

1. Project Data

GEF Project ID	3011
IA/EA Project ID	GF/VIE/08/005
Focal Area	Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)
Project Name	Introduction of BAT and BEP methodology to demonstrate reduction or elimination of unintentionally produced persistent organic pollutants (UPPOPs) releases from the industry in Vietnam
Country/Countries	Vietnam
Geographic Scope	National
Lead IA/Other IA for joint projects	UNIDO
Executing Agencies involved	Vietnam Environment Administration (VEA)
Involvement of NGO and CBO	Not involved
Involvement of Private Sector	Among the executing agencies
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	CO-1, POPS-3
TER Prepared by	Sandra Romboli
TER Peer Review by	Neeraj Negi
Author of TE	Mario Marchich and Pham Minh Chinh
Review Completion Date	
CEO Endorsement/Approval Date	5/28/2008
Project Implementation Start Date	9/7/2009
Expected Date of Project Completion (at start of implementation)	7/31/2011
Actual Date of Project Completion	7/31/2011
TE Completion Date	4/1/2012
IA Review Date	
TE Submission Date	10/1/2012

2. Project Financing

Financing Source	At Endorsement (millions USD)	At Completion (millions USD)
GEF Project Preparation Grant		
Co-financing for Project Preparation		
Total Project Prep Financing	0.05	0.05
GEF Financing	0.75	0.75
IA/EA own	0.04	0.04
Government	1.55	1.55
Other*	-	-
Total Project Financing	2.34	2.34
Total Financing including Prep	2.39	2.39

*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	S	MS	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	U/A	U/A	UA
Monitoring and Evaluation	U/A	MU	MU	MU
Quality of Implementation and Execution	N/A		MS	MS
Quality of the Evaluation Report	N/A	N/A	MU	MU

4. Project Objectives

4.1. Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

To establish the required human resources and infrastructure to implement the obligations of the Stockholm Convention in Article 5 "Measures to reduce and eliminate releases from unintentional production" and coordinate its activities with the national strategies for environmental protection and the national strategies for industrial and sustainable development and cleaner production and thus contribute to the improvement of human and environmental health (CEO approval document). NO CHANGE DURING PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

4.2. Development Objectives of the project:

The specific objective of the project aims at (CEO approval doc):

- Reducing unintentional production of POPs in key sectors of the industry listed in Part II: Source categories in Annex C of the Stockholm Convention by implementation of BAT/BEP; and
- Supporting the BAT/BEP projects and addressing other UP-POPs related issues by development of monitoring and research capacities.

NO CHANGE DURING IMPLEMENTATION

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 TE does not discuss Relevance in any detail in the report, however the project approach addresses Vietnam's obligations under the Stockholm Convention to start reducing about 25% of Polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins and dibenzofurans (PCDDs/PCDFs) releases currently attributed to these source categories. Priority areas identified in the NIP include the stack emission sampling and other industrial release sampling and analysis of PCDD/PCDFs, which is a prerequisite for guiding of BAT/BEP projects and for evaluating BAT/BEP implementation. The project has provided support to the country for complying with the obligations of the Stockholm convention, improving the environment and updating the technology of selected enterprises. The outputs of the project has provided a useful contribution to further develop the guidelines on BAT and BEP.

5.2. *Effectiveness* – **Moderately Satisfactory**

The overall objective of the project was to establish the required human resources and infrastructure to implement the obligations of the Stockholm Convention by supporting the necessary capacity building and regulatory framework to strengthen best available techniques and best environmental practices (BAT/BEP) guidelines. The outcomes of this project provide a useful contribution to further develop at national level the guidelines on BAT and BEP, however there are were issues with some of the results of the project. This was mainly a capacity building project, but the TE does not elaborate sufficiently on the actual evidence of the impact of the capacity measures. Furthermore, the technological units for process improvement and optimization in 4 enterprises only partially developed and were not completed and the effects of the measures were not taken (and samples for analysis were only collected from 2 of them). These technological units were meant not only to be in operation (in terms of reducing UP-POPs) but also to have been evaluated by experts. The TE mentions that the project was overambitious and that was the reason for why this was not done (TE page 43). It is therefore difficult to conclude if the measures used were effective or not. No reduction of UP-POPs and other targeted pollutant releases can be established. However a large number of capacity building, training and public awareness measures were implemented successfully, for example: The project has raised awareness of policy makers on specific BAT/BEP issues including waste management policies. Also it has raised awareness of general public on UP-POPs sources related to releases from common practices, To comply with raising and transfer awareness the project has:

- Organized trainings on “BAT/BEP application and UP-POPs monitoring” for industrial sectors and for each selected enterprise.
- Supported the Dioxin Lab providing some equipment for analysis.
- Supported Vietnamese officials and experts to attend advanced training courses, study tours and workshops at international labs on POPs analysis
- Organized in-site trainings under international experts on stack gas sampling;
- Lectures on practical samplings at industrial waste incinerators and cement kilns.

- Organized lectures of world-class international experts on UP-POPs monitoring sampling to train in-depth officers of Dioxin Lab (advanced methods to take samples and analyze UP-POPs in theory and practice in enterprises).

5.3. *Efficiency* – **Moderately Satisfactory**

The TE mentions that "the BAT/BEP project to reduce emissions of POPs converted resources and inputs into results in a timely and cost-effective manner and also reached the goals set in project document and in the work plan". However there is no evidence to support that statement in terms of alternative comparative input costs. The TE also states that the project was implemented in a short time frame which contributed to an efficient use of resources.

5.4. *Sustainability* – **Unable to Assess**

Overall, the TE does not provided sufficient information or evidence to assess the sustainability risks properly (hence rating U/A). The project provided useful technical support to industrial enterprises to make them aware of the dioxin emissions and the importance of the application of BAT and BEP measures to reduce/mitigate dioxins emissions and releases. As per the TE the new technologies that have been transferred to create the necessary technical

capacity for the management of the POPs emissions are still not sufficient to cover the needs of all the country and that the experience and knowledge related to the BAT / BEP in the field have still a gap - lack of information and specialists. High turn over of trained staff and continued support from Government and/or Donors are key to sustainability here. Also, the TE points out that the Government has not yet budgeted to continue the awareness and sensitization campaign. The TE further points out that the waste incineration sector & iron and steel industry seem to be sustainable. But their sustainability depends on continuous and appropriate Government's policies and further donor support. Techniques of BAT / BEP are difficult to be applied in the pulp and paper production using chlorine as bleaching agent and cement kilns incineration, due to its high costs.

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?

The co-financing this this project represented twice the amount contributed by the GEF and was given in-kind by the Government. The components supported by co-financing were well integrated into the project and according to the TE was used for "mainly for capacity building for the demonstration sites, cleaner production assessments, socioeconomic programs and part of the monitoring costs" (page 40). However the TE

does not provide any further detail on how the co-financing amount was divided between the components / activities of the project.

- 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?

All co-financing materialized at the amounts anticipated.

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?

No delay

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:

The stakeholder ownership section of the TE does not actually assess the country ownership, however it can be derived from the report that the various governmental structures involved in the project have been engaged and contributed to the outputs of the project. Staff in permanent structures were trained and it is therefore likely that they will continue to apply their new skills and knowledge (provided low turn over of staff and continued funding for the work) which will then in turn affect project outcomes and sustainability. Similarly the public awareness campaign could have impact if the work is kept up by the relevant governmental entities. In general the project is helping Vietnam to achieve the Stockholm convention obligations and it is relevant to national policies and priorities which would help enhance country ownership as well.

7. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

7.1. *M&E design at entry* – **Satisfactory**

M&E as design is not discussed in the report, but the logframe in the Project approval document is comprehensive and includes indicators measuring outcome and impact level.

7.2. *M&E implementation* – **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The logframe of in the Pro Doc approved by the CEO included outcome and impact monitoring indicators and targets as well as sources of verification, however the project does not seem to have followed that logframe during implementation. The TE does not report on the logframe achievements other than including a rating for each outcome that the project themselves put

(and no the TE evaluators). The TE does not report sufficiently on the M&E arrangements of the projects or any specific indicators that were followed. The TE states that project monitoring management structure and evaluation procedures were established, steering committee was establish and regular meetings held and project reporting was done as required by UNIDO operational financial regulation. No information is provided on outcome, impact monitoring or stress reduction.

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

8.1. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution – Moderately Satisfactory

M&E as design is not discussed in the report, but the logframe in the Project approval document is comprehensive and includes indicators measuring outcome and impact level.

8.2. Overall Quality of Implementation – Unable to Assess.

The logframe of in the Pro Doc approved by the CEO included outcome and impact monitoring indicators and targets as well as sources of verification, however the project does not seems to have followed that logframe during implementation. The TE does not report on the lograme achievements other than including a rating for each outcome that the project themselves put (and no the TE evaluators). The TE does not report sufficiently on the M&E arrangements of the projects or any specific indicators that were followed. The TE states that project monitoring management structure and evaluation procedures were established, steering committee was establish and regular meetings held and project reporting was done as required by UNIDO operational financial regulation. No information is provided on outcome, impact monitoring or stress reduction.

8.3. Overall Quality of Execution – Moderately Satisfactory

The TE does not provide enough evidence for a comprehensive assessment of the EA and their specific shortcomings/ achievements. The capacity building and awareness raising activities seem to have been successful in their implementation, but the TE provides little evidence on any actual impact of these capacity measures. Trained staff and public awareness have been achieved by the project and knowledge on the BAT and BEP is likely to have increased in Vietnam due to this project. The project has built an initial structure for BAT BEP application in Vietnam adapted to the country needs, global priorities, stakeholders and partners. Details are missing for a proper assessment to be made.

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?	Moderately Unsatisfactory	The TE does not include key information (evidence) regarding outcomes and impact of the project activities.
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	Moderately Unsatisfactory	The TE does not include key information (evidence) regarding outcomes and impact of the project activities.
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Moderately Unsatisfactory	There is a sustainability section in the TE however it is too brief and does not provide evidence of sustainability.
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Moderately Unsatisfactory	Lessons from this project could have been much more comprehensive e.g. looking at what capacity building measures worked well in outreach and which ones that did not.
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Moderately Unsatisfactory	Actual project costs are included as total only.
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Moderately Unsatisfactory	A proper M&E assessment is missing in the TE.

10. Other issues to follow up on

11. Sources of information

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

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

No

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO KNOWLEDGE BEING GENERATED OR IMPROVED?

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

No

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

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

Yes

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

This project had a number of activities generating and disseminating information to many. The project has raised awareness of policy makers on specific BAT/BEP issues including waste management policies. Also it has raised awareness of general public on UP-POPs sources related to releases from common practices. A large variety of media were used to achieve this including; training and workshops, booklets (700 copies) printed reports on U-POPs, Newspaper articles, Magazine articles, DVDs and television documentaries, and Websites (for more detailed information please see TE page 47-50).

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?

The capacity building measures were wide in nature (as described above) and implemented on many fronts, but the TE provides little evidence on any actual impact of these capacity measures. Trained staff and public awareness have been achieved by the project and knowledge on the BAT and BEP is likely to have increased in Vietnam due to this project. The project has built an initial structure for BAT BEP application in Vietnam adapted to the country needs, global priorities, stakeholders and partners. More specifically: - The project selected and implemented pilot projects for industries with the aim of countrywide replication. In the respective pilot projects local staff have been educated and trained, with the purpose that after the completion of the project, national experts are formed and available for national wide implementation of BAT/BEP in the relevant sectors. - The project involved capacity building by developing and delivering training modules. The training modules have been developed together with international experts, and have involved local staff in order that they will be able to serve as resource persons for training beyond the project life. - Scientific and engineering capacity: BAT technology needs understanding of application and skills for implementing the principles in industries in the same sector, having however different operation parameters. In the project scientific and engineering capacity has been established having understanding of the basic and detailed principles of applied technologies. - Knowledge transfer through knowledge management: The reports have been presented in the form of workshop reports, newsletters, inventory and data collection reports. In addition workshop modules have been developed which can be used for regional workshops in the regional provinces of Vietnam.

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

Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE BEING RAISED?

The capacity building measures were wide in nature (as described above) and implemented on many fronts, but the TE provides little evidence on any actual impact of these capacity measures. Trained staff and public awareness have been achieved by the project and knowledge on the BAT and BEP is likely to have increased in Vietnam due to this project. The project has built an initial structure for BAT BEP application in Vietnam adapted to the country needs, global priorities, stakeholders and partners. A number of activities were concluded that benefitted persons from environmental monitoring centers, research institutes and environmental management agencies. Four booklets were produced, a documentary film to raise public awareness and articles published etc. (For exact output please see list below). Baseline review reports (conducted by national and international experts) have been prepared about formation and release of Dioxin/Furan in the four selected industrial sectors with high potential of UP-POPs release: steel making; waste treatment (incinerators); cement production (co-processing in cement kilns); pulp and paper production.

- Some reports have been produced on Dioxin/Furan emission in some industrial sectors in Vietnam (applying the UNEP UP-POPs inventory and calculation toolkit).
- The project organized activities of capacity building and training for the enterprises representing the four industrial sectors (Thai Nguyen Iron and Steel JSC (TISCO) – steel making, Bac Son urban and industrial waste incineration, Holcim cement company, co-processing hazardous waste, and Bai Bang pulp and paper).
- Organization in June 2010 of a training course attended by 100 persons on BAT/BEP application and UP-POPs monitoring in the four industrial sectors. The participants were of some environmental monitoring centers, research institutes and environmental management agencies.
- Dissemination of knowledge about measures combining reduction of UP-POPs release with treatment of the emissions.
- Elaboration of four booklets for BAT/BEP application to reduce UP-POPs release in steel making; waste treatment (incinerators); cement production (co-processing in cement kilns); pulp and paper production.
- Collaboration with newspapers and specialized magazines, publishing articles and newsletters about activities and results obtained by the project.
- A documentary in collaboration with Vietnam Green Program was developed for the Vietnam Television (VTV2 channel, 30 minutes), in order to raise public awareness on risks caused by POPs, Dioxin/Furan releases and the positive results obtained through BAT/BEP applications.

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

UA

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

Trained staff and public awareness have been achieved by the project and knowledge on the BAT and BEP is likely to have increased in Vietnam due to this project. The project has built an initial structure for BAT BEP application in Vietnam adapted to the country needs, global priorities, stakeholders and partners. However it is difficult to establish actual a change in behavior (as defined here). As per the TE: The project has however been too small to create wide spread awareness among enterprises, which would be necessary for sustainable effects in terms of changed behavior and reduced POPs releases.

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

Yes

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

This was a capacity building project and a large number of activities in this project contributed to technical and environmental management skills being built (please see list in question above under awareness raising) and improved. Knowledge on the BAT and BEP is likely to have increased in Vietnam due to this project. The project has built an initial structure for BAT BEP application in Vietnam adapted to the country needs, global priorities, stakeholders and partners.

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

Yes

HOW HAVE THESE SKILLS BEEN APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE TRAINED?

People trained are currently working in national governmental structures. The sustainability of the skills and capacities being built by the project depends on continued financing from the Government and the capability to retain trained staff. As per the TE: The capacity building for BAT/BEP application at the waste incineration sector & iron and steel industry could be sustainable. But, there are some difficulties in applying it at pulp and paper production using chlorine as bleaching agent and for cement kilns incineration.

- The capacity built at the dioxin laboratories could be sustainable, with a low risk of losses through turnover of staff. Laboratories are able to obtain a budget for repairing, maintaining and replacing equipment. But the sustainability of these capacities depends on continued financing of the Government and the capability to retain trained staff. **The project has however been too small to create wide spread awareness among enterprises, which would be necessary for sustainable effects in terms of changed behavior and reduced POPs releases.**

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

No

Were these adopted?

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

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

No

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?

The project has introduced for the first time in Vietnam BAT/BEP applications to reduce POPs release. Expert teams have provided extensive training at different levels of the environment management sector creating environmental consciousness. **New structures do not seem to have been created - rather training and capacity building in existing structures. (Dioxin Laboratory, VEA, , ISEA, VNCP, Min. of Natural Resources and Environment, Min. of Industry and Trade.**

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?

No

UA

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

There is very little information in the TE on what structures that were supported by the project. However, the project brought together the private sector and the government in the issue of addressing UP-POPs and applying BAT/BEP. Also, the TE states that "The project is a good example of cooperation between state and private sector to achieve global environmental benefits" - but no further elaboration is available.

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

No

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?

No

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

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

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?

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?

 <--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

<input type="checkbox"/> Local	<input type="checkbox"/> Intended (local)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintended (local)
<input type="checkbox"/> Systemic	<input type="checkbox"/> Intended (systemic)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

<input type="checkbox"/> Measured	<input type="checkbox"/> Anecdotal
-----------------------------------	------------------------------------

Was there a change in environmental status?

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

<input type="checkbox"/> Local	<input type="checkbox"/> Intended (local)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintended (local)
<input type="checkbox"/> Systemic	<input type="checkbox"/> Intended	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintended (systemic)

(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 No

Socioeconomic No

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

The logframe of in the Pro Doc approved by the CEO included outcome and impact monitoring indicators and targets as well as sources of verification, however the project does not seems to have followed that logframe during implementation. The TE does not report on the lograme achievements other than including a rating for each outcome that the project themselves put (and no the TE evaluators). The TE does not report sufficiently on the M&E arrangements of the projects or any specific indicators that were followed. The TE states that project monitoring management structure and evaluation procedures were established, steering committee was establish and regular meetings held and project reporting was done as required by UNIDO operational financial regulation. No information is provided on outcome, impact monitoring or stress reduction.

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

U/A

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

No

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

The TE does not provide enough evidence to assess sustainability arrangement after the GEF support ends. It does mention that more funding must be secured from the Government to continue activities and that a possible 2nd phase to the project would be useful.

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

U/A - not enough information in the TE.

Has the monitoring data been used for management?

UA

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

Has the data been made accessible to the public?

Yes

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

A website is established by the project: (not clear if it includes monitoring data)
TE page 50: The official website: <http://pops.org.vn>. This website provides information on Vietnam's Decisions, Instructions, Circulars, Standards, related to POPs, dioxin and furan to help policy makers to work out managing measures and relevant orientations for BAT/BEP application to eliminate U-POPs emissions.
- The community can refer to this website for information relating to POPs, U-POPs, BAT/BEP. This is the official and unique website on POPs in Vietnam. Articles, legislative documents relating to POPs, projects on POPs management in Vietnam and POPs treating technologies to implement Stockholm Convention in Vietnam are all available on the website.

“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?

UA

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

<input type="checkbox"/>	Local	<input type="checkbox"/>	Intended (local)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unintended (local)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Systemic	<input type="checkbox"/>	Intended (systemic)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unintended (systemic)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Measured	<input type="checkbox"/>	Anecdotal		

How was the information obtained?

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

UA

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

The following lessons have been derived from this evaluation (TE page 70):

- 1) During the formulation of a project particular attention should be paid to the quantitative figures of the outputs to be accomplished, in order to avoid that later, when evaluating the results achieved by the project, these are different than expected in relation to the target indicators expressed in the project document. In some cases this may indicate that the forecast was too optimistic or too pessimistic.
- 2) Proper and regular monitoring of the project gives the opportunity to adjust timely the production of the outputs according to the initial planning.
- 3) The compilation, analysis and dissemination of the experiences of a positive and successful project require that actions are started to promote the replication of the results in other regions or countries. The positive results obtained may create the opportunity for developing mechanisms at national or regional level to promote the utilization of co financed resources (private or state).
- 4) Improving the available national technological capabilities it is a considerable help for the country for not depending on the changes of the global markets.
- 5) Technology is a combination of several actions, like joint ventures, licensing, purchase of machinery, consultancy and training, maintenance contracts and even new technological processes originated and developed in the enterprises themselves. Implementation or adaptation of innovative technological changes normally involves investments and consequently it originates the problem of financing for the interested enterprises.
- 6) Technology development reduces the prices for the proper disposal of the waste. This approach is more sustainable than subsidizing the disposal costs of the wastes.

Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The TE offers a large number of recommendations (5+ pages) and some lessons learned. The recommendations were mostly around the continuation of monitoring of the UP-POPs, to maintain activities, so as to contribute to the obligations under the Stockholm convention and to go ahead with a new GEF 2nd phase project. And that the Government should support and possibly promote private sector investments into this field. State-of-the-art technologies can further reduce the costs for the control and monitoring also of other POPs. There were also detailed recommendations to the Vietnamese authorities and to the GEF/UNIDO to disseminate the results of the project widely.