

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		4012	
GEF Agency project ID		3875	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Disposal of POPs Pesticides and Initial Steps for Containment of Dumped POPs Pesticides	
Country/Countries		Georgia	
Region		ECA	
Focal area		Persistent Organic Pollutants	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		POPS 1- Strengthening capacity for NIP (National Implementation Plan) Development POPS 2-Partnering in investments for NIP implementation	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		As active project participants- Caucasus Environmental NGO Network (CENN) and the Greens Movement	
Private sector involvement		None stated	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		February 9 th , 2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		February 14, 2012 ¹	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		March 3 rd , 2015	
Actual date of project completion		March 3 rd , 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		1	1
Co-financing	IA own	1.35	NA
	Government		
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		1	.96
Total Co-financing		1.35	.12
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.35	1.08
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		June 5, 2015	
Author of TE		Alexandre Borde & Kate Skhireli	
TER completion date		April 11 2016	
TER prepared by		Molly Watts & Mia Lu	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

¹ This is the date of the start of the project coordinator (TE p.4)

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	HS	HS	NR	S
Sustainability of Outcomes		L	NR	L
M&E Design		S	NR	S
M&E Implementation		S	NR	S
Quality of Implementation		S	NR	S
Quality of Execution		HS	NR	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	NR	MU

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's global environmental objective is to "minimize releases of POPs from obsolete pesticide stockpiles in Georgia." (PD p.10) The objective of the project contributes to the objectives of GEF-4 strategic program 1 (SP-1) "Strengthening capacities for National Implementation Plan (NIP) development and Implementation" (PD, pg16). Objectives of the project are also consistent with GEF-5 focal area objective 1.5 (CHEM-1), which is "phase out Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and reduce POPs releases".

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective of the project is to "create capacity in management of the POPs pesticide stockpiles". The project objective will directly contribute to the broader goal of supporting "sustainable development through elimination of POPs from the environment" (PD, pg10).

According to the ProDoc, there were two principle outcomes under the Project objective (PD, pg10).

The first outcome the project would work towards was strengthening legal and administrative capacity. This would assure that pre-conditions, such as training and improvement of the legal basis necessary for project implementation and further POPs related hazardous waste management issues would be met. To achieve this outcome, the project would review, develop and adopt baseline hazardous waste legislation and policies, develop technical guidelines on safety procedures for POPs pesticides handling, transport and storage (disposal), and train government entities in pesticide site investigation and risk assessment, and management option screening for creating buyer competence for such services.

The second outcome the project would work towards was the "minimization of releases from obsolete pesticide dumps". This would be the key outcome of the project, and would ensure the biggest POPs pesticide stockpile is partly eliminated in an environmentally sound manner and further releases to the environment are minimized. The second outcome would also contribute significantly to creating a local capacity in environmentally sound disposal of POPs containing

wastes. To achieve this outcome, the project would correct the volume of non-soil mixed obsolete POPs pesticides stockpiled through detailed site assessment and development of a long term site remediation plan. It would also excavate and repackage obsolete non-soil mixed POPs pesticides at lagluja dumpsite, implement low cost access control measures in lagluja dumpsite, and would select a pesticide destruction facility and export obsolete pesticide stocks abroad for destruction at a specialized destruction facility.

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

The Terminal Evaluation report didn't mention any change in activities or objectives, nor did the Project Implication Review.

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 TE rated the project as Relevant, and the TER agrees with it and rates the Relevance as Satisfactory. According to the criteria of the GEF, the project's relevance is the extent to which the project is consistent with GEF operational programs or strategic priorities under which the project was financed; and the extent to which its activities are adapted to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time. Given that pesticides wastes management is in the core of the priorities in Georgia, the relevance of the project is obvious (TE,pg29). From GEF's criteria, the project contributes to the objectives of GEF-4 strategic program 1 (SP-1) "Strengthening capacities for National Implementation Plan (NIP) development and Implementation" (PD, pg16).

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

Comparing the results and the primary objectives, the project has overall proved to be effective. This project has sizably improved the state of the dumpsite by withdrawing a total of 230 tons of pesticides wastes, filling the pools affected by the pesticides and burrowing 11 sarcophagi with the remaining wastes. According to the PIR, in the beginning of 2013, a detailed site

assessment was finalized and the project proposed a disposal method. (PIR, pg20). The TE rated the Effectiveness section as highly satisfactory; while the TER believes the outcomes satisfy the objective, but do not exceed the expectation; therefore, TER rates effectiveness as satisfactory.

Noticeable economies of scale have been made possible by the project through synergies with the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol² to remove ODS from the site (15 tons of gas). Disposal of ODS has been made possible, since it was done at the same time as POPs disposal (TE, pg30).

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

According to the TE, the project has been cost-effective since the objectives of the logical framework have been achieved without the need of additional funding during the implementation of the project. An increased budget would have been helpful to take up an additional amount of pesticides wastes, but it would be out of the objectives' scope (TE, pg30).

The project was displayed efficiency in the fact that, although the project document's signature was delayed due to the new governmental clearance procedure in February 2012, there has been no delay observed in project start up or overall. While UNDP was waiting for formal clearance, it ensured the project team was on board and started the project inception phase. This accelerated the inception phase and enabled the project to immediately start implementation at the beginning of 2012. (TE, pg13).

Therefore, both TE and TER rates the Efficiency section as Highly Satisfactory.

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

According to the TE, risks to sustainability are low (TE, pg30), therefore TER rates the section as Likely.

Financial resources: Financial resources have been sufficient to successfully carry out the main activities. Additional fund would have been useful to take up an unexpected amount of non-soil mixed pesticides, but this would have been outside the scope of the project. The TE notes that other financing may be dedicated to taking up related activities but does not provide a specific example of dedicated funding. (TE, pg 30).

Socioeconomics: A positive message of cleaning up the environment and getting rid of the legacy of the past was conveyed from project stakeholders to general public thus strengthening the perception of general public to government efforts in improving the quality of environment.

² <http://www.multilateralfund.org/>

Institutional framework and governance: The project affected positively institutional sustainability through increased capacity of pesticide stockpile management by institutions involved in management of chemicals and hazardous waste.

Environmental: As part of the project's second outcome, (Obsolete pesticide collection and final destruction), a sustainability issue emerges from the fact that the project will not resolve all the POPs pesticides stockpiles in the country. Therefore, it is important to underline that capacity creating in obsolete pesticides handling and destruction is of very high concern in the project design. Local pesticides management, handling and destruction capacity is essential for finishing collecting and disposing remaining POPs pesticide stockpiles in the future. Legislation has been put in place to ban the import and use of POPs pesticides, thus once stockpiles are eliminated, environmental benefits will be sustained.

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 total expenditure for this project from January 2012 to December 2014 was 1,079,276.54 USD, for which GEF contribution amounts to 957,990.92 USD, which accounted for the majority of the expenditure (TE, pg26). The co-finance committed at the budget level was \$1.35mn but only \$0.12mn was realized when the project finished. While materialization of expected co-financing would have played a positive role in project scale up, the project achieved its expected outcomes without it.

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 document's signature was delayed due to the new governmental clearance procedure in February 2012, however there has been no delays observed in the project. While UNDP was waiting for this formal clearance, it ensured the project team was on board and started the project inception phase. This accelerated the inception phase and allowed for the immediate start of project implementation at the beginning of 2012. (TE, pg13).

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:

According to the project's terminal evaluation "with the participation of local municipalities in the project, the country has been a major stakeholder and the outcomes fit very well to the national objectives regarding environmental and health issues." (TE, pg30)

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The M&E plan included: inception workshop and inception report, regular interim and annual project reviews by a project executive board, project implementation reviews, short quarterly operational reports for GEF submission and detailed quarterly progress reports in UNDP format, including financial reports, both mid-term and final evaluations, and a project terminal report. Monitoring and evaluation have been properly planned according to the criteria of UNDP and the GEF. The project document included a satisfactory schedule and M&E budget for monitoring and evaluation (TE, pg26). The details of the project indicators were provided in the Logical Framework Matrix and were Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound (SMART).

Therefore, both TE and TER rate this section as satisfactory.

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

Project monitoring and evaluation has been conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures by the project team and the UNDP Country Office (UNDP-CO) with a support of MPU/Chemicals Unit in Bratislava. The mid-term evaluation included in the M&E plan was not carried out, however due to the project's small size this is considered reasonable. The TE notes integration of M&E in adaptive management through the use of an NEA study at the beginning of the project which influenced the handling of POPs wastes. (TE p.25) The Logical Framework Matrix has provided impact and outcome indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification (TE, pg26). The TE also laid down M&E activities by type, responsible parties and budgets in the evaluation report on page 27 for further details. Furthermore, according to the PIR, projects results were evaluated, and adaptive management was also applied to needs. Five meetings of project steering committee (PEB) took place since the inception of the project. In all, project team ensured regular monitoring of all activities (PIR, pg 13).

Therefore, both TE and TER rate this section as satisfactory.

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
--	----------------------

UNDP was the project implementing agency. The TE rated quality of UNDP implementation as satisfactory, and this TER agrees with that rating. The project implementation has not raised any particular problem, especially under the circumstance that the project document's signature was delayed due to the new governmental clearance procedure in February 2012, while UNDP was waiting for this formal clearance, it ensured the project team to be on board and start project inception phase. This accelerated the inception phase and the ability to immediately start implementing the project at the beginning of 2012. (TE, pg13). According to PIR conducted in 2013, UNDP officer in the UNDP country office provides satisfactory oversight and supervision support to the project (PIR, pg14).

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

The project's executing agency was Georgia's Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection (MoENRP), through the service of wastes and Chemical Management (TE p.22). The TE rated quality of execution by MoENRP as highly satisfactory, while this TER rates it as satisfactory. The Ministry assigned a National Project Director (a senior/mid-level official for the MoENRP) who was responsible for implementation of the project and achievement of project outputs. A Project Management Unit (PMU) was also created with a Project Manager and Assistant. The project execution has been effectively led and is hence satisfactory. The partnership between UNDP and the MoENRP of Georgia has led to satisfactory results, therefore the overall quality of implementation and execution is satisfactory (TE, pg27). The MoENRP made efficient responsible structure by establishing various units in place for management and set up the Execution Board (TE, pg22). The TE notes in particular the communications strategy developed by the MoENRP and the PMU, which led to "a high level of transparency and openness throughout the project implementation." (TE p.24) Judging from the overall outcomes of the project, which met expectations of its project plan, the project execution should be 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.

The impact of this project is sizeable first at the regional scale, since an important amount of pesticides and hazardous wastes in general has been withdrawn, providing a healthier environment to populations near this dumpsite (TE, pg31).

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 project successfully raised the awareness of POP by awareness raising campaign, and pesticides wastes management in the community and society (TE, pg19).

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

According to satisfactory on the outcome 1 of the project, which aimed to strengthen the capacities of the local state holders - the direct output of outcome one was legal capacity building, the project had positive impacts on capacities (TE, pg31).

b) Governance

The project substantially improved the legal framework in the field of pesticides wastes management. Given that the main implementing and executing stakeholder was the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection of Georgia, this project enables them to possibly manage a project that could be replicable in another place in Georgia.

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.

The TE didn't provide any further information on unintended impacts.

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.

Some of the stakeholders involved in the project are contemplating the possibility of implementing a second phase for this project to foster the improvements already started on this site and probably on other related sites (TE, pg31).

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.

There are three major lessons for the project, according to the TE (TE, pg33):

1. Pesticides wastes management is a high priority in Georgia. Despite the lack of comprehensive preparatory studies on what could be in the dumpsite, the first assessment made by NEA has revealed an important amount of hazardous chemical products that pose a serious threat to local population and, given the issue replicates in other dumpsites of the country, at a wider scale to Georgian population. Therefore, undertaking efficient measures and legal reforms to improve hazardous chemicals products management is of the essence.
2. It is essential that the positive results of the project are disseminated and shared effectively. This project has focused on a particular dumpsite on Iagluja Mountain, but the problem concerns actually the entire country and countries of the same region such as Armenia for instance.
3. Risks management remains a priority for UNDP. The focus regarding risks is on safety aspects, since this kind of project encompasses direct risks (on health for instance) and indirect risks (image...). Safety is ensured through the experience and quality of experts, the quality of consulting companies doing studies on such sites and the quality of waste management companies.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

1. One should recommend for this type of projects in the future to have preparatory sub-projects related to overall studies on the sites. It will enables having proper cost estimates on how much it would cost to address them fully with pesticides extraction and solid decontamination, which represents the larger volume and amount of work.
2. Given the new objectives of the GEF, the expertise used for this project can now be expanded through several similar projects.
3. This project can serve as an example for following activities within the same project or projects related to pesticides waste management. As mentioned in the lessons learned, safety can be ensured through the involvement of different skills.

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 report contains a very brief assessment of the projects achievement of objectives, and does not systematically compare expected targets against actual ones. This TER review had to rely on project PIRs to assess achievement of project objectives.	MU
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	Ratings are not always well substantiated, for instance very little information on quality of UNDP implementation and execution by MoENRP has been presented. There is some inconsistency in the presentation of project co-financing.	MU
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The project's discussion of sustainability and replication approach is adequate	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned and recommendations appear somewhat vague and not comprehensive.	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The project contains total costs but not by activity, and is somewhat unclear in reporting of actual co-financing used.	MU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report covers the main points in its evaluation of M&E systems, but fails to note the rather poor quality of project indicators and targets, which are not SMART.	MS
Overall TE Rating		MU

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