GEF

Global Environment Facility

1818 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20433 USA
Tel: 202.473-0508
Fax: 202.522.3240/3245
Internet: www.theGEF.org

March 20, 2009

Dear Council Member,

I am writing to notify you that we have today posted on the GEF's website at www.TheGEF.org, a medium-sized project proposal from UNEP entitled ***Regional (Ghana, Mali, Nigeria, Senegal, Togo, Congo DR): Supporting the Implementation of the Global Monitoring Plan of POPs in West Africa***, to be funded under the GEF Trust Fund (GEFTF). The GEFTF will contribute $583,000 towards a total cost of $1,193,600.

The project supports the countries in the West African region having the capacity to contribute with national POPs analysis to the reporting under the Global Monitoring of POPs.

The project proposal is being posted for your review. We would welcome any comments you may wish to provide by April 03, 2009, in accordance with the new procedures approved by the Council. You may send your comments to gcoordination@TheGEF.org.

If you do not have access to the Web, you may request the local field office of the World Bank or UNDP to download the document for you. Alternatively, you may request a copy of the document from the Secretariat. If you make such a request, please confirm for us your current mailing address.

Sincerely,

f/ William Kalm

Monique Barbut
Chief Executive Officer and Chairperson

Copy to: Country Operational Focal Point
GEF Agencies
STAP
Trustee

REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project
THE GEF TRUST FUND

Submission Date: February 02, 2009
Re-submission Date:

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3674
GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:
COUNTRY(IES): Regional (DR Congo, Ghana, Mali, Nigeria, Senegal, Togo)
PROJECT TITLE: Supporting the Implementation of the Global Monitoring Plan (GMP) of POPs in West African countries
GEF AGENCY(IES): UNEP
OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): UNEP Chemicals; Environmental Toxicology and Quality Control Laboratory, Mali
GEF FOCAL AREA(S): Persistent Organic Pollutants
GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): POPs-SP1
NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: N/A

Expected Calendar	
Milestones	**Dates**
Work Program (for FSP)	N/A
GEF Agency Approval	February 09
Implementation Start	March 09
Mid-term Review (if planned)	N/A
Implementation Completion	August 10

A. PROJECT FRAMEWORK (Expand table as necessary)

Project Objective: Countries in the West African region have the capacity to contribute with national POPs analysis to the reporting under the Global Monitoring of POPs

Project Components	Indicate whether Investment, TA, or STA**	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	GEF Financing*		Co-financing*		Total ($)
				($)	%	($)	%	
1. Standard operating procedures (SOPs) for sampling and analysis of POPs in relevant matrices	STA	Sampling and analysis are performed according to international standard by all partners.	Standard operating procedures for sampling of relevant matrices and analysis of relevant POPs according to reality in West African countries.	72,916	48	80,000	52	152,916
2. Adequately equipped laboratories and trained personnel to undertake sampling and analysis	STA	- Lab personnel trained to high standard. - Sampling in countries done according to international standards.	Reports on training, analysis and sampling exercise	59,250	50	60,000	50	119,250
3. Experiences in participation in international inter-calibration studies	STA	- Quality Assurance protocols in place and used. - Participation in proficiency tests	Data documented on analysis of reference materials and proficiency tests	225,917	56	179,000	44	404,917

4. High quality data on presence of POPs in West African countries are available	STA	- Increased regional awareness of POPs exposures. - Baseline for later effectiveness evaluation. - Network of air samplers established.	- Regional report on POPs levels in human milk and air from at least 4 countries. - Report on comparison of data from the region with other regions.	84,625	50	83,000	50	167,625
5. Governments and stakeholders are aware on details in implementation of the GMP issue in their national implementation plan and reporting to the COP	STA	- Improved implementation of the NIP recommendations with respect to POPs monitoring. - Increased knowledge of POPs presence and the implications in the region.	- Plan for longer term monitoring with baseline established	67,292	40	100,600	60	167,892
6. Monitoring and Evaluation				30,000	100	0	0	30,000
7. Project management				43,000	28	108,000	72	151,000
Total Project Costs				583,000	49	610,600	51	1,193,600

* List the $ by project components. The percentage is the share of GEF and Co-financing respectively to the total amount for the component.
** TA = Technical Assistance; STA = Scientific & technical analysis.

B. FINANCING PLAN SUMMARY FOR THE PROJECT ($)

	*Project Preparation**	*Project*	*Agency Fee*	*Total at CEO Endorsement*	*For the record: Total at PIF*
GEF	0	583,000	58,300	641,300	583,000
Co-financing	10,000	610,600		620,600	555,000
Total	10,000	1,193,600	58,300	1,261,900	1,138,000

***** Please include the previously approved PDFs and PPG, if any. Indicate the amount already approved as footnote here and if the GEF funding is from GEF-3. Provide the status of implementation and use of fund for the project preparation grant in Annex D.

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING, including co-financing for project preparation for both the PDFs and PPG. (expand the table line items as necessary)

Name of co-financier (source)	*Classification*	*Type*	*Amount ($)*	*%**
National Governments (DR Congo, Ghana, Mali, Nigeria Senegal, Togo)	Nat'l Gov't	In-kind	266,000	44
UNEP	Multilat. Agency	In-kind	45,000	7
UNEP Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention	Multilat. Agency	Grant	130,600	21
Government of Sweden	Bilat. Agency	Grant	90,000	15
Recetox	Bilat. Agency	Grant	20,000	3
Steering group member participation: industry	NGO	In-kind	59,000	10
Total Co-financing			610,600	100%

* Percentage of each co-financier's contribution at CEO endorsement to total co-financing.

D. GEF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY FOCAL AREA(S), AGENCY(IES) OR COUNTRY(IES)

GEF Agency	*Focal Area*	*Country Name/ Global*	*(in $)*			
			Project Preparation	*Project*	*Agency Fee*	*Total*
UNEP	POPs	Regional	0	583,000	58,300	641,300
Total GEF Resources			0	583,000	58,300	641,300

***** No need to provide information for this table if it is a single focal area, single country and single GEF Agency project.

E. PROJECT MANAGEMENT BUDGET/COST

Cost Items	*Total Estimated person weeks*	*GEF ($)*	*Other sources ($)*	*Project total ($)*
*Local consultants**	208	9,000	43,000	52,000
*International consultants**	20	25,000	35,000	60,000
*Office facilities, equipment, vehicles and communications***			30,000	30,000
*Travel***		9,000		9,000
Total	**228**	**43,000**	**108,000**	**151,000**

* Provide detailed information regarding the consultants in Annex C.
** Provide detailed information and justification for these line items.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	*Estimated person weeks*	*GEF($)*	*Other sources ($)*	*Project total ($)*
*Local consultants**	500	85,000	40,000	125,000
*International consultants**	20	13,000	38,000	51,000
Total	520	98,000	78,000	176,000

* Provide detailed information regarding the consultants in Annex C.

G. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M&E PLAN:

Day-to-day management and monitoring of the project activities will be the responsibility of the overall coordinating Executing Agency (EA). The EA will submit half-yearly reports to DGEF and a Project Implementation Report (PIR) once a year. The regional team will be coordinated by the Environmental Toxicology and Quality Control Laboratory in Mali (ETQCL) and is comprised of staff from ETQCL and local experts from the six participating countries. ETQCL will be responsible for the recruitment of local/national staff and the execution and monitoring of the activities according to the workplan and expected outcomes.
The Steering Group will monitor the progress of the project and give advice as to implementation. The activities are costed zero because they will be joined with lessons learned and good practices meetings budgeted under the respective components. An independent terminal evaluation will review the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation, coordination mechanisms and outputs (Budget allocation: US$ 30,000).

For details see Project Document Section 6. and Appendix 4.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE THE PROJECT RATIONALE AND THE EXPECTED MEASURABLE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS:

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-3/19 invited the GEF 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, countries in West Africa 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.

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.

B. **DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH NATIONAL PRIORITIES/PLANS:**

The West African countries involved that have completed their National Implementation Plans (NIPs) for the Stockholm Convention (Ghana, Mali, Senegal, Togo) include a section on the need for POPs monitoring to satisfy Article II requirements. In DR Congo and Nigeria the NIPs are under development.

The regional organization group inception workshop for the African region was held in Nairobi, Kenya from 29 to 31 October 2007. 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 Mali as coordinator and confirmed the participating countries for this GEF project.

For details see Project Document Section 3.6.

C. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH GEF STRATEGIES AND STRATEGIC PROGRAMS:

The third Conference of the Parties 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, and asked the GEF to support activities related to the GMP and capacity-building in developing countries. 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 GMP 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.

D. OUTLINE THE COORDINATION WITH OTHER RELATED INITIATIVES:

The identification of existing capacity to analyze POPs in developing countries and basic guidelines for POPs analysis in relevant matrices was done by the GEF-funded project “Assessment of existing capacity and capacity building needs to analyze POPs in developing countries”, which was executed by UNEP Chemicals Branch of the Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE). The project was implemented from 1 January 2005 until 31 March 2008. Phase 1 was implemented during the first year and had regional workshops and the preparation of background documents as well as the initiation of the POPs Laboratory Databank as the major achievements. Phase 2 consisted of the feasibility study where nine laboratories from seven countries in four regions participated in inspection tours and training activities. The experiences gained in the GEF project will form the basis for the training of the national laboratories.

WHO with it's Fourth Round of the breast milk study will form an essential part in this project and so directly contribute with POPs data to the GMP. Further, project activities will be linked and coordinated to ongoing global air monitoring programmes of RECETOX, Czech Republic.

E. **DESCRIBE THE INCREMENTAL REASONING OF THE PROJECT:**

Without GEF support, the developing countries in West Africa would not be able to provide national data to the effectivenss evaluation under the Stockholm Convention. More importantly, without training and provisions to be able to analyse the key GMP matrices air, human milk, and human blood, they also will not be able to contribute to future evaluations. With GEF support and technical assistance of UNEP, these countries will gradually enhance their capacities by implementing new methods to analyze the - for these countries - new matrices and to increase the spectrum to all of the POPs. Strengthening of the analytical performance and international acceptance of the analytical data will significantly increase the monitoring and analytical capacity and thus, these parties will become active contributors to the GMP and with this complying with the requirements set by the Stockholm Convention.

F. INDICATE RISKS, INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS, THAT MIGHT PREVENT THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) FROM BEING ACHIEVED AND OUTLINE RISK MANAGEMENT MEASURES:

A program involving six countries has obvious logistical risks. The Environmental Toxicology and Quality Control Laboratory (ETQCL) in Mali was chosen to coordinate project activities in the region. WHO has been a long-term partner in POPs work in the region. 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.

The other major risk is the ability to do the laboratory work. It is expected that the participating laboratory can be enabled to deliver analytical results for the basic POPs chemicals according to available equipment and analytical capacities, 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.

G. EXPLAIN HOW COST-EFFECTIVENESS IS REFLECTED IN THE PROJECT DESIGN:

National laboratories in the participating countries have been developed in the past on a sectoral basis with separate laboratories for health, mines, agriculture, water, etc. 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, only laboratories which have at least the basis analytical equipment and have staff trained in basis analytical procedures 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.

PART III: INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT

A. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENT:

UNEP Chemicals Branch, DTIE, will be the executing agency and international coordinator. 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 region, the ETQCL, Mali will be subcontracted to coordinate the project. The ETQCL 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 core matrix. Further coordination will be done with the programs implementing air monitoring activities such as RECETOX-Czech Republic.

PART IV: EXPLAIN THE ALIGNMENT OF PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF:

The project components follow the design of the PIF. The PIF components 2. and 3. on 'Training'and 'Strengthening analytical performance' are very closely related and are merged now into one project component 2. 'Adequately equipped laboratories and trained personnel', also to be consistent with the other regional GMP projects.
The project budget was increased by about 9 % because substantial additional co-funding (about 11 % more than at PIF planning stage) could be allocated.

PART V: AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO Endorsement.

 *Maryam Niamir-Fuller* Director Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination, UNEP	*Matthias Kern* Project Contact Person Division of Global Environment Facility Coordination, UNEP
Date: *February 02, 2009*	Tel. and Email: +254 20 762 4088; matthias.kern@unep.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Objectives and Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
Development Objective			
• Countries in West Africa have the capacity to contribute with national POPs analysis to the reporting under the Global Monitoring of POPs	• Sampling programs in place in each country; • Data generated in local POPs laboratories submitted for inclusion into the regional GMP report	• Report to the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention	• Decisions SC-2/13 and SC-3/19 remain unchanged in its main objectives
Immediate Project Objective			
• To build regional capacity on analysis and data generation for POPs in core matrices for the Global POPs Monitoring (GMP) to enable West African countries to contribute to the global report submitted to the Conference of the Parties	• POPs laboratories feed data into the global database for core matrices	• National POPs data sent to regional coordination group for inclusion into global report.	• Financial and human resources available to implement the sub-regional component of the GMP for West Africa region
Outcomes			
1. Sampling and analysis are performed according to international standard by all partners	• SOPs available and accessible three months after project start	• Information exchange within West African countries and international contacts;	• GMP component reflected in NIP
2. Technical personnel is able to carry out sampling in participating countries and analysis in designated laboratories;	• Procurement of spares, consumables, standards, and small equipments carried out to enable analysis of GMP relevant compounds and matrices	• Laboratory logbook updated and proof of ongoing activities on a monthly basis.	• Stability in personnel and provision of spares and consumables to maintain operation of POPs laboratory
3. High quality data on presence of POPs in West African countries available;	• Participation of up to 5 laboratory staff each in two thematic training courses; • Inscription in up to 2 international intercalibration studies;	• Reports on results of intercalibration studies	• Successful participation in international intercalibration studies;
4. High quality data on presence of POPs in West African countries available;	• Chromatograms and results tables contribute to regional GMP cooperation plan and are available for interpretation	• Reports and publications authored	• Implementation of national programs on sampling of 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.	• Long-term strategy developed for future evaluations of GMP data by end of project; • Cooperation at international level through the COP established	• Governments' participation documented in Regional Reports	• Governments and stakeholders willing to cooperate and share data

Objectives and Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
	Regional Coordination Group		
Outputs for Outcome 1:			
1.1 Set-up the management structure for the project	• Institutional arrangements with Environmental Toxicology and Quality Control Laboratory (ETQCL) made; • Consultants/Institutions identified and contracted	• MoU with ETQCL signed	• 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	• Stakeholders and UNEP to meet and agree on main issues	• Detailed workplan prepared and published at project's Web	• All funds available and stake-holders committed
1.3 At the same workshop develop protocols and manuals for sampling and analysis of the core matrices	• Guidance documents from SSC and WHO available; • Workshop held	• Report of workshop, *i.e.*, list of participants; • SOPs drafted; • WHO ethical commitment signed	• GMP Guidance document applicable to West African sub-region; • WHO guidelines available and can be adapted to local conditions; • POPs laboratories operational
1.4 Assignment of responsible staff for air monitoring, mothers' milk monitoring, and POPs analysis	• Informed and trained staff	• Contracts for responsible staff in all 6 countries	• Country willingness to explore this option
1.5 Inspection of the POPs laboratory and identification of needs	• Visit to the POPs laboratory	• Inspection protocols filled out	• Cooperation of the POPs laboratories
Outputs for Outcome 2:			
2.1 Training of responsible personnel to establish and run the network for air samples and mothers' milk sampling	• Training program developed • Training of sampling teams held	• Contract with training laboratories; • Report by training laboratory	• 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; • List of needs for sampling equipment developed	• Report demonstrating location of sampling sites; • Sampling equipment deployed	• Access to sampling sites; • Air samplers prepared for deployment
2.3 Identification of potential donors of mothers' milk in the six countries	• List of potential donors	• Signed agreements	• Hospitals and mothers willing for cooperation
Outputs for Outcome 3:			
3.1 Identification and supply of spares consumables, standards to the laboratories to equip them for POPs analysis in the relevant	• List of needs prepared • Procurement carried out	• Procurement documents authorized	• Infrastructure sufficiently developed so that only minor components are needed

Objectives and Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
matrices			
3.2 Training of laboratory personnel on core matrices in developing country laboratory	• Training sessions for laboratory personnel held; • Training matrices available	• Training programmes available	• 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	• Developing country laboratory inscribes to the intercalibration study and submits data within the timeframe	• Results letter from organizer of intercomparison study	• 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	• Cartridges from air samplers collected and shipped to the laboratories; • Mothers' milk sample containers collected; pools prepared, and shipped to the laboratories	• Sample shipment documents and receipt at laboratories	• Samples will be available; *i.e.*, no damage to air samplers and sufficient 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	• Samples analyzed at subregional POPs laboratory and in back-up laboratories	• Table of results from developing country laboratory • Table of results from back-up laboratory	• POPs laboratories operational at required quality • Data will be made available by all parties
4.3 Evaluation of analytical data and interpretation of results	• Meeting to discuss the results (possibly by teleconference and electronic means)	• Consolidated data report • Publication including comparison with data from other regions or time trends	• 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	• Good representation at subregional workshop (*i.e.*, letters of invitation and confirmation, participants list); • Draft reports available	• Workshop report prepared and published; • Issues for lessons learned reflected in report	• 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	• All countries and stakeholders actively contributing in discussions	• Bulleted list of future actions at national/sub-regional level published	• Countries not capable to implement the components of the NIP; • Change in policy priorities

Objectives and Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
5.3 Diffusion of results and strategies	• Information materials prepared	• Reports and publications available	• Results obtained or of good quality

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF)

GEF Secretariat Review March 27, 2008:

GEF comment	UNEP Reply
Project component 2: it is mentioned under expected outcomes that "national labs have the infrastructure in place to analyze POPs according to international standards" Does that mean the project will be purchasing analytical equipments? Please clarify.	As explained under Part II. G. only laboratories which have at least the basic analytical equipment and have staff trained in basic analytical procedures will be used to achieve outputs and outcomes 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. As described in Section 3.3 of the Project Document under component 2., only procurement of spares, consumables, standards, and small equipments will be carried out to enable analysis of GMP relevant compounds and matrices.
It is expected that UNEP will prepare an annex explaining the rationale behind the global approach of the GMP.	At its third meeting in May 2007, 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 (described in Section 3.6. of the Project Document). The COP Decision indicated above is available at the POPs website (http://chm.pops.int/Convention/COPs/DecisionsRecommendations/tabid/208/language/en-US/Default.aspx).
Linkage with WHO Fourth Round of the breast milk will have to be elaborated in the project proposal.	Linkage with the WHO Fourth Round of breast milk study is described in the Project Document Sections 2.7, 3.5, 3.11, and Section 4.
Main risk relates to difficulties in maintaining capacities for POPs monitoring. Please expand in full MSP description. Please also confirm that the results will be timely enough to inform the first effectiveness evaluation.	In May 2007 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. All project countries will have included sustainability measures into their national planning and budgeting processes by the end of the project. Results will be shared through the regional and global GMP coordination processes. The Meetings of the COP 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. National laboratories in West African region 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 the region. 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 (for details see Project Document Sections 3.5. and 3.6). Even with the delayed start of the project (original implementation start was planned for

	May 2008) we expect that at least a first set of data will be produced for the first effectiveness evaluation. The sampling and analytical work can start immediately after project endorsement by the GEF Secretariat, because the project builds on an already established strong laboratory network including ETQCL and preparatory work carried out under the global Laboratory Project.
The indicative co-financing for the project is on the lower side. Stronger UNEP support is expected for the "support of the GMP" program overall.	It is essential for the project set-up that the activities are an integral part and directly contribute to the international GMP as decided by the COP and coordinated by the Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention (SSC). Further the project should be directly linked to the global Laboratory Databank for the "Assessment of Existing Capacity Building Needs to Analyze POPs in Developing Countries" which was established with financial support from GEF and is located with and run by UNEP DTIE Chemicals Branch. UNEP Chemicals hosts the Laboratory Databank and is co-located with the Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention which allows day-to-day coordination of the project activities with the international GMP coordination by the SSC. UNEP Chemicals has provided substantial in-kind input to the preparation of the PIF and the development of the MSP and will provide international project coordination as the overall Executing Agency. This is supported with substantial in-kind contribution from UNEP and cash contribution from the SSC. For details see Part I. Section C. and Project Document Section 6.2.

ANNEX C: CONSULTANTS TO BE HIRED FOR THE PROJECT

Position Titles	*$/ person week**	*Estimated person weeks***	*Tasks to be performed*
For Project Management			
Local			
Regional coordination	250 $/week	94	Coordination and administration of project activities in the West Africa region. The regional coordinator will make agreements with the participating institutions and manage the project activities in the region.
Country coordination	250 $/week	114	Coordination and administration of project activities in the 6 participating countries
International			
International coordination	3,000 $/week	20	Coordination and administration of project activities in the West Africa region
Justification for Travel, if any: The international and regional coordinators must visit the participating countries. As far as possible this will be combined with technical inspection, backstopping and/or training activities. The Steering Group will meet back-to-back with the technical meetings, *i.e.,* inception workshop and final workshop.			
For Technical Assistance			
Local			
National scientists for air monitoring and for mothers' milk in participating 6 countries	250 $/week	268	The consultants will be responsible to implement the air and mothers' milk component of the project at the national level. They will be responsible to identify the sampling sites/mothers, collect the samples according to the agreed procedures, ship them to the POPs laboratory, present and report the results. The consultants will also contribute to the design of the national study where appropriate.
SOP writers	250 $/week	232	Preparation of the two sets of standard operational procedures (documents) for collecting the air and mothers' milk samples, and for their chemical analysis in the laboratory. The SOPs will include transport and storage o the samples in the field and the laboratory.
International			
SOP technical review	2500 $/week	2	International technical backstopping and review of SOP writing
Expert training and inspection	2500 $/week	16	Train staff in POPs sampling and analysis according to international standards; two staff from the back-up laboratory will undertake a training courses at the developing country laboratories according to the priority needs and interest of the laboratory and provide technical backstopping over the duration of the project;

			Undertake inspection visits to the identified laboratory to assess the present infrastructure and needs.
Expert intercalibration analysis	3000 $/week	1	Undertake an international intercalibration study to compare the local results at international level; give technical advice and assistance to the local laboratory participation in the study
Expert milk analysis	3000 $/week	1	Assist in identifying the clinics and other institutions that will be contacted and developing the list of mothers' willing to donate their breast milk to the project; Supervise and assist collection of mothers' milk samples and shipment to the laboratories in participating countries, and shipment of pools directly to the WHO Reference laboratory for official analysis, as appropriate.
Justification for Travel, if any: For the national air and mothers' milk consultants, each national consultant will undertake national travel to establish and maintain the respective network and collect the samples. The consultant is also expected to attend the 1st and 2nd regional workshop for training, study design (1st WS) and for presenting the results (2nd WS). The SOP consultants do not have to travel to perform their tasks.			

* Provide dollar rate per person weeks or months as applicable; ** Total person weeks/months needed to carry out the tasks.

ANNEX D: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS

No GEF funds were used for project preparation

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

UNEP

PROJECT DOCUMENT

SECTION 1: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

1.1	**Project title:**	Supporting the Implementation of the Global Monitoring Plan of POPs in West Africa countries.
1.2	**Project number:**	GFL/ PMS: 3674
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:**	Region West Africa: DR Congo, Ghana, Mali, Nigeria Senegal, Togo
1.7	**Mode of execution:**	Internal
1.8	**Project executing organization:**	UNEP Chemicals Branch (global coordination), in cooperation with the Environmental Toxicology and Quality Control Laboratory, Mali (regional coordination)
1.9	**Duration of project:**	18 months Commencing: March 2009 Completion: August 2010

1.10	**Cost of project**	**US$**	**%**
	Cost to the GEF Trust Fund	**583,000**	**49**
	Co-financing	**610,600**	**51**
	Cash		
	UNEP Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention	130,600	11
	Government of Sweden	90,000	7
	Sub-total	220,600	18
	In-kind		

	Project governments	266,000	22
	UNEP	45,000	4
	Recetox	20,000	2
	Others (steering group member participation)	59,000	5
	Sub-total	390,000	33
Total		**1,193,600**	**100**

1.11 Project summary

According to Article 16 of the POPs 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, West African 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. Development of detailed guidelines, protocols and manuals, as well as training of staff in participating laboratories and strengthening the performance of sampling and analysis will enable the national laboratories to have the infrastructure in place to analyse POPs according to international standards consistent with GMP Guidelines.With this, the project will strengthen the capacity of West African countries for monitoring POPs concentrations in the key media and will facilitate reporting under the first effectiveness evaluation and drafting the regional report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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
ETQCL	Environmental Toxicology and Quality Control Laboratory
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
NIP	National Implementation Plan
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

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

2.1. Background and context

According to Article 16 of the POPs Convention, 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 mother's milk/human blood to examine human exposure, and ambient air to examine long-range transport. COP3 Decision SC-3/19 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.

So far, in West African developing countries, monitoring of POPs that would allow to establish time or spatial trends has not yet been carried out. Further, the matrices chosen by the COP for the GMP, namely ambient air, human milk, and human blood, have only been analysed in a few occasions. Typically, there are other national priorities such as food stuff and water monitoring or soil analyses at potenital hotspots. Few scattered data collected were mainly generated by some research institutes or universities in a science oriented context rather than for the implementation of multilateral environmental agreements. Few international cooperation activities on POPs monitoring have been carried out, however, they were not targeted to the core media (air, breast milk/human blood) and some of them did not follow the GMP Guidelines established by the ad hoc Technical Working Group for POPs monitoring and adopted by COP3, so their representativeness and quality still need to be assessed further.

As Parties to the Convention, West African 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 that meet the minimum requirements established for comparable data in the GMP guidance document.

2.3. Threats, root causes and barrier analysis

The UNEP Regionally Based Assessment project reported that there was very limited data on POPs in African countries (Appendix 9), and no recent air or human samples (blood or milk) analyzed.

The West African countries have established laboratories with 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 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*
DR Congo	23 March 2006
Ghana	30 May 2003
Mali	05 September 2003
Nigeria	24 May 2004
Senegal	08 October 2003
Togo	22 July 2004

2.5. Stakeholder mapping and analysis

The **Environmental Toxicology and Quality Control Laboratory** (ETQCL) has a dual role in this project: 1. sub-regional coordinator responsible for the regional delivery of this project, and 2. participating laboratory for the national data generation.

In its role as the sub-regional coordinator, ETQCL will undertake the following activities:

1. Enter into a formal agreement with UNEP/DTIE Chemicals Branch and make contractual arrangements within the West African countries to ensure the regional delivery according to project outputs including assignment of the laboratory as the sub-regional backstopping laboratory in this project (including identification of national coordinators in participating countries);
2. Organize a sub-regional workshop to prepare a detailed workplan for the project implementation and to agree on Standard Operational Procedures;
3. Liaise with the national coordinators in all participating countries, the experts responsible for the air and mothers' milk monitoring networks, and the national laboratories in participating countries and enter into an agreement with them;
4. Coordinate the available sub-regional 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. Coordinate provision of the necessary infrastructure to collect relevant samples in all participating countries;
6. Write a final report summarizing the activities undertaken in this project including lessons learned and future needs;
7. Write the financial statement on expenditures occurred during project implementation.

In its role as the assigned laboratory for Mali in this project, ETQCL will undertake the following activities:

8. Liaise with the national coordinator and the experts for the national ambient air and mothers' milk monitoring network (where different from ETQCL);
9. 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 SOPs, the training and capacity building needs;

10. 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;
11. 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;
12. Coordinate provision of the necessary infrastructure to collect relevant samples in Mali;
13. Analyze the agreed samples and submit the results to the expert back-up laboratories and UNEP Chemicals;
14. Participate at the final workshop to discuss results and exchange views;
15. Write a final report on the activities undertaken by the laboratory (at national level) including the results, lessons learned, and future needs;
16. Write the financial statement on expenditures occurred for the national activities undertaken during project implementation for this laboratory.

Partner Laboratories and Institutions/Consultants in the other participating countries:
All partner countries have laboratories with experiences on POPs analysis at different levels. For details on existing capacity and infrastructure, see section 3.6.

Partner Laboratories and National Coordinators in the other participating countries will:

1. Identify and assign national coordinator and national laboratories (the national coordinator will liaise with ETQCL as the sub-regional coordinator);
2. In cooperation with ETQCL identify the experts for the national ambient air and mothers' milk monitoring network and enter into an agreement with them;
3. 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 SOPs, the training and capacity building needs;
4. 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 (where POPs laboratories exist);
5. 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 (where POPs laboratories exist adequately equipped to participate with chemical analyses in this project);
6. Coordinate provision of the necessary infrastructure to collect relevant samples in the respective participating countries;
7. Analyze the agreed samples and submit the results to the expert back-up laboratories and UNEP Chemicals (where POPs laboratories exist adequately equipped to participate with chemical analyses in this project);
8. Participate at the final workshop to discuss results and exchange views;
9. Write a final report on the activities undertaken by the laboratory (also for laboratories where only sampling may be performed) including the results, lessons learned, and future needs as well as from the national experts for air and mothers' milk networks;

10. Write the financial statement on expenditures occurred for the national activities undertaken during project implementation for this country and submit to the sub-regional coordinator at ETQCL.

The Expert Laboratory/ies will provide the following 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 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

The GEF/UNEP project on Regionally-based Assessment of Persistent Toxic Substances (2001-2003) summarized the available data and gaps in the Regional Report for the Sub-Sahara African Region (Appendix 9) as follows:

The identifiable main sources of Persistent Toxic Substances (PTS) in the Sub-Saharan Africa region are agricultural use of pesticides, production and imports, vector control, stocks of obsolete and expired pesticides, industrial sources (manufacture, mining and electricity) and not the least as by-products of combustion including open burning of waste.
Pesticides constitute one of the major sources of PTS in the region. Except for atrazine produced in South Africa, PTS pesticides are generally imported and not produced in region but pesticide formulation plants exist in many countries of the region. Sub-Sahara Africa imports less than 5% in terms of value of total pesticides import of the world.
Regional experts identified the most widely used PTS pesticides for region as mainly organochlorine pesticides namely: DDT, endosulfan, chlordane, lindane (γ-HCH), heptachlor, toxaphene, HCB and aldrin; as well as atrazine. The workshops also noted the possibility and likelihood of illegal trade and use of PTS pesticides (including DDT) in the region. Based on pesticide import data (FAO), South Africa, Kenya, Ethiopia, Sudan, Tanzania, and Mozambique are the highest users of pesticides in the West Africa region.
A serious problem facing the region now is the issue of stocks and reservoirs of obsolete discarded and banned PTS pesticides. The FAO estimates that there might be more than 40,000 tons, perhaps even much more, of these chemicals stocked or discarded over many parts of Africa.
The major industrial PTS chemicals of concern in the region are adjudged to be the following: PCB (mainly from electricity generating industry), HCB (also a PTS pesticide), pentachlorophenol (PCP) and phthalates. Data is lacking on the use and import of PTS industrial chemicals in the region. Industrial output and electricity generation have been used as criteria to rank countries on the production of

PTS especially PCB and PCDD/PCDF from industrial sources.
Waste (domestic, hospital, industrial) burning is possibly the least known factor in the production of PCDD/PCDF in Africa. A large amount of accidental and deliberate combustion is taking place, including the burning of rubber tyres as well as stripping insulation of copper wires and cables. Waste combustion could potentially be the largest source of dioxins and furans in Africa. Moreover, burning of sugar cane fields, a common practice in sugar producing countries, could also contribute to the formation of dioxins.

Sub-Sahara is mainly an agricultural continent and it has been using pesticides for pest and disease control for more than 50 years. Except for South Africa and Zimbabwe, no systematic pesticide monitoring / analysis exist in any of the countries in the region. A big data gap exists in the region as far as levels of PTS in the environment are concerned.
From the data gathered through questionnaires, the trend of concentration observed in Sub-Sahara Africa for PTS is DDT> PCB> toxaphene. These same data apparently indicate that humans were less directly exposed than animals and vegetation to PTS during the period 1970-2002. However the main risk remains the food-web contamination. The occurrence of relatively high levels of DDT, PCB and PCDD/PCDF in adipose tissues and blood of occupationally exposed persons is of immense concern. Equally disturbing is the high levels of HCB, lindane and endosulfan in human breast milk in the region, in view of WHO's vigorous campaign that mothers breast milk is best for children. It has been established by studies in South Africa that organochlorine pesticides (OCPs) can be transferred to infants *via* breast milk. Thus infants are being exposed to these xenobiotics while the toxicological hazards and risks have not been studied in many sub-Sahara African countries.

2.7. Linkages with other GEF and non-GEF interventions

The GEF/UNEP project on Regionally-based Assessment of Persistent Toxic Substances produced a regional report for the Sub-Sahara Africa region (2002) (see section 2.6).

The identification of existing capacity to analyze POPs in developing countries and basic guidelines for POPs analysis in relevant matrices was done by the GEF-funded project “Assessment of existing capacity and capacity building needs to analyze POPs in developing countries”, which was executed by Chemicals Branch of UNEP's Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE). The project was implemented from 1 January 2005 until 30 June 2008. Phase 1 was implemented during the first year and had regional workshops and the preparation of background documents as well as the initiation of the POPs Laboratory Databank as the major achievements. Phase 2 consisted of the feasibility study where nine laboratories from seven countries in four regions participated in inspection tours and training activities. The experiences gained in the GEF project will form the basis for the training of the national laboratories.

WHO with it's Fourth Round of the breast milk study will form an essential part in this project and so directly contribute with POPs data to the GMP. Further, project activities will be linked and coordinated to ongoing global air monitoring programmes of RECETOX, Czech Republic.

SECTION 3: INTERVENTION STRATEGY (ALTERNATIVE)

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

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.

The project activities are based on the NIPs of the participating countries as far as they are available. Ghana, Mali, Senegal and Togo have already finalized and submitted their NIPs, in DR Congo and Nigeria NIPs are under developed (for details see Section 3.6.).

3.2. Project goal and objective

The goal of the project is to build regional capacity on analysis and data generation for POPs in core matrices for the Global POPs Monitoring (GMP) to enable West African countries to contribute to the global report submitted to the Conference of the Parties (COP).

3.3. Project components and expected results

The project has the following components expected outcomes and results and main indicators (for more details see Appendix 1: Project Logical 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 reality in West African countries.

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 done according to international standards.

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;
- Inscription in up to 2 international inter-calibration studies.

Component 4: High quality data on presence of POPs in West African countries are available:

Expected outcome:

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

Expected outputs:

- Regional report on POPs levels in human milk and air from at least 4 countries.
- Report on comparison of data from the region 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 West African countries
- 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 participating countries the laboratory facilities will be strengthened to reliably sample and analyze POPs.

Participating countries will contribute by provision of samples and laboratory facilities and benefit by training in sampling, analytical procedures, 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 West Africa region.

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 the participating 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-3/19 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 six countries has obvious logistical risks. The ETQCL in Mali is the sub-regional coordinator for the GMP Programme and was chosen to coordinate project activities in the West Africa. WHO has been a long-term partner in POPs work in the region. 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 ETQCL was selected as regional hub for the POPs analysis training activities in the region.

The other major risk is the ability to do the laboratory work. It is expected that the participating laboratory can be enabled to deliver analytical results for the basic POPs chemicals according to available equipment and analytical capacities, 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

At its third meeting in May 2007, 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 Africa region was held in Nairobi, Kenya from 29 to 31 October 2007. 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. Due to the size of the region, the workshop recommended to propose two medium size projects for supporting the implementation of the GMP in Africa, one for the Eastern and Southern and one for the West sub-regions. The regional organization group identified and confirmed the participating countries/laboratories for these GEF projects. Mali was identified as

regional project coordinator for the West African countries. The capacities and identified needs of the participating laboratories are as follows:

DR Congo has at present no laboratory with recommended equipment for POPs analysis at international standards. However, the country has institutions such as the Congolese Office for Control (O.C.C), the Laboratory of Ecotoxicology ERGS (Dept of the Environmental Sciences, Faculty of Science, University of Kinshasa) and national consultants familiar with the requirements for chemical analysis (although for other classes of pollutants) and experienced with air sampling programs and their equipment as well as with data handling, The Director of the Ecotoxicology Laboratory ERGS will be assigned to lead this project at the national level, which will concentrate on the national air and breast milk sampling activities, evaluation of results and data interpretation. The chemical analyses will be done elsewhere. Through this project, the laboratories and institutions in the DR Congo will participate in the regional activity, share the experiences and generate data for the GMP. Through the participation, institutions in DR Congo will be trained on the needs and standards for POPs analysis and be enabled to develop the longer-term effectiveness evaluation plan in the at national level and actively contribute to the plan at regional level. The experiences will translate into public training, environmental education and awareness raising programmes that are promoted.

Ghana has four laboratories in the POPs Laboratory Databank, which all have the main equipment present for POPs analysis; none of them would be equipped to analyse for dioxin-like compounds. Three of them use ECD and one uses MS detector. Presently, the laboratories do not have much experience with the GMP matrices but the instrumentation present would allow them to actively generate POPs data for the GMP. The Ghana Focal Point has nominated the Department of Chemistry at the National Nuclear Research Institute of the Ghana Atomic Energy Commission in Legon-Accra to be the designated laboratory for this project.

Identified needs are human resource training in sampling and analytical chemistry, instrumentation and data handling, support to purchase spares, consumables, analytical standards and air sampling equipment, implementation of QA/QC systems, participation in inter-laboratory calibration studies in relevant matrices (ambient air and breast milk) for basic POPs (excluding PCDD/PCDF and dioxin-like PCB) to verify performance.

Mali has one laboratory in the POPs Databank, which is also nominated for this project. In addition, the head of the laboratory will serve as the regional project coordinator. The laboratory is the Environmental Toxicology and Quality Control Laboratory of the Central Veterinary Laboratory (ETQCL) in Bamako. The laboratory's main function is quality control and pesticides residues analysis.

The laboratory has good experience with basic POPs pesticides, especially with DDT, in soil, sediment, water, and food. During summer 2007, a study on the contaminated site by pesticides was undertaken by this laboratory in the scope of the ASP (African Stockpiles Program). 91 samples of soil and water were analyzed. The results are not yet published.

Nigeria has nominated two laboratories, both located at Universities, namely: (1) University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Research Laboratory, (2) Basel Convention Regional Coordinating Centre for Africa, University of Ibadan. The laboratory at the BCRC is a research and training laboratory for graduate students, which would be classified as a Tier 3 (HRGC/ECD) laboratory but presently the laboratory functions are under development.

The POPs laboratory was established in the Chemistry Department, University of Ibadan, in January 1981 with a grant from Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA). UNEP/FAO under the aegis of the Regional Seas Programme for West and Central Africa (WACAF) also donated a gas chromatograph (GC) with ECD to the laboratory in 1984. The laboratory was used for sub-regional training in POPs analysis in fish and sediments for West African countries including Benin,

Cameroon, Ghana and Nigeria. The two gas chromatographs are old and urgently need replacement. The laboratory is used for M.Sc and PhD students' research in POPs. The Chemistry Department of the university is adjacent to the Basel Convention Regional Coordinating Centre for Africa (BCRC Nigeria) in the university campus. In line with the national policy on environmental protection and control, the University of Nigeria Analytical Chemistry Research Laboratory, Department of Pure and Industrial Chemistry, has been primarily concerned with the analysis of water, soil and effluents for hydrocarbon pollutants and trace metals. Since 2005, studies on pesticide residues in soil, effluent, and water have been carried out using facilities from various laboratories across the country. The Nigerian Breweries PLC has built an ultra modern multi functional laboratory in the University. This laboratory, in addition to other facilities, will house a GC with ECD, or GC/MS, NMR, IR and UV/Visible spectrophotometers. With these equipments the POP studies will be strengthened in the next two years. Presently, the laboratory screens food and human blood for toxic metals but it is planned to also include POPs pesticides. There is need for facility upgrade and strengthening of capacity of technical personnel through training and continual re-training. There is also need for updating the analytical protocols to most recent international standards and the need for supply of spares and consumables.

Senegal has one laboratory listed in the POPs Laboratory Databank, namely Laboratory Ceres Locustox, in Dakar, which is nominated for the project. The laboratory is a HRGC/ECD laboratory (Tier 3) and has experience with almost all matrices (exception of ambient air, transformer oils and stack emissions) and all basic POPs. The laboratory has implemented the Good Laboratory Practices system including adequate infrastructure for filing, data handling, storage and processing. They have a QA system n place. It is certified according to GLP since August 2002 by the French authorities (interministerial Group of Chemical Products (GIPC) via the French Committee of Accreditation (COFRAC) in field 6 of OECD). The laboratory is in the stage for seeking accreditation according to ISO 17025. The Quality Assurance Unit makes periodically audits of installations, critical phases and studies. The laboratory has been a member of the Interprofessional Office of Analytical Studies Bipea of France since July 2001 and in the past has successfully participated in international intercalibration studies for PCB and organochlorine pesticides.
The main training needs are adjustments for the analytical protocols and their application to the GMP matrices.

Togo has nominated the Laboratoire de l'Institut Togolais de Recherche Agronomique / Direction des Laboratoires in Lomé, to participate in the project. The laboratory performs analyses of water, soils, fertilizers and vegetation. It also covers foodstuff quality control in addition to supporting different kinds of analyses for agronomic research in Togo. Currently the lab is not yet adequately equipped for POPs analysis, but its business plan includes this kind of analyses and efforts are underway to secure funding in line with the monitoring action plan in the NIP of the Stockholm Convention on POPs. It has been selected by the national stakeholders of the POPs Convention to become the national reference lab for the sampling of POPs and analyses of pesticides and if possible semi-quantitative analysis of PCBs.
The laboratory staff has a good understanding of lab management and performance since it takes part in international intercomparison studies for heavy metals in relevant matrices. The laboratory – although not yet ready to undertake POPs analysis – has a sound basis for the implications and needs to generate quality data and with its human resources will be able to actively contribute to the GMP process.

3.7. Incremental cost reasoning

Without GEF support, the developing countries in West Africa would not be able to provide national data to the effectivenss evaluation under the Stockholm Convention. More importantly, without training and provisions to be able to analyse the key GMP matrices air, human milk, and human blood, they also will not be able to contribute to future evaluations. With GEF support and technical assistance of UNEP, these countries will gradually enhance their capacities by implementing new methods to analyze the - for these countries - new matrices and to increase the spectrum to all of the POPs. Strengthening of the analytical performance and international acceptance of the analytical data will significantly increase the monitoring and analytical capacity and thus, these parties will become active contributors to the GMP and with this complying with the requirements set by the Stockholm Convention.

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 African countries, 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. 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 West Africa regional 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. In addition, the POPs Analytical Guidelines developed under the UNEP/GEF POPs Analytical Capacity Assessment project provide information as to safe laboratory operations including handling and storage of samples and materials or quality control criteria.

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/DTIE Chemicals Branch will be the executing agency and international coordinator. 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 region, the ETQCL, Mali will be subcontracted to coordinate the project. The ETQCL 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 core matrix. Further coordination will be done with the programs implementing air monitoring activities such as 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 West Africa 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 beneficiaries will be the participating laboratories receiving training and consumables/spares. 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 region 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 Logical 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

6.1. Budget by project component and UNEP budget lines

(see Appendix 6)

6.2. Co-financing details

Co-financing Source	Cash	In-kind	Total
Project Government Contributions:			
Ghana	0	40,000	40,000
Mali	0	66,000	66,000
Senegal	0	40,000	40,000
Nigeria	0	40,000	40,000
DR Congo	0	40,000	40,000
Togo	0	40,000	40,000
UNEP		45,000	45,000
UNEP Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention	40,000		40,000
UNEP Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention (GMP programme support in West Africa)	90,600		90,600
Government of Sweden	90,000		90,000
Recetox (Research Centre for Environ-mental Chemistry and Ecotoxicology, Masaryk University in Brno)		20,000	20,000
Others: (Steering group member participation; industry)		59,000	59,000
Total co-financing	220,600	390,000	610,600

6.3. Project cost-effectiveness

National laboratories in the participating countries have been developed in the past on a sectoral basis with separate laboratories for health, mines, agriculture, water, etc. 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, only laboratories which have at least the basis analytical equipment and have staff trained in basis analytical procedures 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.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Project Logical Framework

Appendix 2: Workplan and timetable

Appendix 3: Key deliverables and benchmarks

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: PTS Africa Report

APPENDIX 1: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Objectives and Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
Development Objective			
• Countries in West Africa have the capacity to contribute with national POPs analysis to the reporting under the Global Monitoring of POPs	• Sampling programs in place in each country; • Data generated in local POPs laboratories submitted for inclusion into the regional GMP report	• Report to the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention	• Decisions SC-2/13 and SC-3/19 remain unchanged in its main objectives
Immediate Project Objective			
• To build regional capacity on analysis and data generation for POPs in core matrices for the Global POPs Monitoring (GMP) to enable West African countries to contribute to the global report submitted to the Conference of the Parties	• POPs laboratories feed data into the global database for core matrices	• National POPs data sent to regional coordination group for inclusion into global report.	• Financial and human resources available to implement the sub-regional component of the GMP for West Africa region
Outcomes			
1. Sampling and analysis are performed according to international standard by all partners	• SOPs available and accessible three months after project start	• Information exchange within West African countries and international contacts;	• GMP component reflected in NIP
2. Technical personnel is able to carry out sampling in participating countries and analysis in designated laboratories;	• Procurement of spares, consumables, standards, and small equipments carried out to enable analysis of GMP relevant compounds and matrices	• Laboratory logbook updated and proof of ongoing activities on a monthly basis.	• Stability in personnel and provision of spares and consumables to maintain operation of POPs laboratory
3. High quality data on presence of POPs in West African countries available;	• Participation of up to 5 laboratory staff each in two thematic training courses; • Inscription in up to 2 international intercalibration studies;	• Reports on results of intercalibration studies	• Successful participation in international intercalibration studies;
4. High quality data on presence of POPs in West African countries available;	• Chromatograms and results tables contribute to regional GMP cooperation plan and are available for interpretation	• Reports and publications authored	• Implementation of national programs on sampling of core matrices possible financially and with human

Objectives and Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
			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.	• 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	• Governments' participation documented in Regional Reports	• Governments and stakeholders willing to cooperate and share data
Outputs for Outcome 1:			
1.1 Set-up the management structure for the project	• Institutional arrangements with Environmental Toxicology and Quality Control Laboratory (ETQCL) made; • Consultants/Institutions identified and contracted	• MoU with ETQCL, Mali signed	• 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	• Stakeholders and UNEP to meet and agree on main issues	• Detailed workplan prepared and published at project's Web	• All funds available and stake-holders committed
1.3 At the same workshop develop protocols and manuals for sampling and analysis of the core matrices	• Guidance documents from SSC and WHO available; • Workshop held	• Report of workshop, *i.e.,* list of participants; • SOPs drafted; • WHO ethical commitment signed	• GMP Guidance document applicable to West African sub-region; • WHO guidelines available and can be adapted to local conditions; • POPs laboratories operational
1.4 Assignment of responsible staff for air monitoring, mothers' milk monitoring, and POPs analysis	• Informed and trained staff	• Contracts for responsible staff in all 6 countries	• Country willingness to explore this option
1.5 Inspection of the POPs laboratory and identification of needs	• Visit to the POPs laboratory	• Inspection protocols filled out	• Cooperation of the POPs laboratories
Outputs for Outcome 2:			
2.1 Training of responsible personnel to establish and run the network for air samples	• Training program developed • Training of sampling teams held	• Contract with training laboratories;	• Cooperation at national level; • Access to samples;

Objectives and Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
and mothers' milk sampling		• Report by training laboratory	• 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; • List of needs for sampling equipment developed	• Report demonstrating location of sampling sites; • Sampling equipment deployed	• Access to sampling sites; • Air samplers prepared for deployment
2.3 Identification of potential donors of mothers' milk in the six countries	• List of potential donors	• Signed agreements	• Hospitals and mothers willing for cooperation
Outputs for Outcome 3:			
3.1 Identification and supply of spares consumables, standards to the laboratories to equip them for POPs analysis in the relevant matrices	• List of needs prepared • Procurement carried out	• Procurement documents authorized	• Infrastructure sufficiently developed so that only minor components are needed
3.2 Training of laboratory personnel on core matrices in developing country laboratory	• Training sessions for laboratory personnel held; • Training matrices available	• Training programmes available	• 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	• Developing country laboratory inscribes to the intercalibration study and submits data within the timeframe	• Results letter from organizer of intercomparison study	• 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	• Cartridges from air samplers collected and shipped to the laboratories; • Mothers' milk sample containers collected; pools prepared, and shipped to the laboratories	• Sample shipment documents and receipt at laboratories	• Samples will be available; *i.e.*, no damage to air samplers and sufficient number of participating pregnant mothers
4.2 Exchange of national samples for POPs	• Samples analyzed at subregional	• Table of results from	• POPs laboratories operational

Objectives and Outcomes/Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
analysis in developing country laboratory and mirror analysis in experienced back-up laboratory	POPs laboratory and in back-up laboratories	developing country laboratory • Table of results from back-up laboratory	at required quality • Data will be made available by all parties
4.3 Evaluation of analytical data and interpretation of results	• Meeting to discuss the results (possibly by teleconference and electronic means)	• Consolidated data report • Publication including comparison with data from other regions or time trends	• 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	• Good representation at subregional workshop (*i.e.,* letters of invitation and confirmation, participants list); • Draft reports available	• Workshop report prepared and published; • Issues for lessons learned reflected in report	• 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	• All countries and stakeholders actively contributing in discussions	• Bulleted list of future actions at national/sub-regional level published	• Countries not capable to implement the components of the NIP; • Change in policy priorities
5.3 Diffusion of results and strategies	• Information materials prepared	• Reports and publications available	• 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 and benchmarks

Key Deliverables	Time line (months after project start)
1. Identify sub-regional coordinator, suitable laboratory and institutions in participating countries to collaborate in the project and enter into agreement with them - Agreement will be signed between UNEP Chemicals and the sub-regional coordinating institution (ETQCL) - 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
2. Identify and contract back-up laboratories for training of the laboratories and institutions in the participating countries: • 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.e.*, 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
3. Hold a sub-regional workshop to; • 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
4. Undertake inspection visit(s) to the identified laboratories to assess the present infrastructure and needs: • 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

spares and consumables to adequately equip the developing country laboratory for POPs analysis; • 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;	
5. Develop analytical protocols and training materials for sampling and analysis • 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
6. Provide the necessary spares and consumables to the participating laboratories • 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
7. Networks for collection of air samples and mothers' milk samples will be set-up: • 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; o Air and mothers' milk samples will be collected accordingly and shipped to the participating laboratories. Eventually, pools will directly be shipped to the WHO Reference laboratory for official analysis.	4-6
8. Train the laboratory staff in POPs analysis according to international standards: o 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
9. Analysis of sub-regional priority matrices o After/at the training national samples of interest will be analyzed in the participating laboratory; o 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 o Well characterized samples from intercalibration studies will be analyzed by the participating laboratories o 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. o All participating laboratories will meet to discuss the analytical results; o 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 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 ETQCL. The day-to-day management and monitoring of the regional activities in the participating countries will be the responsibility of the regional team, lead by ETQCL. 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 ETQCL and is comprised of staff from ETQCL and local experts from the six participating countries. ETQCL 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, ETQCL, 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	ETQCL, UNEP	0	Within two months of project start
Inception report	Provides implementation plan for progress monitoring	Project coordinator	0	Immediately following Inception Workshop
Project Review by Steering Committee	Assesses progress, effectiveness of operations and technical outputs; Recommends adaptation where necessary and confirms forward implementation plan.	ETQCL, UNEP	0	Month 9 and 18
Project Implementation Review	Progress and effectiveness review for the GEF, provision of lessons learned	ETQCL, 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	ETQCL, UNEP	0	At the end of project implementation
Independent Terminal evaluation	Reviews effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation,	ETQCL, UNEP, Independent	30,000	At end of project

	coordination mechanisms and outputs Identifies lessons learned and likely remedial actions for future projects Highlights technical achievements and assesses against prevailing benchmarks	external consultant		implementation
Independent Financial Audit	Reviews use of project funds against budget and assesses probity of expenditure and transactions	Audits by ETQCL, 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 framework[1].
- *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

[1] 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.[2]

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

[2] 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..

<u>Rating system for sustainability sub-criteria</u>

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 (*) - - - - -										
Totals										

***** 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* 'GEF EO' rating + 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&E[3]

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.

[3] 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		