. M&E design at entry - *Satisfactory***

A detailed M&E system is described within the project design, inclusive of type of M&E activities, parties responsible, funding from GEF, co-financing and the M&E activity timeframe.

However, MOEF and UNIDO did not prepare a Logical Framework and performance indicators. Instead, they used the Convention Guidelines on NIPs and the results of other NIP Projects in the Region to determine if progress was sufficient in India's Project. The "Guidelines on NIPs" consists of five documents that provide general information that according to the Terminal Evaluation would not be useful for monitoring and evaluating the performance of contractors, in contrast to the performance criteria contained in the Logical Framework that is more detailed. Moreover, the contracts between UNIDO and the institutes specified the achievement of specific performance indicators that were not found in the Convention Documents. The progress in relation to other developing country NIPs may not be relevant to the work being undertaken in India, since each country may have different objectives and smaller funding allocations than India.

### **7.2. M&E implementation – *Highly Unsatisfactory***

Several shortcomings appeared in the M&E plan implementation.

The Project management did not manage the Project based on performance indicators derived from the Project's Logical Framework. Work Plans were developed by most of the contractors, but they were not detailed and updated in time and did little to assist in the timely delivery of outputs. UNIDO did not work with the contracting institutes to assist them in the development of their Work Plans, and in updating them as a result of the technical reviews.

The Project Document required UNIDO to make arrangements for annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIR) and a Mid-Term Review but they were not undertaken. Most of UNIDO's co-financing of \$200,000 remained unspent as a result. Failure to implement these requirements resulted in missed opportunities to detect deficiencies during project implementation.

UNIDO reviewed the Inception Reports in July 2010, almost two years after they were submitted. This time delay in providing feedback was a lost opportunity to provide comments to the contractors on their planned approach to their work and its content.

According to the Project Document, M&E was to be assisted by the National Steering Committee; a Technical Coordination Group to oversee the implementation of the NIP Project; and the establishment of a National Expert Review Group who would report to the National Steering Committee. These committees and groups were not effective and therefore did not contribute significantly to the M&E.

The lack of most of the M&E activities meant that the majority of the M&E co-finance for these activities was not used. The M&E procedures implemented by UNIDO and MOEF in this Project were not consistent with the M&E procedures applied to other GEF projects.

## **8. Assessment of project's Quality of Implementation and Execution**

### **8.1. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution – Unsatisfactory**

### **8.2. Overall Quality of Implementation - *Unsatisfactory***

The quality of implementation of the project is rated as Unsatisfactory for the following reasons:

The project was poorly prepared as evidenced by delays agreeing contracts, organizational delays, delays installing equipment and training staff, lack of enabling legislation.

The implementation of the project was poor due to lack of document control, issues in the contract formulation, inconsistencies in the stakeholder consultation, lack of technical review, poor performance assessment and disbursements, and finally some financial diligences.

The Project Document on the NIP highlighted a number of external factors that could affect the delivery of the outcomes of the project. However, there was no evidence in this Project that any of these macro-economic / infrastructural or Project related external factors had prevented the delivery of the major outcomes of this Project. In this project, there appeared to be little focus on results and evidence of the measurement of those results, and little evidence of effort to build the capacity of the MOEF. The value of UNIDO's contract with MOEF was \$580,000 over two years, which was considered sufficient funding to engage competent and well-qualified staff to undertake work to produce the relevant project outputs.

UNIDO contracts with other organizations provided funding for equipment, training and staff which were also considered sufficient to undertake the analysis of POPs for the inventory. In the Terminal Evaluation, the Project managers reported they had access to key staff in the relevant ministries, suggesting that bureaucracy in this case was not hindering communications and implementation.

The Terminal Evaluation concludes that the lack of outcome delivery was related mainly to poor project management, particularly in relation to contract formulation, implementation of

objectives, awareness raising, stakeholder involvement, and monitoring & evaluation of progress. This assessment indicates that there are many challenges faced by India to achieve the goals of the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action.

### 8.3. Overall Quality of Execution- **Unsatisfactory**

The quality of execution of the project is rated as Unsatisfactory for the following reasons:

#### (1) Untimely and limited follow up on contracts:

All of the contracts contained objectives that were outside of the expertise of the contractor, and duplication of objectives between contracts. As a result, the responsibility for completing particular objectives in a contract was not accepted by the some contractors. It also meant payment for work had been made to more than one contractor for the same outputs.

Moreover, formal agreement on the contracts took about a year for most of the contracts, which delayed the start of the two year Project significantly.

#### (2) Insufficient project management from MOEF

The management of the Project by UNIDO and MOEF was insufficient to ensure on-time delivery of all of the deliverables. The main reason was because the Project management measured progress in the Project according to the Guidelines for the Convention on NIPs, and by comparing India's NIP with other NIPs that had been developed in the region, rather than using the Project document which is an official document approved by the GEF, UNIDO and the GOI.

MOEF as one of the contractors rarely presented information on progress of the work for which it was responsible at the review meetings. Therefore, there was no opportunity for the Project management to review the insufficient progress made by MOEF on the legislative aspects and many of the outputs. The first and only Progress Report by MOEF was submitted three weeks before the Project completion date of 31 December 2010.

Moreover, MOEF left the role of Project Coordinator to UNIDO rather than maintaining this position within its own organization.

#### (3) Poor supervision

The Project Managers changed about half way through the 3-year term, which contributed to insufficient attention being paid by the PM to Project performance. UNIDO did not use modern project monitoring and management procedures to monitor progress in the contracts.

UNIDO organized periodic reviews of the work progress, but these meeting reviewed the technical content of the information and did not check whether or not an output had been delivered.

UNIDO did not ensure that annual Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) and a Mid-Term evaluation were undertaken.

(4) Limited support on resources and options to encourage output delivery from some organizations

The technical and scientific guidance by UNIDO was not adequate, which resulted in the contractors collecting insufficient primary and secondary data for the inventory on POPs. UNIDO failed to provide guidance on statistical analysis methods and appropriate methodologies to estimate quantities of POPs in sectors that were difficult to analyze. UNIDO failed to assist its joint executing partner MOEF to undertake the work that was contracted to MOEF.

(5) Lack of monitoring in the payment procedures

UNIDO did not insist that the contractors provide all the information on each milestone that was specified in the Contracts. Contractors promised but did not deliver all the outputs.

(6) Limited Consultations with stakeholders

Civil society organizations were excluded for participation in the development of the NIP. This action reduced the ability of the Project to significantly increase the awareness of POPs, which would have assisted the contractors in their surveys.

## 9. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

Criteria	Rating	GEF EO Comments
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	The TE contains a strong assessment of the outputs and impacts that resulted from the project.
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	The TE is consistent and the evidence are complete and convincing. The activities, outputs, and evidences are presented in a clear table.
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	The TE makes reasonable assumptions about the sustainability of the project. Each components of the sustainability is rated and explained with clear evidences and arguments.
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	The lessons learnt are supported by the evidences presented in the report. Each lesson is detailed and clearly stated.
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	Co-financing and actual costs are present in the report, as well as the additional co-financing amount. The co-financing amounts are however reported only as "promised" and the actual amounts are reported as not available.
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	The M&E system was not implemented properly during this project. However, the Terminal Evaluation gives explanations and reasons of this shortcoming, and clearly details the significant limitations of the M&E systems.

## Annex I – Project Impacts as assessed by the GEF Evaluation Office

Did the project have outputs contributing to knowledge being generated or improved?

Yes

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO KNOWLEDGE BEING GENERATED OR IMPROVED?

Inventories and assessments of POPs in India.  
Final Completion Report detailing the Inventory, findings and NIP recommendations of the Project.  
Several workshops have been organized within different project components on the various POPs chemicals, to raise awareness amongst stakeholders, policy makers, engineers, scientists, State government officials, industry, and NGOs on a regional basis, covering the entire country.

Is there evidence that the knowledge was used for management/ governance?

Yes

HOW WAS THIS KNOWLEDGE USED AND WHAT RESULTED FROM THAT USE?

Knowledge was used to develop National Implementation plan for India to address POPs, and prepare for implementation of the Stockholm Convention.  
In addition, the Project helped to expand the knowledge on the presence and extent of POPs contamination in India. In particular, it quantified PCB contamination of electrical transformer oil, quantified unintentional emissions of POPs from four main sources, and provided estimates of the quantities of obsolete pesticide stocks. It also compiled information on the production and use of DDT for controlling vectors that cause disease and some information on alternatives that could replace DDT. The NIP also provided information on sites contaminated with PCBs and DDT.

Did the project have outputs contributing to the development of databases and information-sharing arrangements?

No

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO INFORMATION BEING COMPILED AND MADE ACCESSIBLE TO MANY?

Inventories of transformers and equipment containing PCBs waste was initiated. Various surveys conducted contribute to information being compiled. However, most of this information and not accessible to the public. Databases were intended but not created, a website based information management systems was intended but not delivered.

Is there evidence that these outputs were used?

Yes

TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THESE OUTPUTS BEEN USED?

WHAT HAS RESULTED FROM INFORMATION BEING MADE ACCESSIBLE TO OTHERS?

For preparation of the NIP. However, the NIP was of poor quality according to the TE.

Did the project have activities that contributed to awareness and knowledge being raised?

No

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE BEING RAISED?

The MOEF was required to establish schemes for public awareness and education in collaboration with the Ministries of Health, Agriculture, Information and Broadcasting. However, a website-based Information Management System or clearing house mechanism was not established.  
No assessment to determine the extent of awareness on POPs raised amongst the various stakeholders has been carried out.

Was any **positive** change in behavior reported as a result of these activities?

No

WHAT BEHAVIOR (POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE) HAS CHANGED AS A RESULT?

With no follow-up actions reported, continuance of behavioral change due to awareness building among the stakeholders is difficult to ascertain from any of the evaluation reports.

Did the project activities contribute to building technical/ environmental management skills?

Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO **TECHNICAL/ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SKILLS** BEING BUILT OR IMPROVED?

Training and capacity building activities within the Ministries and some participating institutions.

Is there evidence of these skills being applied by people trained?

Yes

HOW HAVE THESE SKILLS BEEN APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE TRAINED?

The TE notes that capacity building was insufficient in MOEF, but sufficient in some participating Institutes.

Did the project contribute to the development of legal / policy / regulatory frameworks?

Yes

Were these adopted?

No

WHAT LAWS/ POLICIES/ RULES WERE ADOPTED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

NIP

Did the project contribute to the development of institutional and administrative systems and structures?

Yes

Were these institutional and administrative systems and structures integrated as permanent structures?

Yes

WHAT OFFICES/ GOVERNMENT STRUCTURES WERE CREATED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

(1) National Steering Committee comprised of: chaired by the MOEF, with the participation of delegates from MOEF, UNIDO/RENAP, the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, the Ministry of Health and Welfare, the Ministry of Agriculture; the Department of Chemical and Petrochemical; the five government sub- contractors(CPCB, CPRI, HIL, NEERI, NIIST); the Confederation of Indian Industry; the Industrial Toxicology Research Centre; and the National Institute of Occupational Health.  
 (2) Expert Technical Group  
 (3) Sub-committee of the Steering Committee

Did the project contribute to structures/ mechanisms/ processes that allowed more stakeholder participation in environmental governance?

Were improved arrangements for stakeholder engagement integrated as permanent structures?

**WHAT STRUCTURES/ MECHANISMS/ PROCESSES WERE SUPPORTED BY THE PROJECT THAT ALLOWED MORE STAKEHOLDERS/ SECTORS TO PARTICIPATE IN ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE/ MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES?**

Many of the project activities required the willing participation of a broad range of stakeholders. Each of the activities such as provision for stakeholder reviews and endorsement at various stages of development of the NIP and its various action plan and strategies required the development of successful methodologies encouraging active participation by relevant stakeholder groups. Furthermore, activities set out for the proposed project were designed so that draft findings are taken to principal stakeholder groups for review and endorsement before being included in the NIP.

Did the project contribute to informal processes facilitating trust-building or conflict resolution?

**WHAT PROCESSES OR MECHANISMS FACILITATED TRUST-BUILDING AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION?  
 WHAT RESULTED FROM THESE?**

Did the project contribute to any of the following:

Technologies & Approaches	No
Implementing Mechanisms/Bodies	No
Financial Mechanisms	No

Please specify what was contributed:


Did **replication** of the promoted technologies, and economic and financial instruments take place?

**SPECIFY WHICH PLACES IMPLEMENTED WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH.**

**WHAT WAS THE RESULT IN THOSE PLACES (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?**



No clear-cut arrangements to facilitate replication, mainstreaming or up-scaling were included within the project design. However, some forms of replication occurred. As examples of replication:

- (1) NEERI, CPRI and CPCB provided data to substantiate their expenditure from non-Project-related funds on future work on POPs (NEERI, CPCB) or to complete the Project (CPRI).
- (2) Over the course of 3 years, NEERI increased the number of scientists working on the Project from 4 to 16 while during this period the Project paid only for 4 technical assistants and no scientific staff.
- (3) NEERI spent almost 20-times more on equipment than funds it received from the Project. During the three year period, staff were trained on equipment operation and maintenance, management of hazardous wastes and management of contaminated sites.
- (4) CPRI expenditure on salaries, contract engineers and technical attendants was 11 times more than provided by the Project.
- (5) Originally, the Project committed CPRI to undertaking surveys on PCBs 3 States, but then this was increased so more than 15 States by CPRI.
- (6) According to the Terminal Evaluation, CPCB planned to expand its activities on dioxin sampling using its own funds. CPCB planned to spend about Rupees 28 million to collect and analyze dioxin samples in its seven laboratories in India.
- (7) The three Institutes and the CPCB stated their commitment to employing more staff and purchasing equipment for work on the post-NIP projects.

Did **scaling-up** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place?

No

SPECIFY AT WHAT ADMINISTRATIVE & ECOLOGICAL SCALE AND WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS ADOPTED.

HOW WAS IT MODIFIED TO FIT THE NEW SCALE? WHAT WAS THE RESULT AT THE NEW SCALE/S (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Did **mainstreaming** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place?

No

SPECIFY HOW (MEANS/ INSTRUMENT) AND WHICH ASPECTS OF THE TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS INCORPORATED INTO THE EXISTING SYSTEM. WHAT WAS THE RESULT OR STATUS (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Did **removal of market barriers** and sustainable market change take place?

No

SPECIFY HOW DEMAND HAS BEEN CREATED FOR WHICH PRODUCTS/ SERVICES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO GEBs.

Based on most of the project's components and/or what it generally intended to do, what type of project would you say this is?

Implementation Strategies

<--dropdown menu

If "combination", then of which types?

&  <--dropdown menu

*QUANTITATIVE OR ANECDOTAL DETAILS ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **PRESSURE HAS BEEN REDUCED/PREVENTED** OR ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **STATUS HAS CHANGED** AT THE DEMONSTRATION SITES AS A CONTRIBUTION/RESULT OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES. FOR SYSTEM LEVEL CHANGES, SPECIFY THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR ECOLOGICAL SCALES.*

Was stress reduction achieved?

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local     Intended (local)     Unintended (local)  
 Systemic     Intended (systemic)     Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

Measured     Anecdotal

Was there a change in environmental status?

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local     Intended (local)     Unintended (local)  
 Systemic     Intended (systemic)     Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

Measured     Anecdotal

Evidence of intended stress reduction achieved at the **local level**

Evidence of intended stress reduction at a **systemic level**

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at the **local level**

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at a **systemic level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **local level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **systemic level**

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place during the project?

Environmental

Socioeconomic

To what extent were arrangements in place and being implemented during the project? Briefly describe arrangements.

To what extent did these arrangements use parameters/ indicators to measure changes that are actually related to what the project was trying to achieve?

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place to function after the project?

To what extent were arrangements put into place to function after GEF support had ended? Briefly describe arrangements.

Was there a government body/ other permanent organization with a clear mandate and budget to monitor environmental and/or socioeconomic status?

Has the monitoring data been used for management?

How has the data been used for management? Describe mechanisms and actual instances.

Has the data been made accessible to the public?

How has the data been made accessible to the public? Describe reporting systems or methods.

*“SOCIOECONOMIC” REFERS TO ACCESS TO & USE OF RESOURCES (DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS), LIVELIHOOD, INCOME, FOOD SECURITY, HOME, HEALTH, SAFETY, RELATIONSHIPS, AND OTHER ASPECTS OF HUMAN WELL-BEING .AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE, INCLUDE “BEFORE” AND “AFTER” NUMBERS, YEARS WHEN DATA WAS COLLECTED, AND DATA SOURCES.*

Did the project contribute to **positive** socioeconomic impacts?

No

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

- Local       Intended (local)       Unintended (local)
- Systemic       Intended (systemic)       Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?       Measured       Anecdotal

Did the project contribute to **negative** socioeconomic impacts?

No

Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report

The major lessons learnt from this project are:

- (1) the importance of using well-conceptualized methodologies and carefully selected monitoring equipment to build inventories on POPs efficiently and cost-effectively;
- (2) a full time project coordinator that uses modern project management procedures to develop contracts and to monitor and review progress; performance based fund disbursement; effective document control procedures; legislative measures in place in order to make significant progress on the management, reduction and elimination of POPs;
- (3) consultation at all stages of the project that fully engages civil society and other stakeholders in projects on POPs;
- (4) Resourcing difficulties (finance, staff, equipment, other) associated with delayed outputs must be identified and resolved as early as possible, in order to build partnerships and a team approach that leads to overall project success;
- (5) The GEF needs to be actively involved in the technical review of the methods used, the review of the data gathered, and to ensure that funding for the future is based on new work that has not been previously funded.

Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The main recommendations given by the Terminal Evaluation are as follow:

(1) UNIDO should review its procedures related to contract formulation and implementation, project management, payments for milestones in the contracts, and project monitoring and evaluation.

(2) A review of existing procedures and costs for inventory development could be useful for ensuring that the most cost-effective and efficient procedures are in place for establishing POPs inventories.

(3) MOEF should ensure that project planning, implementation and consultation are improved using appropriate tools, committees and outreach mechanisms; and to engage suitably qualified personnel to assist with the development and implementation of legislation to manage, reduce and phase out POPs.

(4) A visit to China's Foreign Economic Cooperation Office could also assist the GOI to determine the usefulness of FECCO's structure and approach for future POPs projects in India.

(5) The GEF should consider becoming a member of key committees in order to keep abreast of progress in projects; and to put in place procedures that monitor delivery of co-finance commitments and to ensure that agreed work programs are funded only once.