

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2013

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		4410	
GEF Agency project ID		GF/GLO/11/013	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNIDO	
Project name		Development of the Guidelines for updating of National Implementation Plans (NIPs) under the Stockholm Convention taking into account the new POPs added to the Convention	
Country/Countries		Global	
Region		Global	
Focal area		Persistent Organic Pollutants	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		CHEM-4. Project Mana.	
Executing agencies involved		Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention, UNITAR	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Not involved	
Private sector involvement		through consultations	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		2/9/2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		4/19/2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		3/30/2013	
Actual date of project completion		N/A	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.72	0.69
Co-financing	IA/EA own	0.33	0.33
	Government		
	Other*	0.69	0.66
Total GEF funding		0.72	0.69
Total Co-financing		1.02	0.99
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1.74	1.68
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		08/31/2012	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Mr. Jayanthi Aniruth	
TER completion date		01/31/2014	
TER prepared by		Nelly Bourlion	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

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

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	S	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	L	MU	MU	MU
M&E Design	N/A	U	U	U
M&E Implementation	N/A	MS	MS	MS
Quality of Implementation	N/A	S	S	S
Quality of Execution	N/A	N/A	Not rated	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report			Not rated	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

According to the Project Document, the general objective of the project is “to develop a full set of consolidated guidance ... to assist countries in the preparation and updating their NIPs under the Stockholm Convention, considering the new obligation Parties have to comply with the listing of the 9 new POPs”.

In 2010 the Conference of the Parties added a further nine POPs to the Stockholm Convention, triggering the need for Parties to update their National Implementation Plans (NIPs) by 26 August 2012. The existing guidance documents available to assist Parties to develop NIPs revolved around the management of the original 12 POPs, mostly chemicals that were no longer actively in use. The listing of the new POPs means that Parties have to deal with greater levels of complexity in gathering information on, monitoring and regulating the use and disposal of POPs that are widely used as industrial chemicals. This project sought to provide Parties with a complete set of guidance documents in order to develop inventories of and management plans for POPs, including the new POPs.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project sought to develop a first version of the guidelines and test these documents via a pilot project in a member country before the 5th congress of the parties (COP5). The revised documents were then to be submitted to the COP for consideration in April 2011. Further testing of the guidance documents was planned to be undertaken via pilot projects in two other countries after COP5 in order to test the applicability of the guidelines to different global regions. Training material, based on the guidance documents, were to be created as an output of the project and these materials were to be utilized within the pilot countries.

Stakeholders involved in the pilot projects would provide comments on the guidance documents in order to allow the drafting organizations to improve the usability and quality of the documents. The improved version of the guidance documents would then be translated into six official languages of the United Nations by March 2012 in order to allow Parties to update their NIPs the end of August 2012.

The project has the following three components:

- (1) Parties have appropriate guidance for updating their NIPs considering the new POPs added to the Convention
- (2) Strengthening of capacity and validation on the guidance for developing and updating a National Implementation Plan under the Stockholm Convention focusing on new POPs Chemicals
- (3) Establishment of project management structure including monitoring and evaluation

The project set out to produce the following new guidance documents:

- Guidance for establishing inventory of products/articles containing new POPs and industrial processes using new POPs;
- General guidance for customs on use of commercial/trade names;
- Guidance for strengthening regulatory framework to enable regular monitoring of imported products/articles that may contain new POPs;
- Guidance on labelling of products/articles that contain new POPs or use new POPs during manufacture;
- Guidance for BAT and BEP for production and use of PFOS;
- Guidance for BAT and BEP for the recycling and waste disposal of articles containing POP-PBDEs;
- Database with readily accessible international information useful for development of NIPs.

The project also undertook to review and update the existing guidance documents for the development of NIPS.

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

There were no reported changes in to the Global Environment Objectives and Development Objectives.

4. GEF EO 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 in line with GEF focal area of Persistent Organic Pollutants. The Stockholm Convention (SC) is the means by which the global community has been able to mobilize international action in addressing the threat to the environment and human health posed by exposure to persistent organic pollutants. The Convention has secured commitment to its provisions by 178 Party countries. The NIP that each Party develops is the principal tool used by the SC in order to compel Parties to systematically address the issue of reducing POPs within their boundaries and is therefore vital to the reduction and eventual elimination of listed POPs internationally.

To the extent that countries must comply with the Stockholm Convention, this project is also in line with country priorities. This project produced documents to guide to best alternative technologies and best environmental practices in managing and reducing the use of new POPs, therefore it is highly relevant to the international management of the newly listed POPs.

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

The guidance documents produced were of high quality, however, due to time constraints, the training and capacity building component of the project was not implemented as strongly as expected. The project has been effective in producing guidance documents that are deemed to be robust and of good quality by stakeholders, despite the complexity of the subject matter. The TE also reports that the project has been effective in utilizing the momentum of on-going processes in Nigeria, India and Serbia, to test the quality of the guidance documents and to add value to processes underway. The pilot project processes engaged with two SC Regional Centres, and two Basel Convention RCs, thereby building capacity within four regional centres for the management of NIP update processes. The late start of the project, combined with the deadline for the submission of updated NIPs to the SSC, called for a compression of project activities and therefore necessitated trade-offs during project implementation. The SSC reported that they made a

conscious decision to focus on the development of high quality guidance documents, rather than the development of the approach to capacity building and the development of training material. The project has therefore been only partly effective in delivering only one part of the project outcomes.

The guidance documents can be deemed to be effective only if they are used and properly guide the NIP update processes in Party countries. The impact of the guidance documents can therefore be measured only through the quality of the NIPs produced and the success of the NIP update process in mobilizing sustained action in the management of POPs within Party countries. According to the TE, reviewers/stakeholders within the pilot countries have indicated that the complexity of the subject matter and the consequent difficulty for laymen to follow the guidance documents would necessitate training for stakeholders in developing countries in order to enable them to properly utilize the guidance documents.

The effectiveness of the project is rated as Moderately Satisfactory.

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

The efficiency of the project is rated as satisfactory, because the project was successful in compressing 24 months of project activity into 18 months, despite an initial delay. This was achieved despite the fact that the stakeholders and contributors were spread across various regions of the globe.

According to the TE, stakeholders indicated that the time pressure created by the delayed start was the biggest challenge encountered during implementation. A review of the work flow process indicates that almost 24 months lapsed between initial discussions about the project idea and the start of project implementation. The TE mentions that both UNIDO and GEF were responsible for these delays, but the larger part of the delay is attributable to UNIDO, both in the appointment of a consultant to prepare the project document, as well as the length of time taken in internal approval and financial processes that enables project initiation. Stakeholders also reported delays at the beginning of the project implementation and attributed this delay to weak management of the project by UNIDO at the start of the project and indicated that the SSC therefore had to take a firmer hand in ensuring that project decisions were properly recorded and followed through. UNIDO attributed the initial lack of project momentum to difficulties in identifying lead authors with the requisite skills and experience in compiling chemical inventories and indicated that the experts originally hired could not give sufficient direction to the drafting process. Despite these challenges, the project successfully produced the necessary guidance documents within very tight timeframes, with a relatively small delay of about six months.

The project document includes a detailed project budget that reflects the costs to be incurred in the delivery of each output. According to the TE, this kind of detailed results-based budgeting is not standard UNIDO practice and represents a case of good practice within the parameters of this project. However, the actual financial records of the project reflect the standard UNIDO line items and does not link costs to different outputs.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Unlikely
--------------------	------------------------------------

The TE identified three risks that may potentially affect the sustainability of project outcomes:

- (1) Risk that the guidance documents might quickly become outdated as the new field of POPs management develops and evolves. The guidance documents will require updating in order to remain current, especially on the issues of BET and BEP. Since current expertise in the field is limited to a fairly small group of people, many of whom have been engaged via this project; it is likely to be fairly easy to establish a Community of Practice, with practitioners focused on generating and sharing learning.
- (2) Risk that financial resources for the NIP updating process will be insufficient for the proper implementation of the methodologies contained in the guidance documents. GEF has limited the funding available for the NIP updates to a maximum of US\$ 250,000 per eligible country. UNIDO and the SSC expressed concerns that this quantum of funding might be insufficient to undertake the full extent of the work envisaged, especially with regard to developing inventories of the new POPs. Drafters of the guidance documents sensibly chose to mitigate this risk through the introduction of a tiered approach in the development of the inventories of new POPs.
- (3) Risk that Parties will not utilize guidance documents effectively: stakeholders involved in the pilot testing indicated that the guidance documents are technical in nature and that stakeholders in developing countries will require training in order to allow them to utilize the guidance documents properly. The documents are also copious and account for a collective 623 pages across the eight guidance documents since the complex content area did not allow for further simplification or shortening during the drafting. There is therefore a considerable risk that the guidance documents will not be effectively utilized by Parties if the SSC and UNIDO fail to build the capacity of stakeholders, thereby enabling the use of the documents.

For these reasons, sustainability is rated as Moderately Unlikely:

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?

According to the project document, USD 1,022,700 was expected as co-financing. USD 329,700 or 32.3% of this co-financing was to be contributed by UNIDO, UNITAR and the SSC as in-kind contributions through the contribution of staff time. According to the TE, these in-kind contributions were not tracked by project participants and therefore have not been quantified.

According to the project document, USD 693,000 in cash was to be contributed to the project budget from the Government of Norway and the European Commission, via the SSC's Voluntary

Fund. The TE reports a shortfall of USD 35,765 between the expected cash contributions reflected in the project document compared to the co-financing figures submitted by the SSC. The shortfall in co-funding is small at 5.16% of projected co-funding at the time of constructing the project budget. The issue of concern relates to the failure to properly record and monitor the co-funding commitments and the absence of agreed financial protocols between the main partners implementing the project. The TE mentions that this was evidenced by the lack of information around the in-kind co-funding and the fact that the information about the cash contributions to the project budget had to be collated by the SSC over a period of eight weeks when requested by the evaluator.

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 implementation of this project has been late, the outputs have become available later than expected. Almost all stakeholders interviewed by the terminal evaluator mentioned the time pressure faced by the project as the biggest challenge during project implementation. This time pressure was generally attributed to a "delay in funding approval by the GEF".

The project document was submitted to GEF on 28 October 2011 and the GEF Review of the project document was received by UNIDO within 11 working days, on 15 November 2011. This review asked that the project document be revised to exclude the development of methods to analyze new POPs in products/articles. UNIDO undertook the revision of the project document and resubmitted the revised document to GEF on 10 January 2011, almost two months after. The project was approved by GEF on 9 February 2011, but UNIDO received the commitment letter from the GEF within two months. UNIDO then approved the project internally on 31 March 2011 and the Project Allotment Document (PAD) was issued on 19 April 2011, accounting for a further six-week delay before the start of project implementation. Therefore, this review of the work process indicates that almost 24 months lapsed between initial discussions about the project idea and the start of project implementation. According to the TE, this delay in the start of the project is attributable to both UNIDO and GEF, but the larger part of the delay is attributable to UNIDO, both in the appointment of a consultant to begin the preparation of the project document, but also in the internal approval and financial processes that enables the initiation of a project.

The project document that was resubmitted to GEF in January 2010 did not revise the original project timeline or activities. This oversight by UNIDO, as the developers of the project document, and GEF, as the funders of the project document, meant that the project started implementation 'on the back foot' from the outset.

Nonetheless, given the fact that the first deliverable (submission of Version 1 to COP5) was patently unachievable, the project worked toward the finalization of the guidance documents by March 2012, as envisaged in the project document. Stakeholders reported delays at the beginning of the project, and attributed the delay to weak management of the project by UNIDO at the start of the project and indicated that the SSC had to take a firmer hand in ensuring that project decisions were properly recorded and followed through.

UNIDO, on the other hand, attributed the initial lack of momentum on the project to the fact that it was difficult to identify lead authors with the appropriate academic skills and experience in compiling chemical inventories and indicated that the experts originally hired could not give sufficient direction to the drafting process, as originally envisaged. UNIDO indicated that they therefore had to take a more hands-on approach in directing the discussions of the Expert Drafting Group and had to play a bigger role in managing the process, than originally planned.

Despite these challenges, the project successfully produced the necessary guidance documents within very tight timeframes, with a relatively small delay of about six months. Given the late start of the project, the project team compressed 24 months of activity into 18 months in order to try to meet the project deadline and so allow project stakeholders time to utilize the guidance documents for the updating of their NIPs.

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:

This is a global project, and therefore there is no information about country ownership.

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: Unsatisfactory
-------------------------	-------------------------------

The PD did not develop an M&E system and instead indicated that an M&E system with measurable Objectively Verifiable Indicators would be established at the start of project implementation. This assumption proved to be problematic, because the M&E system for this project was never developed. Therefore, the M&E Design at entry is rated as Unsatisfactory.

As stated in the PD, the project was supposed to set up a project monitoring and evaluation plan during project inception. This M&E plan would establish updated project impact indicators, using the objectively verifiable indicators listed in the projects results framework as the starting point. In addition, the project reporting framework would be established with a detailed work plan and budget for year one being adopted. This system was also supposed to have included a “detailed narrative on the institutional roles, responsibilities, coordinating actions and feedback

mechanisms” (PD, pg. 32) . The project management system and the M&E framework for the project were supposed to have been discussed and/or adopted at a Project Inception Workshop. As indicated in the TE, the first Project Steering Committee meeting, which seems to have substituted for Project Inception Workshop, was a hurried affair conducted on the fringes of COP5. These issues were therefore not addressed at this meeting and were not remedied thereafter.

On the other hand, the development of the M&E system was the entire output 3.2 in the logframe “An M&E mechanism according to GEF M&E procedures designed and implemented”. Therefore, this activity was budgeted in the PD.

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

As explained in the above section (6.1), the M&E was not established for this project at project design. However UNIDO and the SSC did track progress toward project objectives and took corrective action when needed. This is evidenced by the SSC reportedly taking a firmer hand in the management of the project after what they perceived to be several months of inactivity at the beginning of the project in 2011. The SSC reported to the Terminal Evaluator that they reflected on the lack of progress and decided to ‘push UNIDO’ by taking, for example, a hand in the production of minutes after teleconferences, so as to ensure follow-up on agreed actions. UNIDO also reported that they were required to take corrective action in order to redirect the discussions of the Drafting Groups after they discerned that the lead drafters appointed at the time were not able to lead the discussions productively.

This “tracking” of project deliverables is also implied by the SSC’s decision to prioritize the project’s development of high quality guidance documents within the project timeframes, over the development of the capacity building framework and the production of training material. Despite this evidence of the monitoring and tracking of project deliverables, the TE mentions that the project failed to keep records of project progress. According to GEF reporting requirements, the project is not required to submit an annual report to GEF until December 2012; however, the project document indicates that “UNIDO and SSC will be responsible for the production of the Quarterly Project Review including Financial Reports”. These quarterly reports on project progress were not prepared. Moreover, strategic decisions taken during project implementation, like the SSC’s decision to focus on Outcome 1 rather than Outcome 2, was not recorded and did not amend the project deliverables, as indicated on the project results framework.

In the Project Document there was a budget allocation of USD 35,500 for the M&E activities, which appeared to be sufficient for the M&E activities envisaged especially in light of the simple outputs and outcomes of the project. Unfortunately, the financial records for the project do not reflect M&E costs. Instead, project expenditure is listed against the following budget line items: International experts/consultants; Travel of project staff; Sub-contracts; Non-UNDP Meeting and Sundries. It is therefore not possible to reflect on how much of the budget has actually been spent on M&E activities.

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

UNIDO acted as the Implementing Agency (IA) for the project, accessed GEF funding for medium sized projects and was responsible for overall project management and delivery of the project. In addition, UNIDO commissioned, directed, and managed international experts and Expert Working Group members to prepare the guidance documents.

The Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention provided technical support and policy guidance to the drafters of the guidance documents. As the ultimate client and “owner” of the guidance documents produced, the SSC was responsible for ensuring legal compliance of the guideline documents with the provisions of the Stockholm Convention. The SSC was also responsible for coordinating the translation of the guidance documents.

The UNIDO approach differed, in that UNIDO used a much larger group of experts and convened meetings that drew together a number of experts from international organizations, academia and the private sector in order to make input into the process of drafting the guidance documents. Most of the people drawn together for discussions at two “Expert Drafting Workshops” in the first eight months of the project were not contracted to the project or UNIDO, but had their costs associated with attending the workshops paid from the project budget.

According to the TE, this approach appears to have been necessary since the subject matter at hand, the creation of inventories of POPs that are still in wide use, as well as the identification of best available technologies and best environmental practices in dealing with these POPs is very complex and constitutes a new learning area for which expertise is not readily available, either within UNIDO or outside the organization. However, this mode of implementation slowed down the drafting process somewhat, since experts who were contributing to the guidance documents had other jobs that took precedence over this process.

UNIDO then identified four lead authors to lead the drafting of the different guidance documents, along with a number of other experts who were expected to contribute to different chapters of the guidance documents. For the next ten months of the drafting process, UNIDO used smaller groups for direct input into the drafting process and accessed wider expertise through the peer review

process, in which identified experts were sent relevant guidance documents for review and comment.

Therefore, UNIDO overcame initial problems in project management and delivered the project within 18 months; largely due to the personal commitment and effort of the UNIDO project manager and support staff. So overall the quality of implementation is rated as Satisfactory.

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

UNITAR was subcontracted by UNIDO to act as Executing Agency for specific project deliverables. UNITAR recruited two international experts, one of whom was given the responsibility for developing the guidance documents on the control of trade in new POPs and the labelling of articles containing new POPs, while the other was responsible for the development of the guidelines on the regulatory framework for the monitoring of products containing POPs. The responsibility for the updating of the existing guidance documents on the development of NIPs was assigned to a UNITAR staff manager who also acted as UNITAR's project manager for this project. This group of three professionals worked independently on their respective documents and referred to relevant industry experts on a one-to-one basis, as necessary. Members of this three member group reviewed and made inputs into the work done by the other two members and submitted their work for review by the broader team at the 'Experts drafting workshops', as well as peer reviewers.

The SSC was mainly responsible for quality control on the guidance documents prepared and ensured that the documents were compliant with the legal provisions of the Convention and that they would be useful to the Parties to the Convention. The SSC also took the lead in the implementation of the pilot workshops, the costs of which were covered from funding from the European Commission which was managed by the SSC. Since the SSC prepared the Small Scale Funding Agreements for these pilot projects, it made more sense that they take the lead in this process, rather than UNITAR. UNITAR did, however, maintain primary responsibility for delivering and conducting the content of the workshops. Overall, stakeholders indicated that they were satisfied with the role played by SSC even though the restructuring of the Secretariat meant that cooperation and inputs from the larger organization was sometimes delayed.

The success of the project in developing the guidelines appears to be due largely to the personal commitment and the investment of a huge amount of time and effort by key project partners, including representatives of SSC and UNITAR as well as the experts contracted to develop these documents, rather than the use of an effective and articulated project management system.

8. Lessons and recommendations

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

The main two lessons of this project are related to project management.

This project successfully negotiated changing circumstances and time constraints in order to meet prioritized objectives. However, project decisions and priorities were not always recorded or shared. For example, the SSC reported that they made a management decision to focus on delivering high quality guidance documents, rather than the delivery of training material and capacity building. This decision was not recorded in any project documents or minutes and was not reflected in an amendment to the project results framework. Moreover, the project did not generate any annual reports or quarterly reports to report on project progress and therefore did not record this decision in these progress reports. The failure to record management decisions means that the project is unfavorably evaluated against the original project document and project results framework, rather than a more relevant updated document that reflects amendments to the project deliverables.

The delays reported at the beginning of project implementation were attributed by stakeholders to a lack of understanding about roles and responsibilities of organizations and individuals. Clarification of the roles and expectations of the different project partners at project outset might therefore have improved project delivery. It is interesting to note that the project document indicates that these very same issues would be clarified at the 'project inception workshop'. This did not occur and a project that was already very time-constrained was delayed further. It is therefore essential that these basic elements of good project management be properly observed rather than lightly included in documents tailored to please potential funders.

8.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

In the TE, several recommendations are given to the partners involved in the project.

- (1) UNIDO should build the capacity of potential users in developing countries in order to further enable the effective utilization of the necessarily complex and comprehensive guidance documents. While various capacity building activities are planned by UNIDO and SSC, these are not sufficient, a more programmatic approach to capacity building is necessary.
- (2) In order to safeguard the quality of the decentralized training (and to decrease the costs of the training) to be conducted within each NIP update process, UNIDO should develop a package of training material that can be utilized 'on the ground' within developing countries. The training methodology that underlies the training material should be as participatory as possible and should be appropriate for the profile of the target audience within Party countries.
- (3) It is recommended that the SSC work with UNIDO in addressing the capacity building needs of stakeholders involved in the updating of NIPs. The SSC and UNIDO should jointly

consider these recommendations and the options available in order to expedite these capacity building interventions, so as not to delay the process of the NIP updates any further.

- (4) It is recommended that the SSC establish a Community of Practice focused on generating and sharing learning about understanding and managing new POPs. The Community of Practice would include the drafters, collaborators and reviewers mobilized by this project and would allow SSC staff, as well as UNIDO, to stay abreast of developments in the field and to update the guidance documents with the insertion of new links and references to new documents within the guidance documents.
- (5) As the risk that insufficient capacity building will undermine the effective use of the guidance documents produced by this project. It is therefore recommended that GEF consider the possibility of augmenting its contribution to the current project budget in order to co-fund the capacity building activities discussed above.

9. 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 EO 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 detailed assessment of the outcomes and impacts. However, more information is needed on the role of IA and EA, on their quality of implementation and execution.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent and the evidence convincing. Most of the ratings are justified. Quality of implementation and execution is missing information	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report assesses in detail the sustainability of the project. The risks to sustainability are well described, details and evidence are given.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons and recommendations are given, however, they are very general, and not supported enough by evidence. More details on how to apply them is necessary.	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The projects costs and co-financing are given, however they are not detailed per activity, and it is not very clear what the actual costs were compared to the expected costs.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The M&E system is analyzed and described in details. Enough information is given and the analysis is justified with concrete evidences.	S
Overall TE Rating		S

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