



UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

Programme des Nations Unies pour l'environnement

Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente

Программа Организации Объединенных Наций по окружающей среде

برنامج الأمم المتحدة للبيئة

联合国环境规划署



PROJECT DOCUMENT

SECTION 1: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

1.1	Project title:	Supporting the POPs Global Monitoring Plan in the Pacific Islands Region	
1.2	Project number:	GFL/ PMS: 3663	
1.3	Project type:	MSP	
1.4	Sub-programme title:		
	GEF strategic long-term objective:	POPs 1	
	Strategic programme for GEF IV:	POPs 1	
1.5	UNEP priority:	Harmful substances and hazardous waste	
1.6	Geographical scope:	Regional multi-country: Pacific (Fiji, Kiribati, Niue, Samoa, Palau ¹ , Solomon Islands, Tuvalu)	
1.7	Mode of execution:	Internal	
1.8	Project executing organization:	UNEP DTIE Chemicals Branch (global coordination), in cooperation with the Institute of Applied Science/University of South Pacific (regional coordination)	
1.9	Duration of project:	18 months Commencing: December 2008 Completion: June 2010	
1.10	Cost of project	US\$	%
	Cost to the GEF Trust Fund	517,000	49.19
	Co-financing		
	Cash		
	UNEP Secretariat SC	24,000	2.29
	Australian Gov. through UNEP Secretariat SC	100,000	9.51
	Environment Canada	10,000	0.95

¹ Palau has not yet ratified the Stockholm Convention and is therefore not eligible to GEF funding for NIP implementation. The country will be linked to the project activities exclusively through co-funding.

<i>Sub-total</i>	134,000	12.75
In-kind		
Project participating governments*	320,000	30.45
UNEP	50,000	4.76
WHO	10,000	0.95
Recetox	10,000	0.95
Agencies / steering group member participation	10,000	0.95
<i>Sub-total</i>	400,000	38.06
Total	1,051,000	100

* Breakdown see section 6.2.

1.11 Project summary

According to Article 16 of the Stockholm Convention, its effectiveness shall be evaluated starting four years after the date of entry into force of the Convention and periodically thereafter. As Parties to the Convention, Pacific Islands countries are eligible for application of GEF funds to strengthen the monitoring capacity at national level and so to contribute with national data to the GMP. In the independent Pacific Islands countries only Fiji has laboratory facilities (at the University of the South Pacific) to reliably analyse POPs. The capacity of this laboratory to analyze POPs in GMP matrices will be enhanced by this project. The other participating countries will be involved in the project with sampling activities.

Development of detailed guidelines, protocols and manuals, as well as training of staff in the participating laboratory and strengthening the performance of sampling and analysis will enable the national partners to have the infrastructure in place to sample and analyse POPs according to international standards consistent with GMP Guidelines. With this, the project will strengthen the capacity of Pacific Islands countries for monitoring POPs concentrations in the key media and will facilitate reporting under the first and following effectiveness evaluation and drafting the regional reports.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION 1: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION	1
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	4
SECTION 2: BACKGROUND AND SITUATION ANALYSIS (BASELINE COURSE OF ACTION)	5
2.1. Background and context	5
2.2. Global significance	5
2.3. Threats, root causes and barrier analysis	5
2.4. Institutional, sectoral and policy context	5
2.5. Stakeholder mapping and analysis.....	6
2.6. Baseline analysis and gaps.....	7
2.7. Linkages with other GEF and non-GEF interventions.....	8
SECTION 3: INTERVENTION STRATEGY (ALTERNATIVE)	8
3.1. Project rationale, policy conformity and expected global environmental benefits ..	8
3.2. Project goal and objective.....	9
3.3. Project components and expected outcomes and results.....	9
3.4. Intervention logic and key assumptions.....	11
3.5. Risk analysis and risk management measures	11
3.6. Consistency with national priorities or plans.....	11
3.7. Incremental cost reasoning	12
3.8. Sustainability	12
3.9. Replication	12
3.10. Public awareness, communications and mainstreaming strategy	13
3.11. Environmental and social safeguards.....	13
SECTION 4: INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS	13
SECTION 5: STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION	13
SECTION 6: MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN	14
SECTION 7: PROJECT FINANCING AND BUDGET	15
7.1. Budget by project component and UNEP budget lines.....	15
7.2. Co-financing details	15
7.3. Project cost-effectiveness.....	16
APPENDICES	17
Appendix 1: Results Framework	
Appendix 2: Workplan and timetable	
Appendix 3: Key deliverables	
Appendix 4: Costed M&E plan	
Appendix 5: Standard Terminal Evaluation TOR	
Appendix 6: Budget by project component and UNEP budget lines	
Appendix 7: Co-financing commitment letters	
Appendix 8: Endorsement letters	
Appendix 9: PTS Pacific Islands Report	

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

COP	Conference of Parties
CVUA	Chemisches Untersuchungsamt Freiburg
DGEF	Division of GEF Coordination
DTIE	Division of Technology, Industry and Economics
EA	Executing Agency
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GEMS	Global Environment Monitoring System
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GMP	Global Monitoring Plan
IA	Implementing Agency
IAS	Institute of Applied Science
NIP	National Implementation Plan
PIC	Pacific Island Countries
PIR	Project Implementation Review
POPs	Persistent Organic Pollutants
PTS	Persistent Toxic Substances
QA/QC	Quality Assurance/Quality Control
RECETOX	Research Centre for Environmental Chemistry and Ecotoxicology
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
USP	University of South Pacific

SECTION 2: BACKGROUND AND SITUATION ANALYSIS (BASELINE COURSE OF ACTION)

2.1. Background and context

According to Article 16 of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs), its effectiveness shall be evaluated starting four years after the date of entry into force of the Convention and periodically thereafter. The Conference of Parties (COP) has decided (Decision SC-2/13) to complete the first effectiveness evaluation at its fourth meeting in 2009, and has agreed upon the essential modalities for the environmental monitoring component of the first evaluation. The Global Monitoring Plan (GMP) will focus initially on the core media mothers' milk/human blood to examine human exposure, and ambient air to examine long-range transport. COP3 Decision SC-3/16 invited the Global Environment Facility to incorporate activities related to the GMP and capacity-building in developing countries, small island developing states and countries with economies in transition as priorities for providing financial support. Needs for POPs analysis arise from these obligations of Parties when implementing the Stockholm Convention.

As Parties to the Convention, Pacific countries are eligible for application of GEF funds to strengthen the monitoring capacity at national level and so to contribute with national data to the GMP.

2.2. Global significance

The global environmental benefit has to be seen in the context of the efforts of the COP to establish an effective global system for monitoring of the effectiveness of the implementation of the Stockholm Convention. The project contributes to these efforts by strengthening the monitoring capacity at national level and with this enabling the participating countries to contribute national data to the GMP in a regionally and internationally agreed and harmonized approach.

2.3. Threats, root causes and barrier analysis

The UNEP Regionally Based Analysis project reported that there was very limited data on POPs in Pacific countries (Appendix 9), and no recent air or human samples (blood or milk) analyzed, except for Fiji's participation in the GEMS-Food Breast Milk Study in 2002.

The Pacific Region currently has very limited capacity to manage POPs and assistance is needed in all areas. This includes the need for increased monitoring capacity, improved regulations, management structures and enforcement systems.

2.4. Institutional, sectoral and policy context

Participating countries (except Palau, see footnote 2) in the project have ratified the Stockholm Convention and as Parties, are committed to comply with Convention's obligations on POPs monitoring, reporting and information dissemination. Table 1 indicate the date of ratification of the Stockholm Convention from participating countries:

Table 1: Date of Stockholm Convention ratification by participating countries.

Country Name	Date of Stockholm Convention ratification*
Fiji	20/06/2001
Kiribati	07/09/2004
Niue	02/09/2005

<i>Palau</i> ²	28/03/2002 (<i>signature</i>)
Samoa	04/02/2002
Solomon Islands	28/07/2004
Tuvalu	19/01/2004

2.5. Stakeholder mapping and analysis

Institute for Applied Science(IAS)/University of South Pacific (USP) will undertake the following activities:

1. Enter into a formal agreement with UNEP Chemicals and make contractual arrangements within the Pacific Islands countries to ensure the regional delivery according to project outputs including assignment of the USP/IAS laboratory as the reference laboratory for POPs analysis in this project;
2. Organize a sub-regional workshop to prepare a detailed workplan for the project implementation and to agree on Standard Operational Procedures;
3. Receive the expert back-up laboratory and UNEP Chemicals for the inspection tour at the onset of the project and convene relevant meetings with governmental sectors concerned with POPs analysis;
4. Provide the necessary information for designing the workplan of this project such as existing analytical manuals and procedures, and subsequently assist in the joint development of the training and capacity building needs;
5. Ensure provision of the necessary infrastructure to collect relevant samples in all participating countries;
6. Grant access for the back-up laboratory to the laboratory/laboratories for the training course and ensure participation of relevant staff at the training course;
7. Analyze the agreed samples and submit the results to the expert back-up laboratories and UNEP Chemicals;
8. Participate at the final workshop to discuss results and exchange views;
9. Write a final report summarizing the activities undertaken including lessons learned and future needs;
10. Write the financial statement on expenditures occurred during project implementation.

Partners for sampling in participating countries:

Fiji:	Department of Environment, Ministry of Tourism and Environment
Kiribati:	Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development
Niue:	Department for the Environment, Government of Niue
Palau:	Environmental Quality Protection Board
Samoa:	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment

² Palau has not yet ratified the Stockholm Convention and is therefore not eligible to GEF funding for NIP implementation. The country will be linked to the project activities exclusively through co-funding.

Salomon Islands: Environment and Conservation Division, Ministry of Environment,
Conservation and Meteorology

Tuvalu: Department of Environment, Ministry of Natural Resources and
Environment

The Expert Laboratory/ies will provide the following backup services:

1. Participate at the first regional workshop and provide input to the Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) development;
2. Undertake an inspection tour to the developing laboratories to verify infrastructure and operation of the laboratory (this activity is foreseen back-to-back with item 1 above);
3. Define needs for upgrading the laboratory with respect to spares, consumables, and training needs;
4. Prepare a report on the inspection tour and a work program for each of the laboratories for the coming months;
5. Undertake the training in the pilot laboratory according to needs identified; provide and analyze samples as a Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) tool;
6. Provide the necessary spares and consumables to the laboratories;
7. Prepare training manuals and final report on work undertaken in the feasibility study;
8. Provide support to the developing country laboratories and to UNEP Chemicals throughout the project.

2.6. Baseline analysis and gaps

There is no manufacture in the region of any Persistent Toxic Substances (PTS), although many of them are known to have been used in the region. The current usage of PTS pesticides in the region is low, and should be eliminated over the next 10 years or so. Existing stockpiles of PCBs and PTS pesticides should also be eliminated over the next few years. There is no evidence of PCBs being actively used in the region although small quantities are believed to still exist in a few in-use transformers.

Numerous hot spots have been identified, consisting mainly of stockpiles of hazardous wastes and obsolete chemicals, pesticides and transformer oils. Over 100 contaminated sites were identified, of which 54 were assessed as needing major remediation work. These sites include PCBs, buried pesticides, pesticides storage, timber treatment sites and rubbish dumps. Significant efforts will be required for remediation of these sites.

Generally, there is lack of data on the emissions of dioxins, furans and other complex organics from combustion processes and other sources in the region. Some estimates of dioxin emission have been made for some of the countries, on the basis of existing fuel use data (Appendix 9).

The amount of available data on environmental levels of PTS in the region is extremely limited. Of those samples analyzed, the majority have been environmental media (air, water, sediment and marine organisms used as pollution indicators). Hardly any data exists for levels in humans (plasma, milk, fat). Drinking water and food analyses are also very limited. Many Pacific Island countries appear to have had no PTS analyses performed.

From the samples available, a large number had detectable levels of PTS, owing both to local usage and global transport, especially by wind currents. PTS were recorded in some samples for which there is no record that that particular chemical was ever imported into that country. This could indicate either illegal entry or environmental transport.

In general, concentrations are relatively low for most samples. There are a few samples, however, especially of sediments from urban areas that would lead to a classification as contaminated sites in developed countries, and warrant remediation. There are also contaminated areas in Micronesia due to past military activities which have impacted marine food samples. Overall the highest concentrations of PTS tend to have been found for DDT and its derivatives, especially in Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands where DDT is used to control malarial mosquitoes, and PCBs, which have been used as electrical oil insulating material and often disposed of in a haphazard manner.

The results of the Regionally Based Assessment indicate that DDT, PCBs, dioxins and furans are considered to be among the highest priority PTS for the region. Regional meetings also identified other priority needs for the region, especially in terms of capacity building. These included priority needs in education, training and community awareness and participation, and requirements for chemical management systems, technology information and research.

2.7. Linkages with other GEF and non-GEF interventions

This proposal builds on the following activities which have been undertaken over the last years:

- Sub-regional workshops on various aspects of the Stockholm Convention and other related MEAs, organised by UNEP with assistance from SPREP (Cairns, 2001, Apia, 2001, Pohnpei (FSM), 2002, Nadi, 2003, Port Vila, 2004 and Wellington, 2005).
- The AusAID/SPREP POPs in PICs project (1997-2005) which is addressing existing problems and strengthening national capacities for the management of hazardous chemicals, contaminated sites and hazardous wastes. This programme has now progressed to the stage of clean-up and disposal of many of the existing stockpiles of POPs and other hazardous wastes.
- Participation by FSM and PNG in the GEF/UNEP 12-country pilot project on National Implementation Plans for the Stockholm Convention (2002-2005).
- GEF-funded enabling activity projects for preparation of National Implementation Plans in most other countries (as discussed above).
- SPREP participation in a UNEP pilot project on possible Regional Technical Centres for the Stockholm Convention (2004).
- The GEF/UNEP project on Regionally-based Assessment of Persistent Toxic Substances (2001-2003).
- Preparation of a review of regional POPs data by USP for Greenpeace (2000-2001).
- GEF/UNEP project on “Evaluation of Existing Capacities and Capacity Building Needs to Analyze POPs in developing Countries” in which the USP laboratory is one of nine pilot global laboratories (from seven countries) selected to be developed for regional POPs monitoring, 2006-2007.
- USP/EU project under RECETOX for atmospheric POPs monitoring using passive sampling, 2006-2007.
- WHO 4th Round of Breast Milk study on POPs.

SECTION 3: INTERVENTION STRATEGY (ALTERNATIVE)

3.1. Project rationale, policy conformity and expected global environmental benefits

COP 3 has identified a minimal initial need to monitor human milk and air at a regional level for the initial assessment with the future possible addition of further matrices. The Pacific area covers a large part of the earth's surface and so is critical for understanding transport of POPs.

The project is in line with POPs Strategic Program 1: Strengthening Capacities for NIP Implementation. The participating countries will build capacity to contribute internationally acceptable data to the Global Monitoring Plan of POPs and develop concepts for longer-term effectiveness evaluation of the Stockholm Convention in the region according to Decisions adopted at COP 2 and COP 3.

The project activities are based on the NIPs of the Pacific Islands countries involved as far as they are already available. Fiji, Kiribati, Niue, and Samoa have already finalized or prepared a final draft NIP, in Palau and Tuvalu the enabling activities for the NIP development are ongoing. Solomon Islands is in the process of initiating the NIP development (for more information see section 3.6).

3.2. Project goal and objective

The development objective of the project is that countries in the Pacific Islands have the capacity to contribute with national POPs analysis to the reporting under the Global Monitoring of POPs.

The immediate project objective is to build regional capacity on analysis and data generation for POPs in core matrices for the Global POPs Monitoring (GMP) to enable South Pacific Islands States to contribute to the global report submitted to the Conference of the Parties (COP).

3.3. Project components, expected outcomes and results

The project has the following components, expected outcomes and main outputs and indicators (for more details see Appendix 1: Results Framework):

Component 1: Standard operating procedures (SOPs) for sampling and analysis of POPs in relevant matrices:

Expected outcome:

- Sampling and analysis are performed according to international standard by all partners.

Expected output:

- Standard operating procedures for sampling of relevant matrices and analysis of relevant POPs according to SPREP reality.

Main indicator of achievement:

- SOPs will be available and accessible three months after project start.

Component 2: Adequately equipped laboratories and trained personnel to undertake sampling and analysis:

Expected outcomes:

- Lab personnel trained to high standard.
- Sampling in countries properly done.

Expected output:

- Reports on training, analysis and sampling exercise

Main indicator of achievement:

- Procurement of spares, consumables, standards, and small equipments will be carried out to enable analysis of GMP relevant compounds and matrices.

Component 3: Experiences in participation in international inter-calibration studies:

Expected outcome:

- QA protocols in place and used
- Participation in proficiency tests

Expected output:

- Data documented on analysis of reference materials and proficiency tests

Main indicator of achievement:

- Up to 5 laboratory staff will participate in two thematic training courses;
- The USP laboratory will have inscription in up to 2 international inter-calibration studies.

Component 4: High quality data on presence of POPs in Pacific Islands States are available:

Expected outcome:

- Increased regional awareness of POPs exposures.
- Baseline for later effectiveness evaluation.
- Network of passive air samplers established.

Expected outputs:

- Regional report on POPs levels in human milk and air from at least 4 countries.
- Report on comparison of SPREP data with other regions.

Main indicator of achievement:

- Chromatograms and results tables contribute to regional GMP cooperation plan and are available for interpretation.

Component 5: Governments and stakeholders are aware on details in implementation of the GMP issue in their national implementation plan and reporting to the COP:

Expected outcome:

- Improved implementation of the NIP recommendations with respect to POPs monitoring
- Increased knowledge of POPs presence and the implications in the Pacific Islands States
- Basis for follow-up project(s) developed

Expected outputs:

- Workshop Report
- Plan for longer term monitoring with baseline established

Main indicator of achievement:

- The long-term strategy is developed for future evaluations of GMP data by end of project;
- The COP established Regional Coordination Group ensures the cooperation at international level.

Project key deliverables are summarized in Appendix 3.

3.4. Intervention logic and key assumptions

In the independent Pacific island countries only Fiji has laboratory facilities (at the University of the South Pacific) to reliably analyze POPs. This will be enhanced by this project.

Participating countries will contribute by provision of samples and benefit by training in sampling, quality assurance and data management and interpretation as well as learning more about the POPs situation in their countries. The project will assist in establishing the baseline for POPs present in the Pacific Island States.

Development of detailed guidelines, protocols and manuals, as well as training of staff in participating laboratory and strengthening the performance of sampling and analysis will enable the national partners to have the infrastructure in place to sample and analyse POPs according to international standards consistent with GMP Guidelines. With this, the project will strengthen the capacity of Pacific Islands countries for monitoring POPs concentrations in the key media and will facilitate reporting under the first effectiveness evaluation and drafting the regional report.

The key assumptions are that the COP Decisions SC-2/13 and SC-3/16 remain unchanged in their main objectives beyond COP 4, and that the participating countries can ensure during the project and beyond the stability in personnel and provision of spares and consumables to maintain operation of POPs sampling sites and the POPs laboratory.

3.5. Risk analysis and risk management measures

A program involving seven countries has obvious logistical risks. The University of the South Pacific has campuses in each country and they will assist with liaison work. WHO has been a long-term partner in POPs work in the region and has representatives in Fiji, Samoa and Kiribati. All countries have WHO focal points. With this the project builds on an already existing network with proven capacity to carry out the project activities. Based on the positive experience made during the global UNEP/GEF Laboratory Project, the USP Laboratory was selected as regional hub for the POPs analysis training activities in the Pacific region.

The other major risk is the ability to do the laboratory work. As indicated above, the USP laboratory is one of nine pilot laboratories worldwide for UNEP support for POPs analyses and has also been supported by FAO. From previous experience it is expected that the USP Laboratory can be enabled to deliver analytical results for the basic POPs chemicals, only dioxin-like compounds analyses will be done in an experienced international partner laboratory. For Quality Assurance purposes, a number of samples will be analyzed in an experienced partner laboratory.

3.6. Consistency with national priorities or plans

The Pacific countries involved that have completed their NIPs (Fiji, Niue, Samoa) include a section on the need for POPs monitoring to satisfy Article II requirements. Kiribati and Samoa have already developed draft NIPs, in Palau and Tuvalu the enabling activities for the NIP development are ongoing. Solomon Islands is in the process of initiating the NIP development.

The Fiji plan, for example, contains:

Objective 1 (develop local capacity in POPs monitoring)

- Identify laboratory(ies) most capable of doing POPs analyses
- Support laboratory with training and appropriate resource allocation

Objective 2 (develop a cost-effective programme for POPs monitoring)

- Prepare POPs monitoring plan for Fiji as part of workshop on sectoral implementation responsibilities
- Source finances to support the program
- Implement monitoring and reporting with periodic review of monitoring plan and effectiveness of NIP activities that have been carried out

Other country NIPs contain similar components.

At its third meeting in May 2007, with participants from Kiribati, Nauru, and Samoa representing the Pacific Islands, the COP of the Stockholm Convention, by Decision SC-3/19 on effectiveness evaluation, provisionally adopted the amended GMP for POPs (UNEP/POPS/COP.3/22/Rev.1, annex II) and adopted the amended implementation plan for the GMP (UNEP/POPS/COP.3/23/Rev.1). Decision SC-3/19 also established a regional organization group for each of the five United Nations regions to facilitate regional implementation of the GMP and invited Parties to nominate members to those groups with expertise in monitoring and data evaluation. The main objectives of the regional organization group is to define and implement the regional strategy for information gathering, including capacity building, and to prepare the regional monitoring report for the first effectiveness evaluation to be performed by the Conference of the Parties in May 2009. The regional organization group inception workshop for the Asia-Pacific region was held in Beijing, China from 17-19 September 2007, with a participant from Fiji representing the Pacific Islands. The workshop prepared a summary of capacities, gaps and needs, and also developed regional maps indicating existing coverage of monitoring of the core matrices or those programmes under construction. The regional organization group identified Fiji as coordinator and confirmed the participating countries for this GEF project.

3.7. Incremental cost reasoning

Without this project baseline data on POPs contamination for several countries and available protocols for other Pacific island countries would not be developed and they could not meet their obligations under the Stockholm Convention. Global benefits in better understanding the transport of POPs would also not be available. The countries were chosen on the basis of having completed their NIPs (Fiji, Samoa, Niue and Kiribati) and to give a good geographical range for the regional effectiveness (Palau, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu). Baseline for selection of country partners and identification of the regional laboratory in Fiji is the databank developed under the global UNEP/GEF Laboratory Project (see Section 2.7.).

3.8. Sustainability

Countries participating in this project are Parties to the Stockholm Convention and will have to comply with Convention's obligations on monitoring, reporting and information dissemination. In May 2007, with participants from Kiribati, Nauru, and Samoa representing the Pacific Islands, the COP adopted the amended implementation plan for the GMP which is now the basis for all related activities even beyond the lifetime of this project (see also section 3.6.). All project countries will have included sustainability measures into their national planning and budgeting processes by the end of the project. See as well section 3.10 on Mainstreaming.

3.9. Replication

This project builds upon the experiences in the global UNEP/GEF Pilot Project on "Assessment of Existing Capacity and Capacity Building Needs to Analyse POPs in Developing Countries". Lessons learned and good practices from this regional Pacific Islands project reflecting now the aspects of a regional approach will be identified and shared with respective projects in other regions. Results will be shared through the regional and global

GMP coordination processes. The Meetings of the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention have been identified as places where the results of this project can be shared and presented. It is expected that following this first phase the GMP will be further developed; respective global follow-up concepts and projects will build on the capacity developed and lessons learned during this project.

3.10. Public awareness, communications and mainstreaming strategy

National Implementation Plans in participating countries have been developed through a multi-stakeholder processes, where representatives from key ministries participated and endorsed the final NIP. In those NIPs the development of an information exchange, monitoring and reporting system has been identified as national priorities. There is a direct interest and commitment of the countries to follow-up on the project activities on a longer term to serve the national efforts to comply with the Stockholm Convention.

3.11. Environmental and social safeguards

Sampling and analytical work in the participating laboratory will be carried out according to international safety standards and quality control. The POPs laboratory will apply the standards as established in “Good Laboratory Practices” (GLP) which includes the laboratory management of human resources, data reporting and storage, operation of equipment, and disposal of waste.

Generation of data and reporting of results will follow the guidelines that were established under the UNEP/GEF project on laboratory capacity to analyse POPs and according to UNEP’s GMP guidelines (Adopted by Stockholm Convention COP-3).

Countries participating in the mothers’ milk study will sign the statement of interest by both, health and environment sector as required by WHO.

SECTION 4: INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

UNEP Chemicals Branch, DTIE, will be the executing agency. It will provide administrative and technical supervision in the implementation of the project. UNEP Chemicals will closely liaise with the Stockholm Convention Secretariat, other co-funding partner, including the World Health Organization who is implementing a global mothers’ milk survey.

For the regional delivery in the South Pacific Islands region, the University of South Pacific (USP) through Institute of Applied Science (IAS) will be subcontracted to coordinate the project. USP/IAS will report to UNEP Chemicals.

It is envisaged to build upon the experiences in the UNEP/GEF Project on “Assessment of Existing Capacity and Capacity Building Needs to Analyse POPs in Developing Countries”. In order to provide highest technical standards, it is envisaged that UNEP Chemicals will subcontract the expert laboratories from Free University Amsterdam-IVM, the Netherlands, and Örebro University-MTM Centre, Sweden, for training and mirror analysis of samples, and organization of intercalibration studies. The WHO Reference laboratory for mothers’ milk at Chemisches Untersuchungsamt Freiburg (CVUA Freiburg), Germany, will assist in matters related to this ore matrix. Further coordination will be done with the programs implementing air monitoring activities such as Environment Canada, RECETOX-Czech Republic.

SECTION 5: STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

Key stakeholders and beneficiaries are Governmental Ministries and Agencies including the national focal points for the Stockholm Convention, research institutions, and to a lesser extend private institutions. The main beneficiary is the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention and especially the Parties in the South Pacific Islands region. The participating countries will be able to provide significant input to Article 16 of the Stockholm Convention by providing subregional data to the effectiveness evaluation and the Global Monitoring Plan for POPs.

The main direct beneficiary will be the participating laboratory receiving training and consumables/spares. Only Fiji has laboratory facilities at the University of the South Pacific with the potential to analyze POPs. The laboratory at the Institute of Applied Sciences (IAS) at University of South Pacific (USP) will serve as subregional laboratory in this project. It's existing capacities and experiences will be enhanced to the GMP matrices. IAS/USP will analyze the samples from all participating countries; some of the samples will be sent to an expert laboratory for mirror analysis. The other participating countries will be responsible to establish and maintain the networks for the air and human samples. They will design the sampling activities and collect the samples. They will also contribute to the interpretation of the samples (details see Section 2.5.).

Other direct beneficiaries are the environment and health sectors in all participating countries. Jointly, they will collect/organize the collection of mothers' milk samples for the GMP through the mothers donating the breast milk.

Ministries of Environment or other related institutions from the participating countries involved in the implementation of the monitoring component of the NIP will enhance their experiences in ambient air monitoring and interpretation of data.

Indirect beneficiaries are the general public since for most of the countries the first time, national data will be generated that will characterize their exposure to POPs. The ambient air data will provide information as to the "import" of POPs from neighboring regions and the human data will provide information as to the present exposure at the top of the food-chain. The staff operating the networks together with the laboratories – in the Pacific but also in cooperation with the expert laboratories will share experiences and mutually assist each other.

SECTION 6: MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN

The project will follow UNEP standard monitoring, reporting and evaluation processes and procedures. Reporting requirements and templates are an integral part of the UNEP legal instrument to be signed by the executing agency and UNEP.

The project M&E plan is consistent with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy. The Project Results Framework presented in Appendix 1 includes SMART indicators for each expected outcome as well as mid-term and end-of-project targets. These indicators along with the key deliverables and benchmarks as outlined in the work plan and project timetable included in Appendix 2 will be the main tools for assessing project implementation progress and whether project results are being achieved. The means of verification to track the indicators are summarized in Appendix 1. Other M&E related costs are also presented in the costed M&E Plan (Appendix 4) and are fully integrated in the overall project budget.

The M&E plan will be reviewed and revised as necessary during the project inception workshop to ensure project stakeholders understand their roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis project monitoring and evaluation. Indicators and their means of verification may also be fine-tuned at the inception workshop. Day-to-day project monitoring is the responsibility of the project management team but other project partners will have responsibilities to collect specific information to track the indicators. It is the responsibility of the Project Manager to

inform UNEP DGEF (GEF IA) of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that the appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely fashion.

The project Steering Committee will receive periodic reports on progress and will make recommendations to UNEP concerning the need to revise any aspects of the Results Framework or the M&E plan. Project oversight to ensure project meets UNEP and GEF policies and procedures is the responsibility to the Task Manager in UNEP-GEF. The Task Manager will also review the quality of draft project outputs, provide feedback to the project partners, and establish peer review procedures to ensure adequate quality of scientific and technical outputs and publications.

Project supervision will take an adaptive management approach. The Task Manager will develop a project supervision plan at the inception of the project which will be communicated to the project partners during the inception workshop. The emphasis of the Task Manager supervision will be on outcome monitoring but without neglecting project financial management and implementation monitoring. Progress vis-à-vis delivering the agreed project global environmental benefits will be assessed with the Steering Committee at agreed intervals. Project risks and assumptions will be regularly monitored both by project partners and UNEP. Risk assessment and rating is an integral part of the Project Implementation Review (PIR). The quality of project monitoring and evaluation will also be reviewed and rated as part of the PIR. Key financial parameters will be monitored quarterly to ensure cost-effective use of financial resources.

An independent terminal evaluation will take place at the end of project implementation. The Evaluation and Oversight Unit (EOU) of UNEP will manage the terminal evaluation process. A review of the quality of the evaluation report will be done by EOU and submitted along with the report to the GEF Evaluation Office not later than 6 months after the completion of the evaluation. The standard terms of reference for the terminal evaluation are included in Appendix 5. These will be adjusted to the special needs of the project.

SECTION 7: PROJECT FINANCING AND BUDGET

7.1 Budget by project component and UNEP budget lines

(see Appendix 6)

7.2 Co-financing details

Co-financing Source	Cash	In-kind	Total
Project Government Contributions:			
Fiji	0	110,000	110,000
Kiribati	0	35,000	35,000
Niue	0	35,000	35,000
Samoa	0	35,000	35,000
Palau	0	35,000	35,000
Solomon Islands	0	35,000	35,000
Tuvalu	0	35,000	35,000
UNEP	0	50,000	50,000
UNEP Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention	24,000	0	24,000
WHO		10,000	10,000

Australian Government, Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts	100,000	0	100,000
Recetox (Research Centre for Environmental Chemistry and Ecotoxicology, Masaryk University in Brno)		10,000	10,000
Environment Canada	10,000	0	10,000
Others: (Steering group member participation)	0	10,000	10,000
Total co-financing	134,000	400,000	534,000

7.3 Project cost-effectiveness

National laboratories in Pacific Island Countries (PIC) have been developed in the past on a sectoral basis with separate laboratories for health, mines, agriculture, water, etc. Although a strong case has been made for the establishment of national laboratories, sectoral interests have so far prevented this from becoming a reality in any PIC.

Most country laboratories are also characterized by:

- an ability to obtain sophisticated machinery via aid but difficulty to operate and maintain them;
- a lack of user-pay principle so that costs of analyses, even requested by outside users, is paid for out of recurrent budgets rather than clients;
- general civil service problems of low pay, lack of strategic planning, lack of funds for equipment maintenance, nepotism and frequent absence for workshops and other non-laboratory duties.

In any laboratory it only makes sense to set up an analysis if the amount of usage warrants the start-up costs and that there are funds available to pay for these analyses. Therefore a regional laboratory which is already fully-equipped, has been doing pesticide analyses for 15 years and has several trained staff will be used to achieve cost-effectiveness for this project. The present project concept does not allow setting up new laboratories and training as this would require several times the cost of using the existing laboratory infrastructure.

The USP Laboratory also has existing collaborations with the RECETOX Laboratory in Czech Republic sampling for passive air, the MTM Center of Örebro University in Sweden, which was the partner laboratory in the UNEP/GEF project, and the WHO reference laboratory for human milk at the Chemisches und Veterinäruntersuchungsamt Freiburg (CVUA) especially for dioxin and furan analysis. Discussions have also been held to collaborate with the Japanese active air sampling project. Data on analytical costs in the USP Laboratory, sampling in the other regional countries, transport of samples to the regional laboratory and reference laboratories will be given and compared with alternative single country options and calculations for analysis of all POPs in the region at CEO endorsement.

APPENDICES

- Appendix 1: Results Framework**
- Appendix 2: Workplan and timetable**
- Appendix 3: Key deliverables**
- Appendix 4: Costed M&E plan**
- Appendix 5: Standard Terminal Evaluation TOR**
- Appendix 6: Budget by project component and UNEP budget lines**
- Appendix 7: Co-financing commitment letters from project partners**
- Appendix 8: Endorsement letters of GEF National Focal Points**
- Appendix 9: Pacific Islands Regional Report: Regionally Based Assessment of Persistent Toxic Substances. UNEP/GEF, December 2002**

APPENDIX 1: Results Framework

Objectives and Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
Development Objective			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Countries in the Pacific Islands have the capacity to contribute with national POPs analysis to the reporting under the Global Monitoring of POPs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sampling programs in place in each country; POPs laboratory generated data submitted for inclusion into the regional GMP report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report to the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decisions SC-2/13 and SC-3/16 remain unchanged in its main objectives
Immediate Project Objective			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To build regional capacity on analysis and data generation for POPs in core matrices for the Global POPs Monitoring (GMP) to enable South Pacific Islands States to contribute to the global report submitted to the Conference of the Parties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> POPs laboratory feeds data into the global database for core matrices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National POPs data sent to regional coordination group for inclusion into global report. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial and human resources available to implement the sub-regional component of the GMP for Asia Pacific region
Outcomes			
1. Sampling and analysis are performed according to international standard by all partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SOPs available and accessible three months after project start 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information exchange within Pacific Island countries and international contacts; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GMP component reflected in NIP
2. Technical personnel is able to carry out sampling in participating countries and analysis in designated laboratory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procurement of spares, consumables, standards, and small equipments carried out to enable analysis of GMP relevant compounds and matrices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laboratory logbook updated and proof of ongoing activities on a monthly basis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stability in personnel and provision of spares and consumables to maintain operation of POPs laboratory
3. Quality Assurance protocols are in place for participation in proficiency tests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation of up to 5 laboratory staff in two thematic training courses; Inscription in up to 2 international intercalibration studies; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports on results of intercalibration studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Successful participation in international intercalibration studies;
4. High quality data on presence of POPs in Pacific Islands States available;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chromatograms and results tables contribute to regional GMP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports and publications authored 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation of national programs on sampling of

Objectives and Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
	cooperation plan and are available for interpretation		core matrices possible financially and with human resources
5. Governments and stakeholders aware on details in implementation of the GMP issue in their national implementation plan and reporting to Conference of the Parties.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Long-term strategy developed for future evaluations of GMP data by end of project; Cooperation at international level through the COP established Regional Coordination Group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governments participation documented in Regional Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government and stakeholders willing to cooperate and share data
Outputs for Outcome 1:			
1.1 Set-up the management structure for the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institutional arrangements with USP made; Consultants identified and contracted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MoU with USP/IAS signed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GEF funding and co-financing readily available; Personnel with necessary qualifications available
1.2 Organization of a sub-regional workshop prepare a detailed workplan for project implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders and UNEP to meet and agree on main issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed workplan prepared and published at project's Web 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All funds available and stakeholders committed
1.3 At the same workshop develop protocols and manuals for sampling and analysis of the core matrices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guidance documents from SSC and WHO available; Workshop held 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report of workshop, <i>i.e.</i>, list of participants; SOPs drafted; WHO ethical commitment signed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GMP Guidance document applicable to South Pacific Region; WHO guidelines available and can be adapted to small islands region; POPs laboratory operational
1.4 Assignment of responsible staff for air monitoring, mothers' milk monitoring, and POPs analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Informed and trained staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contracts for responsible staff in all 6 countries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country willingness to explore this option
1.5 Inspection of the POPs laboratory and identification of needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visit to the POPs laboratory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inspection protocol filled out 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cooperation of the POPs laboratory

Objectives and Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
Outputs for Outcome 2:			
2.1 Training of responsible personnel to establish and run the network for air samples and mothers' milk sampling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training program developed • Training of sampling teams held 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract with training laboratories; • Report by training laboratory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cooperation at national level; • Access to samples; • Provision of in-kind contribution
2.2 Identification of sampling sites including length of sampling periods and frequency (air matrix)	Shortlist of potential sampling locations; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of needs for sampling equipment developed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report demonstrating location of sampling sites; • Sampling equipment deployed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to sampling sites; • Air samplers prepared for deployment
2.3 Identification of potential donors of mothers' milk in the 6 countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of potential donors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signed agreements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hospitals and mothers willing for cooperation
Output for Outcome 3:			
3.1 Identification and supply of spares consumables, standards to the laboratory to equip them for POPs analysis in the relevant matrices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of needs prepared • Procurement carried out 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procurement documents authorized 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure sufficiently developed so that only minor components are needed
3.2 Training of laboratory personnel on core matrices in developing country laboratory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training sessions for laboratory personnel held; • Training matrices available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training programme available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing country laboratory willing to be trained; • Back-up laboratory prepared and having access to developing country laboratory
3.3 Participation in international intercalibration study	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing country laboratory inscribes to the intercalibration study and submits data within the timeframe 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results letter from organizer of intercalibration study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant international intercalibration study existing; • Participation fee be paid
Outputs for Outcome 4:			
4.1 Collection of national air and mothers' milk samples and preparation of pools where applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cartridges from air samplers collected and shipped to the laboratories; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sample shipment documents and receipt at laboratories 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Samples will be available; <i>i.e.</i>, no damage to air samplers and sufficient

Objectives and Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mothers' milk sample containers collected; pools prepared, and shipped to the laboratories 		number of participating pregnant mothers
4.2 Exchange of national samples for POPs analysis in developing country laboratory and mirror analysis in experienced back-up laboratory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Samples analyzed at subregional POPs laboratory and in back-up laboratories 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Table of results from developing country laboratory Table of results from back-up laboratory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> POPs laboratories operational at required quality Data will be made available by all parties
4.3 Evaluation of analytical data and interpretation of results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting to discuss the results (possibly by teleconference and electronic means) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consolidated data report Publication including comparison with data from other regions or time trends 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantifiable amounts of POPs found in the samples to allow for comparison with other data
Outputs for Outcome 5:			
5.1 Organization of a workshop to evaluate the project outcomes and communicate the results and lessons learned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good representation at subregional workshop (<i>i.e.</i>, letters of invitation and confirmation, participants list); Draft report available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshop report prepared and published; Issues for lessons learned reflected in report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Necessary funds available to organize the sub-regional workshop; Adequate coverage in all participating countries
5.2 Development of long-term strategies for future contributions to the Global Monitoring of POPs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All countries and stakeholders actively contributing in discussions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bulleted list of future actions at national/sub-regional level published 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Countries not capable to implement the components of the NIP; Change in policy priorities
5.3 Diffusion of results and strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information materials prepared 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports and publications available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results obtained or of good quality

APPENDIX 2: Workplan and timetable

Activities \ months after project start	1 – 3	4 – 6	7 – 9	10 – 12	13 – 15	16 – 18
Component 1: Development of Standard Operating Procedures						
1.1 Set-up the management structure for the project						
1.2 Organization of a sub-regional workshop prepare a detailed workplan for project implementation						
1.3 At the same workshop develop protocols and manuals for sampling and analysis of the core matrices						
1.4 Assignment of responsible staff for air monitoring, mothers' milk monitoring, and POPs analysis						
1.5 Inspection of the POPs laboratory and identification of needs						
Component 2: Training of Sampling Teams and Identification of Sampling Sites						
2.1 Training of responsible personnel to establish and run the network for air samples and mothers' milk sampling						
2.2 Identification of sampling sites including length of sampling periods and frequency (air matrix)						
2.3 Identification of potential donors of mothers' milk in the 6 countries						
Component 3: Quality Enhancement						
3.1 Identification and supply of spares consumables, standards to the laboratory to equip them for POPs analysis in the relevant matrices						
3.2 Training of laboratory personnel on core matrices in developing country laboratory						
3.3 Participation in international intercalibration study						
Component 4: Analysis of National GMP Samples						
4.1 Collection of national air and mothers' milk samples and preparation of pools where applicable						
4.2 Exchange of national samples for POPs analysis in						

developing country laboratory and mirror analysis in experienced back-up laboratory						
4.3 Evaluation of analytical data and interpretation of results						
Component 5: Development of Long-term Strategy for GMP under Effectiveness Evaluation						
5.1 Organization of a workshop to evaluate the project outcomes and communicate the results and lessons learned						
5.2 Development of long-term strategies for future contributions to the Global Monitoring of POPs						
5.3 Diffusion of results and strategies						

APPENDIX 3: Key Deliverables

Key Deliverables	Time line (months after project start)
<p>1. Identify sub-regional coordinator, suitable laboratory and institutions in participating countries to collaborate in the project and enter into agreement with them</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Agreement will be signed between UNEP Chemicals and the sub-regional coordinating institution (USP/IAS)- The coordinator will be identified to coordinate all sub-regional activities;- Sub-regional laboratories having adequate infrastructure for POPs analysis will be identified and agreed between project partners;- National institutions in all participating countries having the human resources, the infrastructure to undertake the sampling of the relevant matrices or the need for POPs analysis will be identified- The sub-regional coordinator will make agreements with the participating institutions	1-3
<p>2. Identify and contract back-up laboratories for training of the South Pacific laboratories and institutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The back-up laboratories will be identified by UNEP in collaboration with the sub-regional coordinator including criteria such as:• It is anticipated to have more than one back-up laboratory because of the complexity of the POPs and the matrices (basic POPs vs. dioxin-like POPs; biotic vs. abiotic matrices, <i>i.e.</i>, air vs. mother's milk)• The back-up laboratories will have proven expertise in POPs analysis through successful participation in international intercalibration studies, and excellent communication and teaching skills.	1-3
<p>3. Hold a sub-regional workshop to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bring together institutions from participating countries detail the workplan of the project;• Agree on standard operational procedures (SOPs) for sampling and analysis of the national samples;• UNEP and expert laboratory staff will participate as resource persons.	1-3
<p>4. Undertake inspection visit(s) to the identified laboratory to assess the present infrastructure and needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• UNEP together with the back-up laboratory will visit the premises of the developing country laboratories and note infrastructure, instrumentation, methods applied, human resources, experiences with samples;• Based on the above, UNEP/back-up laboratory together with the laboratory will identify the needs for training program, provision of	2-6

<p>spares and consumables to adequately equip the developing country laboratory for POPs analysis;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The same checklist – already used in the UNEP/GEF POPs Laboratory project - will be applied; it allows a horizontal analysis and to target the training; 	
<p>5. Develop analytical protocols and training materials for sampling and analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protocols for sampling program to identify meaningful samples; • Analytical protocols/training materials will be developed based on existing national procedures and the guidance from Stockholm Secretariat, WHO (for mothers' milk) and the air monitoring programs included in the GMP. The protocols will be adopted to national conditions. 	2-3
<p>6. Provide the necessary spares and consumables to the South Pacific laboratories</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A list of necessary spares and consumables will be prepared jointly, purchased and shipped; • Containers for milk sampling and air samplers will be purchased and shipped to the participating countries; • Analytical standards and reference materials will be identified, purchased, and shipped to the laboratories. 	4-6
<p>7. Networks for collection of air samples and mothers' milk samples will be set-up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agreed protocols will be applied and air samplers deployed accordingly; preferably in all participating countries; • Clinics and other institutions will be contacted and a list of mothers' willing to donate their breast milk to the project will be established; • Institutions and mothers will sign the WHO ethical agreement; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Air and mothers' milk samples will be collected accordingly and shipped to the South Pacific Island laboratory. Eventually, pools will directly be shipped to the WHO Reference laboratory for official analysis. 	4-6
<p>8. Train the South Pacific Island staff in POPs analysis according to international standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Two staff from the back-up laboratory will undertake a training course at the developing country laboratory according to the priority needs and interest of the laboratory; 	4-6
<p>9. Analysis of sub-regional priority matrices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ After/at the training national samples of interest will be analyzed in the South Pacific Islands laboratory; ○ Mirror analysis will be undertaken by the expert 	6-15

laboratory/laboratories (these samples will put an emphasis on the three GMP core matrices)	
10. Undertake an international intercalibration study to compare the local results at international level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well characterized samples from intercalibration studies will be analyzed by the South Pacific labs An intercalibration study between the laboratories will be undertaken 	7-9
11. Hold a final workshop with all laboratories and other institutions as adequate to discuss the results. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All participating laboratories will meet to discuss the analytical results; To discuss the experiences made in this project and give recommendations for follow-up and future studies. 	15
12. High quality sample results will be submitted to regional coordination group for consideration of inclusion into the next global GMP report.	4-15
13. Development of long-term strategies for future contributions to the Global Monitoring of POPs	16-17
14. Write final report.	18

The following reports and publications will be produced:

Technical Reports: Technical Reports are documents of technical scientific nature covering specific areas within the overall project. It is envisaged to prepare technical reports on key areas of activity during the course of the project such as on sampling strategies and study design, analytical protocols, and final data on POPs analysis. The Technical reports will be made publicly available and made available to the stakeholders, *i.e.*, the Regional Coordinating Group for the GMP under the effectiveness evaluation of the Stockholm Convention. The technical reports will feed into the Global Report.

Publications/Conference: It is envisaged that Project Publications will form a key method of crystallizing and disseminating the results and achievements of the project. These publications may be scientific or informational texts on the activities and achievements of the project, in the form of journal articles, multimedia publications, etc. These publications can be based on Technical Reports, depending upon the relevance, scientific worth, etc. of these Reports, or may be summaries or compilations of a series of Technical Reports and other analyses. The project team will determine if any of the Technical Reports merit formal publication, and will also, in consultation with UNEP, the EA and other relevant stakeholder groups, plan and produce these Publications in a consistent and recognizable format. Any publications need prior clearance from UNEP and the participating countries. Project

resources will need to be defined and allocated for these activities as appropriate and in a manner commensurate with the project's budget.

Project Terminal Report: During the last three months of the project, the regional team under the leadership of the regional coordinator will prepare the final regional report as part of the Project Terminal Report. The Project Terminal Report will summarize all activities, achievements, and outputs of the project, lessons learned, objectives met or not achieved, structures and systems implemented, *etc.* and will be the definitive statement of the project's activities during its lifetime. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's activities.

APPENDIX 4: Costed M&E plan

Day-to-day management and monitoring of the project activities will be the responsibility of the executing agency, UNEP/DTIE Chemicals. Chemicals will submit half-yearly reports to DGEF and a Project Implementation Report (PIR) once a year.

The half-yearly reports will include progress in implementation of the project, financial report, a workplan and expected expenditures for the next reporting period. It will also include obstacles occurred during implementation period where necessary.

The PIR will be prepared on an annual basis with the first report due one year after project implementation start according to GEF rules. It will be submitted by DTIE Chemicals to the DGEF task manager.

For the implementation of major regional activities, DTIE Chemicals will subcontract University of the South Pacific (USP). The day-to-day management and monitoring of the regional activities in the SPREP countries will be the responsibility of the regional team, lead by USP. The coordinator of the regional team will report to DTIE Chemicals. The regional team leader will submit half-yearly technical and financial reports to DTIE Chemicals.

The regional team will be coordinated by USP and is comprised of staff from USP and local experts from the six participating countries. USP will be responsible for the recruitment of local/national staff and the execution of the activities according to the workplan and expected outcomes.

The project Steering Group will be kept small but efficient and include the directly concerned stakeholders. The Steering Group will comprise DTIE Chemicals, DGEF, Secretariat of Stockholm Convention, WHO, USP, and the involved bilateral donors.

The Steering Group will meet back-to-back with the technical meetings, *i.e.*, inception workshop and final workshop. The Steering Group will monitor the progress of the project and give advice as to implementation issues.

Table: Monitoring and Evaluation Budget

M&E activity	Purpose	Responsible Party	Budget (US\$)*1	Time-frame
Inception workshop	Awareness raising, building stakeholder engagement, detailed work planning with key groups	USP, UNEP	0	Within two months of project start
Inception report	Provides implementation plan for progress monitoring	Project coordinator	0	Immediately following IW
Project Review by Steering Committee	Assesses progress, effectiveness of operations and technical outputs; Recommends adaptation where necessary and confirms forward implementation plan.	USP, UNEP	0	Month 9 and 18
Project Implementation Review	Progress and effectiveness review for the GEF, provision of lessons learned	USP, UNEP	0	Month 2, 6, 12, 18
Terminal report	Reviews effectiveness against implementation plan Highlights technical outputs Identifies lessons learned and likely design approaches for future projects, assesses likelihood of achieving design outcomes	USP, UNEP	0	At the end of project implementation
Independent Terminal evaluation	Reviews effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation, coordination mechanisms and outputs Identifies lessons learned and likely remedial actions for future projects	USP, UNEP, Independent external consultant	30,000	At end of project implementation

	Highlights technical achievements and assesses against prevailing benchmarks			
Independent Financial Audit	Reviews use of project funds against budget and assesses probity of expenditure and transactions	Audits by USP, UNEP	0	At the end of project implementation
Total indicative M&E cost*¹			30,000	

*1: Excluding project team staff time. All costs of workshop are costed 0 because these will be joined with Lessons Learned and good practices meetings.

APPENDIX 5: Standard Terminal Evaluation TOR

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP GEF project ...

Project Number GF/...

1. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

Project rationale from the project document

Relevance to GEF Programmes

Executing Arrangements

Project Activities

Budget

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION

1. Objective and Scope of the Evaluation

The objective of this terminal evaluation is to examine the extent and magnitude of any project impacts to date and determine the likelihood of future impacts. The evaluation will also assess project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results.

The evaluation will focus on the following main questions: ...

2. Methods

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

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

1. A desk review of project documents including, but not limited to:
 - (a) The project documents, outputs, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNEP and GEF annual Project Implementation Review reports) and relevant correspondence.
 - (b) Review of specific products including the final reports from country executing agencies, workshop proceedings, etc
 - (c) Notes from the Steering Group meetings.
 - (d) Other project-related material produced by the project staff or partners.
2. Interviews with project management and technical support staff.
3. Interviews with intended users for the project outputs and other stakeholders involved with this project, including in the participating countries and international bodies. As appropriate, these interviews could be combined with an email questionnaire.
4. The Consultant shall seek additional information and opinions by e-mail, through telephone communication, or by actual meetings.
5. Interviews with the UNEP/DGEF project task manager and Fund Management Officer, and other relevant staff in UNEP dealing with POPs related activities as necessary. The Consultant shall also gain broader perspectives from discussions with relevant GEF Secretariat staff.

Key Evaluation principles.

In attempting to evaluate any outcomes and impacts that the project may have achieved, evaluators should remember that the project's performance should be assessed by considering the difference between the answers to two simple questions "*what happened?*" and "*what*

would have happened anyway?”. These questions imply that there should be consideration of the baseline conditions and trends in relation to the intended project outcomes and impacts. In addition it implies that there should be plausible evidence to attribute such outcomes and impacts to the actions of the project.

Sometimes, adequate information on baseline conditions and trends is lacking. In such cases this should be clearly highlighted by the evaluator, along with any simplifying assumptions that were taken to enable the evaluator to make informed judgements about project performance.

3. Project Evaluation Parameters

A. Attainment of objectives and planned results:

The assessment of project results seeks to determine the extent to which the project objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, and assess if the project has led to any other positive or negative consequences. While assessing a project's outcomes the evaluation will seek to determine the extent of achievement and shortcomings in reaching the project's objectives as stated in the project document and also indicate if there were any changes and whether those changes were approved. As the project did not establish an elaborate baseline (initial conditions), the evaluator should seek to estimate the baseline condition so that achievements and results can be properly established (or simplifying assumptions used). Since most GEF projects can be expected to achieve the anticipated outcomes by project closing, assessment of project outcomes should be a priority. Outcomes are the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs. Examples of outcomes could include but are not restricted to stronger institutional capacities, higher public awareness (when leading to changes of behaviour), and transformed policy frameworks or markets. The evaluation should assess the extent to which the project's major relevant objectives were effectively and efficiently achieved or are expected to be achieved and their relevance.

- *Effectiveness*: Evaluate how, and to what extent, the stated project objectives have been met, taking into account the “achievement indicators” specified in the project document and logical framework³.
- *Relevance*: In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities? The evaluation should also assess the whether outcomes specified in the project document and or logical framework are actually outcomes and not outputs or inputs.
- *Efficiency*: Cost-effectiveness assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project's outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. Include an assessment of outcomes in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost-effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was then did that affect cost-effectiveness? The

³ In case in the original or modified expected outcomes are merely outputs/inputs then the evaluators should assess if there were any real outcomes of the project and if yes then whether these are commensurate with the realistic expectations from such projects.

evaluation should assess the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing to project implementation and to what extent the project leveraged additional resources. Comparisons of the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects should be made if feasible.

B. Assessment of Sustainability of project outcomes:

Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits after the project ends. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, e.g. stronger institutional capacities or better informed decision-making. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes. The evaluation should ascertain to what extent follow-up work has been initiated and how project outcomes will be sustained and enhanced over time. In this case, sustainability will be linked to the continued use and influence of scientific models and scientific findings, produced by the project.

Four aspects of sustainability should be addressed: financial, socio-political, institutional frameworks and governance, and ecological (if applicable). The following questions provide guidance on the assessment of these aspects:

- *Financial resources.* To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on continued financial support? What is the likelihood that any required financial resources will be available to sustain the project outcomes/benefits once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market trends that support the project's objectives)? Was the project was successful in identifying and leveraging co-financing?
- *Socio-political:* To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on socio-political factors? What is the likelihood that the level of stakeholder ownership will allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- *Institutional framework and governance.* To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance? What is the likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for, the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? While responding to these questions consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency and the required technical know-how are in place.
- *Ecological.* Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits? The TE should assess

whether certain activities in the project area will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes.⁴

As far as possible, also assess the potential longer-term impacts considering that the evaluation is taking place upon completion of the project and that longer term impact is expected to be seen in a few years time. Frame any recommendations to enhance future project impact in this context. Which will be the major ‘channels’ for longer term impact from the project at the national and international scales? The evaluation should formulate recommendations that outline possible approaches and necessary actions to facilitate an impact assessment study in a few years time.

C. Catalytic role

The terminal evaluation will also describe any catalytic or replication effect of the project. What examples are there of replication and catalytic outcomes that suggest increased likelihood of sustainability? Replication approach, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out. No ratings are requested for the catalytic role.

D. Achievement of outputs and activities:

- Delivered outputs: Assessment of the project’s success in producing each of the programmed outputs, both in quantity and quality as well as usefulness and timeliness.
- Assess the soundness and effectiveness of the methods and approached used by the project.

E. Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- **M&E design.** Did the project have a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives? The Terminal Evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for project design of M&E and the application of the Project M&E plan (Minimum requirements are specified in Annex 4). The evaluation shall include an assessment of the quality, application and effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation plans and tools, including an assessment of risk management based on the assumptions and risks identified in the project document. The M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART (see Annex 4) indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should have been specified.
- **M&E plan implementation.** Was an M&E system in place and did it facilitate tracking of results and progress towards projects objectives throughout the project implementation period. Were Annual project

⁴ For example, construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralizing the biodiversity related gains made by the project or, a newly established pulp mill might jeopardise the viability of nearby protected forest areas by increasing logging pressures.

reports complete, accurate and with well justified ratings? Was the information provided by the M&E system used during the project to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs? Did the Projects have an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?

- **Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities.** Were adequate budget provisions made for M&E made and were such resources made available in a timely fashion during implementation?
- **Long-term Monitoring.** Is long-term monitoring envisaged as an outcome of the project? If so, comment specifically on the relevance of such monitoring systems to sustaining project outcomes and how the monitoring effort will be sustained.

F. Assessment of processes that affected attainment of project results.

The evaluation will consider, but need not be limited to, consideration of the following issues that may have affected project implementation and attainment of project results:

- i. **Preparation and readiness.** Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? Were capacities of the executing institutions and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to implementation? Was availability of counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), passage of enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?
 - Ascertain to what extent the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document have been closely followed. In particular, assess the role of the various committees established and whether the project document was clear and realistic to enable effective and efficient implementation, whether the project was executed according to the plan and how well the management was able to adapt to changes during the life of the project to enable the implementation of the project.
 - Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency and adaptability of project management and the supervision of project activities / project execution arrangements at all levels (1) policy decisions: Steering Group; (2) day to day project management: (3) GEF guidance: UNEP DGEF.
- ii. **Country ownership/Drivenness.** This is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements. Examples of possible evaluative questions include: Was the project design in-line with the national sectoral and development priorities and plans? Are project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? Were the relevant country representatives, from government and civil society, involved in the project? Did the recipient government maintain its financial commitment to the project? Have the government approved policies or regulatory frameworks been in-line with the project's objectives?

- iii. **Stakeholder involvement.** Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in project's design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation? For example, did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns? Did the project consult and make use of the skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the design, implementation and evaluation of project activities? Were perspectives of those that would be affected by decisions, those that could affect the outcomes and those that could contribute information or other resources to the process taken into account while taking decisions? Were the relevant vulnerable groups and the powerful, the supporters and the opponents, of the processes properly involved? Specifically the evaluation will:
 - Assess the mechanisms put in place by the project for identification and engagement of stakeholders in each participating country and establish, in consultation with the stakeholders, whether this mechanism was successful, and identify its strengths and weaknesses.
 - Assess the degree and effectiveness of collaboration/interactions between the various project partners and institutions during the course of implementation of the project.
 - Assess the degree and effectiveness of any various public awareness activities that were undertaken during the course of implementation of the project.
- iv. **Financial planning.** Did the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allowed management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for timely flow of funds. Specifically, the evaluation should:
 - Assess the strength and utility of financial controls, including reporting, and planning to allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for a proper and timely flow of funds for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables throughout the project's lifetime.
 - Present the major findings from the financial audit if one has been conducted.
 - Did promised co-financing materialize? Identify and verify the sources of co- financing as well as leveraged and associated financing (in co-operation with the IA and EA).
 - Assess whether the project has applied appropriate standards of due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.
 - The evaluation should also include a breakdown of final actual project costs by activities compared to budget (variances), financial management (including disbursement issues), and co- financing. This information will be prepared by the relevant DGEF Fund Management Officer of the project for scrutiny by the evaluator (table attached in Annex 1 Co-financing and leveraged resources).
- v. **UNEP Supervision and backstopping.** Did UNEP Agency staff identify problems in a timely fashion and accurately estimate its seriousness? Did UNEP staff provide quality support and advice to the project, approved modifications in time and restructure the project when needed? Did UNEP

- and Executing Agencies provide the right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix, frequency of field visits?
- vi. **Co-financing and Project Outcomes & Sustainability.** If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for this? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
 - vii. **Delays and Project Outcomes & Sustainability.** If there were delays in project implementation and completion, the evaluation will summarise the reasons for them. Did delays affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if so in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The *ratings will be presented in the form of a table* with each of the categories rated separately and with **brief justifications for the rating** based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given. The rating system to be applied is specified in Annex 1:

4. Evaluation report format and review procedures

The report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain; the purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated and the methods used. The report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should provide information on when the evaluation took place, the places visited, who was involved and be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. The report should include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report to facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons.

Evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete and balanced manner. The evaluation report shall be written in English, be of no more than 50 pages (excluding annexes), use numbered paragraphs and include:

- i) An **executive summary** (no more than 3 pages) providing a brief overview of the main conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation;
- ii) **Introduction and background** giving a brief overview of the evaluated project, for example, the objective and status of activities;
- iii) **Scope, objective and methods** presenting the evaluation's purpose, the evaluation criteria used and questions to be addressed;
- iv) **Project Performance and Impact** providing factual evidence relevant to the questions asked by the evaluator and interpretations of such evidence. This is the main substantive section of the report and should provide a commentary on all evaluation aspects (A – F above).
- v) **Conclusions and rating** of project implementation success giving the evaluator's concluding assessments and ratings of the project against given evaluation criteria and standards of performance. The conclusions should provide answers to questions about whether the project is considered good or bad, and whether the results are considered positive or negative;
- vi) **Lessons learned** presenting general conclusions, based on established good practices that have the potential for wider application and use. Lessons may also be derived from problems and mistakes. The context in which lessons

may be applied should be clearly specified, and lessons should always state or imply some prescriptive action. A lesson should be written such that experiences derived from the project could be applied in other projects or at portfolio level;

- vii) **Recommendations** suggesting *actionable* proposals for stakeholders to rectify poor existing situations as well as recommendations concerning projects of similar nature.. In general, Terminal Evaluations are likely to have very few (only two or three) actionable recommendations;
- viii) **Annexes** include Terms of Reference, list of interviewees, documents reviewed, brief summary of the expertise of the evaluator / evaluation team, a summary of co-finance information etc. Dissident views or management responses to the evaluation findings may later be appended in an annex.

Examples of UNEP GEF Terminal Evaluation Reports are available at www.unep.org/eou

Review of the Draft Evaluation Report

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

All UNEP GEF Evaluation Reports are subject to quality assessments by UNEP EOU. These incorporate GEF Office of Evaluation quality assessment criteria and are used as a tool for providing structured feedback to the evaluator (see Annex 3).

5. Submission of Final Terminal Evaluation Reports.

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

...

With a copy to:

...

The final evaluation report will be printed in hard copy and published on the Evaluation and Oversight Unit's web-site www.unep.org/eou. Subsequently, the report will be sent to the GEF Office of Evaluation for their review, appraisal and inclusion on the GEF website.

6. Resources and schedule of the evaluation

This final evaluation will be undertaken by an international evaluator contracted by the Evaluation and Oversight Unit, UNEP. The contract for the evaluator will begin on... The evaluator will submit a draft report on ... to UNEP/EOU, the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager, and key representatives of the executing agencies. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to UNEP / EOU for collation and the consultant will be advised of any necessary revisions. Comments to the final draft report will be sent to the consultant by ... after which, the consultant will submit the final report no later than ...

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

The evaluator should not have been associated with the design and implementation of the project. The evaluator will work under the overall supervision of the Chief, Evaluation and Oversight Unit, UNEP. Knowledge of UNEP programmes and GEF activities is desirable. Fluency in oral and written English is a must.

Annex 1. OVERALL RATINGS TABLE

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating)		
Sub criteria (below)		
Effectiveness		
Relevance		
Efficiency		
Sustainability of Project outcomes (overall rating)		
Sub criteria (below)		
Financial		
Socio Political		
Institutional framework and governance		
Ecological		
Achievement of outputs and activities		
Monitoring and Evaluation (overall rating)		
Sub criteria (below)		
M&E Design		
M&E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)		
Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities		
Catalytic Role		
Preparation and readiness		
Country ownership / driveness		
Stakeholders involvement		
Financial planning		
UNEP Supervision and backstopping		
Overall Rating		

RATING OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS

Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Satisfactory (S): The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Unsatisfactory (U) The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Please note: Relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. The overall rating of the project for achievement of objectives and results **may not be higher** than the lowest rating on either of these two criteria. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes a project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.

RATINGS ON SUSTAINABILITY

A. Sustainability will be understood as the probability of continued long-term outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends. The Terminal evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits after the project ends. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, i.e. stronger institutional capacities, legal frameworks, socio-economic incentives /or public awareness. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes..

Rating system for sustainability sub-criteria

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows.

Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Likely (ML). There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability

Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an Unlikely rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than Unlikely, regardless of whether higher ratings in other dimensions of sustainability produce a higher average.

RATINGS OF PROJECT M&E

Monitoring is a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing project with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds. Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or

completed project, its design, implementation and results. Project evaluation may involve the definition of appropriate standards, the examination of performance against those standards, and an assessment of actual and expected results.

The Project monitoring and evaluation system will be rated on ‘M&E Design’, ‘M&E Plan Implementation’ and ‘Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities’ as follows:

Highly Satisfactory (HS): There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Satisfactory(S): There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Unsatisfactory (U): There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The Project had no M&E system.

“M&E plan implementation” will be considered a critical parameter for the overall assessment of the M&E system. The overall rating for the M&E systems will not be higher than the rating on “M&E plan implementation.”

All other ratings will be on the GEF six point scale.

GEF Performance Description	Alternative description on the same scale
HS = Highly Satisfactory	Excellent
S = Satisfactory	Well above average
MS = Moderately Satisfactory	Average
MU = Moderately Unsatisfactory	Below Average
U = Unsatisfactory	Poor
HU = Highly Unsatisfactory	Very poor (Appalling)

Annex 2. Co-financing and Leveraged Resources

Co-financing (basic data to be supplied to the consultant for verification)

Co financing (Type/Source)	IA own Financing (mill US\$)		Government (mill US\$)		Other* (mill US\$)		Total (mill US\$)		Total Disbursement (mill US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
- Grants										
- Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate)										
- Credits										
- Equity investments										
- In-kind support										
- Other (*)										
-										
-										
-										
-										
-										
<i>Totals</i>										

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

Leveraged Resources

Leveraged resources are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO's, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's ultimate objective.

Table showing final actual project expenditure by activity to be supplied by the UNEP Fund management Officer. (insert here)

Annex 3

Review of the Draft Report

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

Quality Assessment of the Evaluation Report

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

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

GEF Report Quality Criteria	UNEP EOU Assessment	Rating
A. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives in the context of the focal area program indicators if applicable?		
B. Was the report consistent and the evidence complete and convincing and were the ratings substantiated when used?		
C. Did the report present a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes?		
D. Were the lessons and recommendations supported by the evidence presented?		
E. Did the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?		
F. Did the report include an assessment of the quality of the project M&E system and its use for project management?		
UNEP EOU additional Report Quality Criteria	UNEP EOU Assessment	Rating
G. Quality of the lessons: Were lessons readily applicable in other contexts? Did they suggest prescriptive action?		
H. Quality of the recommendations: Did recommendations specify the actions necessary to correct existing conditions or improve operations ('who?' 'what?' 'where?' 'when?'). Can they be implemented? Did the recommendations specify a goal and an associated performance indicator?		
I. Was the report well written? (clear English language and grammar)		
J. Did the report structure follow EOU guidelines, were all requested Annexes included?		
K. Were all evaluation aspects specified in the TORs adequately addressed?		

L. Was the report delivered in a timely manner		
------------------------------------------------	--	--

GEF Quality of the MTE report = $0.3*(A + B) + 0.1*(C+D+E+F)$

EOU assessment of MTE report = $0.3*(G + H) + 0.1*(I+J+K+L)$

Combined quality Rating = $(2* \text{'GEF EO' rating} + \text{EOU rating})/3$

The Totals are rounded and converted to the scale of HS to HU

Rating system for quality of terminal evaluation reports

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

Annex 4 GEF Minimum requirements for M&E

Minimum Requirement 1: Project Design of M&E⁵

All projects must include a concrete and fully budgeted monitoring and evaluation plan by the time of Work Program entry (full-sized projects) or CEO approval (medium-sized projects). This plan must contain at a minimum:

- SMART (see below) indicators for project implementation, or, if no indicators are identified, an alternative plan for monitoring that will deliver reliable and valid information to management
- SMART indicators for results (outcomes and, if applicable, impacts), and, where appropriate, corporate-level indicators
- A project baseline, with:
 - a description of the problem to address
 - indicator data
 - or, if major baseline indicators are not identified, an alternative plan for addressing this within one year of implementation
- An M&E Plan with identification of reviews and evaluations which will be undertaken, such as mid-term reviews or evaluations of activities
- An organizational setup and budgets for monitoring and evaluation.

⁵ <http://gefweb.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/MEPTools/meptstandards.html>

Minimum Requirement 2: Application of Project M&E

- Project monitoring and supervision will include implementation of the M&E plan, comprising:
- Use of SMART indicators for implementation (or provision of a reasonable explanation if not used)
- Use of SMART indicators for results (or provision of a reasonable explanation if not used)
- Fully established baseline for the project and data compiled to review progress
- Evaluations are undertaken as planned
- Operational organizational setup for M&E and budgets spent as planned.

SMART INDICATORS GEF projects and programs should monitor using relevant performance indicators. The monitoring system should be “SMART”:

1. **Specific:** The system captures the essence of the desired result by clearly and directly relating to achieving an objective, and only that objective.
2. **Measurable:** The monitoring system and its indicators are unambiguously specified so that all parties agree on what the system covers and there are practical ways to measure the indicators and results.
3. **Achievable and Attributable:** The system identifies what changes are anticipated as a result of the intervention and whether the result(s) are realistic. Attribution requires that changes in the targeted developmental issue can be linked to the intervention.
4. **Relevant and Realistic:** The system establishes levels of performance that are likely to be achieved in a practical manner, and that reflect the expectations of stakeholders.
5. **Time-bound, Timely, Trackable, and Targeted:** The system allows progress to be tracked in a cost-effective manner at desired frequency for a set period, with clear identification of the particular stakeholder group to be impacted by the project or program.

Annex 5 List of intended additional recipients for the Terminal Evaluation

Name	Affiliation	Email
Government Officials		
GEF Focal Point(s)		
Executing Agency		