**UN Environment GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2019**

1. July 2018 to 30 June 2019)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Identification** | | | *4881* | *SB-001062.01.01.01* | |
| Project Number + Project Title | | | *Continuing regional Support for the POPs Global Monitoring Plan under the Stockholm Convention in the Latin American and Caribbean Region* | | |
| Duration months | *Planned* | | *48 months* | | |
| *Extension(s)* | |  | |  |
| Division(s) Implementing the project | | | *UNEP GEF Chemicals and Waste* | | |
| Executing Agency(ies) | | | *Basel Convention Coordinating Centre, Stockholm Convention Regional Centre, for Latin America and the Caribbean Region (BCCC-SCRC) hosted by Uruguay* | | |
| Project Type | | | *FSP* | | |
| Project Scope | | | *Regional* | | |
| Region *(delete as appropriate)* | | | *LAC* | | |
| Names of Beneficiary Countries | | | *Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Jamaica, Mexico, Peru and Uruguay* | | |
| 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) | | | *Where appropriate, insert the most relevant SDG target(s) and indicator(s) to which the project contributes* | | |
| GEF financing amount | | | *3636000* | | |
| Co-financing amount | | | *13375401* | | |
| Date of CEO Endorsement | | | *17-Dec-14* | | |
| Start of Implementation | | | *09-Sep-15* | | |
| Date of first disbursement | | | *09-Sep-15* | | |
| Total disbursement as of 30 June | | | *1335693* | | |
| Total expenditure as of 30 June | | | *1036321* | | |
| Expected Mid-Term Date | | |  | | |
| Completion Date | | *Planned* | *30-Sep-19* | | |
| *Revised* | *31-Dec-20* | | |
| Expected Terminal Evaluation Date | | |  | | |
| Expected Financial Closure Date | | | *21-Dec-21* | | |

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)**  *"a(i) Increase in the number of countries that have used UNEP analysis or guidance, and where possible are applying a multi-sectoral approach, in developing or implementing legislation, policies or action plans that promote sound chemicals management and implementation of the relevant multilateral environmental agreements and SAICM* |
| *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]*  PoW indicator a(i): National Governmental Agencies and Universities in 11 countries have implemented activities for deleting, managing hazardous substances and monitoring their impact on the environment and human health in the Latin American and Caribbean Region. | |

**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.* | |

*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]*  The UNDAFs of all the 11 countries involved in this project have been analyzed, in order for the project to be in line with them. The UNDAFs are closely linked to the MDGs and human development, with the aim to allow their achievement at the national level. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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]*  The project addresses the main problems related to POPs according to the following SDGs:  **SDG 1: End poverty in all its forms and everywhere**  **SDG 2: Eradicate hunger, achieve food security and improve nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture**  **SDG 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages**  **SDG 8: Decent work and economic growth**  **•** eradicating extreme poverty by avoiding exposures to harmful substances which causes lost wages due to illness, the death of current or potential wage earners, or financial hardship brought about by the crippling costs of medical expenses and long-term care for the chronically ill or for children with severe developmental problems.  • improving maternal health through identification of highly exposed mothers (at national scale) and initiating/triggering counter-measures;  • ensuring environmental sustainability through identification of primary pollutants and initiation of countermeasures; and  • developing a global partnership for development. |

*[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 20\_\_ |
| 1st PIR | 2nd PIR | 3rd PIR | 3rd PIR | … 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 20\_\_ |
| **MS** | **MS** | **MS** | **MS** |  |
| *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.***  BCCC-SCRC was the Executing Agency and it has coordinated all project activities implemented by the participant countries, and it also has provided technical assistance and guidance to the countries.  11 national project implementation agreements between the BCCC-SCRC and the countries have been signed (Brazil and Chile have signed the agreements but breast milk activities are not included on them)  Ecuador and Uruguay have implemented their activities through their respective Ministries of Environment, Peru through the Directorate of Health. The BCCC-SCRC is managing the project funds for these countries (Ecuador, Peru and Uruguay). In Argentina, the National Executing Agency is BCRC-INTI hosted by Argentina*.* In Brazil, the National Executing Agency is SCRC-CETESB hosted by Brazil*.* Antigua & Barbuda, Barbados, Chile have implemented their activities through their respective Ministries of Environment. Colombia, Jamaica and Mexico have implemented their activities through Universities  **The project is being executed in a good way, the expected objectives are being met, following is describing the Project’s progress per item:**   * AIR MONITORING   Antigua & Barbuda, Argentina, Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Jamaica, Mexico and Uruguay (10 countries) have finished the air monitoring campaign December 2018 (8th campaign in total since the beginning of the project) and these countries have sent their PUFs to the reference laboratories of the Project.  Peru installed the PAS on May 2018 and will continue until May 2020. The General Directorate for Environmental Health (DIGESA) is in charge of this activity.  The active air sampler was purchased by the BCCC-SCRC from the project suggested supplier and coordinated the shipment to Brazil. The active sampler was installed on May 2018 at CETESB, Sao Paulo, Brazil, and they collected active samples and sent them to the reference laboratories. The CSIC, in collaboration with the BCCC-SCRC, developed a video on the management of the active sampler, summarizing the standard operating procedure (SOP) developed within the framework of the project.   * WATER MONITORING   Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, Jamaica and Mexico have finished the water monitoring on December 2018 (8th campaign in total since the beginning of the project), these countries have sent their samples to the reference laboratory in Örebro.   * BREAST MILK MONITORING   Antigua & Barbuda, Argentina, Barbados, Colombia, Ecuador, Jamaica, Mexico, Peru and Uruguay have finished the breast milk monitoring.  Brazil and Chile have signed the agreements with the BCCC-SCRC but breast milk activities are not included.  The video on breast milk sampling guideline has been developed by the BCCC-SCRC and is available in English, French and Spanish.   * NATIONAL SAMPLES   The countries have started the sampling of their national samples; Antigua& Barbuda, Argentina, Barbados, Brazil, Colombia, Jamaica and Uruguay have sent them to the reference laboratories.   * GLOBAL INTERLABORATORY ASSESSMENT   In the 3rd round of the Biennial Global Interlaboratory Assessment participated the following countries: Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru and Uruguay. POPs listed in the annexes of the Stockholm Convention until 2013 were included in the assessment (in addition, hexachlorobutadiene listed in 2015).  Test materials included: naturally contaminated samples: sediment, fish, human milk, air extract, human blood (plasma) and surface water and Standard solutions.  Samples were sent by MTM Research Centre, Örebro University or IVM VU University July 2016.  The workshop to address the interlaboratory results was held in China, April 6th – 8th, 2017. The BCCC-SCRC Uruguay organized the workshop together with the BCRC-SCRC China. The participating countries were Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador and Uruguay. Mexico was invited but they could not come.  The 4th round of the Biennial Global Interlaboratory Assessment was launched in April, 2018. The invitations were sent to the countries and the registration was closed at April 30th.  Samples were sent by either MTM Research Centre, Örebro University or E&H VU University by early September 2018.  The participant’s countries sent the result on January 2019.   * TRAININGS   The **analytical trainings** made by CSIC have been developed in:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Country** | **Date** | | Colombia | December 2017 | | Jamaica | January 2018 | | Brazil | February 2018 | | Uruguay | April 2018 | | Barbados | May 2018 | | Antigua & Barbuda | March 2019 |   Under the Project “Establishing the Tools and Methods to Include the Nine New POPs into the Global Monitoring Plan” the BCCC-SCRC supported the **webinar about Analysis of New POPs** of the Stockholm Convention. This Webinar was done on May 2016, with the following topics:  \* PFOS analysis guide.  \* Passive and active samplers for air sampling.  \* Brief comments about analysis of PBDE and HBCD.  The webinar was aimed at laboratories and technical personnel linked to the sampling and analysis of persistent organic pollutants (POPs).   * PROJECT EXTERNAL REVISION   The UNEP GMP 2 external revision evaluator has been interacted with the participant countries among this period by email and Skype as well as with the BCCC-SCRC.  The evaluator has met via Skype with the BCCC-SCRC at least three times since the project beginning, and has sent to the BCCC-SCRC two questionnaires trying to acquire all the project information during this period.  During the Medellin workshop there were several meetings between the evaluator and the members’ countries as well as a plenary discussion.   * ANALYSIS OF POPS IN THE DIFFERENT MATRICES   Some countries like Argentina, Colombia, Jamaica and Uruguay are starting to analyze the basic POPs in the different matrices (breast milk, national’s samples, PUFs).   * REGIONAL WORKSHOPS (INCEPTION, MEDIUM TERM, GENEVA MEETING)   The **inception workshop** was held in Montevideo (December 2th - 4th, 2015). The participant’s countries were Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Jamaica, Mexico, Peru and Uruguay.    **The Project Steering Committee met during the inception workshop.**  The **Midterm workshop** was held in Medellin, Colombia (June 11th - 13th, 2018).  The BCCC-SCRC organized the workshop in Medellin, sent the invitations, purchased the flight tickets, made agreements with the hotel and other catering services, audio-visual equipment and translation for the successful development of the workshop. The DSAs were also managed from the BCCC-SCRC offices.  The participant’s countries were Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Jamaica, Mexico, Peru and Uruguay. In addition to the national delegates, there were experts from the reference laboratories, UNEP personnel and representatives from other monitoring networks, as can be seen in the agenda. The UNEP GMP 2 external evaluator also attended this workshop. RECETOX and the BRS Secretariat participated via Skype.  The objectives of the workshop were met:  • Strengthening communication among core partners on the progress of the POPs Global Monitoring Plan in the GRULAC Region.  • Discussing on the needs, opportunities and challenges beyond POPs GMP2.  • Development of the national report and the sustainable plan.  The workshop documents and presentation there are in the following link: http://www.ccbasilea-crestocolmo.org.uy/es/estocolmo/proyectos/proyecto-gmp/  **The Project Steering Committee met during the Midterm workshop.**  The workshop was carried out successfully and the participants actively intervened. Final members’ assessments are attached as well as a draft version of the workshop report.  **Geneva meeting**  The meeting on the GMP 2 project was held in Geneva in May 8th, 2019, during the BRS Conventions COPs. In the meeting participated the national delegates that attended the BRS COP.  Highlights of the deliberations:  The project is in its final phase. All stakeholders must review and ensure that measures are in place for timely completion of remaining activities according to the work plan of the agreement:   * + Project coordinators to identify potential issues and challenges in timely implementing remaining activities and communicate to the UN Environment within two weeks where actions or assistance are needed.   + Initiate activities to establish the process for the preparation of national report of the project (see annex III for the suggested format of the national report).   + Ensure accuracy and completeness of Substantive Progress Reports and Expenditure reports and timely submission of them to facilitate the release of next installment, where applicable.   Follow-up activities:  Complete the survey on activities to improve the sustainability of POPs monitoring.  As project will be extended until June 2020, BCCC-SCRC has made amendment to agreements for extend the execution period, beyond that, the activities and products pending must finalize in 2019.  PNUMA suggested table of contents for the final report to be presented in December 2019. | | | | | |

*[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 20\_\_ |
| **MS** | **S** | **MS** | **MS** |  |
| Lot of progress achieved this year which means the implementation of the project is almost back on track. | | | | | |

*[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 20\_\_ |
| **L** | **L** | **M** | **L** |  |
| This project remains at low risk | | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder engagement** | *Describe progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO endorsement)*  *[section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal]* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Gender mainstreaming** | Gender dimensions  The project is of a scientific nature that does not directly impact people’s productive activities. Therefore the gender equity issue takes a different dimension than for pure emissions reductions activities. The particular vulnerability to POPs exposure of women in childbearing age was taken into account in the design of the monitoring activities, notably by the incorporation of mother’s milk as one of the core matrices of the POPs GMP. The collection of human milk samples has been conducted on the basis of the ethical clearance as required by WHO, and after signature of the statement of interest by both, health and environment sector.  For society as a whole, the health effects of exposures to harmful substances and hazardous waste lead to an increase in public health costs, loss in productivity, and a legacy of health and environmental problems passed down to future generations. The improper management of chemicals perpetuates a vicious cycle of resource degradation, increasing poverty and the erosion of livelihoods.  The participating countries clearly expressed the need and the interest to continue POPs Monitoring projects utilizing and improving established partnerships and cooperation. They concluded that the first phase of the project produced atmospheric data on POPs and in mothers’ milk in Latin American and Caribbean that was non-existent before. It trained various laboratories in the passive air sampling, analysis, quantitation and standardization of results. Its enhanced collaboration between countries and laboratories. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Knowledge activities and products** | *Provide a narrative of knowledge activities/ products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement/ Approval*  *[section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal]* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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.*  *[section to be shared with communication division/ GEF communication]* |
|  | |

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** | **Baseline level** | **Mid-Term Target or Milestones[[2]](#footnote-2)** | **End of Project Target** | **Observations/ justification on rating** | **Progress rating [[3]](#footnote-3)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective[[4]](#footnote-4)** | # of countries, capable to undertake sampling in the core and other matrices for POPs analysis | 0 | NOT DETERMINATED | 11 | 10 of 11 countries finished monitoring POPs on air. Peru will continue monitoring until May 2020 because it has started May 2018.  5 of 5 countries have finished the sampling for POPs monitoring on water.  9 of 11 countries have finished the sampling for POPs monitoring on breast milk. | S |
| # of countries with reported data on up to 23 POPs | 0 | NOT DETERMINATED | 11 |  | MU |
| # of regional roadmap for sustainable POPs monitoring published | 0 | NOT DETERMINATED | 1 | During the interim workshop (Medellin, Colombia June 11th - 13th, 2018) the countries started an awareness raising process on this issue. | MS |
| **Outcome 1:** | national project implementation agreements signed | 0 | NOT DETERMINATED | 11 | 11 national project implementation agreements signed (Brazil and Chile have signed the agreement but these do not include breast milk activities) | S |
| laboratories submitted information to UNEP for updating information in the databank | 0 | NOT DETERMINATED | At least 8 | The participant laboratories have submitted all the necessary information by answering a survey on training needs. | S |
| **Outcome 2:** | of countries that carried out sampling in abiotic matrices | 0 | NOT DETERMINATED | At least 10 | 10 of 11 countries have finished monitoring POPs on air. Peru will continue monitoring until May 2020 because it has started May 2018.  5 of 5 countries have finished the sampling for POPs monitoring on water. | S |
| **Outcome 3** | training reports for analysis of abiotic matrices | 0 | NOT DETERMINATED | At least 8 | Training for analysing abiotic matrices were done in 6 countries:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Country** | **Date** | | Colombia | December 2017 | | Jamaica | January 2018 | | Brazil | February 2018 | | Uruguay | April 2018 | | Barbados | May 2018 | | Antigua & Barbuda | March 2019 | | S |
| sectoral reports developed in abiotic matrices | 0 | NOT DETERMINATED | 2 (one on air; one on water) | 0 | MU |
| countries that carried out sampling in biotic matrices | 0 |  | At least 10 | 9 of 11 countries have finished the sampling for POPs monitoring on breast milk and they have sent the pools to the reference laboratory.  Brazil and Chile have signed the agreement but breast milk activities are not included. | MS |
| **Outcome 4** | training report for analysis of biotic matrices | 0 | NOT DETERMINATED | At least 8 | Training on breast milk analysis has been carried out in Colombia, Jamaica and Uruguay | MS |
| sectoral reports developed in biotic matrices | 0 | NOT DETERMINATED | 1 | 0 | MU |
| rounds for interlaboratory assessments held | 0 | NOT DETERMINATED | 2 | The workshop to share the results of the interlaboratory exercise was held in China, April 6th – 8th, 2017. The BCCC-SCRC Uruguay organized the workshop together with the BCRC-SCRC China. The participating countries were Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador and Uruguay. 10 countries have signed up into the 3rd round of the Biennial Global Interlaboratory Assessment; just 9 countries have submitted their results.  The 4th round of the Biennial Global Interlaboratory Assessment was launched in April, 2018. The invitations were sent to the countries and the registration was closed at April 30th.  Samples were sent by either MTM Research Centre, Örebro University or E&H VU University by early September 2018.  The participant´s countries sent the result on January 2019. | S |

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.** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| MS | MS | Despite accumulated delay in the previous years, the completion of the Mid-Term Review during this cycle and efforts put by the executing agency, the project has made a lot of progress during the past 12 months and country ownership remain strong |

**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 | Brazil and Chile have signed the agreement but breast milk activities are not included. |  |
| on gender actions |  |  |
| on safeguards |  |  |
| on delivering GEF Core Indicators |  |  |
| on delivering of PoW EA |  |  |
| on sustainability of results |  |  |
| others |  |  |

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

| **Outputs [[5]](#footnote-5)** | **Expected delivery date[[6]](#footnote-6)** | Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2018[[7]](#footnote-7) | Implement-ation status as of 30 June 2019) | **Progress rating justification** | **Progress rating[[8]](#footnote-8)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Output 1: Securing conditions for successful project implementation** | | | | | |
| Activity 1: Key stakeholders sign legal documents to carry POPs monitoring activities for all 23 POPs in the region | 12 month then start | 70% | 82% | The agreements between the BCCC-SCRC and the countries have been signed by 11 countries.  Brazil and Chile have signed the agreement but is not included breast milk activities. | MS |
| Activity 2: Organize a regional inception workshop to launch the project and detail the activities and responsibilities with a workplan and budget | 9 month then start | 100% | 100% | Completed | S |
| Activity 3: Update POPs laboratory databank with information on new laboratories, new POPs and new matrices. | 6, 12 and 48 month then start | 50% | 80% | The participant laboratories have submitted all the necessary information by answering a survey on training needs. The database should be updated with the information provided by the labs. | S |
| **Output 2: Capacity building and data generation on analysis of core abiotic matrices** | | | | | |
| Activity 4: Identify the sampling sites for air monitoring in the region, and provide them sampling equipment and materials to make them operational | 12, 24 and 40 month then start | 80% | 100% | 10 of 11 countries finished monitoring POPs on air. Peru which will continue monitoring until May 2020 because started in May 2018.  The active air monitor was installed in Brazil. | S |
| Activity 5: Identify strategic sampling sites for water monitoring in the region, and provide them sampling equipment and materials to make them operational | 12 and 40 month then start | 100% | 100% | Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, Jamaica and Mexico have finished the water monitoring December 2018 (8th campaign in total since the beginning of the project), these countries have sent their samples to the reference laboratory in Örebro. | S |
| Activity 6: Provide equipment, training and guidelines to make operational the national laboratories undertaking analysis of abiotic matrices in the region | 12, 184 and 24 month then start | 50% | 60% | The General procedure for analysis of POPs in abiotic matrices is ready in 3 languages (English, Spanish and French).  Training for analysing abiotic matrices have been done in 6 countries:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **country** | **Date** | | Colombia | December 2017 | | Jamaica | January 2018 | | Brazil | February 2018 | | Uruguay | April 2018 | | Barbados | May 2018 | | Antigua & Barbuda | March 2019 | | MS |
| Activity 7: Analyse national samples for air and water and report high quality data for the region | During 3 and 4 year  then start | 0% | 10% | The air monitoring started on January 2017 and finished on December 2018. Peru which will continue monitoring until May 2020 because started in May 2018. The countries have sent their samples to the reference laboratory in Örebro and Barcelona.  The water monitoring started on April 2017 and finished on December 2018. the sampling for POPs monitoring on water. The countries have sent their samples to the reference laboratory in Örebro.  Argentina, Colombia, Jamaica and Uruguay are starting to analyze the basic POPs in the different matrices (breast milk, national’s samples, PUFs) | MS |
| Activity 8: Summarize results of analysis from the region in two distinctive sectoral reports, i.e. one for air and one for water | 48 month then start | 0% | 0% |  |  |
| **Output 3: Capacity building and data generation on analysis of core biotic matrices** | | | | | |
| Activity 9: Provide materials and guidelines to countries in the region to undertake sampling of human milk for the 6th round of UNEP/WHO survey | 12 month then start | 100% | 100% | The guideline on breast milk sampling is available in both languages (English and Spanish) and all countries have received the glass bottles to take breast milk samples.  The video of guidelines on breast milk sampling is available in three languages (English, French and Spanish). | S |
| Activity 10: Provide materials, training and guidelines to national laboratories in the region to undertake analysis of human milk samples | 12 and 30 month then start | 40% | 40% | The General procedure for analysis of POPs in human milk is ready in 3 languages (English, Spanish and French).  Training on breast milk analysis has been carried out in Colombia, Jamaica and Uruguay. | MU |
| Activity 11: Successfully implement the 6th round of human milk survey in the Latin American and Caribbean region, with high quality data reported by the UNEP/WHO reference laboratory | 6 and 30 month then start | 36% | 85% | 9 of 11 countries have finished the monitoring sampling for POPs on breast milk and have sent the pool to the reference laboratory.  Brazil and Chile have signed the agreement but is not included breast milk activities. | MS |
| Activity 12: Compare results of the 6th round of human milk survey with data from earlier rounds and report them to the Global Monitoring Plan | During 3 year  then start | 0% | 0% |  | MU |
| **Output 4:**  **Assessment report of existing analytical capacities and reinforcement of national POPs monitoring** | | | | | |
| Activity 13: Organize two rounds of the “Biennial Global Interlaboratory Assessment for POPs Laboratories” implementing the 3rd and 4th round and prepare a report summarizing the test results | 21 and 45 month then start | 50% | 80% | The 3rd round of POPs interlaboratory exercise has finished. The lessons learned and results were addressed at the workshop held in Beijing, China, April 6th to 7th, 2017.  The 4th round of the Biennial Global Interlaboratory Assessment was launched in April, 2018. The invitations were sent to the countries and the registration was closed at April 30th.  Samples was sent by either MTM Research Centre, Örebro University or E&H VU University by early September 2018.  The participant´s countries sent the result on January 2019. | MS |
| Activity 14: At national level, each country identifies, collect and analyze samples of major interest for national chemicals management (such as fish or other foodstuffs but also sediments and soils), with high quality data being reported | 39 month then start | 0% | 10% | Argentina, Colombia, Jamaica and Uruguay are starting to analyze the basic POPs in the different matrices (breast milk, national’s samples, PUFs) |  |
| **Output 5: Securing conditions for sustainable POPs monitoring** | | | | | |
| Activity 15: Develop conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations from GMP phase 2 for future monitoring plan | 42 and 48 month then start | 0% | 0% |  |  |
| Activity 16: Prepare a state-of-the-art report to picture the present situation of POPs in the Latin American and Caribbean region’s environment and humans | 48 month then start | 0% | 0% |  |  |
| Activity 17: Develop a roadmap for sustainable POPs monitoring in the Latin American and Caribbean region | 36 and 48 month then start | 0% | 0% |  |  |

Overall project implementation progress [[9]](#footnote-9) *(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.** |
| MS | MS | Lot of progress achieved this year which means the implementation of the project is almost back on track. |

**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** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**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** |
|  |  |  | CEO: |
| TM: |
| PM: |
|  |  |  | CEO: |
| TM: |
| PM: |
|  |  |  | CEO: |
| TM: |
| PM: |
| ESERN  [add cells as appropriate to capture all Medium and High Risks] |  |  |  |
|  |
|  |
| **Overall Risk Rating**  **Project Manager** | | |  |
| Overall Risk Rating  Task Manager | | |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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.** |
| L | L | Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project to deliver the expected results and, whenever possible, the proposed measures to address these risks. Refer also to the assumptions and drivers e.g. when the assumptions are not holding and/ or the drivers are not in place. Please refer to the GEF risk rating table below |

**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 [Roles and responsibilities] | 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM : | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Governance structure  [oversight] | 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM : | 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Work flow  Budget | 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Budget | Activities are progressing within planned budget | Minor budget reallocation needed | Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Stakeholder engagement | 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| TM: |
| Other, please specify. Add rows as necessary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: |  | X |  |  |  |  |
| TM: Increased risk in recent months |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  | PM: | 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[[10]](#footnote-10)** | | **Action to Take** | **Who** | **Date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Condition** | **Consequence** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

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 | This project remains at low risk |
|  | | **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. Some projects are adopting/planning to adopt milestones for tracking the achievement of outcomes. Add the corresponding milestones in this column when applicable to inform the rating. Milestones are optional and may substitute for Mid-Term Target. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. 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-3)
4. Add rows if your objective has more than 3 outcome indicators. Same applies for the number of outcomes. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. As per latest workplan (latest project revision) [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Implementation may be assessed by qualitative assessments, percentage of delivery, and/or budget expenditure (planned and actually spent). The 2018 assessment should be copied from previous PIR. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. To be provided by the UNEP Task Manager [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. 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-9)
10. Only for Substantial to High risk. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)