

**UNIDO PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT (Final Project Implementation Report)<sup>1</sup>**  
**Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 (1 July 2012 – 30 June 2013)**

**Date: 23 October 2013**

**1. Project Information**

<b>General Information</b>	Project Title	Regional Project to Develop Appropriate Strategies for Identifying Sites Contaminated by Chemicals listed in Annexes A, B and/or C of the Stockholm Convention
	GEF ID	2720
	UNIDO ID (SAP Grant Number)	200000293
	Region	Regional
	Country(ies)	Ghana, Nigeria
	GEF Focal Area(s)	POPs
	Co-Implementing Agency(ies)	-
	Project Executing Partners	Federal Ministry of Environment, Nigeria and the Ministry of Environment and Science, Ghana
	Project Size (FSP, MSP, EA)	FSP
<b>Milestone Dates</b>	Project CEO Endorsement/Approval Date	30 October 2007
	Project Implementation Start Date (PAD Issuance Date)	1/3/2008
	Original Expected Implementation End Date (indicated in CEO Endorsement/Approval document)	01/03/2012
	Revised Expected Implementation End Date (if any)	12/31/2012
	Actual Implementation End Date <sup>1</sup>	12/31/2012
<b>Funding</b>	GEF Grant (USD)	\$ 2,000,000
	GEF PPG (USD) (if any)	\$ 650,000
	Total GEF Grant Disbursements as of 30 June 2013 (USD) Total Expenditures = Commitments + Payments)	\$ 1,921,188.81
	Co-financing (USD) at CEO Endorsement	\$2,100,000
	Materialized Co-financing at Project Completion (USD):	\$1,550,000 (unable to mobilize bilateral funds)
	Total Project Cost (USD) (GEF Grant + Co-financing at CEO Endorsement)	\$ 2,265,000
<b>Evaluations</b>	Mid-term Review Date	8/1/2011

<sup>1</sup> Only for projects that have gone through **operational closure** – all activities have been closed and project is due for Terminal Evaluation

**UNIDO PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT (Final Project Implementation Report)<sup>1</sup>**  
**Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 (1 July 2012 – 30 June 2013)**

	Planned Terminal Evaluation Date	12/31/2012
	Tracking Tool Date <sup>2</sup>	12/31/2012

## 2. Main Findings of the Report

Output 1 – A suitable organizational arrangement set up for timely and well-monitored implementation of the project.

All the organs, Regional Ministerial Committee (RMC), Regional Steering Committee (RSC), Regional Coordinator (RC), National Project Directors and administrative staff, National Coordinator Units (NCUs) under this output have been set up. However, all the expectations in the project document have not been met (mainly the mobilization of funds to start implementation of the agreed regional policy. It was felt that due to political turmoil in the region, the funding institutions were reluctant to commit themselves, however these issues would be addressed when time would be right for the two countries):

Output 2 – Establishment of Regional Policy and National legal Frameworks for the Management of Contaminated Sites.

This output has progressed well to the extent that the view is that the POPs policy framework is ready to be passed. Nigeria intends to take steps for the policy to be passed through the National Council on the Environment and subsequently approval by the Federal Executive Council. However this may be affected by the elections next month (April) and its uncertain aftermath. In Ghana efforts should be initiated by the preparation of a memorandum to cabinet for approval through the Ministry of Environment, Science and Technology (MEST).

Output 3 – National and Regional Capacity Building and Institutional Strengthening.

Officials of Ministries of Environment in both Ghana and Nigeria have benefited from training under this output of the project. The beneficiaries are mostly from government agencies especially the NCU agency and did not include officers from other multi-lateral development agencies (MDAs). The training has not been fully put into practice due to delay in the procurement of equipment and inactivity in identification of contaminated sites and collection of samples for analysis. No private sector or other MDAs participants benefited from the training apart from the fieldwork for toolkit case studies in the two countries.

Most training beneficiaries found the training useful but some think further training is required as there was no hand on training on analytical work. A number of stakeholders interviewed have not seen the toolkit. One of the Nigeria trainees has been reassigned to Environmental Assessment Unit in Abuja. One Nigerian trainee found the training useful resulting in broadening area of interest and change in research area to use of nanotechnology.

---

<sup>2</sup> For FSPs and MSPs the Tracking Tool (TT) date should be the same as the Expected Implementation End Date.

**UNIDO PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT (Final Project Implementation Report)<sup>1</sup>**  
**Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 (1 July 2012 – 30 June 2013)**

Output 5: Establishment of Environmental Information Management System (IMS) and Framework for stakeholders' engagement and Public Educational and Awareness Programme.

The CSOs have been trained in the use toolkit and have been involved in the identification of hotspots of contaminated sites, and conducted socio-economic survey. The capacity of the CSOs has been built to enable them carry out on effective education, and raise of awareness.

Information dissemination through media-websites and newsletters were developed in collaboration with the existing Governments tools and activities to promote information on the project activities. The Nigeria and Ghana NCUs have both published their newsletter published and also developed websites with links between the two countries and UNIDO.

**3. Rating of Project Implementation Performance**

*Please indicate the project's progress made in achieving the outcomes against key performance indicators' targets **specified in the project's M&E Plan/Log-Frame at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval**. Please expand the table as needed. Definition of ratings can be found in the AMR 2013 Guidelines and Definitions Annex.*

<b>Outcomes by Project Component</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Target Level</b>	<b>Progress To Date</b>	<b>Rating (HS/S/MS/MU/U/HU)</b>
<b>Component</b>				
<b>Output 1: A suitable organization arrangement set up for timely and well monitored implementation of the project.</b>	NCU Offices in place with staff and a good understanding of requirements/responsibilities with results	Approval of the NCUs by governments	All indicators are in place	HS for Nigeria and S for Ghana because of lack of expertise.
<b>Component</b>				
<b>Output 2: Establishment of Regional Policy and national Legal framework for management of contaminated sites</b>	Draft national and regional policy and regulations passed to National Parliaments for approval	Enactment in the National Parliaments and in approval with ECOWAS	The Ghana National policy has been cleared and approved by Parliamen in 2013. In Nigeria the government's Apex Body the National	S for Nigeria and Ghana and MS for the Region as it takes a long time to harmonise the policies and legal matters for all countries of

**UNIDO PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT (Final Project Implementation Report)<sup>1</sup>**  
**Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 (1 July 2012 – 30 June 2013)**

			Council on Environment has cleared the document in 2011.and forwarded it to the Executive Council for enactment. The regional policy has been submitted to ECOWAS and Waiting for response	the region.
<b>Component</b>				
<b>Outputs 3 and 4: National and regional Capacity building and institutional strengthening and toolkit for the selection of environmentally sound and economically feasible remediation technologies for Ghana and Nigeria.</b>	<p>i. National Laboratories functioning with fully trained staff and data on contaminated sites available and model experiments on land remediation carried out.</p> <p>ii. Demonstration Tool kit and action taken to promote it</p>	<p>i. The Regional laboratory located in the university of Ibadan is set up and essential have been installed. The GC/Ms and GC are operational. In Ghana there was a delay due to link up with establishing the cleaner production centre and the laboratory has been set up with the help of this project and Norwegian assistance for gas/oil sediment analysis..</p> <p>ii. The tool kit is fully operational</p> <p>iii. Plans in place for long term sustainability</p>	<p>i. Laboratories are functioning and a number of contaminated (at least 10 sites in each countries) sites have been identified</p> <p>ii. Tool kit available and demonstration in progress and two work shops have been organized</p> <p>iii. A business plan for long term sustainability was prepared for submission to the Government</p>	<p>i.HS for Nigeria and S for Ghana.</p> <p>ii. HS</p> <p>iii. HS</p>

**UNIDO PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT (Final Project Implementation Report)<sup>1</sup>**  
**Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 (1 July 2012 – 30 June 2013)**

Component				
<p><b>Output 5: Establishment of environmental IMS and framework for stakeholders engagement and public educational and awareness programme</b> Component</p>	<p>i. IMS Labs set up and data base on Contaminated sites established</p> <p>ii. public education/ awareness well established</p>	<p>i. Database on potential contaminated sites has been set up and a main regional data base set up.</p>	<p>i. Labs have been set and training completed and data base has been established regional data base in progress</p> <p>ii. Around 4 public education /awareness workshops have been conducted for different groups and news letters have been prepared for circulation and Lagos area of hot spots have been mapped. This will enable the Government to agree with the public in prioritizing the contaminated sites and start clean-up.</p>	<p>i. S</p> <p>ii. S</p>
<p><b>Output 6: Regional monitoring and evaluation plan</b></p>	<p>i. Pre-midterm, Midterm, and Terminal evaluation completed</p> <p>ii. Socio-economic studies were carried out</p>	<p>i. All evaluations were carried out</p> <p>ii. Socioeconomic studies were complete.</p>	<p>i. All Evaluation reports available.</p>	<p>i. S</p> <p>ii. S</p>

**UNIDO PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT (Final Project Implementation Report)<sup>1</sup>**  
**Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 (1 July 2012 – 30 June 2013)**

**4. Overall ratings and assessment of progress made towards achieving “Global Environment Objectives/Development Objectives” and “Implementation Progress”**

*Definition of ratings can be found in the AMR 2013 Guidelines and Definitions Annex.*

Project Performance Ratings	
<b>Overall Global Environment Objectives/Development Objectives Rating</b>	S
<b>Overall Implementation Progress Rating</b>	S
<b>Overall Key Performance Indicators Rating</b>	S
<b>Ratings:</b> HS=Highly Satisfactory; S= Satisfactory; MS=Marginally Satisfactory; MU=Marginally Unsatisfactory; U=Unsatisfactory; HU=Highly Unsatisfactory	

**4.1 Narrative assessment of factors justifying the rating on progress towards achieving “Global Environment Objectives/Development Objectives” (DO):**

At the start of the project, there was no national capacity to enable understanding the implications of POPs contaminated sites on public health and the environment. With the development of tool kit and policy document and with full participation of stakeholders, this has contributed to the progress of the project implementation in Nigeria and Ghana. Considering many unexpected barriers on land laws, substantive and non substantive-mainly lack of national policies and by-laws-, the progress is commendable and the awareness to POPs contaminated sites and their environmentally sustainable management, has risen many folds.

**4.2 Narrative assessment of factors justifying the rating on progress made towards achieving “Implementation Progress” (IP):**

The project had number of unexpected delays (as mentioned above) and in addition the infrastructure supposed to be existing (experts, labs, institutions) at the start of the project was not available. However the project at the end of the implementation stage has made significant progress and an extensive business plan for long-term sustainability of the National geo-environmental research centres (GRCs) will be submitted to the Governments.

**4.3 If the project received a sub-optimal DO and/or IP rating(s) (MU, U, or HU) in FY 2012 (1 July 2011 – 30 June 2012) report, please provide a detailed progress report on actions taken to rectify the rating(s) and improve the overall performance of the project:**

N/A

**UNIDO PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT (Final Project Implementation Report)<sup>1</sup>**  
**Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 (1 July 2012 – 30 June 2013)**

**5. Assessment of Risk**

*Please provide the overall risk rating of the project. Definitions of the risk ratings can be found in the AMR 2013 Guidelines and Definitions Annex.*

Project Risk Ratings	
<b>Overall Risk Rating</b>	L
<b>Ratings:</b> H-high; S-substantial; M- moderate; L- low	

5.1 Please indicate project’s progress made in **managing risks, identified in the project document at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval:**

At the time of CEO Endorsement four principal risks were highlighted and were termed as low. All these risks still remain low including the inadequate timeframe, which was High to moderate due to many unpredictable parameters interfered with the timeframe, however it also became low at the end of the project and with all outputs implemented.

5.2 Specify additional/new risks internal or external to the project which affect implementation of the project and prospects of achieving project objectives:

**N.A.**

5.3 If the project received a sub-optimal risk rating and was perceived to be *at risk* in **FY 2012 (1 July 2011 – 30 June 2012) report**, please provide a detailed progress report on actions taken to rectify the rating and improve the overall performance of the project: Since the last mid-term evaluation report the progress of the project has been speeded up especially in the establishment of analytical laboratory, IMS laboratory and promoting tool kit. The toolkit has the desired effect of spin off to other countries in the region. The toolkit has officially been recognized by the Stockholm Convention secretariat and posted in its website as the official document to be used by all countries of the world. Several countries have started projects based on the use and guidance provided by the toolkit.

**N.A.**

**6. Assessment of Outcomes and Outputs**

*Please provide an assessment of whether the **outcomes and outputs** achieved by the project reached the levels envisioned **at the CEO Endorsement/Approval stage**. If not, please provide justification.*

As described under item 3 all outputs made good progress before completion of the project. Under output 2 the enforcement of law and under output 4 development of pilot scale remediation of contaminated sites and under output 6 socio-economic studies could not be undertaken. This was mainly due to the fact that these turned out to be rather overambitious, time consuming, and complicated exercise. In addition, some of the infrastructure supposed to be present at the start of the project such as analytical laboratories and IMS set up especially in Nigeria were not in place.

**UNIDO PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT (Final Project Implementation Report)<sup>1</sup>**  
**Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 (1 July 2012 – 30 June 2013)**

**7. Global Environment Benefits**

*Please provide an assessment of the achieved **Global Environmental Benefits**. Indicate whether the levels envisioned **at the CEO Endorsement/Approval stage** have been achieved, if not, please provide justification.*

The project has resulted in creating full awareness in the implementing countries to this complicated subject affecting particular poor segment of the community living close to contaminated sites. The project has developed capacity in both Nigeria and Ghana to systematically identify POPs contaminated sites and take preliminary steps to mitigate the adverse effect on health and environment. The project brought successful twinning an advanced institution in the UK with the GRCs in Nigeria and Ghana. As an outreach of the project the tool kit is being used in other countries for training purposes. In the COP-5 held in Geneva 2010, the toolkit was released to create awareness among the participating countries.  
(HS)

**8. Implementation Issues**

*Please indicate any project implementation issues experienced by UNIDO as the Implementing Agency of the project during FY 2013.*

*N/A since the project was closed in 2012.*

**9. Execution Issues**

*Please indicate any project execution issues identified by Project Executing Partners, Project Management Unit (PMU), Project Steering Committee (PSC) and other relevant stakeholders during FY 2013 and indicate actions that were agreed upon to rectify these issues.*

The project was closed in 2012. However, many issues raised will be addressed by the counterparts in their business plans developed during the implementation of the project.

**10. Lessons Learned**

*Please indicate key lessons learned identified to date, which would be of relevance to any future projects and initiatives in the same area.*

The project has addressed a new field on POPs and chemicals pollution abatement (of contaminated sites management) in the developing countries. Implemented at a regional level, in Nigeria and Ghana, the project was a challenging experience and the two countries need



**UNIDO PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT (Final Project Implementation Report)<sup>1</sup>**  
**Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 (1 July 2012 – 30 June 2013)**

additional support to further strengthen the established facilities and sustain the experience gained so as to enamel other countries to replicate it.

**11. Co-financing and Additional Leveraged Financing**

*Please indicate the level of materialized co-financing from the sources indicated at CEO Endorsement level. If new sources of co-financing have been identified during project implementation, please indicate those. Please expand the table as needed.*

Sources of Co-financing <sup>3</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing <sup>4</sup>	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm	Actual Amount Materialized at Closing
Government	Govt of Ghana	In kind	250,000	50,000	150,000
Government	Govt of Nigeria	In cash In kind	900,000 250,000	Cash 400,000	Cash 800,000
Multilateral	UNIDO	In cash In kind	100,000 200,000	100,000 200,000	100,000 200,000
Private Sector	Geoenvironmental Research Centre, UK	In kind	250,000	150,000	250,000
Bilateral	DANIDA, CIDA, mining industries in Ghana, GTZ, Germany, ECOWAS etc	In kind	150,000	ECOWAS 20,000 in kind	ECOWAS 50,000 in kind
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>2,100,000</b>	<b>920,000</b>	<b>1,550,000</b>

<sup>3</sup> Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Other

<sup>4</sup> Type of Co-financing may include: Grant, Soft Loan, Hard Loan, Guarantee, In-Kind, Other

**UNIDO PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT (Final Project Implementation Report)<sup>1</sup>**  
**Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 (1 July 2012 – 30 June 2013)**

**12. GEF Grant Disbursement Summary**

*Please provide a summary of all GEF grant disbursements as of 30 June 2013 (total expenditures of the project=commitments + payments).*

Grant	Project Manager	Sponsored Class	Expenditure USD
200000293	EISA	1100 - International Experts	445,368.78
200000293	EISA	1500- Project Travel	100,119.30
200000293	EISA	1600- Mission costs	3,846.10
200000293	EISA	1700 - National Consultants/Staff	118,223.86
200000293	EISA	2100 - Contractual Services	265,710.76
200000293	EISA	3000 - Trainings/ Fellowships/Study Tours	175,743.94
200000293	EISA	3500 - International Meetings	93,645.75
200000293	EISA	4500 - Equipment	200,313.01
200000293	EISA	5100 - Other Direct Costs	99,032.98
200000293	KORMAWA	1100 - International Experts	49,596.07
200000293	KORMAWA	1500- Project Travel	23,319.57
200000293	KORMAWA	1600- Mission costs	30,072.21
200000293	KORMAWA	1700 - National Consultants/Staff	18,893.18
200000293	KORMAWA	3000 - Trainings/ Fellowships/Study Tours	47,686.37
200000293	KORMAWA	3500 - International Meetings	49,084.16
200000293	KORMAWA	4500 - Equipment	182,836.78
200000293	KORMAWA	5100 - Other Direct Costs	17,695.99
200000293	<b>Result</b>		<b>1,921,188.81</b>

**13. Project Terminal Evaluation**

*Please provide a plan and budget for the terminal evaluation of the project.*

The project is operationally completed.

**14. Feedback from National Operational Focal Points (OFPs)**

No report has been submitted by the national focal point.

**N.A.**

**15. Feedback from Co-financiers and Other Partners/Stakeholders**

**UNIDO PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT (Final Project Implementation Report)<sup>1</sup>**  
**Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 (1 July 2012 – 30 June 2013)**

The counterpart has provided financial support of U\$ 1.2 million but no feedback report received.

**16. Please indicate the name of the Focal Area Tracking Tool(s) attached to this report**

*Instructions and links to the relevant focal area tracking tools are provided in the AMR 2013 Guidelines and Definitions Annex.*

**N.A.**

**17. Additional Supporting Information and/or Documents**

*Please provide any additional information and/or attach relevant supporting documents (E.g. relevant technical reports, PSC meeting minutes, project websites, photos, video links, publications, flyers, etc.).*

**N.A.**