**UN Environment GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2019**

1. July 2018 to 30 June 2019)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Identification** | | | *5648* |  | |
| Project Number + Project Title | | | *Global Project on the Implementation of PRTRs as a Tool for POPs reporting, Dissemination and Awareness Raising for Belarus, Cambodia, Ecuador, Kazakhstan, Moldova and Peru* | | |
| Duration months | *Planned* | | *48 months* | | |
| *Extension(s)* | | *n/a* | |  |
| Division(s) Implementing the project | | | *UNEP GEF Chemicals and Waste* | | |
| Executing Agency(ies) | | | *UNITAR* | | |
| Names of Other Project Partners | | | *Ministry of Environment of Belarus, Cambodia, Ecuador, Moldova, Peru and Ministry of Energy from Kazakhstan* | | |
|  | | |
| Project Type | | | *MSP* | | |
| Project Scope | | | *Global* | | |
| Region *(delete as appropriate)* | | | *Global* | | |
| Names of Beneficiary Countries | | | *Belarus, Ecuador, Cambodia, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Peru* | | |
| Programme of Work | | | *Chemicals and Health Programme of Work* | | |
| GEF Focal Area(s) | | | *POPs* | | |
| UNDAF linkages | | | *Where appropriate, insert the UNDAF strategic objective to which achievement the project contributes.* | | |
| Link to relevant SDG target(s) and SDG indicator(s) | | | *- Goal 3. “Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages” (Target 3.9)*  *- Goal 6. “Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all” (Target 6.3)*  *- Goal 9. “Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation” (Target 9.4)*  *- Goal 12. “Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns” (Target 12.4, 12.5, 12.8)*  *- Goal 16. “Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels” (Target 16.10)* | | |
| GEF financing amount | | | *2,000,000* | | |
| Co-financing amount | | | *8,232,258* | | |
| Date of CEO Endorsement | | | 06.02.2014 | | |
| Start of Implementation | | | 26.11.2015 | | |
| Date of first disbursement | | | 07.09.2015 | | |
| Total disbursement as of 30 June | | | USD 1,829,999.94 | | |
| Total expenditure as of 30 June | | | *USD 1,837,268.75* | | |
| Expected Mid-Term Date | | | *N/a* | | |
| Completion Date | | *Planned* | *31 Dec 2019* | | |
| *Revised* | *N/a* | | |
| Expected Terminal Evaluation Date | | | *Q12020* | | |
| Expected Financial Closure Date | | | *Q2 2020* | | |

1. **OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS**

*To be completed by UNEP/GEF Task Manager*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **UN Environment Subprogramme(s)** *Chemicals and Health Subprogramme* | **Specify the relevant Expected Accomplishment(s) & Indicator(s)** |
| *Describe any progress made towards delivering the stated PoW Expected Accomplishments and Indicators. State key changes since previous reporting period. [Section to be shared with relevant Regional and Global SubProgramme Coordinators]* | |

**For all GEF 6 and later projects:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **GEF Core Indicators**  *Insert core indicator(s) from Core Indicator Worksheet to which the project contributes* | **Indicative expected Results** *[add figure approved at CEO endorsement/ approval]* |
|  | Indicative expected Results  *[add figure approved at CEO endorsement/ approval]* |
| *Describe any progress made towards meeting the indicative expected results as per the approved project documentation. Describe any key changes since previous reporting period.*  During the current reporting period the Third Project Steering Committee (PSC) meeting was organized by UNITAR in Siem Reap, Cambodia from 25 to 27 March 2019. The PSC meeting was held back-to-back with the Final Lessons Learned Workshop of the project. The agreements between UNITAR and five of the six participating countries (Moldova, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Peru, Cambodia) terminated on 31 March 2019. Regarding these five countries the project can be considered closed and PRTR objectives successfully achieved. Final narrative reports and financial reports were submitted to UNITAR, together with grant-out closure forms.  After consultations between UNITAR, the implementing agency and the ministry of environment of Ecuador, a new agreement was signed in Quito on 28 May 2019 between UNITAR-MOEE and FIAS to continue the project and achieve the completion of activities and deliverables by the end of the year 2019. | |

*To be completed by Project Manager, as relevant*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Planned linkages with UNDAF** | *Describe progress towards the UNDAF strategic objective to which the project contributes.*  *[Section to be shared with Monitoring Unit within PPD]* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Planned contribution to relevant SDG target(s) and SDG indicator(s)** | *Describe progress towards the stated SDG target(s) and SDG indicator(s) to which the project contributes*  *[section to be shared with SDG unit]* |

*[complete the fiscal year and select: 1st PIR; 2nd PIR; …. Final PIR. Add more columns if needed]*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Implementation Status** | FY 2016 | FY 2017 | FY 2018 | FY 2019 | FY 2020 |
| 1st PIR | 2nd PIR | 3rd PIR | 4th PIR | Final PIR |

*[complete the fiscal year in the first line; select* ***HS; S; MS; MU; U; HU; unknown; not rated*** *to rate the progress towards the development objective for the fiscal year you are reporting in the second line. Add more columns if needed]*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Development Objective Rating FY** | FY 2016 | FY 2017 | FY 2018 | FY 2019 | FY 2020 |
| **S** | **S** | **S** | **S** |  |
| *Describe progress made towards achieving the project results as per table 3.1. State key changes since previous reporting period.* ***The information here must be consistent with the assessment and justification provided under 3.1.*** | | | | | |

*[complete the fiscal year in the first line; select among* ***H; S; MS; MU; U; HU; unknown; not rated*** *to rate the implementation progress in the fiscal year you are reporting in the second line. Add more columns if needed]*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Implementation Progress Rating** | FY 2016 | FY 2017 | FY 2018 | FY 2019 | FY 2020 |
| **S** | **S** | **S** | **S** |  |
| *Describe annual implementation progress, including any significant [expected and unexpected] environmental or other changes (Results) attributable to project implementation. Also, please discuss any major challenges to meet the objectives or specific project outcomes. [section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal ‘Information on Progress, challenges and outcomes on project implementation activities’ and is the primary report that viewers can see before opening the detailed PIR].* ***The information must be consistent with the assessment and justification provided under 3.2.*** | | | | | |

*[complete the fiscal year in the first line; select* ***H; S; M; L;*** *to rate the fiscal year you are reporting. Add more columns if needed]*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Rating** | FY 2016 | FY 2017 | FY 2018 | FY 2019 | FY 2020 |
| **M** | **M** | **L** | **L** |  |
| *Describe key changes since previous reporting period. Projects with ESERN rating high medium/ high risk must refer to the safeguards implementation plan and its implementation.*  *[section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal and in UN Environment Open Platform]*  ***The information here must be consistent with the assessment and justification provided under 3.3*** | | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder engagement** | *Describe progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO endorsement)*  The project included the creation of national teams to engage key national stakeholders. The National Steering Committees involved participants from government, industry associations, NGOs and Academia. This setting allowed countries to reinforce their environmental governance structures and to further strengthen the relations with national institutions, following a multi-stakeholder approach. Moreover, the project is fostering the engagement of the private sector: industrial facilities from key sectors are participating in the design phase of the PRTR system and will report to National Authority. For example, industries engaged in the PRTR pilot reporting at national level, expressed appreciation for training programme and guidance provided in the framework of the project activities. Private sector was invited to attend different national workshops (e.g. Peru, Moldova, Cambodia) and given the opportunity to share their experience in joining the voluntary reporting of emissions and transfer of pollutants identified under the national PRTR system. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Gender mainstreaming** | *Describe progress, challenges and outcomes related to the gender-responsive measures documented at CEO Endorsement/ Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent. Older projects that were designed before gender mainstreaming should proactively report any possible gender benefits, as appropriate.*  One of the objectives of the project, among others, is to enhance public access to information on the environment, to facilitate public participation, and to contribute to pollution prevention and reduction. Increased access to information made available by national PRTR systems enables communities to empower themselves with the knowledge of environmental issues that may impact their homes, health and/or livelihoods. Such knowledge made publicly available will allow community members to take informed decisions to protect their own wellbeing, by protecting themselves from environmental hazards. Information on threats posed by local environment pollution is particularly important to women, whose traditional roles in many of the participating countries see them as the main collectors of water, and growers of produce for domestic consumption. Knowledge of environmental pollution provided by PRTR pilot activities is therefore particularly empowering to women. The gender analysis also showed a good percentage of women attendance during the different seminars and national workshops, mostly from governmental institutions, e.g. ministries and national agencies. Awareness raising campaigns also contributed to reach out to women, e.g. in Cambodia 54% of the people who attended training and events were women. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Knowledge activities and products** | *Provide a narrative of knowledge activities/ products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement/ Approval*  During the project, knowledge sharing was fostered through a wide range of tools such as UNITAR website, social media, outreach activities, publications, lessons learned, informative videos and brochures. A dedicated online platform was developed (available at prtr.unitar.org) in order to collect relevant PRTRs publications, guidance materials, documents and national strategies produced under the project. At national level, knowledge activities included the implementation of awareness raising campaigns in order to increase public knowledge of environmental issues and in using PRTR information made available on the national PRTR reports and websites. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Stories to be shared** | *Optional for mature projects: Provide a brief summary of any especially interesting and impactful project results that are worth sharing with a larger audience, and/or investing communications time in, if any.*  The project contributed to the legal adoption of PRTR legislation in Moldova, allowing the country to establish the necessary legal framework for the annual reporting of emissions from the industrial sector and facilitate country’s compliance with the PRTR Protocol. Thanks to the support given through the project activities, the implementation of PRTR system in Kazakhstan has been prioritized in the government’s agenda. As a result, the Government approved the documentation for accession to PRTR Protocol and passed the documents to the Senate, the ratification of the Protocol is expected before the end of the year. The adoption of a specific PRTR legislation at national level is an important step for the sustainability of the reporting system beyond the project implementation. |
|  | |

1. **RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND RISK**

*Based on inputs by the Project Manager, the* ***UNEP Task Manager****[[1]](#footnote-1) will make an overall assessment and provide ratings of:*

1. *Progress towards achieving the project Results(s)- see section 3.1*
2. *Implementation progress – see section 3.2*

*Section 3.3 on Risk should be first completed by the Project Manager. The UNEP Task Manager will subsequently enter his/her own ratings in the appropriate column.*

* 1. **3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project Results(s**) [copy and paste the CEO Endorsement (or latest formal Revision) approved Results Framework, adding/deleting outcome rows, as appropriate]

| **Project objective and Outcomes** | **Indicator[[2]](#footnote-2)** | **Baseline level[[3]](#footnote-3)** | **Mid-term target or Milestones[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **End of project target** | **Observations/justification on rating** | **Progress rating [[5]](#footnote-5)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective[[6]](#footnote-6):**  To improve access and accuracy of environmental data on POPs and other priority chemicals in 6 countries, and to enhance awareness and public participation on environmental matters, through implementation of fully operational national PRTRs. | Number of PRTRs operational and serving POPs reporting and access to information purposes | Participating countries (6) have designed national PRTR systems | n/a | 6 National PRTR pilots completed | 5 National PRTR pilot report submitted to UNITAR. Ecuador will submit the report by the end of 2019, according to the extended agreement signed in May 2019. | MS |
| **Outcome 1:**  National PRTR proposal guides implementation of PRTRs and guides the development of country-specific PRTR legal instruments | Existing materials identified | Reports from previous national PRTR projects and initiatives and from international organizations |  | Initial guidance materials available and used by participating countries | Library of existing resources and international guidelines on PRTRs made available by UNITAR through the online PRTR Platform (prtr.unitar.org) | S |
| Number of PRTR national executive proposals updated | Preliminary PRTR proposals developed in Phase I in all countries. |  | 6 updated national PRTR proposals | 5 updated National PRTR Proposals submitted to UNITAR. Ecuador will submit the document by the end of 2019, according to the extended agreement signed in May 2019. | MS |
| Number of draft legal instrument for PRTRs developed in support of the establishment of PRTRs | Preliminary draft legal frameworks prepared in Ecuador and Peru and other countries started internal discussions |  | 6 drafts of the national PRTR legal framework | Kazakhstan included specific PRTR provisions in the Environmental Code already adopted at national level.  Cambodia prepared a draft decreedand Peru have identified possible legal instruments in order to include PRTR in the current national legislation. In Moldova a national decree to establish PRTR reporting has been adopted by the parliament. | S |
| **Outcome 2:** Capacity for collecting and using PRTR data increased significantly in each country, resulting in increased public knowledge of environmental issues and in using PRTRs as a basis for the development of SC national reports. | Number of training modules to address key issues on PRTR developed | PRTR online training platform from UNITAR (PRTR:Learn) |  | At least 5 or 6 global training modules developed | 5 training modules have been developed and uploaded on PRTR:Learn platform. The text for a new module on the PRTR Protocol (Kiev Protocol) is being discussed with the Secretariat (UNECE). | S |
| Number of national training programmes and sessions developed | PRTR awareness-raising and basic training programmes were initiated in the previous UNEP-GEF project |  | At least 6 training sessions per country  At least 5 industry sectors trained per country | All participating countries successfully held the national inception workshop and training of reporting industries and government officials. | S |
| Number of national specific guides on estimation techniques for key or priority sectors | Cambodia has developed preliminary guides on emission factors for: thermal power stations, plants for the pre-treatment; incineration, open burning of waste; medical waste. Peru has developed them for  a) Production of fish flour; b) Smelting of iron and steel; and c) Smelting of non-ferrous metals |  | At least 4 guidelines developed | Cambodia, Moldova, Kazakhstan and Peru have developed national guidelines on available release estimation techniques (RET). | S |
| **Outcome 3:**  Revised guidance on PRTRs and POPs reporting in use by each participating country ensures comparable PRTR systems. | Number of documents related to PRTR standardization reviewed | OECD publications on PRTRs on PRTR data, list of pollutants and sectors harmonization  CEC reports on standardization and comparability from 2002 to 2012 |  | Final report on standardization available  At least 20 international and national documents and studies reviewed | UNITAR PRTR Platform provided a specific module on best standardization practices. The video module is provided with a downloadable factsheet as well. | S |
| Revised concise guidelines on PRTR and POPs reporting | Guidance developed for Phase I |  | Guidance developed and endorsed by country projects | A comprehensive study on the possible integration of PRTR and MEAs reporting (including POPs) is being finalized. |
| Pilot testing results from countries analyzed and includes recommendations to improve PRTR systems and to improve the quality of data | No pilot testing on implementation has been conducted in the past |  | Pilot PRTR reports available at project website | 5 countries have conducted PRTR pilot trials and collected data from industrial facilities.  Once reports will be finalized, they will be uploaded on the project website (prtr.unitar.org). Ecuador will submit the pilot report by the end of 2019, according to the extended agreement signed in May 2019. |
| **Outcome 4:**  Improved public access to PRTR data and dissemination of information allows full participation of key stakeholders. | Number of PRTR national consultation strategies developed | NGO awareness raising activities from project 2009-2012 |  | At least 6 national PRTR consultation strategies developed | 5 countries have drafted national strategies for public access to environmental information and PRTR data. Ecuador will submit the document by the end of 2019, according to the extended agreement signed in May 2019. | MS |
| Number of PRTR consultation strategies implemented | PRTR Consultation strategies from Canada, USA, UK, Spain and Australia available |  | At least 6 national PRTR consultation strategies implemented | 5 countries have implemented national dissemination and communication strategies. 4 reports have been submitted to UNITAR. Belarus is finalizing the implementation report. Ecuador will submit the document by the end of 2019, according to the extended agreement signed in May 2019. | S |
| **Outcome 5:[[7]](#footnote-7)**  Key lessons learned on PRTR development, improving access to information, and using PRTRs as POPs reporting tools disseminated among national stakeholders, and widely among SC Parties. | Report on lessons learned and main outputs | No lessons learned document developed for PRTR implementation |  | Final lessons learned report endorsed by stakeholders  Draft lessons learned report | Final lessons learned workshop was held in Siem Reap, Cambodia, in March 2019. The draft lessons learned report was endorsed by project stakeholders, including national coordinators and the implementing agency. | S |
| Number of Steering Committee Meetings reports available |  | 2 Steering Committee Meeting reports | 3 Steering Committee Meeting reports | 3 Project Steering Committee have been organized as planned:  - Madrid (November 2015)  - Lima (March 2018)  - Siem Reap (March 2019)  The 3 PSC meeting reports are available on the project website (prtr.unitar.org) |

Overall rating of project progress towards meeting project Result(s) (*To be provided by UNEP GEF Task Manager.)*

| **FY2018 rating** [previous] | **FY2019 rating**  [current] | **Justification of the current FY rating and explanation of reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods.** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| S | S | Progress towards meeting the objectives of the project is excellent except in Ecuador but the Executing Agency has taken proactive action to ensure progress in this. country |

**Risks to the delivery of results**

The second column should be completed by the Project Manager and the third column should summarize the recommendations that the Project Manager and Task Manager have agreed upon to address the problem/risk. Projects should complete only the relevant sections and are free to add/delete problems/risks. This section should inform the risk rating in section 3.3.

| **Problems/risks identified** | **Description of the problem/risk** | **Agreed recommended actions** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| on achieving targets |  |  |
| on stakeholder engagement |  |  |
| on gender actions |  |  |
| on safeguards |  |  |
| on delivering GEF Core Indicators |  |  |
| on delivering of PoW EA | The national implementation of the project in Ecuador is behind the agreed work plan and planned timeframe of activities | UNITAR, as implementing agency (EA), revised and amended the terms of reference under the agreement with the Ministry of Environment of Ecuador. A new tripartite agreement was signed in May 2019 with the scope to include a third national public institution able to manage and report on the expenditures and use of the funding made available through the project. the new agreement will be valid until 31 December 2019. |
| on sustainability of results |  |  |
| others |  |  |

**3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs**

| **Outputs [[8]](#footnote-8)** | **Expected delivery date [[9]](#footnote-9)** | **Implementation status as of 30 June 2018 (%)** | **Implementation status as of 30 June 2019 (%)** | **Progress rating justification** (as much as possible, describe in terms of immediate gains to target groups, *e.g. access to project deliverables, participation in receiving services; gains in knowledge, etc*) | **Progress rating[[10]](#footnote-10)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output 1: Project baseline strengthened and national needs identified** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activity 1: Review existing PRTR related materials | Jul-2016 | 100% | 100% | National Coordination Teams within the Ministry of Environment of the 6 participating countries were formed. National Steering Committee meetings were held to identify key actors and experts at national level. | S |
| Activity 2: Update PRTR national executive proposals | Nov-2016 | 90% | 90% | Peru, Moldova, Cambodia, Kazakhstan and Belarus have updated and reviewed with UNITAR their national PRTR proposals. Ecuador is expected to review and update the national PRTR proposal, which was developed in 2013, during the new terms of the agreement signed in June 2019 and valid until December 2019. | S |
| Activity 3: Draft national PRTR legal framework | Feb 2018 | 90% | 90% | Kazakhstan included specific PRTR provisions in the Environmental Code already adopted at national level and is expected to ratify the PRTR Protocol by the end of 2019.  Cambodia and Peru have identified possible legal instruments in order to include PRTR in the current national legislation.  Moldova, which is party to the PRTR Protocol, adopted a national legal framework that established national PRTR reporting. | S |
| **Output 2: Build capacity to implement PRTRs as a National POPs Reporting System** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activity 4: Develop and implement training modules for global use, including training platform | May 2017 | 100% | 100% | PRTR platform developed and available at the following link: http://prtr.unitar.org  The platform includes training module, library of guidance materials, news, workshops’ document, resource materials, informative videos, information on webinars, meetings. | S |
| Activity 5: Develop and implement national training for key sectors | Feb 2018 | 90% | 90% | National PRTR trainings for reporting industries, government officials, academia and media were successfully completed in Moldova, Peru and Cambodia. National training activities for civil society and key stakeholders were also undertaken in Kazakhstan and Belarus. Ecuador is expected to undertake national trainings during the second half of 2019. | S |
| Activity 6: Review and compile international guides on estimation techniques | Feb 2018 | 60% | 90% | Countries have developed national guidelines on available release estimation techniques (RET). In Cambodia, booklets on RETs for specific sectors were distributed to the industries participating in the PRTR pilot and translated in both English and Khmer language. In addition, UNITAR is finalizing a comprehensive study on integration of PRTRs and POPs reporting estimations. | S |
| Activity 7: Conduct pilots using PRTRs to report on POPs | Feb 2018 | 30% | 90% | All countries, except for Ecuador, have submitted their PRTR Pilot Reports to UNITAR. The reports include the data on the type and quantities of emissions from point sources of pollution (e.g. industrial facilities) selected from a specific industrial area and/or municipality. | S |
| **Output 3: Build capacity to implement PRTRs as a National POPs Reporting System** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activity 8: Collect and analyze materials on standardization | June 2017 | 100% | 100% | UNITAR PRTR Platform provide a module on best standardization practices. The module includes an accessible factsheet which includes guidance on the best practices of PRTRs standardization. | S |
| Activity 9: revise and finalize existing guidance on POPs inclusion into PRTRs | Dec 2018 | 50% | 85% | UNITAR sent out for comments the initial draft of the study on the integration of PRTRs data and MEAs reporting, which is currently being finalized. | MS |
| Activity 10: Analyze and compare PRTR data from pilots | Feb 2018 | 10% | 80% | PRTR pilot reports from countries were submitted and revised by UNITAR. Ecuador is expected to send the PRTR data from the pilot by the end of 2019. | MS |
| **Output 4: Access to PRTR data and public information** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activity 11: Develop national strategies for public access to environmental information | May 2017 | 90% | 90% | All 5 countries submitted the national strategies for public access to environmental information. Ecuador is expected to provide the PRTR communication strategy within the timeframe of the revised agreement. | S |
| Activity 12: Implement national strategies for public access to environmental information | Oct 2018 | 30% | 90% | Countries implemented the awareness raising strategy and dissemination of PRTR data. The information has been collected through national reports submitted to UNITAR. | S |
| **Output 5: Lessons learned and replication** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activity 13: Organize a global workshop on lessons learned | Nov 2015 | 100% | 100% | Workshop took place in November 2015 | S |
| Activity 14: Organize a mid-term global meeting on lessons learned | May 2017 | 100% | 100% | Workshop, including second PSC meeting was held in March 2018. | S |
| Activity 15: Organize a final global meeting on lessons learned | Dec 2018 | 0% | 100% | The final lessons learned workshop and third PSC meeting was held from 25 to 27 March 2019 in Siem Reap, Cambodia. | S |

Overall project implementation progress [[11]](#footnote-11) *(To be completed by UNEP GEF Task Manager.):*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FY2018 rating** [previous] | **FY2019 rating**  [current] | **Justification of the current rating and explanation of reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods.** |
| S | S | Implementation progress has remain on track in spite of the delay in Ecuador |

**Risks in implementation**

This section should be completed by the Project Manager and summarize implementation risks (e.g. procurement delays, reputational risks etc).

The first column should be completed by the Project Manager and the second column should summarize the recommendations that the Project Manager and Task Manager have agreed upon to address the problem/risk. This section should inform the risk rating in section 3.3.

| **Problems/risks identified** | **Agreed recommended actions** | **By whom** | **When** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The national implementation of the project in Ecuador has been significantly delayed.  UNITAR, as implementing agency (EA), revised and amended the terms of reference under the agreement with the Ministry of Environment of Ecuador. A new tripartite agreement was signed in May 2019 with the scope to include a third national public institution able to manage and report on the expenditures and use of the funding made available through the project. the new agreement will be valid until 31 December 2019. | Due to the limited timeframe to implement the remaining project activities and deliver the outputs in the terms of reference of the new agreement, the EA will provide additional support and assistance to the MOE of Ecuador, in order to guarantee the completion of the project according to the new workplan. Additional webinars, international experts and field missions will be provided after consultation with the national PRTR team and according to availability of funding. | EA | May 2019- December 2019 |

**3.3. Risk Rating** *[Insert the Medium and High Risks and mitigation measures identified at CEO endorsement (e.g. Section A.5) and any relevant risk from safeguards screening and/or management plans.]* *Expand the table to include medium and high risks observed during implementation, e.g. problems identified in sections 3.1. and 3.2.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | **Mitigation at CEO approval** | **Mitigation at implementation** | **Rank** |
| PRTRs not sustained by countries | Component 1 includes activities on legislation development, which will ultimately ensure the institutionalization and sustained use of PRTRs. However, the responsibility for the process of legislating rests with the participating government and will be beyond the life of the project. The project aims to develop sustained capacity in each of the participating countries, and includes a pilot PRTR reporting exercise, as well as a full reporting exercise, to allow countries to “learn by doing.” It is hoped that this approach will lead to the institutionalization of PRTRs well before legislation takes effect. | Long term sustainability of the project will be determined by national endorsement of the PRTR proposal and political willingness to adopt a legislative framework to make PRTR reporting mandatory at national level. Countries such as Moldova and Kazakhstan have already adopted national PRTR legal framework that will support the long-term sustainability of the PRTR systems. | CEO: **M** |
| TM:M |
| PM: |
| **Overall Risk Rating**  **Project Manager** | | |  |
| Overall Risk Rating  Task Manager | | | M |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FY2018 rating** [previous] | **FY2019 rating**  [current] | **Justification of the current risk rating and explanation of reasons for change (positive or negative) since previous reporting periods.** |
|  | M | Sustainability of the PRTR beyond project implementation remain a risk. |

**High Risk (H):** There is a probability of greater than 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.   
**Substantial Risk (S):** There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.   
**Modest Risk (M):** There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.   
**Low Risk (L):** There is a probability of up to 25% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.

**Optional Annexes and/or Links:**

* **Project Steering Committee Minutes of the year reported**
* **Half yearly Report**
* **Quarterly Reports**
* **Risk Factor Table form previous template (recommended for substantial and high-risk projects)**

**Risks Factor Table**

*There are two tables to assess and address risk: the first “risk factor table” to describe and rate risk factors; the second “top risk mitigation plan” should indicate what measures/action will be taken with respect to risks rated* ***Substantial*** *or* ***High*** *and who is responsible to for it.*

**High Risk (H):** There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.   
**Substantial Risk (S):** There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.   
**Modest Risk (M):** There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.   
**Low Risk (L):** There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.

|  |
| --- |
| **RISK FACTOR TABLE** |
| ***Project Managers*** *will use this table to summarize risks identified in the* ***Project Document*** *and reflect also* ***any new risks*** *identified in the course of project implementation. The Notes column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project,* ***as relevant****. The “Notes” column has one section for the Project Manager (****PM)*** *and one for the UNEP Task Manager (****TM)****. If the generic risk factors and indicators in the table are not relevant to the project rows should be added. The* ***UNEP Task Manager*** *should provide ratings in the right hand column reflecting his/her own assessment of project risks.* |

|  |  |  |  | **Project Manager Rating** | | | | | | **Notes** | **Task Manager Rating** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Factor** | **Indicator of Low Risk** | **Indicator of Medium Risk** | **Indicator of High Risk** | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined |  | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined |
| **INTERNAL RISK** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Project management** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Management structure | Stable with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood | Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others | Unclear responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Project teams are clear of their roles and have experience in project management | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Governance structure | Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet periodically and provide effective direction/inputs | Body(ies) meets periodically but guidance/input provided to project is inadequate. TOR unclear | Members lack commitment Committee/body does not fulfil its TOR | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: The Project Steering Committee met regularly. Three PSC meetings have been organized | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Internal com­munications | Fluid and cordial | Communication process deficient although relationships between team members are good | Lack of adequate communication between team members leading to deterioration of relationships and resentment | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Communication with National Coordinators from the countries was fluid and responsive. Following the recent changes in the project management team in Ecuador and the signature of the new tripartite agreement the communication with the national coordinator has improved. | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Work flow | Project progressing according to work plan | Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall timetable | Major delays or changes in work plan or method of implementation |  | X |  |  |  |  | PM: No major delays or changes in the workplan have been encountered during the implementation of the project.  After a period of lack of responsiveness and administrative constraints, the project in Ecuador is progressing and activities are foreseen to end by the end of 2019. | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Co-financing | Co-financing is secured, and payments are received on time | Is secured but payments are slow and bureaucratic | A substantial part of pledged co-financing may not materialize | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Co-financing reports are being collected from implementing partners at national level. The total amount of co-financing might result to be less than originally approved in the project document. | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Budget | Activities are progressing within planned budget | Minor budget reallocation needed | Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: No budget reallocations have been requested by the implementing agency. | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Financial management | Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for | Financial reporting slow or deficient | Serious financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Funds are correctly managed and transparently reported on a six-months basis. Peru is managing the funds through UNDP Peru. All other countries are managing the funds through national accounts and reporting regularly to UNITAR. | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Reporting | Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues | Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed or lack critical analysis of progress and implementation issues | Serious concerns about quality and timeliness of project reporting | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: All countries are reporting complete information about the project activities through narrative reports submitted every six months. Final narrative reports have been collected from the countries (with the exception of Ecuador, which is expected to submit the final narrative report by December 2019) | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Stakeholder involvement | Stakeholder analysis done and positive feedback from critical stakeholders and partners | Consultation and participation process seems strong but misses some groups or relevant partners | Symptoms of conflict with critical stakeholders or evidence of apathy and lack of interest from partners or other stakeholders | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: UNITAR is implementing the project following a multi-stakeholder approach, meaning that each participating country established a national steering committee of the project which involves all national key stakeholders of PRTR implementation. | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| External com­munications | Evidence that stakeholders, practitioners and/or the general public understand project and are regularly updated on progress | Communications efforts are taking place but not yet evidence that message is successfully transmitted | Project existence is not known beyond implementation partners or misunderstand­ings concerning objectives and activities evident | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Communication of project objectives, activities and progress to global stakeholders has been carried out regularly by UNITAR as executing agency. By participating in international level meetings such as the Global Round Table on PRTRs, the OECD PRTR Working Group and the Meeting of the Parties of the PRTR Protocol. At national level, implementing partners have also undertaken communication strategies to regularly inform national stakeholders on project activities and results. | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Short term/long term balance | Project is addressing short term needs and achieving results with a long term perspective, particularly sustainability and replicability | Project is interested in the short term with little understanding of or interest in the long term | Longer term issues are deliberately ignored or neglected | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Long term sustainability of the project will be determined by national endorsement of the PRTR proposal and political willingness to adopt a legislative framework to make PRTR reporting mandatory at national level. Countries such as Moldova and Kazakhstan have already adopted national PRTR legal framework that will support the long term sustainability of the PRTR systems. | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Science and technological issues | Project based on sound science and well established technologies | Project testing approaches, methods or technologies but based on sound analysis of options and risks | Many scientific and /or technological uncertainties | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: N/A | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Political influences | Project decisions and choices are not particularly politically driven | Signs that some project decisions are politically motivated | Project is subject to a variety of political influences that may jeopardize project objectives |  | X |  |  |  |  | PM: The Government of Kazakhstan, as a result of this project, have passed the law on PRTR implementation which now is being review by the Senate; it is foresee that the country will also ratify the PRTR Protocol by the end of 2019. The Government of Moldova also approved the PRTR legal framework.  The MOE of Peru is currently drafting a new law on chemicals and PRTR provisions will be included.  In Cambodia, the MOE is working on a “Self-Monitoring” system for industries, synergies and integration of PRTR into the self-monitoring have been considered.  Belarus at the moment seems to lack the political willingness to adopt national PRTR legislation and ratify the PRTR Protocol |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Other, please specify. Add rows as necessary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |

|  |  |  |  | **Project Manager Rating** | | | | | | **Notes** | **Task Manager Rating** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Factor** | **Indicator of Low Risk** | **Indicator of Medium Risk** | **Indicator of High Risk** | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined |  | Low | Medium | Substantial | High | Not Applicable | To be determined |
| **EXTERNAL RISK** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Project context** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Political stability | Political context is stable and safe | Political context is unstable but predictable and not a threat to project implementation | Very disruptive and volatile |  | X |  |  |  |  | PM: In 2016, Moldova, Ecuador and Peru changed the Ministry of Environment, with subsequent delays in signing the agreement and starting the implementation of the project. In 2017 Belarus changed the director of the national institution in charge of the project implementation (RSE BRC Ecology). |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Environmental conditions | Project area is not affected by severe weather events or major environmental stress factors | Project area is subject to more or less predictable disasters or changes | Project area has very harsh environmental conditions | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: N/A | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Social, cultural and economic factors | There are no evident social, cultural and/or economic issues that may affect project performance and results | Social or economic issues or changes pose challenges to project implementation but mitigation strategies have been developed | Project is highly sensitive to economic fluctuations, to social issues or cultural barriers | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: N/A | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Capacity issues | Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners | Weaknesses exist but have been identified and actions is taken to build the necessary capacity | Capacity is very low at all levels and partners require constant support and technical assistance | X |  |  |  |  |  | PM: Knowledge and capacities of national teams on PRTR implementation have been improved through customized face-to-face trainings, seminars, workshops and webinars. | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Others, please specify |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*If there is a significant (over 50% of risk factors) discrepancy between Project Manager and Task Manager rating, an explanation by the Task Manager should be provided below*

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **TOP RISK MITIGATION PLAN** |
| Rank – importance of risk  Risk Statement – potential problem (condition and consequence)  Action to take – action planned/taken to handle the risk  Who – person(s) responsible for the action  Date – date by which action needs to be or was completed |

| **Rank** | **Risk Statement[[12]](#footnote-12)** | | **Action to Take** | **Who** | **Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Condition** | **Consequence** |  |  |  |
| **Medium** | The national implementation of the project in Ecuador has been significantly delayed between 2017 and 2018. | UNITAR, as implementing agency (EA), revised and amended the terms of reference under the agreement with the Ministry of Environment of Ecuador. A new tripartite agreement was signed in May 2019 with the scope to include a third national public institution able to manage and report on the expenditures and use of the funding made available through the project. the new agreement will be valid until 31 December 2019. | Due to the limited timeframe to implement the remaining project activities and deliver the outputs in the terms of reference of the new agreement, the EA will provide additional support and assistance to the MOE of Ecuador, in order to guarantee the completion of the project according to the new workplan. Additional webinars, international experts and field missions will be provided after consultation with the national PRTR team and according to availability of funding. | EA | May 2019- December 2019 |

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High) (*Please include PIR risk ratings for all prior periods, add columns as necessary*):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FY2018 rating** | **FY2019 rating** | **Comments/narrative justifying the current FY rating and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period** |
| L | L | Appart from the delay in Ecuador, the overall risk is low. |
|  | | **If a risk mitigation plan had been presented for a previous period or as a result of the Mid-Term Review/Evaluation please report on progress or results of its implementation** |
|  |

1. For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Add rows if your project has more that 3 key indicators per objective or outcome. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Depending on selected indicator, quantitative or qualitative baseline levels and targets could be used (see Glossary included as Annex 1). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Many projects did not identify Mid-term targets at the design stage therefore this column should only be filled if relevant. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). See Annex 2 which contains GEF definitions. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Add rows if your project has more than 4 objective-level indicators. Same applies for the number of outcome-level indicators. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Add rows if your project has more than 5 Outcomes. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Outputs and activities as described in the project log frame or in any updated project revision. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. As per latest workplan (latest project revision September 2016) [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Only for Substantial to High risk. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)