

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2017

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3263	
GEF Agency project ID		GF/CPR/07/009	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNIDO	
Project name		Strengthening Institutions, Regulations and Enforcement Capacities for Effective and Efficient Implementation of the National Implementation Plan (NIP) in China	
Country/Countries		China	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Chemicals	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP: 14 Persistent Organic Pollutants	
Executing agencies involved		State Environmental Protection Administration (SEPA)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		In project execution	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		November 6, 2007	
Effectiveness date / project start		November 23, 2007	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 31, 2012	
Actual date of project completion		June, 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0	0
	Co-financing	0.03	NA
GEF Project Grant		5.41	5.41
Co-financing	IA own	0.20	NA
	Government	6.63	NA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	1.50	NA
	Private sector		
NGOs/CSOs		1.50	NA
Total GEF funding		5.41	5.41
Total Co-financing		9.85	44.45
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		15.26	49.86
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		August, 2015	
Author of TE		Not given	
TER completion date		3/23	
TER prepared by		Molly Sohn	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Neeraj Negi	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	BLIND REVIEW	BLIND REVIEW	BLIND REVIEW	S
Sustainability of Outcomes		BLIND REVIEW	BLIND REVIEW	ML
M&E Design		BLIND REVIEW	BLIND REVIEW	S
M&E Implementation		BLIND REVIEW	BLIND REVIEW	MS
Quality of Implementation		BLIND REVIEW	BLIND REVIEW	S
Quality of Execution		BLIND REVIEW	BLIND REVIEW	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		BLIND REVIEW	BLIND REVIEW	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

While an explicit global environmental objective is not provided for the project, the project’s objective is to “generate significant benefits for the protection of the global environment and human health” through sound management of POPs at national and local levels. (Request for CEO Endorsement, p.4)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project’s development objective was “to assist China to effectively and efficiently implement the Stockholm Convention by strengthening regulations and enforcement and to enhance the capacities for sound management of POPs at national and local levels.” (Request for CEO Endorsement p.1) This objective would be achieved through three project components:

- 1) Strengthening of policy and regulatory framework for more effective implementation of the Stockholm Convention and the National Implementation Plan, including improvement of policy and regulatory framework & development of a co-financing strategy
- 2) Strengthening of institutional capacity, including environmental monitoring, research and development, technology transfer, data collection and reporting as well as evaluation and follow up, and finally legislation enforcement
- 3) Promotion of environmental protection through public awareness and education

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

There were no changes in the Global Environmental Objectives or Development Objectives.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The project is relevant to China’s national priorities, including China’s 11th Five Year Programme (2006-2010). The TE notes that the project did not properly assess existing laboratory capacities in the country, and also underestimated time required to establish them.

The project is in line with GEF’s Operational Program 14 (OP14) on Persistent Organic Pollutants, as well as the Strategic Program 1 of GEF-4 for Persistent Organic Pollutants “Strengthening Capacities for NIP Development and Implementation” as the project is directly related to strengthening capacity in eligible countries to implement National Implementation Plans for the Stockholm Convention.

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

Although the terminal evaluation does not report against targets, it may be inferred that the project’s development objectives have been met. Therefore, this TER rates effectiveness as satisfactory.

The project’s first component focused on strengthening of policy and regulatory framework for more effective implementation of the Stockholm Convention and the National Implementation Plan, including improvement of policy and regulatory framework & development of a co-financing strategy. Working with the College of Beijing University and University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, the project achieved the following: the promulgation and implementation of 27 persistent organic pollutant policies, standards and technical guidelines, incorporation of persistent organic pollutant reductions and control measures into the national environmental management and industrial policy standard system; incorporation of SC requirements into the Industrial Restructuring Catalogue of 2011, and the Key hazardous chemicals directory for environmental management, domestic investment was stimulated through international funding and the implementation of international cooperation projects. 6 of 13 local policies and regulations promoted by the project have been implemented. The project also identified key co-financing partners, including central and local government enterprises, international community and the public and stimulated domestic investment through international funding, mobilizing 600 million in support funds. The project also promoted the establishment of a green financing system which the Industrial Bank Co implemented, leading to the approval by the end of 2013 of 19 proposals for a total amount of approximately 225 million USD.

The project’s second component focused on strengthening of institutional capacity, including environmental monitoring, research and development, technology transfer, data collection and

reporting as well as evaluation and follow up, and finally legislation enforcement. As part of the project, a National Monitoring Plan was formulated, which covered the monitoring of persistent organic pollutants through sampling. This sampling required the establishment and capacity building of a network of laboratories. A number of laboratories participated in comparison and verification exercises, which found the laboratories' results to be reliable. As part of research and development efforts, the project prepared a situational analysis on funding available for technology for persistent organic pollutants, evaluated the progress of persistent organic pollutant related R&D activities, proposed a mechanism for promoting technology commercialization covering the government, enterprises, universities, and research institutions, and participated in international and domestic academic exchanges and conferences, and conducted R&D progress exchange and dialogue related activities. The project established a Technology Transfer Promotion Center (TTPC).

The project's final component was the promotion of environmental protection through public awareness and education. The project used TV, radio, newspaper and internet mainstream media resources to establish publicity channels and build platforms for persistent organic pollutions related information, established cooperative partnerships with environmental protection projects, NGOs, academies and schools, and conducted information campaigns directed at the public at large. As part of education efforts, an analysis of the existing education system was undertaken, assessing the status of information available, and the development of textbooks and training materials. An education course in persistent organic pollutants was launched and over 300 environmental protection bureau chiefs were trained.

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

The TE notes that the project fully completed 48 out of its 50 contracts, and met its objectives efficiently, and within a reasonable timeframe. The TE notes that there was a one-year delay, though the reasons for this delay, and the types of delays experienced are not provided. This TER therefore rates efficiency as satisfactory.

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

The TE notes that the conditions for replication of the project's pilot initiatives are present, but that additional resources and support are needed for sustainability of outcomes, beyond the resources of the national government. Although there are some risks, follow up support from international institutions for sustainability is likely to materialize. Therefore, this TER rates overall sustainability of outcomes as moderately likely. Financial, sociopolitical, institutional and environmental risks to sustainability are listed below:

Financial Resources: The TE notes that additional resources and support are required for the project's pilot initiatives to be disseminated in country. Both central and provincial governments expressed their intentions to the evaluation team to continue supporting project activities financially. However, a risk noted in the TE is that, despite assurances of ongoing support from the government, the government is

not financially capable of complying with the Stockholm Convention, which evolves as new substances are regularly added, without additional support. The project mobilized 4.5 times expected co-financing, which is a positive indication that the additional resources necessary for replication can be mobilized.

Sociopolitical Sustainability: The TE found country ownership of project activities to be strong, and no sociopolitical threats to sustainability are noted.

Institutional Framework and Governance: Persistent Organic Pollutant management has been integrated into national and local 5 year plans, as well as into daily workplans of central and provincial structures.

Environmental: No environmental risks to sustainability are noted.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

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

The TE reports realized co-financing at 44.5 million USD, or 4.5 times the expected amount. It does not specify the source, but does note that this successful mobilization is a positive indicator of continued sustainability, and that the "large "unplanned" amounts of co-financing boosted the project results significantly." (TE p.21) This co-financing number does not correspond with PIRs.

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

The project was intended to be implemented over 5 years, but was ultimately implemented over 8 years. The need for extension came from the fact that the project underestimated the time required to establish laboratory capacities, as there were only a handful of laboratories in operation at project start, with others in the process of being established. Less advanced provinces in the country would have missed out on the benefits of training undertaken by the project if the project had closed before these laboratories were established.

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

The TE found country ownership to be strong. Both central and provincial governments have confirmed their intention to continue support of project activities.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately

Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The project design documents include an M&E workplan with dedicated budget, and plans for adequate reporting, including annual review meetings, project implementation reviews, and a mid-term review. The total indicative cost for M&E, excluding team and UNIDO staff time, is 170,000\$ USD. Project indicators are relevant to the project, of good quality and include baselines and target values, as well as means of verification.

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

Project M&E was considered as a separate project component. 14 local project offices were set up to promote project implementation and carry out the annual review of the work plan. The project also conducted annual three-way review meetings and submitted annual project implementation reports, which provide data on completion of project outputs and on some indicators. Mid-term and final tracking tools were submitted. A project mid-term evaluation was carried out as well, though it is not clear if it was used for adaptive management.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The project implementing agency was UNIDO. The TE notes that UNIDO's strong relations with the Chinese government and specifically with FECO, and that the evident support for continued collaboration would strengthen the project. UNIDO's support the project was considered positive by the evaluation team, with UNIDO conducting country missions, and coordinating with FECO as necessary on delivery of project inputs. The project design was sound, with the only flaw, noted previously, being that the time necessary to build capacity of laboratories was underestimated.

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

The project executing agencies was China's Foreign Economic Cooperation Office (FECO) within the Ministry of Environmental Protection. The country also established a Convention Implementation Office (CIO) for implementation of the Stockholm Convention, and this office worked in coordination with FECO. The Project Management Office (PMO) was housed within FECO, with a national project management recruited for day to day project management. The TE notes that stakeholders at all levels expressed their full satisfactory with FECO coordination and management of activities. Based on the successful delivery of project components in an efficient manner, this TER rates quality of project execution as satisfactory.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

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

Although the policy and regulatory framework in the country was strengthened, the TE and PIRs do not provide any evidence of the resultant environmental changes in country.

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

The promote attitudes and behaviors which will foster environmental protection the project used TV, radio, newspaper and internet media resources, formed cooperative partnerships with environmental protection projects, environmental campaigns, NGOs and CBOs, established schools and developed textbooks and training materials for teachers in 130 colleges and 320 middle and primary schools. Over 300 environmental protection bureau chiefs were trained at the prefecture level. (TE p. XI)

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-

building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The project strengthened or established a network of laboratories in monitoring of persistent organic pollutants in environmental and human samples. A Technology Transfer Promotion Center (TTPC) was established, and four pilot technologies were successfully transferred. The project established a project information management system for the collection and integration of project related information. (TE p.xi)

b) Governance

27 Policies, standards and technical guidelines, for management of persistent organic pollutants were promulgated and implemented, and Persistent Organic Pollutant reduction and control measures were incorporated into national environmental management and industrial policy standard systems. Additionally, Stockholm Convention requirements were incorporated into the Industrial Restructuring Catalogue (2011) and Key hazardous chemicals directory for environmental management. (TE p.xi)

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

No unintended impacts were noted.

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

The TE notes that conditions for replication of pilot projects are present, but that additional resources will be necessary for this to occur. The TE does not note any adoption of GEF initiatives at scale as of yet.

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The project's lessons learned are included below:

The mixed form of agency execution and national execution may be an effective/efficient implementation modality; however this is only possible in cases where the national and provincial capacities are sufficiently developed.

Integrating project objectives into national and provincial economic, environmental and social development plans can provide a good opportunity to mobilize financial support, and also help to demonstrate that a high level of co-funding is available in the Government of China for projects that are aligned with development priorities.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The project's recommendations are included below:

Recommendations to the Government of China- The government of China should continue to provide its support to activities initiated by the SIRE project including:

- Promoting the replication of demonstration pilots;
- Ensuring continued awareness raising/education and monitoring activities;
- Facilitating further integrated cooperation between national and provincial authorities so as to not lose momentum gained and capacities developed; and,
- Considering developing mechanisms to facilitate the further development and promotion of the Technology Transfer Promotion Centre (TTPC) to ensure widespread reach to all provinces.

Recommendations to UNIDO- UNIDO should strongly consider:

- Continuing to proactively support the Government of China (GOC) as it seeks to design new programs to address evolving Stockholm Convention (SC) targets;
- Maintaining close ties to the Technology Transfer Promotion Centre (TTPC) in order to:
 - o Ensure that it has access to the most up-to-date technical knowledge and information;
 - o Facilitate the establishment/strengthening of direct connections with technology suppliers; and,
 - o Facilitate the establishment of direct links with industrial associations, other professional technology transfer institutions and large-scale industrial parks.
- Carrying out an impact evaluation in the near future (five years) as the size of this project would be ideal for this exercise and could provide valuable lessons for future work in China.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

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

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE report gives a detailed account of project activities and delivery of components, however at the outcome and impact level it is difficult to get a picture of project accomplishments, or reduction in levels of persistent organic pollutants from information in the TE.	MU
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	Evidence is presented for all parameters, and ratings are substantiated, though somewhat inflated.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The project provides relevant information on project sustainability, although not all four dimensions of sustainability are addressed.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned and recommendations provided are relevant and comprehensive.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report provides project costs and co-financing, although sources of co-financing are not provided.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE provides adequate information on the project's M&E system.	S
Overall TE Rating		MS

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