

**Report of the Independent Terminal Evaluation  
of the UNEP-UNIDO GEF Project:  
*“Fostering Active and Effective Civil Society Participation in Preparations  
for Implementation of the Stockholm Convention”***

**GF/4030-03-23**

**March 2007**

**Nee Sun CHOONG KWET YIVE**

## Table of Contents

	Acronyms and Abbreviations	3
	Executive summary	4
1	Introduction	7
2	Major findings	10
2.1	Attainment of objectives and planned results	10
2.2	Achievement of outputs and activities	14
2.3	Cost-effectiveness	29
2.4	Financial Planning and control	31
2.5	Impact	31
2.6	Sustainability	33
2.7	Stakeholder participation / public awareness	35
2.8	Country ownership / drivenness	37
2.9	Implementation approach	37
2.10	Replicability	38
2.11	Monitoring and evaluation	39
3	Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons	41
3.1	Overview	41
3.2	Achievements	41
3.3	Weaknesses	42
3.4	Overall assessment	44
3.5	Recommendations	45
3.6	Lessons	46
3.7	Concluding words	47
	Annex 1: Terms of Reference	48
	Annex 2: Hubs, hub leaders and participating countries	64
	Annex 3: List of interviewees	65
	Annex 4: Projects selected for assessment	66
	Annex 5: TOR for hubs	68
	Annex 6: Snapshot Project Detail Report, 31 Dec 2006, UNIDO	71

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

COP	Conference of Parties
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DDT	Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
EHF	Environmental Health Fund
GAIA	Global Alliance for Incineration Alternatives
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GPM	Global Project Manager
IPEN	International POPs Elimination Network
IPEP	International POPs Elimination Project
MSP	Medium Size Project
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NIP	National Implementation Plan
NIS	Newly Independent States
PAM	Project Activity Memorandum
PAN	Pesticide Action Network
PCBs	Polychlorinated Biphenyls
PCDD	Polychlorinated Dibenzo-p-Dioxins
PCDD/Fs	Polychlorinated Dibenzo-p-Dioxins and Furans
PCDF	Polychlorinated Dibenzo Furans
POPs	Persistent Organic Pollutants
PTS	Persistent Toxic Substances
RAPAM	Red de Accion sobre Plaguicidas y Alternativas en Mexico
SAEFL	Swiss Agency for the Environment Forests and Landscape
SAICM	Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SGP	Small Grant Programme
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organisation
UNITAR	United Nations Institute for Training and Research
USA	United States of America
VROM	Dutch Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment

## **Executive summary**

### **Introduction**

An independent and terminal, instead of a mid-term as specified in the TOR of the report, evaluation of the GEF funded project “*Fostering Active and Effective Civil Society Participation in Preparations for Implementation of the Stockholm Convention*” (referred to as “*International POPs Elimination Project*”, IPEP) was carried out between October 2006 and January 2007 on behalf of UNEP-UNIDO.

The major objectives of IPEP were to:

- Encourage and enable NGOs in 40 developing countries and countries with economies in transition to engage in activities that provide concrete and immediate contributions to country efforts in preparing for the implementation of the Stockholm Convention
- Enhance the skills and knowledge of NGOs to help build their capacity as effective stakeholders in the convention implementation process
- Help establish regional and national coordination and capacity in all regions of the world in support of NGO contributions to effective Stockholm Convention implementation as well as longer term efforts to achieve chemical safety

EHF, assisted by IPEN, coordinated and managed the project with guidance, monitoring and evaluation by UNIDO and UNEP through the Project Steering Committee.

While GEF provided the core funding (\$ 1,000,000), cash co-financing was obtained from various sources including the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation and Swiss Agency for the Environment Forests and Landscape (\$ 100,000), Dutch Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment (\$ 120,000) and Canada POPs fund (\$ 250,000) through UNEP Chemicals. Originally planned for two years, the project was completed in 35 months.

### **Achievements**

- Hubs, hosted by IPEN NGOs, were established in eight regions of the world to provide guidance and support to participating NGOs.
- A comprehensive and multilingual, including all UN languages, website was created within months of the start of the project. The website, which is regularly updated, contains all information regarding IPEP activities and reports.

- More than 160 NGOs from 61 countries participated in IPEP. These NGOs participated in a total of 260 project activities involving different sectors of the population including scientists, farmers, fishermen, grassroots communities and even local authorities in a few cases.
- NGOs have enhanced their capacity and knowledge regarding POPs and related issues and this allowed some of them to participate and effectively contribute to NIP processes according to the Global report.
- Extensive awareness-raising campaigns, targeting all sectors of the society particularly exposed populations like those living near incinerators, have been carried out using different modes of communication including brochures, press releases, radio and TV.
- The Global Chicken Egg study involving 17 countries was considered by the project management as a major achievement. Seventy percent of the samples were found to contain levels of dioxins that exceeded the EU limit and sixty percent exceeded the EU limits for PCBs.

### **Weaknesses**

- China, the most populated country and one of the largest countries of the world, and Brazil the most populated and largest country of Latin America, have had very limited participation in IPEP. And it is known that formation and release of POPs, especially PCDD/Fs, is closely linked to the population size of a country.
- Due to difficulties in raising co-finance, the five international experts teams were not established; support and assistance were provided to NGOs in a different manner, mainly by hubs with help from the GPM.
- Despite the large number of policy briefs and policy recommendations produced in the context of IPEP activities in the different regions, there is little evidence, so far, that these have been considered during policy formulation and decision-making or in NIPs.
- It was not possible to obtain appropriate detailed summary reports to carry out a proper financial assessment of the project.
- Although IPEP was geared exclusively towards NGOs, the level of involvement of national or local authorities was very low. The lack of private sector involvement in the project was also a matter of concern.
- The selection mechanism and criteria for the number of PAMs that a country or an NGO could submit was not totally clear and transparent.

## **Recommendations**

It is important that the project management and partners including implementing agencies and Stockholm Secretariat consider making communication and outreach efforts to promote IPEP and its products to government officials and policy makers to create opportunities for outputs and NGOs to be better considered in decision-making processes.

It also appears crucial that project management and implementing agencies should consider follow-up activities on a global level to maintain momentum that has been developed during IPEP. Otherwise, this momentum will gradually be lost with time as in most of these countries POPs, generally, are not a priority.

If global follow-up activities are to be undertaken, these following issues need to be considered:

- (i) Ensure that densely populated and large countries are more actively engaged
- (ii) Encourage more involvement of government officials for example POPs focal points or officials responsible for NIP or post NIP activities

## **1. Introduction**

### **1.1 This report**

According to the terms of reference (TOR) (annex 1), this report was initiated as an independent **mid-term** evaluation of the GEF project “*Fostering Active and Effective Civil Society Participation in Preparations for Implementation of the Stockholm Convention*” (referred to as “*International POPs Elimination Project*”, IPEP) carried out on behalf of UNEP-UNIDO. However, as this evaluation exercise started in October 2006, after the completion of IPEP (August 2006), it was decided that it would be more appropriate if a **terminal** evaluation were conducted instead. This report provides the approach and findings of the **terminal** evaluation exercise of the IPEP project.

### **1.2 The Project**

#### **1.2.1 Project Rationale**

Successful implementation of the Stockholm Convention and longer-term efforts to reduce and eliminate other persistent toxic substances (PTS) will require enhanced public awareness about POPs and increased civil society participation, involvement and interest in the Convention and related activities.

The main objective of the project was stated as: ‘*To Encourage and enable NGOs in approximately 40 developing countries and countries-with-economies-in-transition to engage in activities within their countries that will provide concrete and immediate contributions to country efforts in preparing for Stockholm Convention implementation.*’

These activities would additionally serve to enhance the skills and knowledge of NGOs in participating countries to help build their capacity as effective stakeholders and participants during national preparations for Convention implementation. In the longer-term (after project completion), these activities would leave NGOs who have participated in the project with enhanced capability to undertake future and ongoing national and regional activities aimed at the reduction and elimination of POPs and other PTS.

#### **1.2.2 Executing Arrangements**

The project was executed by the NGO, Environmental Health Fund (EHF), on behalf of the International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN). The United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO) provided project execution assistance including, inter alia, transfer of funds to NGOs and financial management. UNEP was the implementing agency and also provided guidance and oversight for the execution of the project.

EHF is a USA-based NGO that works with NGOs in North America and around the world supporting education, technical assistance and advocacy aimed at protecting human health and the environment. EHF has an Executive Director and a Deputy Director. EHF Global Chemical Safety Program was established in 2000 to support the International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN) and to assist NGOs in developing countries and countries-with-economies-in-transition with issues related to chemical safety at global, regional, national and community levels. The IPEP Global Project Manager works for EHF and reports to the EHF Global Chemical Safety Director. The Project Manager, based in Chicago, USA was responsible for the management of IPEP including day-to-day contact with various stakeholders of the project.

Initially planned to run for two years (September 2003 - August 2005), the project was completed in 35 months (October 2003 – August 2006).

### **1.2.3 Budget**

The total budget was US\$ 2,000,000 with US\$ 1,000,000 funded by the GEF Trust Fund and the other US\$ 1,000,000 coming from co-funding agencies.

### **1.2.4 Evaluation**

The evaluation of the IPEP project was carried out by an independent consultant: Mr. Nee Sun CHOONG KWET YIVE (Mauritius).

#### **1.2.4.1 Terms of Reference of the evaluation**

As mentioned earlier, a terminal evaluation was conducted instead of the originally planned mid-term evaluation. The objectives of the evaluation (mid-term) as reported in the terms of reference (annex 1) were slightly modified so as to meet the requirements for a terminal evaluation.

The evaluation focused on the main following issues:

1. The relevance of the project design vis-à-vis the practical conditions encountered by project execution;
2. The appropriateness of the execution means and implementation arrangements vis-à-vis the project objectives;
3. The results of phase I vis-à-vis initial objectives and as a basis for phase II;
4. The quality of outputs, outcomes and impacts of the project

#### **1.2.4.2 Methodology**

The evaluation of the project was carried out between October 2006 and January 2007. For this, the evaluator undertook a number of activities including:

1. Review of documents.



The documents reviewed included the project document, outputs, performance reports, final report, documents posted on the IPEP website ([www.ipen.org/ipenweb/ipep.html](http://www.ipen.org/ipenweb/ipep.html)), hub evaluation reports, hub reports and meeting minutes.

#### 2. Interviews with stakeholders and participants.

These interviews were either face-to-face or by telephone and included the Project Manager, hub leaders, participating NGOs, staff of UNIDO and UNEP. A list of interviewees is given in annex 3

#### 3. Email interaction

Email questionnaires were sent to the Project Manager and also some participating NGOs. The questionnaires inquired about (i) the strength and weaknesses of IPEP (ii) lessons learned (iii) the respondents' experience acquired during IPEP (capacity building) and (iv) problems encountered

#### 4. Visits to hubs

The evaluator visited two hubs (Anglophone Africa and South East Asia) where a number of documents (progress reports, final reports, financial statements, etc.) were reviewed in depth. During these visits, hub management unit staff, key government officials (POPs focal points and NIP coordinators), and NGOs were interviewed.

#### 5. Baseline

The project did not establish a clear baseline and in this context it was difficult for the evaluator to assess the results and impacts of outputs in countries where IPEP was active. Furthermore, the terms outputs and outcomes, which were used inconsistently in the Global Report, also made the evaluation task difficult especially when assessing changes that occurred in countries where IPEN worked.

### **1.2.4.3 Evaluation report**

The evaluation followed the approach and outline proposed in the terms of reference (TOR) for this task (annex 1). An overall rating of the IPEP project is given in chapter three.

## 2. Major findings

The findings are discussed with respect to the eleven categories defined in the TOR (annex 1).

### 2.1 Attainment of objectives and planned results

The extents to which the project objectives have been met are discussed in Table 1.

Table 1: IPEP Project – Objectives and Outcomes

From Logical Framework in project document		Evaluation findings (numbered paragraphs correspond to indicators)
Objectives and Outcomes	Indicators	
<p><b>Rationale:</b> Successful implementation of the Stockholm Convention and longer-term efforts to reduce and eliminate other persistent toxic substances (PTS) will require enhanced public awareness about POPs and increased civil society participation, involvement and interest in the Convention and related activities</p> <p><b>Objective:</b> Encourage and enable NGOs in approximately 40 developing countries and countries with economies in transition to engage in activities within their countries that will provide concrete and immediate contributions to country efforts in preparing for Stockholm Convention implementation.</p> <p>These activities would additionally serve to enhance the skills and knowledge of NGOs in participating countries to help build their capacity as</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. National Implementation Plans for Stockholm Convention are actively supported and endorsed by NGOs and other civil society organizations in most countries where the project has worked</li> <li>2. Effective advocacy in support of Convention ratification and implementation occurs in most countries where the project has worked based upon increased awareness, knowledge and understanding in society about effects of POPs and about the measures required to reduce and eliminate them.</li> <li>3. In most countries (more than 30) where the project worked, sectors of the</li> </ol>	<p>IPEP has definitely contributed towards the involvement and participation of NGOs and civil society in activities to implement the Stockholm Convention in countries where the project was executed. However, it is not clear to what extent IPEP outputs have influenced policy decisions and it is also difficult to assess the NGOs' contributions to the NIPs. Nevertheless IPEP has proved to be successful in terms of quantity of outputs produced and in terms of raising awareness especially among the grassroots communities and populations at risk (e.g. people living near incinerators). The findings are discussed in the paragraphs below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In all countries (61) where the project worked, about 160 NGOs participated in various activities related to the different topics highlighted in the project document including awareness-raising, country and hotspot reports, etc. Many of these NGOs (e.g. Tanzania, Kenya, Philippines, Malaysia) have participated in meetings and workshops (e.g. Priority Setting Workshop) organised in the context of enabling activities for NIP development. Some of them (e.g. Philippines, Kenya, and Tanzania) were members of the NIP steering committee or technical sub-committees. However, it is not clear to what extent IPEP helped in these NIP participations as most of these NGOs were already involved in POPs before IPEP. It is most likely that NGOs with experience in POPs and related issues would have participated in NIP processes even without IPEP.</li> <li>2. As mentioned earlier, many of the NGOs and civil society organisations involved in IPEP already knew about POPs and some even being actively involved in activities related to POPs before IPEP started especially those that were IPEN members. IPEP was however an appropriate opportunity for other NGOs, especially those working with grassroots communities to know about POPs and become aware of their dangers and effects on health. It was also an opportunity for these NGOs to build and / or enhance their capacity and knowledge on POPs. It has been put into practice in a few but real cases. For example, in a municipal region, known as a barangay, of Quezon City, Philippines, thanks to the efforts of a local NGO (involved in IPEP activities) and in collaboration with the local authorities for the promotion of waste recycling (e.g. composting), there has been a significant decrease in volume of solid wastes to be managed. This has been possible, as, although basic, an appropriate waste collection system has been put in place: including availability of separate bins for different types of waste (e.g.</li> </ol>

<p>effective stakeholders and participants during national preparations for Convention implementation. In the longer-term (after project completion), these activities would leave NGOs who have participated in the project with enhanced capability to undertake future and ongoing national and regional activities aimed at the reduction and elimination of POPs and other PTS.</p>	<p>national NGO community and civil society actively follow government plans and efforts to implement the Stockholm convention, and they provide useful support aimed at effective implementation. Longer-term efforts to reduce and eliminate other PTS also receive support.</p> <p>4. Governments, intergovernmental organisations and others come to view national, regional, and global NGO networks as making significant ongoing contributions to implementation of the Stockholm Convention, and see these networks as an important future on this and related matters.</p> <p>5. After completion of the project, NGOs in most of the countries where the project has worked continue to remain involved in the Stockholm Convention implementation activities, and continue effectively</p>	<p>organic, paper, etc.), their collection and transport to the recycling sites. Awareness campaigns have been undertaken in all countries participating in IPEP. However, it is very difficult to assess to what extent these have been effective and have made people adopt more environmentally friendly attitudes.</p> <p>3. According to the Global report, NGOs in many countries (more than 50), where the project has worked, have effectively and actively followed and participated in activities and plans for NIP development. This could indeed be verified in a few cases where NGOs have provided valuable inputs to the NIP (e.g. inputs regarding DDT in Kenya). It was however difficult to assess the extent of these contributions for the whole project. It is also difficult to assess the extent to which IPEP helped NGOs in their participation in NIP processes, as some NGOs would have participated even without IPEP. Being IPEN members prior to IPEP, these NGOs already had the experience and knowledge on POPs related issues. Moreover, for various reasons, efforts of some NGOs (e.g. in Malaysia) were not considered in the NIP. These reasons include (i) IPEP was not properly timed, it came after NIP activities (e.g. Malaysia, Philippines), or (ii) NGOs were not considered as useful and reliable stakeholders with the necessary technical knowledge and background to effectively provide valuable inputs to NIP (iii) certain NGOs that participated in IPEP were viewed as “problem” maker rather than a “cooperative” partner.</p> <p>4. In some countries (e.g. Philippines, Tanzania) some of the NGOs involved in IPEP are highly considered with regards to matters pertaining to POPs and are often seen as organisations that have the up-to-date information regarding these chemicals and related issues. However, it should also be pointed out as mentioned in paragraph 3 (iii), in other countries where IPEP has worked, much effort has still to be pursued so that authorities and governments accept and view NGOs as partners rather than “opponents”.</p> <p>5. In most countries, IPEP has created a momentum that needs to be sustained and enhanced. For instance, for many NGOs (e.g. in Philippines, Tanzania, Malaysia) that participated in IPEP, POPs has become one of their main topics of interest. A few have already secured funding for continued future activities in this field. Other NGOs (in Philippines and Malaysia) have initiated a movement involving local communities to prevent the planned construction of incinerators in their area. From information gathered, these efforts will be sustained until the plan is completely abandoned by the authorities. These are just a few examples of NGOs that are committed to continued efforts in POPs related issues after IPEP. Continued involvement in POPs, which however would still have happened without IPEP, is certainly true for the IPEN NGOs that have long and solid experience, but this is not likely to be the case for most other NGOs, unless initiatives are taken globally by international agencies.</p>
--	---	--

	promoting the reduction and elimination of POPs and other PTS.	
--	--	--

1.

## 2.2 Achievement of outputs and activities

The tables 2 and 3 below give the findings regarding evaluation of outputs and activities.

Table 2: Project outcomes / outputs

<b>Project outputs to achieve outcomes:</b>	<b>Indicators:</b>	<b>Evaluation findings (numbered paragraphs correspond to indicators)</b>
<p>2. Solid POPs-related, country relevant information is prepared by National NGOs and made available to governments and society in countries where the project is active</p> <p>3. NGO participation in the National Implementation Plan (NIP) preparation processes and/or NGO-prepared informational and policy inputs to NIP preparations takes place in most countries where the project is active. These make positive contributions to NIP preparations.</p>	<p>1. Country-relevant information has been prepared by national NGOs and disseminated. A rich base of information about POPs is available on project website, including country-specific and country-relevant information in many national and local languages. At the conclusion of the project, IPEN will have secured the support needed to maintain and continue to update this website, and will have plans and arrangements in place to do so.</p> <p>2. In more than 20 countries, NGOs supported by the project are registered to have participated in NIP preparation activities and/or have provided useful NGO-produced informational or</p>	<p>For the evaluation of the outputs of IPEP project, four outputs from each of the eight regions covering hotspots reports, awareness raising issues, PCBs, POPs pesticides and dioxin studies have been selected as recommended in the TOR of this evaluation. The selected outputs are given in Annex 4.</p> <p>1. According to information found on the IPEP website*, 261 Project Activity Memoranda (PAM) have been submitted by NGOs found in 61 countries of the eight regions. The average PAM per country is 4.3 with the Eastern Europe, Caucasus, Central Asian countries Hub submitting on average the highest PAM per country (7) and the Francophone Africa Hub submitting on average the lowest number of PAM per country (2.6) (Table 2). There is a very wide range of submission of PAM country wise ranging from one (15 countries) to 25 for Russia (Annex 4). China is one of the countries that submitted only one PAM and this can be considered as a weakness of IPEP. Indeed, it would have been more meaningful if the most populated country of the globe were a more active participant in the project as it is expected that the release of POPs depends greatly on the population size amongst other factors. The same comment applies for Brazil, the largest country in the Latin America region and also one of the most populated and submitting only one PAM.</p> <p>A user-friendly and comprehensive website* containing all information about</p>

<p>4. Increased level of awareness, understanding, and knowledge within the national NGO community and society as a whole concerning the effects of POPs on human health and the environment and the measures to reduce and eliminate them.</p> <p>5. NGOs and civil society in most countries where the project has been active have expanded their interest, capacity and competence in POPs-related issues, leading to their on-going involvement in Stockholm Convention implementation efforts and other efforts that address persistent toxic substances (PTS).</p>	<p>technical inputs to country NIP processes. NGO inputs are positively reflected in the NIP, and this serves to encourage and facilitate positive NGO involvement in NIP implementation.</p> <p>3. Awareness about POPs is enhanced within the national NGO community and civil society in most of the countries where the project works – especially within sectors targeted by the project for information dissemination and awareness-raising activities. In more than 20 countries, this information is used in national and/or local media reports and other programs that promote Convention ratification and/or the reduction and eliminations of POPs.</p> <p>4. At the completion of the project, in more than 30 countries, NGOs and civil society groups that had</p>	<p>IPEP (PAM, reports, hubs, etc.) and information related to POPs has been created. To date (December 2006) about 55 % of the final PAM reports have been posted on the website (Table 4). Most of them are in English and some of them exist in translated version (Russian, French, Spanish, and also local languages e.g. in African regions and Asia Pacific regions). According to information gathered from the Project Manager, uploading of the remaining reports will be finalized by February of 2007. However, the updating of the site does not cover all the sections. For example, the last update for posting the reports is December 2006 whereas the list of NGOs still dates back to June 2005. This could be the reason why some NGOs having participated in IPEP are not listed in the project website, for example the NGO Ground Work of south Africa that submitted 3 PAMs. It should also be pointed out that some countries having submitted PAMs are not listed on the website e.g. Hungary and Kyrgyztan. However, despite these minor omissions / imperfections that are easily corrected, the IPEP website is of very good standard.</p> <p>2. For all regions, the different topics (hotspot report, country report, awareness, the POPs) have been covered. All the reports selected for evaluation are of a good standard containing well-presented technical information. They are a source of valuable country specific information regarding POPs and related issues. However, except for the Global Egg Study for PCBs and dioxins and a few other studies (e.g. PCB contamination in Philippines), IPEP has not produced new technical information. Most of the technical information contained in the reports, especially hotspots reports, was gathered from different sources (e.g. national inventories, NIPs, previous studies,</p>
---	---	--

<p>6. NGO facilitation and support mechanisms (global, regional and national) enhanced and/or developed during the project will successfully find the resources to continue in operation after completion of the project, and will continue providing ongoing support to NGO efforts addressing POPs and other PTS. Global NGO POPs network continues and becomes more effective in promoting global, regional, national and local efforts aimed at the elimination of POPs and other PTS.</p>	<p>been involved in project activities continue as Stockholm Convention stakeholders and/or as advocates and/or as providers of POPs-related information. The relevant expertise and capabilities of these groups will have been qualitatively improved over the course of the project and awareness in society about POPs will have increased. At MSP completion, NGOs in at least 20 countries will have secured funds and/or other sources of support to enable them to continue activities of the kind originally undertaken with project support.</p> <p>5. At the completion of the project, resources for continuing work have been secured. Ongoing, international NGO POPs-expert teams will continue to support national NGO efforts; NGO</p>	<p>published research data, published documents, etc.). Funding was the limiting factor. In many of these countries, the facilities for POPs analysis do not exist and having these analyses done elsewhere is very costly.</p> <p>During the missions to the two hubs, it was found that in countries where IPEP started before or during the same period as NIP processes, some NGOs could participate and give valuable inputs to the NIP (e.g. Kenya). On the other hand in countries where IPEP started well after or at the end of NIP enabling activities, the NGOs could not participate or give inputs to NIP (e.g. Malaysia). Good timing of IPEP in this respect was crucial.</p> <p>According to the global report, 21 policy briefs and 88 reports with policy recommendations have been produced which is well above the 30 as indicated in the project document. However, again as mentioned earlier, the scope of this evaluation did not allow assessing, even during hub missions, whether these recommendations were considered in the NIP in countries where IPEP was timely planned with respect to NIP activities or whether they influenced policy or decision-making in these countries.</p> <p>3. According to the IPEP website and PAM submission list, 164 NGOs from 61 countries participated in IPEP with an average of 2.7 NGOs per country (Table 5). In some countries there were more NGOs than submitted PAMs, e.g. 9 NGOs and 8 PAMs submitted in Armenia. In other countries, NGOs have been more active, submitting at least 5 PAMs or more. There are indications that within a hub, some NGOs were limited to submitting only one PAM despite having the capacity to submit more. The criteria for NGO selection and</p>
--	---	---

	<p>regional facilitation hubs will continue to provide support and facilitation to NGOs in eight regions of the world and in five of the six UN languages; and global mechanisms to support and facilitate NGO activities on POPs-related issues will have been enhanced. Continuing NGO involvement in Stockholm Convention implementation activities at global, regional, national, and local levels, and relevant capacity and involvement at regional, national and local levels are far greater than was in place at the start of the project. Enhanced international NGO support mechanisms are also in place and supported.</p>	<p>PAM allocation to participate in IPEP were not clear. In all cases, all the countries hosting the hub submitted the largest number of PAMs.</p> <p>The awareness aspect of IPEP has been very satisfactorily covered in all countries. Indeed, in all countries where IPEP was active, there has been a Global Day of Action where awareness regarding POPs was raised targeting not only specific target groups like the policy decision makers and occupationally exposed workers but also, the general public. For this, different means of communication were used including brochures, radio interviews, press releases, and workshops amongst others. To reach a wider audience national and local languages were very often used. Another very positive point of the project is that thanks to the IPEP, many of the participating NGOs, originally involved in other fields have had their capacity enhanced to deal with POPs issues. Moreover, many of these NGOs, especially in the African and Asian regions, targeted specifically grassroots communities like small planters or fishermen. IPEP has also been an opportunity for members of the civil society, with the help of NGOs, to undertake activities to reduce the risk of exposure to POPs, more specifically to PCDD/Fs. One example is the strong movement against the construction of the biggest municipal waste incinerator in Broga-Semenyih, Malaysia. In this context, a documentary film entitled “<i>Alice lives here</i>” (in Malaysian language with English and Chinese subtitles) was produced by the NGO ReelPower. This documentary film which, now exists on CD and that has been widely disseminated, was broadcasted a number of times on national Malaysian TV stations and received very positive reviews in local newspapers. The documentary was awarded best documentary film in</p>
--	--	---



		<p>Malaysia in 2006.</p> <p>4. Most of the NGOs, more than 50 of them, across all eight regions, which participated in the project, were or have become IPEN members. Those that became IPEN members after IPEP and some others expanded their interest to participate in the project (e.g. ReelPower of Malaysia, Cavite Green Coalition of Philippines, and Fisherfolk Against Toxic of Philippines). For some of these NGOs, it was the first time that they had the opportunity to develop a full project proposal, execute it and write a report. IPEP has definitely helped these NGOs not only to gain knowledge and experience on POPs related issues but also to enhance their capacities with regards to project management.</p> <p>Most of the NGOs involved in IPEP have indicated their wish to continue to work on POPs, however some of them mentioned that funding was a major problem. This correlates with information from the global report, which states that only 37 out of 164 participating NGOs from 27 countries have secured funding for further activities on POPs. The Tanzania Plantation and Agricultural Workers Union (TPAWU) is one of the 37 and was one of the NGOs interviewed during the mission to the Anglo Africa hub. They indicated that they have secured a substantial amount of money from SAICM for a project on pesticides that will include POPs pesticides.</p> <p>5. The establishment of the hubs in the eight regions has been an important factor to achieve the goals and objectives of the project. It has also helped for the creation of a network of NGOs that now has the capacity to deal with POPs issues within a country, a region and globally. Most of these NGOs, under the leadership of hub</p>
--	--	--

		<p>managers, have developed close links and have in some cases worked on common projects. For example in Philippines an alliance of 10 NGOs is promoting a Programme / Project entitled “Ecological Waste Management”. However, a weakness of IPEP is the small number of participating NGOs from big and populated countries like China or Brazil as mentioned. All the hubs are fully operational with the appropriate office equipment (computer, telephone, internet access, etc.). There are indications according to interviews carried out during missions that the hubs will continue to provide support and assistance to NGOs that continue to undertake activities after IPEP. The cost, which will be minimal, will be borne by the NGO hosting the hub.</p>
--	--	--

\* <http://www.oztoxics.org/ipepweb/index.html>

Table 3: Project activities to achieve outputs / outcomes

<b>Project activities to achieve outputs/outcomes:</b>	<b>Indicators:</b>	<b>Evaluation findings (numbered paragraphs correspond to indicators)</b>
<p>1. Eight existing and established NGOs (in eight different regions) will help NGOs in approximately 40 countries develop and implement MSP activities, and will do so in ways that help strengthen regional and national NGO capacity relative to POPs and other PTS. NGO-based, MSP regional facilitation hubs will be located in: Anglophone Africa; Central and Eastern Europe; Francophone Africa; Latin America</p>	<p>1. Regional facilitation hubs have been established and are functioning in accordance with the terms of reference. Hubs are providing NGOs in their region effective support and assistance in the preparation, implementation, and review of country-based project activities in accordance with project guidelines. Summary regional reports are prepared and posted on the project website. The</p>	<p>To achieve the goals and objectives of IPEP, the planned activities as proposed in the project document were enabled and executed satisfactorily by the Global Project Manager (GPM) / EHF with oversight by the Project Steering Committee and guidance by UNIDO and UNEP. However, a number of problems hindered the smooth implementation of the project. Funds transfer to the IPEP participating NGOs was the main reason why the project suffered several months of delay with regard to the deadline. The findings are discussed in the different numbered paragraphs laid out below.</p> <p>1. The terms of reference (Annex 5) for the regional hubs were prepared by IPEN in September 2003 and</p>

<p>and the Caribbean; the Middle East; Russia and the newly independent states (NIS); South Asia; and Southeast and East Asia and the Pacific. Regional facilitation hubs will work with NGOs in their region to help them identify, prepare and implement country-based project activities ( to be agreed in written project activity memoranda). Hubs will serve as primary point of contact between country-based NGOs and the project and they will facilitate and oversee project capacity-building functions. Hubs will also provide initial review of project outputs, prepare regional summary reports, and assist NGOs with post-project sustainability plans including fund raising plans. [<b>GEF \$160,000; co-finance \$240,000; Total \$400,000</b> (average \$25,000 per hub per year)]</p> <p>2. National and/or local NGOs – with assistance from project expert teams and regional hubs – will prepare country-</p>	<p>NGOs that host regional facilitation hubs continue providing valuable support and facilitation to NGOs in their region following completion of the project with financing from non-GEF sources committed by the end of the project.</p> <p>2. Documents and materials have been prepared, and they have been submitted and/or appropriately disseminated. These</p>	<p>reviewed by the Project Steering Committee at its first meeting in Vienna on 29 April 2004. The selection of NGOs to serve as facilitating hub unit for each of the eight regions was done in a fair and transparent manner. Indeed a sub-committee of the IPEN Steering committee was established for this purpose. All selected NGOs that served as hub facilitators were already IPEN members. The hubs together with the Global Project Manager provided necessary support including technical to all IPEP participating NGOs. These NGOs interviewed during the evaluation indicated that hubs were very helpful during all the stages of their participation (i.e. PAM development, project execution and report writing) by providing them with necessary information and guidance. They also highlighted that their knowledge and capacities were definitely enhanced regarding POPs and related issues including management, reduction and elimination of POPs. Most of the NGOs, also reported in the minutes of the second Project Steering Committee, that fund transfer was a major problem. This was the reason for many of them not being able to meet deadlines. As pointed out in these same minutes, the major reason was probably the delay that occurred during transfer of funds between the New York bank and the bank accounts of NGOs. It was also difficult to trace back the bank transactions due to confidentiality reasons. It should be pointed out that the management of funds (checking of invoices, funds transfers, etc.) for about 261 PAMs, amounting to about 780 (261 x 3) document handling and</p>
---	--	--

<p>specific and/or country relevant informational and policy documents and materials (e.g. policy briefs, country information reports, hotspots reports, etc.) for submission to NIP processes and/or for dissemination to policy makers, NGOs, and civil society in their country. In addition, follow-up by regional hubs to assure that documents prepared are appropriately disseminated and used. <b>[GEF \$220,000; Co-finance \$150,000; Total \$370,000]</b></p>	<p>documents and materials are on file and most of them are also on the project website. In at least 30 countries, the documents have received relevant consideration during NIP preparations and/or other efforts preparatory to Stockholm Convention implementation. A brief report is on file for each document with information on its dissemination and evaluating its relevance, usefulness, and impact.</p>	<p>processing, over a period of about 2 years constituted an enormous task for one person (at UNIDO's office in Vienna) and this had certainly added to the delay of funds. For future projects, and especially those of the same nature and duration as IPEP and involving a large number of institutions /groups and other stakeholders, this management aspect should not be overlooked and appropriate human resources should be provided in order to avoid such problems. Moreover, regarding funding, some NGOs also mentioned that the funds obtained from IPEP were just sufficient or too little for the nature of activities they were undertaking and had to devise ways and means to raise funds to complete the project activity (e.g. ReelPower in Malaysia).</p>
<p>3. Translate key information and documents into all project languages (English, French, Spanish, Russian and Arabic) as needed. <b>[GEF \$50,000; co-finance \$25,000; Total \$75,000]</b></p>	<p>3. Key information and documents have been translated and are available in all project languages on project website.</p>	<p>Furthermore, according to feedback gathered from hub leaders the Global Project Manager was the key person for the success of IPEP. He accomplished his job very well by providing the necessary support, guidance and assistance to all hubs and participating NGOs mainly through email communication, and some times by face-to-face meetings during missions to hubs and countries.</p>
<p>4. Utilising documents and materials prepared under Activity 2 above, organise and carry out country-based project activities such as: (a) NGO participation in government-sponsored NIP preparation activities and other preparations for Convention implementation; (b)</p>	<p>4. Informational, public awareness, or campaigning activities relating to POPs are undertaken in more than 30 countries; successfully completed; and conform to outputs and goals specified in written project activity memoranda. Awareness and</p>	<p>2. IPEP has been a particularly successful project in terms of the quantity of outputs produced, 261 PAMs submitted (Table 4), including hotspots reports, country reports, awareness-raising campaigns, policy briefs etc. To date (December 2006), 55% of these reports / outputs are posted on the IPEP website, and according to information gathered</p>

<p>POPs public awareness activities or campaigns at the national, district or local levels; and (c) meetings or workshops for training or raising POPs awareness that target national NGOs or selected civil society sectors. [GEF \$220,000; co-finance \$150,000; Total \$370,000]</p> <p>5. Provide needed and useful issue-based, policy and technical expertise, information and guidance to national and/or local NGOs engaged in MSP activities. Establish and maintain five issue-focused, international NGO expert teams that provide support and assistance to NGOs undertaking country-based activities, including preparation of informational and policy documents, organization of awareness activities and campaigns, and interventions into NIP preparation processes. [GEF \$50,000; co-finance \$150,000; Total \$200,000]</p> <p>6. Establish and regularly update a global website containing country-</p>	<p>understanding of POPs have been enhanced within the targeted sectors of society. NGO participation in country NIP preparation and related activities (including, in many cases, provision of informational and policy outputs) occurs in more than 20 countries and adds value to the processes.</p> <p>5. Five issue-focused, international NGO expert teams provide NGOs in many countries valuable support and assistance relating to the production of documents, planning of awareness activities, and/or preparation for participation in country NIP processes. Completed evaluation forms from country-based NGOs have been received and indicate the value of the support and assistance the expert team provided.</p> <p>6. A global website is established and maintained during the</p>	<p>from the Global Project Manager the posting will be completed by February 2007. The Global report of the project states that IPEP has helped NGOs in 53 countries to participate in NIP processes. The question to ask is; “without IPEP, how many NGOs would still have participated in the NIP processes?” There are indications from mission visits to hubs that a number of these NGOs would still have participated in the NIPs given their involvement in POPs as IPEN members. However, one has to recognize that IPEP has significantly enhanced NGOs’ capacities to be active. Most, if not all of these outputs produced are valuable, however, another question is “to what extent these outputs have been considered and included in NIPs?” Again, this is a difficult issue to quantify although there are indications from mission visits that NGOs have indeed contributed significantly to NIPs (e.g. Kenya). Regarding policy briefs and policy recommendations produced, 109 according to Global report, in the context of IPEP, it is also difficult to assess to what extent these have been considered in NIP processes or influenced policy decisions. Even during mission visits, it was not possible to see indications of these. Dissemination of project findings / outputs has been satisfactory. Generally, whenever a PAM involves a given area, the results / reports are made available to the population of the area or to the community leaders. For example, in many cases involving grassroots communities, the reports have been translated in local languages and given to community leaders e.g. water and sediments</p>
--	--	---

<p>specific and/or country-relevant informational, educational, and policy-oriented materials about POPs from approximately 40 countries, including information in many national and local languages. Provide and update regional summary information as well as a global database of, and linkages to, POPs-related information of potential interest to NGOs, governments, industry, or other stakeholders. <b>[GEF \$50,000; co-finance \$75,000; Total \$125,000]</b></p> <p>7. Global MSP administration, management and technical oversight by an existing and established NGO in the IPEN network for all aspects of MSP management functions. Activities to include: (a) support and facilitate the work of the eight regional facilitation hubs; (b) promote communications and information exchange between hubs; (c) assure that issue-focused international expert teams provide</p>	<p>MSP and the support necessary for post-project maintenance and updating is secured. By the fourth quarter of the project's second year, country-specific and/or country-relevant materials from approximately 40 countries are posted on the website; materials can be found in many national languages and local languages; updated regional summaries, a comprehensive global database, and linkages to POPs-related information are present on the website.</p> <p>7. The MSP is effectively administered and managed; its activities conform to MSP guidelines; the regional facilitation hubs have received the support and assistance they need to function effectively; communication and information sharing between hubs takes place and is effective; the five issue-focused international expert teams function and provide needed support and assistance to NGOs working on project activities;</p>	<p>analysis in the Vikuge POPs contaminated site.</p> <p>3. According to the project website, although most of the posted reports are in English, many of them have been translated or exist in the other UN languages (e.g. French, Spanish, Arabic or Russian). Documents including reports, brochures, posters, etc. have also been produced in national (e.g. Hindi or Malay) and local (e.g. local Philippines and Tanzanian) languages.</p> <p>4. In all countries where the project has worked, a Global Day of Action was organized to raise awareness amongst all sectors of the population including targeted groups like exposed workers and the general public. Different means of communication in appropriate languages were used: brochures, press release, radio and TV. Moreover, whenever a PAM involved a given sector of the society, the results / findings of the study were generally disseminated to these populations as was confirmed in some countries during the hub evaluation missions. However, it is difficult and too early to assess the impact of these campaigns on the public, for example whether people have adopted more environmentally friendly attitudes. NGO participation in NIPs and adding value to these processes has already been discussed in the previous paragraph.</p> <p>5. Due to difficulties experienced by the Project Management to raise co-finance money, it was not possible to establish the five issue-focused NGO expert teams that would have provided support and assistance to</p>
--	--	---

<p>the assistance needed by NGOs engaged in activities described in items 2 and 4 above; (d) review and approve (based on MSP guidelines) proposed project activities agreed between regional hubs and country-based NGOs; (e) collaborate with regional hubs to review and evaluate the outputs from country-based project activities; (f) provide overall MSP technical oversight; (g) serve as primary point of contact between the project and UNEP and UNIDO; (h) assist regional hubs to prepare for post-project sustainability; and (i) other MSP management functions and UNIDO direct costs related to project administration (except financial management to be carried out by UNIDO). [<b>GEF \$250,000; co-finance \$ 210,000; Total \$460,000</b>]</p>	<p>country-based project activities conform to project guidelines and are appropriately reviewed and evaluated by regional hubs; MSP outputs are technically sound; interface between MSP and GEF IA and EOE is smooth and sound; all MSP post-project sustainability goals are achieved.</p>	<p>NGOs as mentioned in the project document. Instead, a less formal version was developed that involved academic experts, physicians, medical associations and a number of technical persons linked to IPEP NGOs in different ways. From findings gathered during hub visits, in fact the support and assistance were mostly provided by the hub leaders or people from the hub. Besides being scientists, these persons are fully knowledgeable about POPs as they are members of an NGO affiliated to IPEN. Moreover, most of them have been involved in POPs activities for a number of years. For example one of the two hub leaders of the South East Asia hub is responsible for GAIA an NGO advocating non incinerating technologies / strategies for waste management. There are examples for many other hubs, for example the Arnika Association NGO, the hosting hub for Central and Eastern Europe, has extensive experience regarding POPs chemicals and related issues; it is also true for Eco Accord the NGO managing the Russian-speaking hub. All the NGOs interviewed during mission visits have indicated and highlighted the valuable support they received both from the hub and the Global Project Manager. One can conclude that although the requirements in terms of establishment of five expert teams proposed in the project document were not met, the project worked very well and the participating NGOs received the required help and support from the hub and the Global Project Manager. However, this should be qualified as the results would have been of better quality if the five expert teams were</p>
--	---	---

		<p>established.</p> <p>6. A comprehensive and well-presented website* capturing all the information about the project including aims and objectives of IPEP, partners, hubs, participating NGOs, reports, Stockholm Convention and other useful information about POPs and related issues has been developed and maintained by the Project Management Unit. The website is in English; however a number of documents are available in other languages. For example, some of the posted IPEP reports exist also in other languages (e.g. French, Spanish or Russian), or a number of UN documents or reports in different languages like the Spanish version of the document Citizen's Guide to the Stockholm Convention or dioxin inventories in French and Spanish versions are also available. As mentioned in paragraph 1 of the previous section, updating of the website is needed especially regarding posting of reports and updating of participating countries and NGOs. Information received from the Global Project Manager (GPM) indicated that the website would be updated by February 2007. Moreover, as the IPEP website is integrated in the IPEN website, it is expected that updating the IPEP website, after completion of the project, would not imply major cost implications and can easily be borne by IPEN provided arrangements have been made for this. This is indeed the case, IPEN has indicated that they have secured the support needed to maintain and update the website.</p> <p>7. From the point of view of the number</p>
--	--	---



		<p>of outputs produced during the project, the MSP has been a success. Moreover, the two targets in the project objectives, that is the number of countries and NGOs covered, have been achieved. In this respect, full credit must be given not only to the Global Project Manager but also in particular to the hub leaders. However, not enough effort has been made to enhance NGO participation in the project from China and Brazil, two of the most populated countries of their respective regions. And this could be considered a weakness of IPEP.</p> <p>UNIDO and UNEP provided guidance to the project solely through Project Steering Committee meetings. There are indications, from minutes of Project Steering Committee meeting of 7 February 2005 and interview with UNEP, that communication between UNIDO and UNEP was not as it should have been, especially regarding review and approval of progress and technical reports. This was confirmed during face-to-face interview with UNEP who stated that despite numerous email reminders to UNIDO, progress and technical reports were not sent to UNEP for review and approval.</p> <p>Feedback obtained from hubs during visits indicates that the Global Project Manager provided all necessary support for the smooth running of the project in their region and one of the hubs rated the Project Management as “splendid”. Although the five issue-focused international expert teams were not established for reasons discussed previously, the hub management units, with the help of</p>
--	--	--

		<p>the Global Project Manager, were able to provide the support needed for NGOs to complete project activities in a satisfactory manner and meeting the PAM requirements. However, it should again be pointed out that due to fund transfer delays, some of the NGOs were not able to meet deadlines for submission of reports. While the regional hubs were monitoring the activities of participating NGOs of the region, and providing help and assistance whenever needed on a day-to-day basis, the reviewing of PAMs and reports for quality assurance was done mainly by the Global Project Manager.</p>
--	--	---

\* <http://www.oztoxics.org/ipepweb/index.html>

Table 4: Project Activity Memoranda (PAM) per country for different hubs

Hub	No of countries submitting at least one PAM	No of Project Activity Memoranda submitted (PAM)	No of PAM per country	No of Reports posted on IPEP Website <sup>1</sup>	% of reports posted on site (%)
Anglophone Africa	7	32	4.6	19	59.3
Central and Eastern Europe	10	49	4.9	21	42.8
Eastern Europe, Caucasus, Central Asian countries	8	56	7.0	44	78.6
Francophone Africa	9	23	2.6	5	21.7
Latin America	8	22	2.8	19	86.4
Middle East	8	24	3.0	13	54.2
South Asia	5	34	6.8	16	47.1
South East Asia	6	21	3.5	6	28.6
Total	61	261	4.3	143	54.8

<sup>1</sup><http://www.oztoxics.org/ipepweb/index.html>

Table 5: Participating NGOs per country in hubs

Hub	No of countries submitting at least one PAM	No of participating NGOs	No of participating NGOs per country
Anglophone Africa	7	14	2.0
Central and Eastern	10	14	1.4

Europe			
Eastern Europe, Caucasus, Central Asian countries	8	61	7.6
Francophone Africa	9	11	1.2
Latin America	8	15	1.9
Middle East	8	15	1.9
South Asia	5	11	2.2
South East Asia	6	23	3.8
Total	61	164	2.7

### 2.3 Cost-effectiveness

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

The project management has been very successful in raising co-finance (cash: \$901,576 and in-kind: \$1,084,489, Table 6) in a ratio almost 2 to 1 with regards to funds coming from GEF. It should be pointed out that the hubs also contributed to raise funds for the project (Table 7). However, some of the figures given in Table 7 need some justification. For example, \$179,700 for the in-kind contribution of the Francophone Africa hub or \$133,273 for that of Latin America are difficult to justify, especially these hubs have produced only 23 and 22 project activity reports (Table 4). Taking into consideration that on average about \$87,500 were disbursed to each hub (see section 2.4) to fund the PAMs and including the co-finance (cash and in-kind) raised, the Francophone Africa and Latin America hubs are the least cost-effective hubs (Table 8). It cost about two to three times more money to run a PAM in these regions than in the others. As the standard of living in these two regions is not much higher than in the others, it is highly probable that the in-kind contribution from these hubs have been well overestimated.

Given the global nature of the project and the large number of project outputs (261 project activity reports, 150 public awareness activities and 53 workshops) and the funds involved, GEF: \$1,000,000 and more than \$1,800,000 in co-finance, IPEP can be considered to have been a very cost effective project that involved more than 160 NGOs from 61 countries (Table 5). However, the figures for the in-kind contributions, particularly those for the hubs, need to be re-evaluated. Moreover, it is too early and difficult to assess whether the project outputs have had positive impacts in countries where they have been produced.

Table 6: Summary of IPEP funds including co-financing\*

Source	Cash (\$)	In-kind (\$)	Total (\$)
GEF / UNEP	1,000,000		1,000,000

Canada POPs Fund / UNEP Chemicals	250,000		250,000
SDC/SAEFL / UNITAR	100,000		100,000
VRM / EHF	120,000		120,000
Anonymous donor / EHF	100,000		100,000
IPEN in-kind support		200,000 <sup>a</sup>	200,000
EHF		100,000 <sup>b</sup>	100,000
Center for International Environmental Law, Commonweal, PAN North America		50,000 <sup>c</sup>	50,000
Cash and in-kind contributions directly raised or provided by NGOs from hubs <sup>d</sup>	331,576	734,489	1,066,065
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,901,576</b>	<b>1,084,489</b>	<b>2,902,899</b>

\* <http://www.ipen.org/ipenweb/ipep/IPEP%20Final%20Report%20IPEN%20Format%20241006.pdf> (page 37)

<sup>a</sup> The source of these funds is charitable foundation donors to IPEN; the services included IPEN staff time and organizational support; support from IPEN workgroups; and funds for travel and related expenses for global meetings

<sup>b</sup> The source of these funds is charitable foundation donors to EHF; the services included co-finance for global project manager salary, benefits and office; other professional staff support; international travel costs

<sup>c</sup> The source of these funds is charitable foundation donors to the NGOs; the services provided include staff support and travel costs

<sup>d</sup> See Table 7 for breakdown

Table 7: Breakdown of NGO co-finance (cash and in-kind)\*

Region / Hub	Cash (\$)	In-kind (\$)	Total (\$)
Anglophone Africa	21,142	28,493	49,635
Central and Eastern Europe	137,241		137,241
Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia	26,731	125,000	151,731
Francophone Africa	46,000	179,700	225,700
Latin America	96,026	133,273	229,299
Middle East		66,000	66,000
South Asia	3,900	119,393	123,293
Southeast Asia	536	82,630	83,166
<b>Total</b>	<b>331,576</b>	<b>734,489</b>	<b>1,066,065</b>

\* <http://www.ipen.org/ipenweb/ipep/IPEP%20Final%20Report%20IPEN%20Format%20241006.pdf> (page 38)

Table 8: Efficiency of hubs

Region / Hub	Co-finance (\$)	GEF* (\$)	Total (\$)	No of PAMs (\$)	Cost per PAM (\$)
Anglophone Africa	49,635	87,500	137,135	32	4,300
Central and Eastern Europe	137,241	87,500	224,741	49	4,600
Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central	151,731	87,500	239,231	56	4,300

Asia					
Francophone Africa	225,700	87,500	313,200	23	13,600
Latin America	229,299	87,500	316,799	22	14,400
Middle East	66,000	87,500	94,100	24	3,900
South Asia	123,293	87,500	210,793	34	6,200
Southeast Asia	83,166	87,500	170,666	21	8,100
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,066,065</b>	<b>700,000</b>	<b>1,766,065</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>6,800</b>

\* Funds disbursed on average to each hub according to figures obtained from UNIDO

## 2.4 Financial Planning and Control

To assess this aspect of the project, the evaluator received only a snapshot Project Detail Report (as at 31 December 2006) from UNIDO that concerns only GEF funding (Annex 6). No other financial reports could be obtained from the GPM for the project management from the EHF side, and for the hubs. The other financial information, relative to co-financing, was obtained from the Global report as mentioned in paragraph 2.3. In this regard, it was difficult for the evaluator to assess the funds disbursed for each activity (e.g. translation, website or workshops) as planned in the project document. Only gross information like funds disbursed to project management or to the hubs can be obtained from the snapshot report sent by UNIDO.

The disbursement of funds was done as indicated in the project document. According to financial summary sent by UNIDO, \$260,000 and \$160,000 (\$20,000 for each hub) were disbursed to EHF and hubs respectively. Disbursements to NGOs for PAM funding was done only on recommendation from the GPM that sent signed invoices to UNIDO, which then processed the funds transfer. As discussed earlier, funds transfer from UNIDO to NGOs was a major problem and caused project activities to be delayed.

As mentioned in paragraph 2.3, the project management together with the hubs have been quite successful in raising co-finance (Tables 6 and 7). However, despite the fact that more than \$900,000 of cash co-financing was raised, an excess of more than \$250,000 with respect to the \$ 650,000 planned in the project document, the project claimed it was not possible to set up the five issue-focused international expert teams. There is need for some clarification and justification from the Project Management on this matter. Moreover, some figures, more specifically the in-kind contributions need to be revisited, as they seem to be overestimated.

Whilst the funds for managing the hubs were satisfactory, many of the participating NGOs indicated that the funds allocated to them by project were insufficient and these NGOs had to provide both in-kind and cash contributions in order to successfully finalize the activities. In some regions, funding was a limiting factor for participation in IPEP or to produce a high quality product. As these regions are not properly equipped to undertake POPs analysis (e.g. African or South East Asia Hubs), it is very costly to have these analyses undertaken elsewhere.

## **2.5 Impact**

Although it is too early to assess the impacts of IPEP, there are some indications that IPEP has, to a certain extent, achieved part of the goal for which it was implemented.

### Impact on NGOs and civil society

Many of the participating NGOs that had experience in other issues such as climate change or AIDS have had their capacity enhanced in POPs and related issues thanks to IPEP. In total more than 160 NGOs from 61 countries (Table 5) participated in IPEP and submitted 261 PAMs (Table 4). Many of these PAMs were related to studies / projects that involved grassroots communities. POPs that were merely regarded as a strange word by these communities are no longer, and they are now fully aware of the risks associated with activities like burning or incineration. Furthermore, prior to IPEP, people in many countries did not know about POPs and the health hazards associated with these compounds. With the Global Day of Action that NGOs undertook to raise awareness in most of the countries participating in IPEP, this is certainly no longer the case. However, the extent to which these campaigns have made people change their attitudes and adopt more environmentally friendly habits, like avoiding the burning of wastes, remains to be assessed. And this can only be undertaken a few years after the project.

The Global Egg Project has also produced very valuable information regarding high levels of PCDD/Fs and PCBs found in eggs sampled near potentially polluted areas. These results have been communicated to governments for appropriate actions to be taken. In many cases, these results have been the starting point for residents of these potentially polluted areas to put pressure on authorities to set up the appropriate system in order to better monitor these areas / activities.

For various reasons, economic, social or others, people generally resist changes in habits / behaviours. However, with sustained efforts and appropriate strategies, things change. A very good example is the successful recycling of waste programme that has been set up in a barangay (municipal region) of Quezon City, Philippines and that has helped to decrease the volume of waste considerably.

Although many governments are still reluctant to work with NGOs, IPEP has given the opportunity to some of them to prove their credibility by providing their respective governments with valuable information that has been incorporated in the NIP (e.g. Kenya).

Despite these few positive and encouraging examples, it is beyond the scope of this evaluation and too early to comprehensively assess the immediate impacts of IPEP in the countries where it was active.

### Longer Term impacts

Although much effort has been made through NIP activities or IPEP to raise awareness regarding POPs, in many developing countries, including in countries where IPEP has worked, these chemicals, or activities liable to produce them, are far from being a subject of popular concern. People of these countries, although having heard about them, either have not yet realized the dangers associated with them or have decided the issue is not a priority for them. As seen earlier, although there are a few examples of positive impact of IPEP on the public, it is anticipated that much more effort must be made to sustain awareness campaigns regarding POPs and in this respect, not only the governments but also NGOs have a key role to play as these are very often the key stakeholders in direct contact with the exposed communities and the public in general. It is therefore important that opportunities are given to NGOs, especially NGOs that have worked or collaborated with IPEP, to continue work in this field. For example, it would be wise, and is recommended, that governments consider these NGOs as valuable stakeholders and involve them in post-NIP activities especially during implementation of NIPs whenever appropriate. On the other hand, if no follow up activities are done, all the momentum gathered during the project will be gradually lost.

### **2.6 Sustainability**

Assessing the impacts of IPEP is difficult, and assessment of the sustainability of the project is even more difficult. However, the different aspects have been discussed and are presented below.

#### Financial resources

As mentioned in previous paragraphs, financial resources are one of the major limiting factors that IPEP participating NGOs are facing to sustain efforts in promoting a POPs free environment. According to the Global Report of the project, 37 NGOs from 27 countries have already secured funds to continue efforts in the area.

Being a member of the Project Steering Committee and having signed a joint communiqué with IPEN in May 2005, the UNDP-GEF Small Grants Programme has been and still is a potential source of funding for future POPs activities.

Although very rare, IPEP has given NGOs opportunities to initiate project activities that have generated some income to sustain the efforts for which they have been implemented. An example is the recycling waste project promoted by a participating IPEP NGO in a barangay in Philippines. This NGO, with the collaboration of the local authority of the barangay, initiated activities to put in place a system for the recycling of domestic wastes. Compost and slabs have been produced and sold to generate income, which was used to improve the system. For instance, more appropriate bins have been purchased and used to collect the wastes.

The project has been very successful in leveraging co-financing mentioned in the Global report. It has been able to secure more than \$1,800,000 including in cash and in kind co-financing. The co-financing funds have been raised both at project management level and at hub levels.

### Socio-political

For the countries where NGO contributions have been considered and included in the NIPs, the onus is on the governments to enable activities to implement the action plans developed in the NIPs. In countries where NGOs have recognized experience and proven capacity regarding POPs, these NGOs will most likely be invited to give their views whenever decisions regarding POPs related issues are being taken. In other countries this is unlikely to happen unless the public, properly informed by the NGOs, put pressure on the authorities. This happened a number of times for example in Philippines and Malaysia.

### Institutional framework and governance

All countries involved in IPEP are parties to the Stockholm Convention and most of them have already ratified it. In this respect, they have the obligation to improve their legal and institutional framework in order to manage POPs. According to the NIPs they need also improve their technical capacity in order to monitor POPs. However, it is difficult to assess the linkages between this capacity building and outcomes of IPEP. The IPEP participating NGOs have here a vital role to play to make sure that these happen.

### Environmental

Article 1 of the Stockholm Convention states “*Mindful of the precautionary approach as set forth in Principle 15 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, the objective of this Convention is to protect human health and the environment from persistent organic pollutants*”. It is therefore understood that all activities undertaken under the Convention to protect the human health from POPs must also be ecologically sound. However, are these activities also ecologically sustainable? Although limited, there are a few examples where ecologically sustainable activities have been successfully promoted like the recycling of domestic wastes in Philippines. However, it was not possible to evaluate and assess this aspect of the whole project.

### Replication and catalysis

Given the global nature of IPEP, NGOs within a country and within regions have developed close relations, and the regional hubs facilitated this. Replication of successful project / activities within a country or in other regions is definitely possible and feasible and will be facilitated if the same NGOs that participated in IPEP are



involved. It would make more sense to build on existing capacities and network than to start from scratch again. Although many of the participating NGOs have shown enthusiasm and commitment, replication of IPEP activities is unlikely to happen without international funding.

## **2.7 Stakeholder participation / public awareness**

### Identification and engagement of stakeholders

The identification and selection of NGOs in each of the eight regions to serve as facilitating hub was done in a fair and transparent manner. After a call for nominees across the IPEN network, a sub committee of the IPEN steering committee was set up and made the selection of the NGOs to serve as facilitation hubs. The selection was done on the recommendation of a regional review committee and of NGOs having proven capacity and experience amongst other criteria.

To encourage other NGOs to participate in IPEP, the hubs not only made extensive outreach efforts but also utilized pre-existing NGO networks or used other fora to promote IPEP, as was the case in Anglophone Africa where the hub presented IPEP to the Eastern African NGOs/CSOs that attended a workshop on the 'Implementation of International and Regional Chemicals Conventions'. As a whole, the hubs were very successful in getting more than 160 NGOs from 61 countries to participate in IPEP. However, this success should be mitigated by the fact that big and highly populated (and therefore high priority) countries like China and Brazil were not very active countries in IPEP.

IPEP has given opportunity to scientists, local communities and other sectors of civil society to get involved and participate in projects / activities, initiated by NGOs that are of direct concern to their everyday life. In many cases, they contributed greatly to these activities either in terms of knowledge or time. These stakeholders were particularly committed when the activity was either a hotspot study or a survey.

Generally, the authorities, local or national, were not particularly involved in IPEP activities except in rare cases like in the waste recycling programme in Philippines. The education sector could also have played an important role especially during awareness-raising campaigns. It would have been the stakeholder of choice to raise awareness amongst the younger generation in schools (primary and secondary).

There is no evidence that the private sector has been invited to participate in IPEP, which otherwise could have been an important source of co-financing for the project.

### Effectiveness of collaboration / interactions between the various project partners and institutions

The collaboration between the Global Project Manager and the hubs, through extensive email communications, face-to-face meetings during hub or country visits

or workshops, has been very satisfactory according to feedback obtained during mission visits. In this respect, the GPM has travelled extensively visiting most of the hubs and many countries including Nigeria, Tanzania, Mexico, Austria, Argentina, Egypt, Thailand, India, Uruguay and Russia over the 35-month implementation period. The Global Project Manager also did all the technical review of PAMs and reports of all the hubs.

According to the minutes of Project Steering Committee meetings, UNIDO and UNEP provided appropriate guidance and oversight for the good management of IPEP. However, interview with UNEP indicated that there were communication problems between UNIDO and UNEP. While the financial reports were forwarded to UNEP for review and approval in a timely manner, that was not the case for progress and technical reports. Despite numerous email reminders sent to UNIDO, UNEP did not receive these technical and progress reports for review and approval. In the course of the project UNIDO adapted to situations, especially with regards to fund transfer delays, so as to manage funds satisfactorily. But there is no evidence that UNIDO participated in Regional meetings as planned in the project document.

The hubs worked closely with the participating NGOs by not only providing needed support and appropriate guidance but also participated in various activities like talks or workshops for local communities with which the NGOs worked. For example in Philippines, the hub leaders were involved in all activities that were undertaken by the NGOs of the region.

#### Effectiveness of any various public awareness activities

In most countries involved in IPEP, awareness campaigns have been organized by the NGOs targeting not only the general public but also specific sectors of the civil society like fisherman communities or small agricultural communities. It would have been meaningful if school children were targeted during these campaigns, and there is no indication that this has been done. Although there are indications that these campaigns have been successful in some cases, it was not possible and too early to assess the overall effectiveness of these activities. However, it can be anticipated that these awareness activities will meet the objectives of the project only if further sustained efforts are made, as POPs issues, for various reasons, are not a priority in many of these countries.

#### Review country participation and identify any barriers to participation by regions / countries

The project has fully met its objective in terms of country participation; 61 countries participated with respect to the 40 proposed in the project document. This success is mitigated by the disparity of involvement of NGOs from the different countries. Whilst some countries proposed a large number of PAMs (Russia, Ukraine and Tanzania), many participated at the level of only one or two PAMs (e.g. China, Brazil, etc.). The difficulty experienced by the hubs in identifying appropriate NGOs

in these countries to participate in IPEP could have been for a variety of reasons; for example, language barriers in countries where the national language is not a UN language or political barriers in countries where NGOs are generally perceived by the public sector as “unfriendly” entities.

Some regions have been more prolific than others. For example, the Central and Eastern Europe Hub and the Eastern Europe, Caucasus, Central Asian countries’ Hub have produced about 50 PAMs compared to about 20 to 30 for the other Hubs (Table 4). As some of these activities are based on scientific findings, high cost implications for analysis is definitely a strong barrier. This can partly explain the trend seen in the hubs, as some of these European countries are fully equipped for POPs analysis.

## **2.8 Country ownership / drivenness**

### Assess the level of country ownership and commitment

The project was totally geared towards NGOs in order to enhance their capacities to become more active stakeholders in the Stockholm Convention implementation process. The project can be described to be country driven as the NIP processes are enabled, developed and managed by national authorities.

However, the country ownership is very low, as most activities of IPEP have been executed without or with very low involvement of national governments. Moreover, although policy briefs have been developed and submitted to governments in many countries, there is little indication that these have led to changes in national policies.

## **2.9 Implementation approach**

The design of project has some weaknesses. The expected outcomes are not clearly defined and the terms outputs / outcomes were used inconsistently. The focus was mainly on outputs rather than on outcomes of the project. In this context, it was difficult for the evaluator to properly assess changes that occurred in countries where the project worked.

The implementation approach outlined in the project document was closely followed. The project officially started in September 2003, and after constitution of the project Steering Committee (members: UNEP, UNIDO, UNITAR, GEF SGP, IPEN, EHF, RAPAM, PAN Afrique and PAN Philippines) the first six months of the project were devoted to the establishment of the eight regional facilitating hubs. This exercise was completed in May 2004 by which time the eight hubs were fully operational. The Project Steering Committee that met a number of times in Vienna and at COP 1 and 2 provided the oversight of IPEP and guidance to project management. During these meetings the different aspects of the project were discussed thoroughly and in-depth. Topics included; TOR of hubs, mechanism for the selection of NGOs to serve as hub, co-financing and mechanisms for fund release. Meetings involved the active

participation of all stakeholders more specifically UNEP, UNIDO, IPEN and EHF, as reported in the minutes of proceedings (29 April 2004, 7 February 2005).

The Global Project Manager (GPM), appointed within EHF, provided the necessary assistance and support to the hubs and to participating NGOs and submitted, as required, progress and financial reports and other documents e.g. TOR of hubs to Project Steering Committee, UNIDO and UNEP. The hubs guided the selected NGOs on the preparation of PAMs, execution of the projects and reporting. To ensure high technical quality, all project activities were reviewed by the GPM who had the appropriate and adequate scientific background for this purpose.

There is evidence that adaptive management occurred during the implementation of IPEP, more specifically regarding funds management. Funds transfers from UNIDO to NGOs accounts were a major problem. It was noted that once the funds were released by UNIDO, upon signed invoices by the GPM, it took some time before these funds were credited to the accounts of the NGOs. These problems delayed project activities and caused problems in NGO participation. UNIDO responded to this by hiring a new person in order to assist in funds management. The Project Steering Committee also modified the schedule of payment, instituted by UNIDO Contract Department, by reducing the payments to participating NGOs from three to two. That helped in reducing paper work and delays. This new schedule of payment was adopted for the remaining period of the project and helped to reduce delays. As mentioned earlier, many NGOs indicated that the funds were the limiting factor in the project activities.

The logical framework, introduced and proposed by UNEP, was used during implementation for monitoring and evaluation of the project. The interim reports, submitted by the GPM, indeed indicated the progress of the project with respect to the indicators such as the quantity of outputs produced or number of participating NGOs and countries for each region. It should be pointed out, however, that a mid term evaluation of IPEP, although discussed in the first Project Steering Committee meeting (Vienna, 29 April 2004) and planned for May 2005, has not been undertaken.

## **2.10 Replicability**

This topic has been partly covered under impacts and sustainability. Given the regional approach of hubs that has been applied, the project can easily be replicated in other countries or regions if this is based on capacities built, networks created and experience gained during IPEP.

As follow-up steps, it is proposed in the Global Report of the project to have three Medium Size Projects: one for NGOs in GEF-eligible countries in Central Europe, Eastern Europe, the Caucuses and Central Asia; one for NGOs in Africa and the Arabic-speaking countries; and one for NGOs in Asia, Latin America and the Pacific in order to foster effective civil society participation in the actual implementation of

the Stockholm Convention. These would be very relevant, as further activities need to be initiated in order, not only for more civil society participation, but also, for sustained awareness-raising efforts among the different sectors of society, especially in developing countries where POPs is not regarded as an issue of concern.

It should be pointed out also, as mentioned earlier, that UNDP-GEF SGP, that has recognized the expertise and demonstrated output of IPEP projects, is a potential source of funding for NGOs to sustain or replicate efforts for reduction and elimination of POPs.

## **2.11 Monitoring and Evaluation**

According to the project document, monitoring and evaluation of IPEP would consist of (i) semi-annual and annual summary progress reports; (ii) annual financial reports and quarterly reports for details project expenses and disbursements; (iii) external evaluation prior to the end of the project (Mid Term Evaluation); (iv) Project Performance and Evaluation Review; and (v) final report. The external evaluation prior to the end of the project (Mid Term Evaluation) has been replaced by this terminal evaluation.

The mid term evaluation was not done, which would have identified problems and barriers and helped for adjustment. However, given the global and decentralized nature of IPEP, monitoring and evaluation was not an easy task. Yet, this aspect was adequately addressed by the GPM and the Project Steering Committee including UNIDO and UNEP and contributed to an effective implementation of IPEP.

The GPM submitted two Performance Progress reports in February 2005 and in September 2005. These reports indicated the progress of the project in terms of (i) number of participating NGOs from different countries (ii) number of PAMs submitted and accepted for funding for the different topics highlighted in the project document (hotspot reports, country report, awareness-raising activities and activities related to individual POPs) and (iii) number of activities successfully completed. The report also gave the financial situation of the project especially with regards to co-finance raised. The reports also mentioned the creation of the project website on which information related to IPEP would be posted as soon as they would be received - for instance the reports of project activities. An Individual Project Implementation Review Report was also submitted by the GPM in which all the 11 categories (ranging from objectives and outcomes through cost effectiveness financial control and cost planning to sustainability, replicability and monitoring etc.) have been rated highly satisfactory (HS). The ratings have been justified by comments made with regards to indicators. However, only the rating for implementation approach concur with that of the evaluator. The other aspects have been, with justification, less highly rated by the evaluator (see section 3.4).

In view of these reports, it is clear that the GPM used the logical framework of the project document as a guiding tool to implement and manage IPEP.

Monitoring and evaluation of IPEP occurred through in-depth discussions in meetings of Project Steering Committee where all aspects of the project including progress, technical, management or financial were reviewed and assessed. The discussions are reported in the minutes of the two meetings held in April 2004 and February 2005 in Vienna.

### **3. Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons**

#### **3.1 Overview**

The major objectives of IPEP were to:

- Encourage and enable NGOs in 40 developing countries and countries with economies in transition to engage in activities that provide concrete and immediate contributions to country efforts in preparing for the implementation of the Stockholm Convention
- Enhance the skills and knowledge of NGOs to help build their capacity as effective stakeholders in the convention implementation process
- Help establish regional and national coordination and capacity in all regions of the world in support of NGO contributions to effective Stockholm Convention implementation as well as longer term efforts to achieve chemical safety

EHP, assisted by IPEN, coordinated and managed the project with guidance, monitoring and evaluation by UNIDO and UNEP through the Project Steering Committee.

While GEF provided the core funding (\$1,000,000), cash co-financing was obtained from various sources including the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation and Swiss Agency for the Environment Forests and Landscape (\$100,000), Dutch Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment (\$120,000) and Canada POPs fund (\$250,000) through UNEP Chemicals. Total cash co-financing amounted to about \$900,000 and that of in-kind contributions to more than \$1,000,000 (Table 6). Originally planned for two years, the project was completed in 35 months.

#### **3.2 Achievements**

The major findings of this evaluation exercise are listed below.

- As planned in the project document, hubs were established and hosted by NGOs, members of IPEN, in eight regions of the world. These hubs, which are still fully operational, provided guidance and support to participating NGOs.
- A comprehensive and well-presented website was created within months of the start of the project. The website, regularly updated, contains all information regarding IPEP, including project activity reports and other related documents in all UN languages. It also contains other POPs-related documents and useful links

to other sites. At the end of the evaluation exercise, not all project activity reports were uploaded on the website. The GPM stated that this would be completed in the first quarter of 2007.

- The regional hubs have been quite successful in getting more than 160 NGOs from more than 60 countries to participate in IPEP through outreach activities and using pre-existing networks. These NGOs submitted about 260 PAMs that covered all the topics mentioned in the project document. IPEP, through these participations, mobilized a relatively large number of persons from different sectors of the population in these regions including scientists, farmers, fishermen, grassroots communities and even local authorities in a few cases.
- Thanks to IPEP, most NGOs have enhanced their capacity and knowledge regarding POPs and related issues that allowed some of them to participate and effectively contribute to NIP processes according to the Global report. However, it was difficult to assess these participations and contributions during the evaluation exercise.
- Extensive awareness-raising campaigns, targeting all sectors of the society particularly exposed populations like those living near incinerators, have been carried out using different modes of communications including brochures, press release, radio and TV.
- The Global Chicken Egg study in which 17 countries participated can be considered to be a major achievement of the project. Priority was given to countries that lacked information about POPs in their environment. The study did not attempt to determine the average level of POPs (PCDD/Fs, PCBs and HCB) in eggs in the country. Rather, samples were collected near facilities like cement kilns or industrial plants that NGOs suspected to be potential sources of POPs release. Seventy percent of the samples were found to contain levels of dioxins that exceeded the EU limit and sixty percent exceeded the EU limits for PCBs.

### **3.3 Weaknesses**

The project's achievements are mitigated by some weaknesses identified during this evaluation.

- Although the project has been successful in terms of NGO and country participation, it should be highlighted that China, the most populated country and one of the largest countries of the world, and Brazil the most populated and largest country of Latin America, have had very limited participation in IPEP. Both countries have participated at the level of only one PAM. And it is known that formation and release of POPs, especially PCDD/Fs, is closely linked to the population size of a country. This is an important issue as POPs travel long distances as stated in the Stockholm Convention: "*POPs possess toxic properties, resist degradation, bio accumulate and are transported, through air, water and*



*migratory species, across international boundaries and deposited far from their place of release, where they accumulate in terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems”.*

- The project document called for establishment and maintenance of five issue-focused international expert teams that would have provided support and assistance to NGOs. However, as Project Management (EHF) was unable to raise co-finance money, \$150,000 according to project document, these five teams were not established; support and assistance were provided differently, mainly through hubs with help from the GPM.
- Despite the large number of policy briefs and policy recommendations produced in the context of IPEP activities in the different regions, there is no evidence so far that these have been considered during policy formulation and decision-making. Even during missions to hubs, the evaluator was not provided with any evidence that these have happened in the countries visited. In many countries, NGOs are not generally considered as valuable stakeholders that could contribute effectively unless they have proven track record like in some countries e.g. Philippines or Tanzania where NGOs were invited to participate in NIP processes or to provide information regarding POPs issues. In some cases NGOs could not participate and contribute to NIPs due to the bad timing of IPEP that came after the enabling activities to implement the Stockholm Convention.
- For the evaluation of the financial aspects of the project, only a snapshot financial summary was provided by the UNIDO and no other financial documents/reports could be obtained. It is rather peculiar that the Project Manager (main subcontractor), who managed \$260,000, excluding co-funding, could not provide a financial report. This observation also applies for the hubs. Fund transfer was also a weakness that caused big delays in project activities. Moreover, in many cases, funds allocated were not sufficient for NGOs to properly accomplish the tasks for which they submitted a PAM. This also caused delay to the activities as the NGOs had to devise ways and means to raise funds. In most countries except the European and some others, facilities do not exist for POPs analysis. For this reason, all the hotspots reports from these countries had to rely mostly on published data as it would have been too costly to have these analyses done elsewhere. This was a limiting factor to produce new data and impacted on the quality of these reports.
- Although IPEP was geared exclusively towards NGOs, the very low involvement of national or local authorities is a matter of concern. Some awareness-raising activities were undertaken among government officials; however, there should have been more activities to explain the aims and objectives of IPEP to local and national authorities. For example, national POPs focal points could have been invited to launching workshops or to get involved in some of the project activities. There was no evidence that the private sector, a major potential source of co-financing, was invited to participate in the project.

- The PAM application mechanism, selection criteria for NGOs and the number of PAMs that a country or an NGO could submit, were not totally clear and transparent. In all the hubs, the host country submitted the largest number of PAMs and the hosting NGO also submitted the highest number of PAMs. There are indications that within a hub, some NGOs that had the knowledge and capacity to produce PAMs were limited to only one despite their wish to participate in more activities whilst other NGOs submitted up to 5 PAMs.

### 3.4 Overall Assessment

According to the TOR of this evaluation (annex), it is required to assess and rate the eleven different categories of IPEP from ‘highly satisfactory’ to ‘highly unsatisfactory’. The table below gives this assessment and brief comments on points already discussed in the report.

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Evaluator’s Rating<sup>1</sup></b>
<b>Attainment of objectives and planned results</b>	Although objectives in terms of NGO and country participation achieved, IPEP NGO contributions to NIPs not clear and difficult to assess	Moderately Satisfactory (4)
<b>Achievement of outputs and activities</b>	Large number of outputs produced, activities well planned and monitored.	Satisfactory (5)
<b>Cost-effectiveness</b>	Substantial co-finance raised, some figures need to be re-evaluated though.	Satisfactory (5)
<b>Financial Planning and Control</b>	No financial reports available for project management and hubs. Funding was a limiting factor for producing quality reports or for IPEP participation	Moderately Unsatisfactory (3)
<b>Impact</b>	Too early to assess.	Moderately Unsatisfactory (3)
<b>Sustainability (sub-criteria)<sup>2</sup></b>	Although many NGOs have shown strong commitment to POPs and related issues, again too early and difficult issue to evaluate	Moderately Unsatisfactory (3)

<b>Financial</b>	<i>Some NGOs have already secured funding for future activities</i>	<i>Moderately likely</i>
<b>Socio-political</b>	<i>NGOs not seen as valuable stakeholders in many countries</i>	<i>Moderately unlikely</i>
<b>Institutional framework and governance</b>	<i>Many countries yet to improve their capacities for proper management of POPs</i>	<i>Moderately unlikely</i>
<b>Environmental</b>	<i>Difficult to assess</i>	<i>Moderately unlikely</i>
<b>Stakeholder participation / Public awareness</b>	Governments involvement too low	Moderately unsatisfactory (3)
<b>Country ownership / driveness</b>	Governments involvement too low	Moderately Unsatisfactory (3)
<b>Implementation approach</b>	Good and strong leadership of GMP	Highly Satisfactory (6)
<b>Replicability</b>	Possible if funding available and using same hub approach and the NGO capacity built	Moderately Satisfactory (4)
<b>Monitoring and Evaluation (sub-criteria)<sup>1</sup></b>	Adequate	Satisfactory (5)
<b>Effective monitoring &amp; evaluation in place (indicators, baselines, etc.)</b>	<i>Logical framework used as guidance document for project implementation</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>
<b>Information used for adaptive management</b>	<i>Delays in funds transfer and problems of communication between UNIDO and UNEP not adequately addressed</i>	<i>Moderately Unsatisfactory</i>
<b>Overall Rating</b>		Overall Average: 4.0 Moderately Satisfactory

<sup>1</sup> A number rating 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly Unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = 0.

<sup>2</sup> Rating scale for sustainability sub-criteria; Highly Likely = 6, Likely = 5, Moderately Likely = 4, Moderately Unlikely = 3, Unlikely = 2, Highly Unlikely = 1, and not applicable = 0

### 3.5 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this evaluation, it is important that the Project Management and partners (EHF, IPEN and hub leaders) including implementing agencies (UNEP, UNIDO) together with the Stockholm Secretariat consider making communication and outreach efforts to promote IPEP and its products to government officials and policy makers. These efforts should be made within months of completion of IPEP so that project outputs can be considered in NIPs or post-NIP activities or in policy decisions whenever possible. These efforts may also help NGOs to be considered

especially more favourably in regions and countries where much resistance has been encountered.

It also appears crucial that project management and implementing agencies should consider follow-up activities on a global level to maintain momentum that has been developed during IPEP. For example, the three Medium Size Projects proposed in the Global Report: one for NGOs in GEF-eligible countries in Central Europe, Eastern Europe, and the Caucuses and Central Asia; one for NGOs in Africa and the Arabic-speaking countries; and one for NGOs in Asia, Latin America and the Pacific could be implemented in the short term (not later than two years after completion of IPEP) in order to sustain efforts for fostering active civil society participation in the actual implementation of the Stockholm Convention or in post-NIP activities. Otherwise, the momentum gathered during IPEP will gradually be lost with time as in most of these countries POPs, generally, are not a priority.

If global follow up activities are to be undertaken, these following issues need to be considered:

- (i) Ensure that populated and big countries are more actively engaged
- (ii) Encourage more involvement of government officials for example POPs focal points or officials responsible of NIP or post NIP activities

### **3.6 Lessons**

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

- Decision and policy-makers and governments are involved at an early stage to ensure that project outputs are considered during decision-making stages.
- In projects of similar scope (60 countries involving more than 160 NGOs) appropriate human resources for administration of a large volume of financial and substantive reports should be planned so that funds transfer, monitoring and administration would not be limiting or delaying factors.
- Depending on regions and countries the time and resource requirements are different for effective project implementation. For example not all regions are adequately equipped (e.g. for POPs analysis) to carry out certain activities (e.g. hotspots report). So appropriate financial resources should be allocated. In countries where Internet access may be a barrier for effective and rapid communication, longer time period would be needed to undertake project activities.
- Other key stakeholders, for example private sector or education sector, should also be involved in the process to ensure sustainability and success.

- Funds need to be disbursed in larger amounts to fewer NGOs in fewer countries. This would enable production of outputs of better quality rather than thinly spreading funds to many NGOs in many countries which often results in reports of limited usefulness.

### **3.7 Concluding words**

During interviews, the evaluator was impressed by the enthusiasm and willingness of NGOs and other participants to contribute meaningfully towards addressing the issues and problems posed by POPs. While funding was very often a limiting factor, the energy and commitment to achieve the objectives of the activities in which the NGOs were engaged was an indication of what can be done at this level if opportunities exist. These initiatives and efforts should be greatly acknowledged and fully encouraged as with they are contributing to make the world a safer and better place to live not only for us but also for future generations. The lesson from this project is that, regardless the region and the country, with the right committed persons and appropriate support a lot can be achieved even with limited resources.

## Annex 1

### TERMS OF REFERENCE

**Joint UNEP/UNIDO Independent Mid-Term Evaluation of the UNEP/UNIDO GEF  
project  
“Fostering Active and Effective Civil Society Participation in Preparations for  
Implementation of the Stockholm Convention”  
GF/4030-03-23**

#### 1. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

##### Project rationale

Successful implementation of the Stockholm Convention and longer-term efforts to reduce and eliminate other persistent toxic substances (PTS) will require enhanced public awareness about POPs and increased civil society participation, involvement and interest in the Convention and related activities.

The main objective of the project was stated as: *‘To Encourage and enable NGOs in approximately 40 developing countries and countries with economies in transition to engage in activities within their countries that will provide concrete and immediate contributions to country efforts in preparing for Stockholm Convention implementation.’*

*These activities would additionally serve to enhance the skills and knowledge of NGOs in participating countries to help build their capacity as effective stakeholders and participants during national preparations for Convention implementation. In the longer-term (after project completion), these activities would leave NGOs who have participated in the project with enhanced capability to undertake future and ongoing national and regional activities aimed at the reduction and elimination of POPs and other PTS.*

The expected outcomes from this project included:

1. Solid POPs-related, country-relevant information prepared by national NGOs and made available to governments and society in countries where the project is active;
2. NGO participation in the National Implementation Plan (NIP) preparation processes and/or NGO-prepared informational and policy inputs to NIP preparations

takes place in most countries where the project is active. These make positive contributions to NIP preparations.

3. Increased level of awareness, understanding, and knowledge within the national NGO community and society as a whole concerning the effects of POPs on human health and the environment and the measures required to reduce and eliminate them.
4. NGOs and civil society in most countries where the project has been active have expanded their interest, capacity and competence in POPs-related issues, leading to their ongoing involvement in Stockholm Convention implementation efforts and other efforts that address persistent toxic substances.
5. NGO facilitation and support mechanisms (global, regional and national) enhanced and/or developed during the project will successfully find the resources to continue in operation after completion of the project, and will continue providing ongoing support to NGO efforts addressing POPs and other persistent toxic substances. Global NGO POPs network continues and becomes more effective in promoting global, regional, national and local efforts aimed at the elimination of POPs and other PTS.

### **Relevance to GEF Programmes**

This project supports and is consistent with the objectives and provisions of the Stockholm Convention on POPs; with GEF Initial Guidelines for Enabling Activities of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants; and with OP#14: Reducing and Eliminating Releases of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) into the Environment.

By adopting the Stockholm Convention in May 2001, governments demonstrated their intent to include successful Convention implementation among their national priorities. The Convention contains important provisions related to public participation and access to information. Article 10 obliges Parties to promote public participation in addressing, and in developing adequate responses to POPs and their health and environmental effects. This should include, inter alia, providing opportunities for the public to give input on Convention implementation. Article 10 also requires Parties to facilitate the provision of all available information about POPs to the public. It further calls for the development and exchange of educational and public awareness materials and education and training programs. Reflecting the requirements of Article 10, the POPs Enabling Activities projects that have been funded by the GEF and currently endorsed by more than 65 national governments. Stockholm Convention Enabling Activities Projects foresee the active involvement of NGOs and civil society in all stages of the development of a government's National Implementation Plan for the Convention.

### **Executing Arrangements**

The project was executed by the NGO, Environmental Health Fund, on behalf of the International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN). The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) provided project execution assistance including, inter alia, transfer of funds to NGOs and financial management.

## **Project Activities**

The project duration was 35 months from October 2003 to July 2006.

The project had seven components:

1. Eight existing and established NGOs (in eight different regions) would help NGOs in approximately 40 countries develop and implement MSP activities, and would do so in ways that help strengthen regional and national NGO capacity relative to POPs and other PTS. NGO-based, MSP regional facilitation hubs would be located in: Anglophone Africa; Central and Eastern Europe; Francophone Africa; Latin America and the Caribbean; the Middle East; Russia and the newly independent states (NIS); South Asia; and Southeast and East Asia and the Pacific. Regional facilitation hubs would work with NGOs in their region to help them identify, prepare and implement country-based project activities (to be agreed in written project activity memoranda). Hubs would serve as primary point of contact between country-based NGOs and the Project and they would facilitate and oversee project capacity-building functions. Hubs would also provide initial review of project outputs, prepare regional summary reports, and assist NGOs with post-project sustainability plans including fund raising plans;
2. National and/or local NGOs – with assistance from project expert teams and regional hubs – would prepare country-specific and/or country-relevant informational and policy documents and materials (e.g., policy briefs, country information reports, hotspot reports, etc.) for submission to NIP processes and/or for dissemination to policy makers, NGOs, and civil society in their country. In addition, follow-up by regional hubs to assure that documents prepared are appropriately disseminated and used;
3. Translate key information and documents into all project languages (English, French, Spanish, Russian and Arabic) as needed;
4. Utilizing documents and materials prepared under Activity 2 above, organize and carry out country-based project activities such as: (a) NGO participation in government-sponsored NIP preparation activities and other preparations for Convention implementation; (b) POPs public awareness activities or campaigns at the national, district or local levels; and (c) meetings or workshops for training or raising POPs awareness that target national NGOs or select civil society sectors;
5. Provide needed and useful issue-based, policy and technical expertise, information and guidance to national and/or local NGOs engaged in MSP activities. Establish and maintain five issue-focused, international NGO expert teams that provide support and assistance to NGOs undertaking country-based activities, including preparation of informational and policy documents, organization of awareness activities and campaigns, and interventions into NIP preparation processes;
6. Establish and regularly update a global website containing country-specific and/or country-relevant informational, educational, and policy-oriented materials about POPs from approximately 40 countries, including information in many national and local languages. Provide and update regional summary information as well as a



global database of, and linkages to, POPs-related information of potential interest to NGOs, governments, industry, or other stakeholders;

7. Global MSP administration, management and technical oversight by an existing and established NGO in the IPEN network for all aspects of MSP management other than financial management functions. Activities were to include: (a) support and facilitate the work of the eight regional facilitation hubs; (b) promote communications and information exchange between the hubs; (c) assure that issue-focused international expert teams provide the assistance needed by NGOs engaged in activities described in items 2 and 4 above; (d) review and approve (based on MSP guidelines) proposed project activities agreed between regional hubs and country-based NGOs; (e) collaborate with regional hubs to review and evaluate the outputs from country-based project activities; (f) provide overall MSP technical oversight; (g) serve as primary point of contact between the project and UNEP and UNIDO; (h) assist regional hubs to prepare for post-project sustainability; and (i) other MSP management functions and UNIDO direct costs related to project administration (except financial management to be carried out by UNIDO).

#### **Budget**

The total budget was US\$ 2,000,000 with US\$ 1,000,000 funded by the GEF Trust Fund and co-funding from collaborating agencies of US\$ 1,000,000.

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION**

As far as possible, the mid-term evaluation should be a participatory exercise, involving the implementation team, beneficiary views and other stakeholders. The purpose of adopting a participatory approach is to encourage ownership of review findings that is necessary for follow up action and to encourage a more accurate and shared view of project progress. This approach is also more likely to ensure that any emerging lessons are learnt where they are needed most.

### **2. Objective and Scope of the Evaluation**

The objective of this mid-term evaluation (MTE) is to assess operational aspects, such as project management and implementation of activities and also the extent to which objectives are being fulfilled. The evaluation will assess project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results. It will focus on corrective actions needed for the project to achieve maximum impact.

The evaluation will focus on and assess the following main issues:

1. The relevance of the project design vis-à-vis the practical conditions encountered by project execution;
2. The appropriateness of the execution means and implementation arrangements vis-à-vis the project objectives;
  - Are the planned activities likely to achieve the outcomes? - and if not, should they be done differently, or are different activities required?
  - If all the outcomes are achieved, will they achieve the project objectives? - and if not, what changes to the project are required?
  - Are the assumptions in the logical framework correct? - and if not, does the logical framework require more fundamental revision?
  - Are the risks being managed successfully? - and if not what actions should the project staff take to manage the risks?
3. The results of phase I vis-à-vis initial objectives and as a basis for phase II;
4. The quality of outputs, outcomes and impacts so far.

*In short, the evaluation will identify the best strategy for achievement of the outcomes and impacts specified in the project document.*

### **3. Project Evaluation Criteria**

The success of project implementation to date will be rated on a scale from 'highly unsatisfactory' to 'highly satisfactory'. In particular the evaluator shall **assess and rate** the project with respect to the eleven categories defined below:<sup>1</sup>

#### **1. Attainment of objectives and planned results:**

The evaluation should assess the extent to which the project's major relevant objectives were effectively and efficiently achieved or are expected to be achieved and their relevance. The "achievement" indicators

---

<sup>1</sup> However, the views and comments expressed by the evaluator need not be restricted to these items.

provided in the log frame of the project document should be used together with the evaluation parameters described.

- *Effectiveness*: Evaluate how, and to what extent, the stated project objectives have been met (by components), taking into account the “achievement indicators” in the project logframe / project document. To what extent have the identified changes been caused by the development intervention rather than external factors? Relevance: Are the project’s intended outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies?
- *Efficiency*: Include an assessment of *outcomes* achieved to date in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Is the project cost-effective? How does the cost-time vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Has the project implementation been delayed?

## **2. Achievement of outputs and activities:**

Assessment of the project’s success to date in producing each of the programmed outputs, both in quantity and quality as well as usefulness and timeliness. , The evaluator should examine the technical outputs produced and the associated quality control / review processes that are applied to them by the project managers. The consultant should apply a sampling strategy to select technical reports and assess them for their technical relevance, validity and quality.

The sample should be stratified by region, with a random selection of 4 outputs for each of the following regions.

- Anglophone Africa;
- Central and Eastern Europe;
- Francophone Africa;
- Latin America and the Caribbean;
- Middle East;
- Russia and the newly independent states (NIS);
- South Asia;
- Southeast and East Asia and the Pacific.

The sample should cover studies/ reports that include:1) hotspot reports, 2) awareness raising activities and their scope 3) PCD related activities 4) Pesticide related activities 5) Dioxin and Furan studies.

:

## **3. Cost-effectiveness:**

Cost-effectiveness assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project’s outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project’s

compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept. The evaluation will:

- Assess the cost-effectiveness of the activities of the project funded by GEF and whether these activities are likely to achieve the goals and objectives within the planned time and budget. How do the costs compare to the costs of similar projects in similar contexts?
- Assess the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing to project implementation and to what extent the project leveraged additional resources.
- Determine the extent to which scientific and technical information and knowledge have been incorporated within, and have influenced the execution of the project activities.

#### **4. Financial Planning and Control**

Review of financial planning requires assessment of the quality and effectiveness of financial planning and control of financial resources since the project's inception. The evaluation should include assessment of actual project costs by activities compared to budget (variances), financial management (including disbursement issues), the status of co-financing secured against that anticipated and patterns of co-financed expenditure by activity. The evaluation should assess whether the use of project funds is commensurate with the attainment of physical progress, efficacy and the timeliness of procurement and disbursement activities. The evaluation should:

- Assess the strength and utility of financial controls, including reporting, and planning to allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for a proper and timely flow of funds for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables.
- Present the major findings from financial audits if any have been conducted.
- Identify and verify the sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing (in co-operation with the IA and EA).
- Assess whether the project has applied appropriate standards of due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.
- The evaluation should also include a breakdown of final actual expenditure of GEF and co-financed funds for the project.<sup>2</sup>

#### **5. Impact:**

Impacts (long term effects) stemming from project interventions can take time to be fully realised. Some effects, however, can be realised as a part of the implementation process. The evaluation will:

- Evaluate, as far as possible, the immediate impact of the project on NGOs and civil society in the countries selected;

---

<sup>2</sup> To be prepared in consultation with the relevant UNON/DGEF Fund Management Officer of the project.

- As far as possible, also assess the potential longer-term impacts, considering that the evaluation is taking place at the mid term and that longer term impact is expected to be seen in a few years time. Frame recommendations to enhance future project impact in this context. Which will be the major ‘channels’ for longer term impact?

#### 6. Sustainability:

Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits after the project ends. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, i.e. stronger institutional capacities, legal frameworks, or public awareness. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes. The evaluation should ascertain how project outcomes will be sustained and enhanced over time.

Five aspects of sustainability should be addressed: financial, socio-political, institutional frameworks and governance, ecological (if applicable), and replication<sup>3</sup>. The following questions provide guidance on the assessment of these aspects:

- *Financial resources.* What is the likelihood that financial and economic resources will be available such as the project outcomes/benefits will be sustained once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market trends that support the project’s objectives)? Was the project was successful in identifying and leveraging co-financing.
- *Socio-political:* What is the likelihood that the level of stakeholder ownership will allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project
- *Institutional framework and governance.* What is the likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? What is the relevance and applicability of the project’s recommendations to federal and local authorities? While responding to these questions consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency and the required technical know how are in place.

---

<sup>3</sup> Replication refers to repeatability of the project under quite similar contexts based on lessons and experience gained. Actions to foster replication include dissemination of results, seminars, training workshops, field visits to project sites, etc. GEF Project Cycle, GEF/C.16/Inf.7, October 5, 2000

- *Ecological.* The analysis of ecological sustainability may prove challenging. What is the likelihood that project achievements will lead to sustained ecological benefits?
- *Replication and catalysis.* What examples are there of replication and catalytic outcomes that suggest increased likelihood of sustainability? Replication approach, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources).

**7. Stakeholder participation / public awareness:**

This consists of three related and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the GEF- financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project. The evaluation will specifically:

- Assess the mechanisms put in place by the project for identification and engagement of stakeholders and establish, in consultation with the stakeholders, whether this mechanism was successful, and identify its strengths and weaknesses.
- Assess the degree and effectiveness of collaboration/interactions between the various project partners and institutions during the course of implementation of the project.
- Assess the degree and effectiveness of any various public awareness activities that were undertaken during the course of implementation of the project.
- Review country participation and identify any barriers to participation by regions / countries

**8. Country ownership / drivenness:**

This is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements. The evaluation will:

- Assess the level of country ownership. Specifically, the evaluator should assess the countries level of commitment.

**9. Implementation approach:**

This includes an analysis of the project’s management framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management. The evaluation will assess the efficiency of project organisation and management with respect to its size and composition, organisational structure, personnel management and policy, the

qualifications of local staff and consultants. Specifically the evaluation will:

- Ascertain to what extent the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document have been closely followed. In particular, assess the role of the various committees established and whether the project document was clear and realistic to enable effective and efficient implementation, whether the project was executed according to the plan and how well the management was able to adapt to changes during the life of the project to enable the implementation of the project.
- Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency and adaptability of project management and the supervision of project activities / project execution arrangements at all levels.
- Assess the effectiveness of supervision and administrative and financial support provided by UNEP/DGEF.
- Identify administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project.
- Assess whether the logical framework was used during implementation as a management tool and whether feedback from M&E activities more broadly was used for adaptive management.

#### **10. Replicability:**

- Assess whether the project has potential to be replicated, either in terms of expansion, extension or replication in other countries and/or regions and whether any steps have been taken by the project to do so and the relevance and feasibility of these steps.

#### **11. Monitoring and Evaluation:**

The evaluation will consider the effectiveness of the M&E system (in defining performance indicators and collecting and analysing monitoring data on project progress) and follow-up on primary stakeholders' reactions to project activities.:

- The evaluation shall include an assessment of the quality, application and effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation plans and tools, including an assessment of risk management based on the assumptions and risks identified in the project document. The evaluation shall comment on how the monitoring mechanisms were employed throughout the project's lifetime and whether this allowed for tracking of progress towards project objectives and how the project responded to the challenges identified through these mechanisms. The tools used might include a baseline, clear and practical indicators and data analysis systems, or studies to assess results that were planned and carried out at specific times in the project.

The *ratings will be presented in the form of a table*. Each of the eleven categories should be rated separately with **brief justifications** based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given. The following rating system is to be applied:

HS	= Highly Satisfactory
S	= Satisfactory
MS	= Moderately Satisfactory
MU	= Moderately Unsatisfactory
U	= Unsatisfactory
HU	= Highly Unsatisfactory

#### **4. Methods**

This Mid Term Evaluation will be conducted as an in-depth evaluation using a participatory approach whereby the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager, key representatives of the executing agencies and other relevant staff are kept informed and regularly consulted throughout the evaluation. The consultant will liaise with the UNIDO Evaluation Group, UNEP/EOU and the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager on any logistic and/or methodological issues to properly conduct the evaluation in as independent a way as possible, given the circumstances and resources offered. The draft report will be circulated to UNEP/DGEF Task Manager, key representatives of the executing agencies and the UNEP/EOU. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to UNEP/EOU and UNIDO Evaluation Group for collation and the consultant will be advised of any necessary revisions.

The findings of the evaluation will be based on the following:

1. A desk review of project documents including, but not limited to:
  - (a) The project documents, outputs, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNEP and GEF annual Project Implementation Review reports) and relevant correspondence.
  - (b) Review of specific products including the website .
  - (c) Notes from the Steering Committee and other meetings.
2. Interviews with project management (such as the Project Coordinator, the Executing Agency, former project managers involved).
3. Interviews and telephone interviews with other stakeholders, including NGOs which participated in the project . As appropriate, these interviews could be combined with an email questionnaire.
4. The Consultant shall determine whether to seek additional information and opinions from representatives of donor agencies and other organisations by e-mail or through telephone communication.

#### **5. Evaluation report format and review procedures**

The report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain; the purpose of the review, exactly what was evaluated and the methods used. The report



must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible and include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report to facilitate clear managerial responses.

Evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete and balanced manner. Dissident views in response to evaluation findings may be appended in an annex. The evaluation report shall be written in English, be of no more than 40 pages (excluding annexes), use numbered paragraphs and include:

- i) An **executive summary** (no more than 3 pages) providing a brief overview of the main conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation;
- ii) **Introduction and background** giving a brief overview of the project, for example, the objective and status of activities;
- iii) **Scope, objective and methods** presenting the purpose of the evaluation, the assessment criteria used and questions to be addressed;
- iv) **Project Performance and Impact** providing factual evidence relevant to the questions asked by the evaluator and interpretations of such evidence;
- v) **Conclusions and rating** of project implementation success giving the reviewer's concluding assessments and ratings of the project against given criteria and standards of performance. The conclusions should provide answers to questions about whether the project is considered good or bad, and whether the results are considered positive or negative;
- vi) **Recommendations** suggesting actionable proposals regarding improvements that can benefit the project in its remaining lifespan. The evaluator shall make clear recommendations that primarily aim to enhance the likelihood of project impacts. Recommendations should always be specific in terms of who would do what and provide a suggested timeframe;
- vii) **Lessons learned** presenting general conclusions from the standpoint of the design and implementation of the project, based on established good and bad practices. Lessons must have the potential for wider application and use, and the wider context in which lessons may be applied should be specified;
- viii) **Annexes** include a breakdown of actual expenditures against activities and the current status and expenditure relating to co-financing for the project. This information will be prepared in consultation with the relevant DGEF Fund Management Officer of the project (table attached in Annex 1 Co-financing and leveraged resources); terms of reference, list of interviewees, and so on.

The scope of the evaluation is guided by the “Global Environment Facility Guidelines for Implementing Agencies to conduct Terminal Evaluations, May 2003”<sup>4</sup> to evaluate the

---

<sup>4</sup> [http://www.gefweb.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/MEPTools/IA\\_Guidelines\\_for\\_TE.pdf](http://www.gefweb.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/MEPTools/IA_Guidelines_for_TE.pdf)

activities supported by GEF through this project. As such, a comprehensive mid term evaluation, will provide valuable information and useful experience for the project in advance of the terminal evaluation of the project.

Examples of UNEP GEF Terminal Evaluation Reports are available at [www.unep.org/eou](http://www.unep.org/eou)

### **Review of the Draft Report**

Draft reports submitted to UNEP EOU and UNIDO Evaluation Group are shared with the corresponding Programme or Project Officer and his or her supervisor for initial review and consultation. The DGEF staff and senior Executing Agency staff are allowed to comment on the draft evaluation report. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. The consultation also seeks agreement on the findings and recommendations. UNIDO Evaluation Group and UNEP EOU collate the review comments and provide them to the evaluators for their consideration in preparing the final version of the report.

### **Quality Assessment of the Evaluation Report**

All UNEP GEF Mid Term Evaluations are subject to quality assessments by UNEP EOU. These apply GEF Office of Evaluation quality assessment criteria and are used as a tool for providing structured feedback.

The quality of the draft evaluation report will be assessed and rated against the following criteria:

<b>Report Quality Criteria</b>	<b>UNEP EOU Assessment notes</b>	<b>Rating</b>
A. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives in the context of the focal area program indicators if applicable?		
B. Was the report consistent and the evidence complete and convincing and were the ratings substantiated when used?		
C. Did the report present a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes?		
D. Were the lessons and recommendations supported by the evidence presented?		
E. Did the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?		
F. Did the report include an assessment of the quality of the project M&E system and its use for project management?		

Rating system for quality of terminal evaluation reports

A number rating 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly Unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = 0.

A score for the quality of the terminal evaluation report is calculated by applying the GEF OE formula as follows:

Quality of the TE report =  $0.3*(A + B) + 0.1*(C+D+E+F)$   
 The total is rounded and converted to the scale of HS to HU  
 Quality of the TE report = Moderately Unsatisfactory

Report Quality Criteria	UNEP EOU Assessment	Rating
A. Quality of the lessons: Were lessons readily applicable in other contexts? Did they suggest prescriptive action?	Lessons were well formulated. Lessons learned of relevance to other global assessments should be included if possible.	
B. Quality of the recommendations: Did recommendations specify the actions necessary to correct existing conditions or improve operations ('who?' 'what?' 'where?' 'when?'). Can they be implemented?	Recommendations were adequately presented.	
C. Was the report well written? (clear English language and grammar)	The report was very well written.	
D. Did the report structure follow EOU guidelines, were all requested Annexes included?	The report was largely compliant with the guidelines (some Annexes are missing, cofinancing, TORs (details of people contacted by phone?))	
E. Were all evaluation aspects specified in the TORs adequately addressed?	Some aspects have yet to be addressed (details in comments document)	
F. Was the report delivered in a timely manner	No. However, the delay was due to a serious medical condition suffered by the evaluator.	

In addition UNEP EOU applies a rating scheme designed to compliment that of GEF EO.

EOU assessment of TE report =  $0.3*(A + B) + 0.1*(C+D+E+F)$   
 The total is rounded and converted to the scale of HS to HU

Since the substantive content captured by the GEF EO rating system is considered more important, the EOU complimentary criteria are given a reduced weighting in calculating the overall report quality.

**Combined GEF EO /UNEP EOU TE quality Rating**

(2\* 'GEF EO' rating + EOU rating)/3  
The total is rounded and converted to the scale of HS to HU

General comments on the draft report with respect to compliance with these TOR will also be compiled and shared with the evaluation team.

**6. Submission of Final Mid Term Evaluation Reports.**

The final report shall be submitted in electronic form in MS Word format and should be sent to the following persons:

Segbedzi Norgbey, Chief, Evaluation and Oversight Unit  
UNEP, P.O. Box 30552  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel.: (254-20) 624181  
Fax: (254-20) 623158  
Email: [segbedzi.norgbey@unep.org](mailto:segbedzi.norgbey@unep.org)  
and

Donatella Magliani, Director, Evaluation Group  
Bureau for Organizational Strategy and Learning  
UNIDO, P.O. Box 300, Vienna International Centre, 1400 Vienna, Austria  
Tel.: (+43-1) 26026-4773 ; Fax: (+43-1) 26026-6828  
Email: [d.magliani@unido.org](mailto:d.magliani@unido.org)

With a copy to:

Olivier Deleuze, Officer-in-Charge  
UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination  
P.O. Box 30552  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: + 254-20-624166  
Fax: + 254-20-624041/4042  
Email: [olivier.deleuze@unep.org](mailto:olivier.deleuze@unep.org)

Bahar Zoorfi  
UNEP/GEF Task Manager, POPs Enabling Activities  
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)  
Division of GEF Coordination (DGEF)  
P.O. Box 30552-00100  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: +254-20-7623765  
Fax: +254-20-7624041  
Email: [Bahar.Zorofi@unep.org](mailto:Bahar.Zorofi@unep.org)

Matthias Kern  
UNEP/GEF POPs SPO  
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)  
Division of GEF Coordination (DGEF)  
PO Box 30552-00100  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: 254 20 7624088  
Fax: 254 20 7624041  
Email: [Matthias.Kern@unep.org](mailto:Matthias.Kern@unep.org)

The final evaluation report will be considered as an 'internal document' with the circulation of the report to be determined by DGEF management.

#### **7. Resources and schedule of the evaluation**

This final evaluation will be undertaken by an international evaluator contracted by the Evaluation and Oversight Unit, UNEP. The contract for the evaluator will begin in September 2006 and end in December 2006 (20 days) spread over 11 weeks study). The evaluator will submit a draft report in November 2006 to the UNIDO Evaluation Group, UNEP/EOU, the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager, and key representatives of the executing agencies. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to UNEP / EOU for collation and the consultant will be advised of any necessary revisions. Comments to the final draft report will be sent to the consultant by September 2006 after which, the consultant will submit the final report no later than October 2006.

The evaluator will after an initial telephone briefing with EOU and UNEP/GEF travel and meet with project staff at the beginning of the evaluation.

In accordance with UNEP/GEF policy, all GEF projects are evaluated by independent evaluators contracted as consultants by the EOU. The evaluators should have the following qualifications:

The evaluator should not have been associated with the design and implementation of the project. The evaluator will work under the overall supervision of the Chief, Evaluation and Oversight Unit, UNEP. The evaluator should be an international expert in the field of industry and environment and have experience with project evaluation. Knowledge of UNEP programmes and GEF activities is desirable. Fluency in oral and written English is a must, and knowledge of French an asset.

## Annex 2: Hubs, hub leaders and participating countries

Hub	Leader	NGO	Countries
<b>Anglophone Africa</b>	Silvani Mng'anya <a href="mailto:semnganya@yahoo.com">semnganya@yahoo.com</a> <a href="mailto:agenda@bol.co.tz">agenda@bol.co.tz</a>	AGENDA for Environment and Responsible Development (Tanzania)	Gambia, Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda
<b>Central and Eastern Europe</b>	Executive Director of Toxics & Waste Programme <a href="mailto:Jindrich.petrlik@arnika.org">Jindrich.petrlik@arnika.org</a>	Arnika Association (Czech Republic) Associate of IPEN	Albania, Belarus, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Romania, Slovakia, Turkey
<b>Eastern Europe, Caucasus, Central Asian Countries</b>	Olga Speranskaya Head of Programme on Chemical Safety <a href="mailto:speransk@ntserver.cis.lead.org">speransk@ntserver.cis.lead.org</a>	Eco Accord (Russia)	Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Russia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan
<b>Francophone Africa</b>	Henry Diouf <a href="mailto:henrydiouf@pan-africa.sn">henrydiouf@pan-africa.sn</a> (Senegal)	Charge des Programmes Pesticide Action Network – PAN Africa (Senegal)	Congo, Benin, Burundi, Cameroon, DRC, Guinea Bissau, Mali, Mauritania, Senegal, Togo
<b>Latin America</b>	Fernando Bejarano Gonzalez <a href="mailto:rapam@prodigy.net.mx">rapam@prodigy.net.mx</a>	RAPAM (Mexico) Red de Accion en Plaguicidas y sus Alternativas para America Latina Member of IPEN	Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela
<b>Middle East</b>	Dr Mohamed El Banna, MD <a href="mailto:mbanna@starnet.com.eg">mbanna@starnet.com.eg</a>	Day Hospital / WIT (Egypt)	Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Palestine, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Yemen
<b>South Asia</b>	Upasana Choudhry <a href="mailto:upasana@toxicslink.org">upasana@toxicslink.org</a>	Toxics Link (India)	Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka
<b>South East Asia</b>	Romy Quijano, MD <a href="mailto:romyquij@yahoo.com">romyquij@yahoo.com</a> Manny Calonzo <a href="mailto:Many.gaia@no-burn.org">Many.gaia@no-burn.org</a>	SEAPEN  GAIA (Both of Philippines)	Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Thailand

### **Annex 3: List of interviewees**

#### ***1. Face-to-Face interviews***

##### UNEP-GEF

1. Dr. Ms Bahar ZOROFI
2. Dr. Michael SPILSBURY, GEF Evaluation Officer

##### UNIDO

1. Dr. Johannes DOBINGER, Evaluation Officer
2. Ms Elisabeth SLOWIAK, Finance Department

##### Tanzania

1. Mr. Silvani MNG'ANYA: Hub leader for Anglophone Africa; AGENDA
2. Five members of AGENDA that participated in project activities run by AGENDA
3. Mr. Yahya MSANGI, Tanzania Plantation and Agricultural Workers Union
4. Ms Jane MATERU, ENVIROCARE
5. Ms Angelina MADETE, Vice President Office, Department of Environment, Project Coordinator for NIP and POPs focal point.

##### Kenya

1. Ms Rachel KAMANDE, ENVILEAD
2. Mr. Barua EJIDIUS and two colleagues, CEAG Africa

##### Philippines

1. Dr. Romeo QUIJANO, Hub leader, PAN Philippines
2. Mr. Manny CALONZO, Hub leader, GAIA
3. Ms S. QUIJANO, PAN Philippines
4. Three members of Advocates of Science and Technology for the People (AGHAM)
5. Two members of Fisherfolk Against Toxics (PAMALAKAYA)
6. Members of Cavite Green Coalition, Health Care Without Harm and Ecological Waste Coalition

##### *Malaysia*

1. Ms Yin San LOH and four colleagues, ReelPower
2. Ms. Jennifer MOURIN and colleague, PAN Asia and the Pacific
3. Ms. Meenakshi RAMAN and colleague, Consumers' Association of Penang

#### **2. Telephone interview / interaction**

1. Dr Joseph DIGANGI, IPEP Coordinator
2. Dr Johannes DOBINGER, UNIDO
3. Dr. Michael SPILSBURY

#### **3. Email interaction**

Email interaction and communication with most of the persons mentioned above

#### Annex 4: Selection of projects for assessment

Hub	Countries (number of proposals submitted - reports posted on website)*	Selected project (Country)	Topic
1. Anglophone Africa	Gambia (1 - 0), Ghana (1 - 0), Kenya (6 - 6), Nigeria (5 - 0), South Africa (5 - 1), Tanzania (8 - 8), Uganda (6 - 4)	1. POPs pesticide contaminated site in Kenya 2. Global day action (South Africa) 3. Identify and verify pesticides hotspots and contaminated sites in Tanzania. 4. Practices leading to release of POPs: dioxins and furans in Uganda	Hotspot – Pesticides Awareness – All POPs Hotspots - Pesticides PCDD/Fs
2. Central and Eastern Europe	Albania (1 - 0), Belarus (9 - 5), Bulgaria (7 - 4), Croatia (0), Czech Republic (13 - 7), Estonia (1 - 0), Hungary (3 - 0), Romania (2 - 0) Slovakia (6 - 2), Turkey (5 - 3)	1. Belarus country situation report 2. Conference on Pesticides impact on the Danube and Black sea region (Bulgaria) 3. POPs pesticides and hazardous waste incineration in the Czech Republic 4. Global eggs sampling for by-product POPs – interpretation of the analysis results and national reports (Czech Republic) 5. The Kosice municipal waste incinerator: A POPs hotspot in Slovakia	All Awareness, pesticides Pesticides, PCDD/Fs PCDD/Fs, PCBs Hotspot
3. Eastern Europe, Caucasus, Central Asian countries	Armenia (8 - 6), Azerbaijan (3 - 2), Georgia (1 - 0), Kazakhstan (3 - 2), Kyrgyzstan (4 - 2), Moldova (8 - 7), Russia (25 - 23), Ukraine (4 - 3), Uzbekistan (0)	1. Monitoring of PCB levels in environmental media in the Republic of Armenia and the identification of hotspots (Armenia) 2. Public environmental inventory of pesticides in the Republic of Azerbaijan and organization of a public movement for their elimination (Azerbaijan) 3. POPs in Trans-Dniesteria, Moldova: Situation assessment and public awareness raising 4. PCBs pollution of Nizhegorodskaya Oblast; Territory monitoring and inventories of PCBs sources – as the option to address the problem (Russia) 5. Public hearings on Khimprom Co. in Ufa; site of dioxin catastrophe (Russia)	Hotspots (PCBs) Pesticides All POPs – Awareness PCBs PCDD/Fs
4. Francophone Africa	Benin (3 - 1), Burundi (2 - 0), Cameroon (2 - 1), DRC (2 - 1), Guinea Bissau (1 - 0), Mali (1 - 0), Mauritania (3 - 0), Senegal (5 - 1), Togo (4 - 1)	1. Training grassroots communities on exposure risks to POPs in the district of Oueme-Benin (Benin) 2. POPs country situation report for Cameroon 3. Sampling of eggs for by-product POPs (Senegal) 4. Socio-economic, health and environmental impact study of pesticide use in agriculture in	Awareness Awareness – Pesticides PCBs, PCDD/Fs Pesticides



		Davie (Togo)	
5. Latin America	Argentina (7 - 7), Brazil (1 - 1), Chile (1 - 1), Colombia (1 - 1), Costa Rica (0), Mexico (8 - 6), Paraguay (1 - 0), Peru (1 - 1), Uruguay (2 - 2), Venezuela (0)	1. Incineration hotspot (Argentina) 2. Civil society seminar for the NIP development in Brazil 3. Source identification of POPs pollution in eastern Morelos. A participatory approach (Mexico) 4. Egg sampling for POPs (Uruguay)	Hotspot (PCDD/Fs) Awareness  All POPs – Awareness  PCBs, PCDD/Fs
6. Middle East	Egypt (7 - 3), Jordan (4 - 3), Lebanon (5 - 4), Morocco (2 - 1), Palestine (3 - 1), Sudan (1 - 0), Syria (0), Tunisia (1 - 1), Yemen (1 - 0)	1. Country situation report for Egypt 2. POPs and Policy in Jordan 3. Lebanon Country situation report 4. Global day of action – Together against pesticide damages (Morocco) 5. Country situation report (Palestine)	All Pops  All POPs All POPs  Awareness – Pesticides  All POPs
7. South Asia	Bangladesh (4 - 0), India (15 - 7), Nepal (7 - 5), Pakistan (4 - 2), Sri Lanka (4 - 2)	1. Identification of POPs Hotspots Lucknow City (India) 2. Case study of Zero Waste Kovalam a progressive waste management programme with focus on BAT options and material submission (India) 3. Country situation report from Nepal 4. Egg sampling for by-product POPs (Pakistan)	Hotspot  PCDD/Fs  All POPs  PCBs, PCDD/Fs
8. South East Asia	Cambodia (2 - 1), China (1 - 0), Indonesia (3 - 0), Malaysia (3 - 2), Philippines (10 - 3), Thailand (2 - 0)	1. POPs awareness-raising among university students and NGOs (Cambodia) 2. Public awareness-raising on POPs and incineration using film (Malaysia) 3. Country profile on pesticide POPs Philippines 4. Capacity building and public awareness-raising on health care waste incineration (Philippines)	Awareness  Awareness – PCDD/Fs  Pesticides  Awareness PCDD/Fs

\*The first number corresponds to the number of Project Activity Memoranda submitted and the second number corresponds to the number of reports posted on the website.

## **Annex 5: TOR for Hubs**

# **International POPs Elimination Project**

UNIDO Project Number: GF/GLO/03/012/21-01

UNEP Project Number: GF / 2760 - 03 - PMS: GF/4030-03

## **Terms of Reference for NGOs acting as Hubs for the International POPs Elimination Project (IPEP)**

September 2003

### **NGO requirements**

The Hub NGO should be an IPEN participating organization and one that endorses the IPEN Stockholm Declaration.

The Hub NGO should be located in one of the eight regions where IPEP will operate: Anglophone Africa, Central and Eastern Europe, Francophone Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, Middle East, Russia and the NIS, South Asia, Southeast and East Asia and the Pacific.

The Hub NGO should have expertise in the Stockholm Convention.

The Hub NGO should have expertise in policy interventions, campaigning, and awareness-raising activities.

The Hub NGO should have demonstrated the ability to work collaboratively with NGOs throughout its region including those with different perspectives or styles.

The Hub NGO should have reasonable competence in English; both written and spoken.

The Hub NGO should have a demonstrated capacity to hire and supervise personnel.

The Hub NGO should be prepared and able (using funds made available through IPEP) to hire or delegate staff to be responsible for IPEP implementation and operation. This will require a minimum of one full time person or a full time equivalent (two or more people working less than full time each on this task). However, a single person who will be devoting a substantial portion of his/her time to the role will be designated as the key contact with global management and regional NGO's

The Hub NGO bears final responsibility for management of the person(s) responsible for IPEP implementation in the regions and insures that delegated and agreed IPEP work will be fully and satisfactorily carried out.

The Hub NGO should be able to display professionalism in its work including:

- Ability to work cooperatively with others in their country and region who have differing views and perspectives;
- Competent telecommunications, computer and writing skills;
- Experience in writing reports, organizing events, and meeting deadlines;
- Can provide prompt and appropriate responses to written and spoken English communications; has regular office hours; and can supply advance notification of absence from office; etc.

The Hub NGO should be willing to work with Project Management on plans to develop and establish the financial support that will be needed to continue regional NGO activities relating to POPs and related issues after the end of IPEP.

### **Hub Responsibilities**

One full-time equivalent staff person to be made available.

Bi-weekly report to global management.

Identify NGOs in country of Regional Hub and at least four other countries in the region that have interest and ability to work on POPs-related issues at various levels. This should be done both at the start of IPEP and during the project as opportunities arise.

Assess strengths and weaknesses of NGOs in region to help identify appropriate matches between proposed IPEP Project Activities and the interests, needs and abilities of individual NGOs.

Develop ideas for IPEP Project Activities for the region consistent with IPEP guidelines, and match these activities to candidate NGOs depending on level of experience and type of activity.

Help individual NGOs plan Project Activities that are consistent with IPEP objectives and their interests and experience. These would include a work plan, outputs, an agreed budget and terms for payment. See project guidelines.

Help the NGOs write up the plan in the form of a Project Activity Memorandum (PAM). Each PAM should include an NGO contact, contact information, project title, brief description of project and what will be delivered, personnel who will work on the project, a work schedule, and payment schedule. PAMs should be short. The Hub will arrange to have PAMs translated into English as needed.

Submit PAMs to global coordination center for review and final approval.

Assist NGOs in the regions to secure the help that they may need to carry out the agreed activity, e.g. from the International Expert Teams.

If a proposed PAM is not approved because of its failure to meet IPEP guidelines and/or because it has not been adequately written up, the Hub should help to revise and re-submit the PAM. (A clear reason or reasons for non-approval will be supplied.)

Review each NGO Project Activity at mid-point and completion to ensure they conform to the terms agreed in the PAM. Report to global management

Help NGOs in the region participate in National Implementation Plans (NIP) preparation activities. Hubs, as possible, and with assistance from global management, IPEN, involved Intergovernmental Organizations (e.g. UNIDO, UNEP, UNDP, World Bank) and others, will help NGOs to overcome obstacles that might inhibit their effective participation in NIP preparations. The objective is to encourage governments to invite NGOs participating in IPEP to become participants or recognized stakeholders in the country NIP preparation process. In other cases, NGOs may participate indirectly through written submissions or by other means.

Hubs will also facilitate communications between NGOs in the region and will help encourage and motivate them.

The Hubs will also establish and maintain regional information for the project website and translation services.

Hubs will share experiences between themselves and the Global Project Management Center through e-mail discussions, teleconferences, meetings, and individual visits.

Help regional NGOs to obtain financial support to continue work on POPs and broader issues of chemical safety.

Each Regional IPEP Hub will prepare a Regional Report. Regional Reports will be based on: the Country Situation Reports prepared as Project Activities by NGOs in their region; information contained in other Project Documents prepared as IPEP Project Activities in the region; and other readily available information. These will include reports in Spanish, French, Russian and Arabic for the Latin America, Francophone Africa, NIS Region; and Middle East, respectively. All Regional Reports will also be available in English.

**Annex 6: Snapshot Project Detail Report as at 31 Dec 2006, UNIDO**

