Strengthen National Decision Making towards Ratification of the Minamata Convention and build capacity towards implementation of future provisions

Project Evaluation

Patrick Breard Lead Evaluator patrick@breard.com

Final Workshop of the Project Minamata Initial Assessment - Istanbul - Turkey -26th - 27th March 2019

Table of Contents



- **Evaluation Objectives**
 - Simplified Theory of Change at Evaluation
 - **Project Assumptions**
 - **Project Stakeholders**
- **Evaluation Methodology**

Objectives of the Evaluation



- The purpose of the global MIA project evaluation is primarily to strengthen accountability, but we also aim to promote organizational learning.
- Scope of the evaluation is the global MIA project period i.e. 2015 to 2019. Some of the specific questions the evaluation will attempt to address include:
 - How did the project relate [to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and] to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?
 - To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?
 - Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?
 - To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?
 - Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?
- The Evaluation's mandate is to determine, as systematically and objectively as possible, the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact of the project.

Simplified Theory of Change at Evaluation



Project Resources

- Staffing, leadership, management
- Financial support (GEF funding)
- In-kind contributions from partner organizations (UNDP, UNITAR, etc.)
- Information technologies
- Data, information, and knowledge
- International agreements, norms, standards
- Networks & partnerships
- Communications and outreach **Governments and Stakeholders**
- Staff time
- Institutional and organizational capacities (national and local)
- Financial resources
- Partnerships
- Information technologies
- Data, information and knowledge (including national legislations, assessments, etc.)

- Project Activities • Audiences' needs
- and priorities identified
- Capacity development activities and events organized and delivered
- Information collected, synthesized & organized
- Technical consensus developed
- Information uptake and application strategies developed
- Dissemination strategies developed

- National Coordination/Consultation Mechanism on Mercury operational
- Policy and regulatory framework, and institutional and capacity needs in regard to the implementation of Convention provisions assessed
- Awareness raised on the environmental and health impacts of Mercury
 - Project countries equipped and prepared for the mainstreaming of national Mercury Priorities

National MIA report

developed

- National capacity huilt to National Mercury Profile developed
- built to undertake Mercury inventories

- Enabling environment established for decision-making on the ratification of the Minamata Convention
- National Mercury Profile and Mercury Initial Assessment Report available

Mercury Initial Assessment (MIA) undertook to enable the **Governments of** Bangladesh, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania, Mozambique, and Samoa to determine the national requirements and needs for the ratification of the **Minamata Convention** and establish a national foundation to undertake future work towards the implementation of the Convention.

Project Assumptions

- It is assumed that in the situation that a country disposes of an Inter-Agency Coordinating Mechanism on Chemicals – responsibilities related to Mercury can easily be added to their TORs.
- It is assumed that all involved institutions are **willing to share information** about current **capacity**, **gaps and needs**.
- It is assumed that all government institutions are willing to **share accurate information** about the **health effects** of Mercury and the **potential health exposure** for certain risk groups.
- It is assumed that once the project has agreed on which Hg priorities to mainstream, national development plans are being reviewed and it is timely to mainstream selected priorities.
- It is assumed that the project will have **available sufficient funds** to hire technical experts that have already a proven track record in the area of Hg.
- The project team is able to **collect the necessary data** and information that would be necessary to prepare a high-quality Mercury Profile.
- The MIA report is of sufficiently high quality and in line with government expectations, that it can be **approved and adopted relatively fast**.

Project Stakeholders



- Global MIA Project Team (UNITAR/UNDP)
- UNITAR Chemicals and Waste Management Programme
- The GEF
- Ministries of Environment
- Ministries of Finance
- Ministries of Health
- Ministries of Energy
- Ministries of Mining
- Ministries of Local Government and Municipalities/City Councils
- Private sector
- CSOs

Methodology of the Evaluation

- Secondary Sources
- Interviews
- Survey

Schedule of the Evaluation

Task	March 2019	April 2019	May 2019	June 2019
Phase 1: Inception				
Draft				
Evaluation design/question matrix				
Phase 2: Data collection				
Full desk review				
Interview preparations				
Interviews with ministries				
Interviews with other key stakeholders (remote)				
Stakeholder surveys				
Phase 3: Analysis and reporting				
Analysis and zero report drafting				
Zero draft comments from Evaluation Manager				
Draft report preparation and presentation				
Draft report comments from stakeholders				
Report finalisation				

Limitations to the Evaluation



- No country visits, which may reduce opportunities for collecting evidence of impact at national level and of the challenges faced during project implementation.
- Short time frame availed for the research may not allow for a comprehensive collection of survey responses.
- Possible unavailability of data may be another challenge if not all narrative reports are available due to changes in project management.
- Consultations with Samoa may be limited due to the 13-hour time difference between the country and the consultant's home base (France).
- Project implementation in Mozambique was very delayed, which may limit the depth and scope of the assessment.
- Gender is an area which might be difficult to evaluate in this type of project.