

## GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID:	2067		Review date: at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	472	<b>GEF financing:</b>	1.00	1.00
Project Name:	Fostering Active and Effective Civil Society Participation in Preparations for Implementation of the Stockholm Convention. (NGO-POPs Elimination Project).	IA/EA own:		
Country:	Global	Government:		
		Other*:		
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	1.00	1.90
Operational Program:		<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>2.90</b>
IA	<b>UNEP</b>	<b>Dates</b>		
Partners involved:	UNIDO	Work Program date		April 2003
		CEO Endorsement		May 2003
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		<b>September 2003</b>
		Closing Date	Proposed: <b>06/30/2006</b>	Actual: <b>12/31/2006</b>
Prepared by: Soledad	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: <b>33 months</b>	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: <b>39 months</b>	Difference between original and actual closing: <b>6 months</b>
Author of TE: Nee Sun CHOONG KWET YIVE		TE completion date: <b>March 2007</b>	TE submission date to GEF OME: <b>May 2007</b>	Difference between TE completion and submission date: <b>2 months</b>

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

## 2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

Please refer to document "GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for the verification and review of terminal evaluations" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable		GEF EO
			UNEP	UNIDO	
2.1 Project outcomes	<b>S</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>
2.2 Project sustainability	<b>N/A</b>	<b>MU</b>	<b>MU</b>	<b>MU</b>	<b>MU</b>
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	<b>NA</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>MU</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MU</b>
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>MS</b>

**Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why?**

YES. It is clear, well written and addresses all the major issues that a terminal evaluation is expected to address

according to the GEF-EO Guidelines for IAs and EAs to conduct TE. The TE presents an assessment of all relevant outcomes and achievements of project objective; was consistent, presented an assessment of sustainability of outcomes; the lessons and recommendations listed in the terminal evaluation report are supported by the evidence presented and are relevant to the portfolio and future projects. In addition, a table with project costs (totals, per activity, and per source) is presented. The report, however, does not include a complete assessment of the M&E system. It does refer to the plan at entry, but does not sufficiently describe how it was implemented.

**Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.?**

YES.

Although it is not mentioned as a follow up issue, it is written in the form of a serious doubt. In page 41 of the TE, the evaluator states: "For the evaluation of the financial aspects of the project, only a snapshot financial summary was provided by the UNIDO and no other financial documents/reports could be obtained. It is rather peculiar that the Project Manager (main subcontractor), who managed \$260,000, excluding co-funding, could not provide a financial report. This observation also applies for the hubs. Fund transfer was also a weakness that caused big delays in project activities."

In addition, according to the TE, the overall budget of IPEP including in-kind and cash co-finance, calculated and given in the Global report, amounted to \$2,902,899 as indicated in Table 6 of the TE report, that also lists the donors / source of funds. It was, however, not possible to get a financial summary breakdown that would give detailed costs for: salaries, staff travel, administration and overhead costs of secretariats that would have helped for a better analysis and evaluation.

UNEP's EOU states that there were problems with financial disbursement and detailed financial information was either not available or not fully disclosed by the project.

### 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

#### 3.1 Project Objectives

**What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?**

According to the Project Brief Document Global Environmental Objectives of the project were "to successfully implement the Stockholm Convention and longer-term efforts to reduce and eliminate persistent toxic substances (PTS), enhance public awareness about POPs and to increase civil society participation, involvement and interest in the Convention and related activities."

According to the TE there were no changes to the global environmental objectives during implementation.

**What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?**

According to the project documents, the project had the following development objectives:

1. To encourage and enable NGOs in approximately 40 developing countries and countries with economies in transition to engage in activities within their countries that will provide concrete and immediate contributions to country efforts in preparing for Stockholm Convention implementation.
2. To enhance the skills and knowledge of NGOs to help build their capacity as effective stakeholders in the Convention implementation process;
3. To help establish regional and national coordination and capacity in all regions of the world in support of NGO contributions to effective Stockholm Convention implementation as well as longer term efforts to achieve chemical safety.

According to the TE there were no changes to the DO during implementation

#### 3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

**What major project outcomes and impacts are described in the TE?**

The major project outcomes and impacts listed in the terminal evaluation report are:

- Hubs were established and hosted by NGOs, members of IPEN, in eight regions of the world. These hubs, which are still fully operational, provided guidance and support on strengthening regional and national NGO capacity relative to POPs to participating NGOs.
- A comprehensive and well-presented website was created within months of the start of the project. The website, regularly updated, contains all information regarding IPEP, including project activity reports and other related documents in all UN languages. It also contains other POPs-related documents and useful links. The GPM (Global Project Manager) stated that this would be completed in the first quarter of 2007.

- The regional hubs have been quite successful in getting more than 160 NGOs from more than 60 countries to participate in IPEP through outreach activities and using pre-existing networks. These NGOs submitted about 260 PAMs (Project Activity Memo) that covered all the topics mentioned in the project document. IPEP, through these participations, mobilized a relatively large number of persons from different sectors of the population in these regions including scientists, farmers, fishermen, grassroots communities and even local authorities in a few cases.
- Most NGOs have enhanced their capacity and knowledge regarding POPs and related issues that allowed some of them to participate and effectively contribute to NIP processes according to the Global report. However, according to the TE, it was difficult to assess these participations and contributions during the evaluation exercise.

The Global Chicken Egg study, for example, in which 17 countries participated, can be considered to be a major achievement of the project. Priority was given to countries that lacked information about POPs in their environment. The study did not attempt to determine the average level of POPs (PCDD/Fs, PCBs and HCB) in eggs in the country. Rather, samples were collected near facilities like cement kilns or industrial plants that NGOs suspected to be potential sources of POPs release. Seventy percent of the samples were found to contain levels of dioxins that exceeded the EU limit and sixty percent exceeded the EU limits for PCBs.

#### 4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT

##### 4.1.1 Outcomes (use a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU)

<b>A Relevance</b>	<b>Rating: 6 HS</b>
The objectives are consistent with GEF OP#14 - Persistent Organic Pollutants /Initial guidelines for POPs enabling activities – Capacity Building Support Component. The project seeks to facilitate the implementation of commitments related to Article 10 on the part of signatories and parties to the Stockholm Convention.	
<b>B Effectiveness</b>	<b>Rating: 4MS</b>
By and large, results are commensurate with the objectives stated in the project document. However, according to the TE, it is not clear to what extent IPEP outputs have influenced policy decisions and it is also difficult to assess the NGOs' contributions to the National Implementation Plans. In addition, due to difficulties in raising co-finance, the five international expert teams were not established; support and assistance were provided to NGOs in a different manner, mainly by hubs with help from the GPM.	
<b>C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</b>	<b>Rating: 4 MS</b>
According to UNEP EOU assessment, the cost-effectiveness of "raising awareness" seems to be satisfactory whereas the cost effectiveness of influencing POPS-related policy (the higher purpose) was rather limited. According to the TE, although more than \$900,000 of cash co-financing was raised, an excess of more than \$250,000 with respect to the \$ 650,000 planned in the project document. In contrast, the project management claimed that it was not possible to set up the five issue-focused international expert teams due to difficulty in raising sufficient cofinancing.	

##### 4.1.2 Impacts

In accordance with the TE, although it is too early to assess the impacts of IPEP, there are some indications that IPEP has, to a certain extent, achieved part of the goal for which it was implemented. Many of the participating NGOs that had experience in other issues such as climate change or AIDS have had their capacity enhanced in POPs by means of IPEP. In total more than 160 NGOs from 61 countries participated in IPEP and submitted 261 PAMs (Project Activity Memos).

**4.2 Likelihood of sustainability.** Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= no or negligible risk to 1= High risk)

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: 3 MU</b>
According to the Global Report of the project, Financial resources are one of the major limiting factors that IPEP participating NGOs are facing to sustain efforts in promoting a POPs free environment. According to the Global Report of the project, only 37 NGOs of the 161 that were involved (23 %), from 27 countries have already secured funds to continue efforts in the area.	
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: 4 ML</b>
As a global project, the sociopolitical risks vary according to the countries' context and relationship between the governments and the civil society. Furthermore, according to the TE, although IPEP was geared exclusively towards NGOs, the level of involvement of national or local authorities was very low. The lack of private sector involvement in the project was also a matter of concern. NGO influence on governments was limited, especially where the National Implementation Plans happened before the IPEP project.	

<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: 3 MU</b>
All countries involved in IPEP are parties to the Stockholm Convention and most of them have already ratified it. In this respect, they have the obligation to improve their legal and institutional framework in order to manage POPs. According to the National Implementation Plans they also need to improve their technical capacity in order to monitor POPs. However, it is difficult to assess the linkages between this capacity building and outcomes of IPEP. At the same time, lack of institutional capacity hinders the sustainability of the project. According to the TE, many relevant institutions still lack capacity with respect to POPs.	
<b>D Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
Environmental risks to the sustenance of the project's benefits are negligible	

#### 4.3 Catalytic role

<b>a. Production of a public good</b>
Extensive awareness-raising campaigns, targeting all sectors of the society particularly exposed populations like those living near incinerators, have been carried out using different modes of communications including brochures, press release, radio and TV.
<b>b. Demonstration</b>
Given the regional approach of hubs that has been applied, the project can easily be replicated in other countries or regions if this is based on capacities built, networks created and experience gained during IPEP.
<b>c. Replication</b>
<b>d. Scaling up</b>

#### 4.4 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

<b>A. M&amp;E design at Entry</b>	<b>Rating (six point scale):</b>	<b>4 MS</b>
According to the project document, monitoring and evaluation of IPEP would consist of (i) semi-annual and annual summary progress reports; (ii) annual financial reports and quarterly reports for details project expenses and disbursements; (iii) external evaluation prior to the end of the project (Mid Term Evaluation); (iv) Project Performance and Evaluation Review; and (v) final report. Although indicators have been specified, they are vague and the plan to monitor progress during the implementation has not been specified.		
<b>B. M&amp;E plan Implementation</b>	<b>Rating (six point scale):</b>	<b>3 MU</b>
According to the TE, the logical framework was used to guide overall project implementation. However, according to UNEP's EOU project progress reports were not received by UNEP, constraining oversight and UNEP monitoring. Not much discussion of the M&E implementation plan is provided in the TE		
<b>C.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&amp;E in the budget included in the project document? UA</b>		
<b>C.2 Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&amp;E during project implementation? UA</b>		
<b>C.3 Can the project M&amp;E system be considered a good practice?</b>		
No. Because the design was not well defined to facilitate measurement of project performance during the implementation. This led to probable misunderstandings or misinterpretations of performance—where the evaluator notes unrealistic performance monitoring: “ an Individual Project Implementation Review Report was also submitted by the Global Project Manager in which all the 11 categories (ranging from objectives and outcomes through cost effectiveness financial control and cost planning to sustainability, replicability and monitoring etc.) were rated highly satisfactory (HS). However, only the rating for implementation approach concurs with that of the evaluator. The other aspects were, with justification, less highly rated by the evaluator. In addition, according to UNEP's EOU, there was an absence of evidence in the report on the existence of M&E systems and their use in adaptive management.		

#### 4.5 Lessons and Recommendations

Project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

<b>What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?</b>
The lessons that appear in the report are mainly phrased as recommendations for any future projects of this size and nature, especially those involving NGOs. What could be considered lessons, however, are the weaknesses of the project identified by the evaluator. These are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In many cases, funds allocated were not sufficient for NGOs to properly accomplish the tasks for which they submitted a Project Activity Memorandum (PAM).</li> <li>• Although IPEP was geared exclusively towards NGOs, the very low involvement of national or local authorities is a matter of concern. Some awareness-raising activities were undertaken among government officials; however,</li> </ul>

there should have been more activities to explain the aims and objectives of IPEP to local and national authorities. For example, national POPs focal points could have been invited to launching workshops or to get involved in some of the project activities.

- The PAM application mechanism, selection criteria for NGOs and the number of PAMs that a country or an NGO could submit, were not totally clear and transparent. In all the hubs, the host country submitted the largest number of PAMs and the hosting NGO also submitted the highest number of PAMs.

**List (or if detailed summarize) the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation**

Any future projects of this size and nature, especially those involving NGOs, should make sure that:

- Decision and policy-makers and governments are involved at an early stage to ensure that project outputs are considered during decision-making stages.
- In projects of similar scope (60 countries involving more than 160 NGOs) appropriate human resources for administration of a large volume of financial and substantive reports should be planned so that funds transfer, monitoring and administration would not be limiting or delaying factors.
- Depending on regions and countries the time and resource requirements are different for effective project implementation. For example not all regions are adequately equipped (e.g. for POPs analysis) to carry out certain activities (e.g. hotspots report). So appropriate financial resources should be allocated. In countries where Internet access may be a barrier for effective and rapid communication, longer time period would be needed to undertake project activities.
- Other key stakeholders, for example private sector or education sector, should also be involved in the process to ensure sustainability and success.
- Funds need to be disbursed in larger amounts to fewer NGOs in fewer countries. This would enable production of outputs of better quality rather than thinly spreading funds to many NGOs in many countries which often results in reports of limited usefulness.
- If global follow-up activities are to be undertaken, following issues need to be considered:
  - Ensure that densely populated and large countries are more actively engaged
  - Encourage more involvement of government officials for example POPs focal points or officials responsible for NIP or post NIP activities

**4.6 Quality of the evaluation report** Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document "GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for the verification and review of terminal evaluations" for further definitions of the ratings.

**4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings from other sources such as GEF EO field visits, etc.**

None.

<b>4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<b>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b>	5
<b>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?</b> The report was consistent and ratings were substantiated. However, evidence was incomplete in some aspects.	4
<b>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b>	5
<b>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b> The section on lessons learned contains recommendations for future projects, not lessons learned. The TE reviewer found that what was under the title of Project Weaknesses could be taken as lessons learned. These, in turn, need more detail.	4
<b>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b> The report did not include these. According to UNEP's EOU this appears to be a problem of the project, not the evaluator, as EOU was copied on exchanged correspondence attempting to gain access to such information.	3
<b>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&amp;E systems?</b> The TE presents a description of the M&E design and what the different reports during the project implementation stated. The evaluator also provides a rating for M&E. However, the report does not include an assessment of the M&E systems. The only	3

sentence that could be used as assessment is: In view of these reports, it is clear that the GPM used the logical framework of the project document as a guiding tool to implement and manage IPEP (p. 38)	
--	--

**4.6.3 Assessment of processes affected attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.**

<b>Co-financing and Project Outcomes &amp; Sustainability.</b>	
According to the TE, the project management has been very successful in raising co-finance (cash: \$901,576 and in-kind: \$1,084,489, Table 6) in a ratio almost 2 to 1 with regards to funds coming from GEF. It should be pointed out that the hubs also contributed to raise funds for the project). However, some of the figures given in Table 7 of the TE document need some justification. For example, \$179,700 for the in-kind contribution of the Francophone Africa hub or \$133,273 for that of Latin America are difficult to justify. In addition, as mentioned in paragraph 2.3 of the TE, the project management together with the hubs have been quite successful in raising co-finance. However, despite the fact that more than \$ 900, 000 of cash co-financing was raised, an excess of more than \$ 250,000 with respect to the \$ 650,000 planned in the project document, the project claimed it was not possible to set up the five issue-focused international expert teams.	
<b>Delays and Project Outcomes &amp; Sustainability.</b> If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons responsible for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkage did it affect it?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to the TE, there were fund transfer delays as a consequence of communication problems between UNIDO and UNEP</li> <li>• In many cases, according to the TE, funds allocated were not sufficient for NGOs to properly accomplish the tasks for which they submitted a PAM. This also caused delay to the activities as the NGOs had to devise ways and means to raise funds. In most countries except the European and some others, facilities do not exist for POPs analysis. For this reason, all the hotspots reports from these countries had to rely mostly on published data as it would have been too costly to have these analyses done elsewhere. This was a limiting factor to produce new data and impacted on the quality of these reports.</li> </ul>	

**4.7 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended?** Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.

<b>Yes:</b>	<b>No: x</b>
-------------	--------------

Explain:

**4.8 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)**

Last PIR (2006) Project Document UNEP EOU / UNIDO EO Assessment
---