UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

INDEPENDENT TERMINAL EVALUATION

For the UNDP/GEF Project on

Environmentally Sound Management and Destruction of PCBs

Mexico

June 2015

Cristóbal Vignal
Senior International Consultant

Table of Contents

i Synopsis

Title of project:	**Environmentally Sound Management and Destruction of PCBs**
GEF Project Id	3270
ATLAS Award ID:	00049136 (00059701, as per ToRs)
PIMS Number:	3692 (www.thegef.org) 4371
Terminal Evaluation Timeframe	2009 - 2015
Date of Mid Term Evaluation	March-June, 2011
Country:	MEXICO
GEF Focal Area	POPs
Operational Program	14
GEF Strategic Objective:	POPs SP-1 and POPs SP-2
Executing Agency:	Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources. (SEMARNAT)
GEF Budget (USD):	$4,630,000.00
Co-Financing Budget (USD):	$14,060,000.00
Project Document Signature date:	Mexico City, 2009
Date of first disbursement:	2009
Original Planned Closing Date:	2013

i.i Acknowledgements

The evaluator acknowledges and thanks the support and information provided by numerous officials from the Mexican Government, individuals and UNDP's project stakeholders. All of the interviewees provided valuable feedback during the evaluation mission.

Likewise, the ET extends its thanks to representatives of the provincial government of Chiapas and companies in Tuxtla for their time, feedback and contributions that were essential for this report.

The evaluator would also like to acknowledge the role played by the UNDP Country Office, and in particular the projects Programme Manager, without whose support, dedication and remarkable adaptive management skills this evaluation would not have been possible.

Last but not least, the evaluator wishes to express deep appreciation for the strong support provided by the project team in Mexico. Their time and availability, the information provided and, handling of logistics during the field visit greatly facilitated the comprehension of the multiple facets of the project and documentation of its results.

Cristóbal Vignal

Montreal, June 2015

ii Executive Summary

ii.i Project Summary Table

Title of project	**Environmentally Sound Management & Destruction of PCBs in Mexico**
Terminal Evaluation Timeframe	2009 - 2015
Date of Mid Term Evaluation	March-June, 2011
Executing Agency	Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources. (SEMARNAT)
GEF Budget (USD)	$4,630,000.00
Co-Financing Budget (USD)	$14,060,000.00
Original / actual closing Date	2013 / 2015

ii.ii Project Description

The goal of this project was to minimize the risks of exposure to PCBs, and their release into the environment, in order to protect the population of Mexico (in particular those most vulnerable, such as school children and workers), while simultaneously promoting Mexico's timely compliance with the Stockholm Convention (SC) requirements for PCB management (including provisions on decommissioning, and destruction[1]).

The objective of the project was to strengthen capacity in Mexico to manage and phase out PCBs in an environmentally sound and safe manner, placing emphasis on government coordination and facilitation of services. The project principally sought to support the environmentally sound management and phase out of PCBs owned by private sector SME generators, as well as within sensitive sites and municipalities[2].

Based on the information presented to the evaluator, the following main projects results were observed:

- Legislation in the form of Standards (NOM-133) is ready and should be approved before the end of Q3 2015;

- As regards destruction the target has been exceeded (by 66%), which is considered highly satisfactory. As well it would appear that mechanisms are in place for the destruction of identified existing stockpiles;

- The project was instrumental in providing up-to-date information regarding existing stockpiles (data used to revise official inventory figures, as well for input for the NIP

[1] Project Results Framework - GEF Project #3270 https://www.thegef.org/gef/project_detail?projID=3270

[2] The definition of "Sensitive sites" includes schools, hospitals, wells, shopping centers and the food production sector

update currently ongoing), but also in providing guidance and support to owners as regards best available options for their destruction.

ii.iii Evaluation Rating Table

PROJECT PERFORMANCE RATING		
Criteria	Rating	Comment
Monitoring and Evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) - (6 pt. scale)		
Overall quality of M&E	HS	No shortcomings identified
M&E design at project start up	HS	
M&E Plan Implementation	HS	
IA & EA Execution: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) - (6 pt. scale)		
Overall Quality of Project Implementation/Execution	HS	No shortcomings identified
Implementing Agency Execution	HS	
Executing Agency Execution	HS	
Outcomes Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) - (6 pt. scale, except Relevance 2 pt.)		
Overall Quality of Project Outcomes	HS	Overall highly satisfactory, exceeded expectations
Relevance: relevant (R) or not relevant (NR)	R	Considered highly relevant by all sectors
Effectiveness	HS	Assessed as highly effective at all levels
Efficiency	S	Rating affected by the delay of over one year
Sustainability: Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U) - (4 pt. scale).		
Overall likelihood of risks to Sustainability:	L	Overall sustainability of project results is considered Likely; However funds must continue to be mobilized, both nationally and internationally
Financial resources	L	
Socio-economic	L	
Institutional framework and governance	L	
Environmental	L	
Impact: Significant (S), Minimal (M), Negligible (N) - (3 pt. scale)		
Environmental Status Improvement	S	Significant overall, exceeded expectations
Environmental Stress Reduction	S	
Progress towards stress/status change	S	
Overall Project results	HS	Even with minor shortcomings in efficiency, as Relevance and Effectiveness are critical criteria, overall the project is assessed as Highly Satisfactory

ii.iv Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

A number of recommendations are made to support the long-term sustainability of the project and facilitate the achievement of the impacts sought. In particular it is considered that:

- Active participation of all key Federal and state level stakeholders should continue to be encouraged after the project ends to ensure, in particular that the momentum gained be maintained and/or supported during the transition period between projects;
- Active participation of the private sector (hospitals, sensitive sectors, etc.) should continue to be encouraged and/or supported during the transition period between projects;
- Mechanisms should be put in place to facilitate the transfer and/or internalization of capacities built by the project management unit; as the projects progress in time, and in particular, well before they come to an end the risk always exists that this institutional memory and established network of contacts will fade and/or loose interest.

In addition to the above, it is also suggested to integrate into future efforts in support of compliance with the Stockholm Convention, the results and experience gained from this project into other cross cutting activities of UNDP, in Mexico as well as regionally to lay the foundation for future Stockholm Convention related interventions for all POPs, and not only PCBs.

As regards future directions for the project, it is strongly suggested to expand awareness raising and capacity building activities to the population in general, to avoid the potential backlash that could be brought on by ignorance and/or fear of the wrongly perceived “consequences” that could be faced if PCBs were to be found in equipment being used and/or serviced. In particular this was documented during the interviews as having happened in a “number of instances” where the fear of owning potentially contaminated equipment/oils would have led to these having been discretely - and illegally - disposed of in the field.

iii Acronyms and Abbreviations

ET	Evaluation Team
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
PCB	Polychlorinated biphenyls
NOM	Norma Official Mexicana - National Official Standards
SC	Stockholm Convention
NIP	National Implementation Plan under the Stockholm Convention
IA	Implementing Agency
NEX	National Execution
POP	Persistent Organic Pollutants
ITE	Independent Terminal Evaluation
GEF	Global Environment Facility
PSC	Project Steering Committee
SME	Small and medium sized enterprises
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean
PCU	Project Coordinating Unit
Relaciones Exteriores	Foreign Affairs Ministry
SEMARNAT	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources for its acronym in Spanish: Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the evaluation

The general purpose of this Independent Terminal Evaluation (ITE) is to objectively analyze the implementation of the project as well as its achievements, results and impacts. This evaluation aims to determine the relevance, implementation and success of the project, including the sustainability of its results; it will compile and analyze lessons learned, as well as best practices, regarding the strategies employed and the implementation arrangements, which may be relevant for other similar projects in the country and/or in other countries of the world.

The purpose of the ITE will be to assess the achievement of the UNDP project on Environmentally Sound Management and Destruction of PCBs in Mexico, funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), with a grant of US$4,630,000.

This ITE will document results, and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

1.2 Scope and methodology

The scope of the evaluation was from 2009 to date, and a field mission took place from 8 to 12 June 2015 to conduct interviews with the key organizations and individuals. Although the majority of stakeholders of the project are in the capital region, the objective was also to visit at a minimum 2 of the pilot sites (in the DF and in Chiapas). Unfortunately, for reasons beyond the control of the evaluator[3], the only possible site visit was to the city of Tuxtla in the State of Chiapas, and this took place on Wednesday the 10th of June.

The ITE followed a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, UNDP Country Office, project country team and other key stakeholders. The evaluation was conducted according to guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF in the *Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP- supported, GEF-Financed Projects* (UNDP, Evaluation Office – 2012) and the structure of the present report follows that described in this document. The criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact were used in the ITE and the main results of the project are described in detail in the chapter entitled “Findings”, below.

[3] Senior officers and/or persons in charge with prior project involvement were not available on these dates

Relevant information and documents for this ITE were obtained with the support of the Project Management Unit, UNDP Mexico, as well as the Foreign Affairs Ministry (Relaciones Exteriores) the executing agency for the project. As well, additional information for this analysis was obtained through a series of stakeholder interviews, as referenced in the annexes. These interviews were complemented by the above mentioned field visit in Tuxtla.

It is important to note that although the CEO Endorsement Document stipulates "a two person team of national and international independent evaluators, strengthened with government appointed experts" will conduct a terminal evaluation, only one international expert was appointed. This is considered as a limiting factor, as a two-member team would have facilitated the impartial verification/triangulations of findings.

Project description and development context

1.3 Project start and duration

The project was initially approved for 4 years in October of 2008 and implementation started in April of 2009. The Project Steering Committee (PSC) progressively extended this timeframe to 6 years responding to different necessities, opportunities and challenges, and with an adaptive management approach in mind. The extensions were documented accordingly in the PSC minutes[4] and the Annual Reports of the Project (PIRs). The completion date was ultimately set for March 2015.

At the time of this evaluation a limited number of activities were still in the process of being completed and/or transferred to the authorities; however the evaluator received confirmation that the official closing workshop for the project took place on 30 June 2015.

1.4 Problems addressed

Through the destruction of significant quantities of PCBs, and creation of an enabling environment facilitating their decommissioning and destruction, the project directly addressed the problem of release of PCBs into the global environment (global cycling).

It is important to mention that the project supported the mainstreaming of capacities that have shielded it with relative success from the administrative changes brought upon by the changes in government, be it through the legislation and policy work, or

[4] Minutes of the PSC meetings: 18/04/2012 - extension to December 2013; 10/07/2013 - extension to July 2014; 15/01/2014 - extension to September 2014; and 12/11/2014 - extension to March 2015

through the implementation of an integrated management system, as described in detail in sections below.

In addition to these non-negligible results, the project also improved the lives of citizens by directly removing and/or reducing the possibility of exposure to released PCBs in the pilot states where the project was implemented (Guanajuato, Chiapas, Federal District and, Nuevo Leon, as well as the municipality of Cuautitlán Izcalli).

1.5 Objectives of the project

The goal of this project was to minimize the risks of exposure to PCBs, and their release into the environment, in order to protect the population of Mexico (in particular those most vulnerable, such as school children and workers), while simultaneously promoting Mexico's timely compliance with the Stockholm Convention (SC) requirements for PCB management (including provisions on decommissioning, and destruction[5]).

The objective of the project was to strengthen capacity in Mexico to manage and phase out PCBs in an environmentally sound and safe manner, placing emphasis on government coordination and facilitation of services.

The project principally sought to support the environmentally sound management and phase out of PCBs owned by private sector SME generators, as well as within sensitive sites[6] .

1.6 Baseline Indicators established

The selected indicators (Improved national capacities for management and, phase-out of PCBs) are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time framed. For this reason it is considered that they are suitable to determine the attainment of the objectives.

Through the documentary information and the information collected in the field, the evaluator considers that there was sufficient evidence to establish a baseline for the project; sources of information were sufficient to verify and document the progress and constraints encountered during the assessment; data and information derived from interviews were qualitatively satisfactory and this was verified through comparison of figures from different sources and through crosschecked interviews

[5] Project Results Framework - GEF Project #3270 https://www.thegef.org/gef/project_detail?projID=3270

[6] The definition of sensitive sites includes schools, hospitals, wells, shopping centers and the food production sector

with relevant actors in an independent way, showing that respondents views and contributions were in full agreement.

1.7 Main stakeholders

In addition to the governmental structures directly responsible for the environment and for energy, the project reportedly included all of the relevant key industrial stakeholders, as well as the representatives from civil society organizations involved in hazardous waste and chemical safety issues, and academia. These stakeholders are included in the Technical Advisory Committee and the list in included in the Annexes for easy reference.

The evaluator was presented with extensive documentation demonstrating that all of the main federal and state level stakeholders had been either contacted by the project and/or had been directly been involved with the project.

1.8 Expected results

The project seeks to "create an enabling environment for decommissioning and destruction of Mexico's remaining inventory of PCB wastes, including official (reported) inventory and part of those wastes identified and decommissioned within three industrialized states and one municipality" (These "Pilots" were implemented - as is further detailed below - in the State of Guanajuato and in Cuautitlán Izcalli).

The enabling environment will be established through implementation of five project components (outcomes) established in the Project Document:

1. Development and implementation of strategies and activities for strengthening Mexico's institutional capacity within central and state governments for environmentally sound management and destruction of PCBs, including legislation and enforcement;
2. Facilitation of expansion and/or upgrading of interim storage so that Mexico has adequate safe central and regional interim PCB storage facilities for its national PCB inventory, with particular emphasis on access to facilities by small-and medium-size enterprises (SMEs);
3. Establishment and demonstration of a nationally-coordinated, comprehensive servicing system for PCB management;
4. Raising awareness of legal obligations and best practices for PCB management and destruction in the private and public sectors through outreach and training; and,
5. Project management (monitoring and evaluation).

The project components will be tested in one state and one municipal pilot, refined and applied in these jurisdictions and replicated in three other states during the project, to provide a sound basis for continued implementation beyond the project life.

It is expected that finding pragmatic, market-based and regulatory-driven solutions to encourage efficient disposal of widely dispersed, smaller volumes of PCB inventory will serve to strengthen chemicals management capacities and provide a means by which to link the PCB work to Mexico's broader national chemicals management agenda.

2 Findings

2.1 Project Design / Formulation

The design of the project was assessed as adequate and the project document in general is assessed as being of good quality, containing relevant and concise information, aiming to the enhancement of capacity for environmentally acceptable collection of Mexico's stockpile of PCB containing equipment and oils, towards their ultimate disposal [7].

The project was tailored on the NIP that confirmed POPs as a priority issue and the evaluator was able to determine that a participatory project identification and development process, involving key national stakeholders and international agencies, was effectively applied in its design.

The project is fully aligned with the objectives and result of the PIF, which indicated that state pilots would serve to develop a federal system. The PPG phase in addition demonstrated that PCB issues for smaller PCB holders would be better dealt with at the state level. This influenced the design of the project and led to the approach to rollout the service system in 3 states, after testing in the State of Guanajuato and the Municipality of Cuautitlán Izcalli.

The project is considered to be aligned with UNDP's 2008-2012 Country Programme document, which seeks to strengthen "institutional and individual capacities" to "stop and/or reverse environmental degradation, support natural resources conservation, encourage participatory management, natural resources governance and promote human development through policies and programs for sustainable development".

The Project is also aligned with UNDPs 2008-2011 Strategic Plan: Accelerating global progress on human development, in particular as relates to governance, capacity

[7] 2014 Project Implementation Report, 5 September 2014

building and development, protecting vulnerable groups all targeted towards strengthening of national ownership.

Considering the above, it is estimated that the project design is adequate to address the problems at hand, and is fully aligned with the objectives of the preparatory phase.

2.1.1 Analysis of LFA/Results Framework

The project was formulated based on the logical framework approach with a clear thematically focused development objective. The narrative synthesis is consistent; the products are necessary to achieve the expected results. The baselines and targets are clear; the indicators, as it was pointed out above, are suitable; the verification sources are accessible, and the risks and assumptions identified are external critical factors that are beyond the control of the project.

The information obtained during the evaluation allowed to verify that progress to date corresponds to the activities, outputs and outcomes set out in the logical framework of the project and that they are measured by the indicators defined in the logical framework.

The list of interviews carried out satisfactorily (See Annexes) ensured that the views and experiences of all relevant stakeholder categories were appropriately included.

2.1.2 Assumptions and Risks

The project document discusses assumptions and risks in detail and these are also referenced in the Terms of Reference for this evaluation (see Annexes). No erroneous assumptions were noted, or unidentified risks encountered during the implementation of the project.

2.1.3 UNDP comparative advantage

UNDP brings to this projects not only a wealth of expertise on pollution control, but also the experience and ability to draw together government and industrial sectors to cooperate and support programmes that pursue a common good. The different PCB projects under implementation in LAC, as well as its experience in the energy sector (the main holders of PCBs) have clearly represented an advantage for the project.

In addition UNDP's longstanding presence in Mexico has allowed it to develop effective collaborative partnerships with all of the key stakeholders that are of importance to the project. These partnerships have helped UNDP to acquire in depth understanding of the needs, expectations and modus operandi of its different stakeholders.

2.2 Project Implementation

2.2.1 Adaptive management and feedback from M&E activities

The mission and document review allowed the evaluator to confirm that adaptive management was used extensively throughout the implementation of the project. In particular, as regards Component 2, changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation were necessary to reflect the realities identified by the assessment on storage capacities. As these were considered to be adequate to meet the demands of the country, the SC determined that funds initially allotted for this activity could be redirected. In particular, the SC during its meeting of 25 Jan 2010 approved the request to redirect the above-mentioned funds towards the budget for destruction, which consequently was increased from $600,000 to $1,000,000 (this decision is repeated in SC of 15 Dec).

The case of the mining town of San Felipe Nuevo Mercurio, in Zacatecas is also a case in point, as the community was decontaminated (and PCBs destroyed) in order to provide its inhabitants with "minimized risk of exposure to PCBs"[8].

2.2.2 Partnership arrangements

The evaluator was not informed of concerns or shortcomings as regards the partnership arrangements required for the adequate implementation of the project. The implementation capacity in terms of human resources, offices and related infrastructure, administrative system and management was observed to exist, and to be fully operational and highly functional.

Overall the capacity of the project management unit established under the project by the partner institution (SEMARNAT) was found by the evaluator to be strong and focused, and in addition to be very well coordinated with the other departments and stakeholders.

It was also possible to identify public/stakeholder awareness at the levels required to ensure the support of the project's long-term objectives.

2.2.3 Project Finance

As stipulated in the Project Document, UNDP supported the overall management of the project and its funds and assisted SEMARNAT, the National Executing Agency in the execution of the project, through the provision of timely assistance at key phases of results based management project implementation, in the review of documents and reports prepared by the project, in the disbursement of funds necessary for the

[8] An investment of approximately $300,000 allowed for the decontamination of housing elements and water wells, directly affecting and/or putting at risk 66 families (247 persons)

recruitment of international experts and, in other related international expenditures established in the Annual Work Plans approved by the PSC .

Overall, the budget of the project is considered to have been adequate to achieve the expected outcomes contributing to the environmentally sound management and destruction of PCBs and the evaluator was provided with no evidence to document any problems/shortcomings in the disbursement of funds in an appropriate and/or timely manner. Additionally, there are financial controls carried out by UNDP and by the PCU. There were no reports of financial audits having been prepared at this stage. The evaluator was informed that 5 external administrative audits had been conducted, all delivering positive results.

The table below is a summary of the financing sources/expenditures and was prepared by UNDP, based on information provided by the government.

Co-financing (type / source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US$)		Government (mill. US$)		Partner Agency (mill. US$)		Total (mill. US$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants								
Loans / Concessions								
In-kind support			1.060	0.159			1.600	0.159
Other			13	9.800	0	8.810	13	18.610
Totals							14.060	18.769

2.2.4 Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation

A Project Inception Workshop was held in July 2009 with the full project team, relevant government counterparts, key counterparts and UNDP. A Project Steering Committee (PSC) including the government, UNDP, industry and NGO representatives was constituted at project inception and met on 11 occasions throughout the life of the project to review project progress, provide strategic guidance, and approve annual work plans and budgets. The PSC was instrumental for monitoring project progress and for provision of input/guidance and decision-making, as documented in the minutes of the meetings. A technical Advisory

Committee was set up at project inception and the list of members is included in the Annexes.

A Mid-Term review of the project was conducted end of 2011 by a project independent expert and sought to determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes (the Executive Summary of this report is included in the Annexes).

The evaluator was able to ascertain that a monitoring and evaluation system, covering also the administrative aspects of the project, is in place and monitoring of progress and outputs based on indicators was adequately carried out throughout the life of the project. Overall the M&E component was assessed as Highly Satisfactory.

The evaluator received a detailed presentation on the M&E system in place for the overall project by the full time expert in charge of the system. Further to this, it is considered that a highly satisfactory record of program progress exists. Additionally M&E is actively involved in support of workshops and administrative procedures and provided valuable inputs for preparation of quarterly and semi-annual reports to UNDP, and bi-annual regional status reports to the GEF [9].

The management by the Project Coordinating Unit (PCU) is considered to be highly satisfactory both as regards the supervision of experts, and in delivering outputs going well beyond expectations. The evaluator was able to ascertain that it has full recognition of UNDP and stakeholders, governmental institutions and civil society alike, academia and the local communities where pilots were implemented.

2.2.5 UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution coordination, and operational issues

The GEF Agency for project implementation was the United Nations Development Organization (UNDP) and the project was implemented under the UNDP National Execution modality (NEX) following standard UNDP rules and procedures for project implementation[10].

The project was executed nationally through the SEMARNAT (Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources for its acronym in Spanish: Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales) and its DGGIMAR (Directorate General of Integrated Management of Hazardous Materials and Activities - Dirección de Gestión Integral de Materiales y Actividades Riesgosas).

SEMARNAT was responsible for overall execution but proactively supported collaboration with other Ministries, institutions, and the private sector to facilitate the

[9] The PIRs have been extensively used as information source throughout this evaluation

[10] Update of the terminology: National Execution Modality (NEX) is now National Implementation Modality (NIM)

success and longer term sustainability of the project. Of notable importance was the close collaboration established with the SENER (Ministry of Energy – Secretaría de Energía) on identification of PCB containing equipment (in use, as well as decommissioned), as well as on capacity building regarding safe practices.

SEMARNAT/DGGIMAR coordinated the project and co-chaired the Project Steering Committee (PSC) with UNDP, which was installed in 2009 and is considered to have been fully operational since that time. The PSC was tasked in particular with providing support in particular as regards the activities related to the regulatory framework, while gradually shifting the responsibility toward the permanent government structures.

The PSC includes representatives from the SEMARNAT, SENER, UNDP and the Coordinator of the project.

The PSC met on 3 occasions in 2009 and 2010, on 2 occasions in 2011, one occasion in 2013, and 2 occasions in 2014, [11], for a total of 11 times.

As well, the project established a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) that included key industrial stakeholders as well as representatives from civil society organizations. The Inception Workshop for the project took place in Mexico City on 2 July 2009 and was followed by the first meeting of the TAC on 30 July. The 2nd meeting of the TAC took place in July 2010, the 3rd in November 2012, and the 4th and final TAC meeting took place in November 2014.

As was pointed out before in this evaluation, it is important to note that this project has clearly demonstrated that adaptive management can be successfully pursued to ensure the continuity of a project. In this case it is notable that the project was implemented relatively unhindered through two public administration regimes in the country and in particular, at the SEMARNAT.

2.3 Project Results

2.3.1 Overall results

The overarching objective of the project is to deliver strengthened capacity within Mexico for environmentally sound and safe PCB management and phase out - with a particular emphasis on government coordination and facilitation of services in support of environmentally sound PCB management - and phase out by small-and-medium

[11] 4/03, 30/04 (exchanges via mail/phone), and 27/10 2009 – 25/01, 26/05, and 15/12 2010 – 8/04, and 17/09 2011 – 18/04/2012 (request to extend project to end 2013 granted) – 10/07/2013 (agreement to extend the project to 07/2014) – 15/01 (Agreement to extend project to 09/2014) and 12 /11/2014 (agreement to extend to 03/2015)

generators, and from sensitive sites. More specifically the Logframe of the project describes the expected Outcome as “Strengthened legal framework adopted” and the expected Output as “PCB Legislation, Technical guidance reviewed and updated”. Based on the information presented to the evaluator, the following overall results have been observed:

Legislation in the form of Standards (NOM-133) is ready and should be approved before the end of Q3 2015;

As regards destruction the target of the full reported waste inventory has been exceeded by 66%, which is considered highly satisfactory. As well it would appear that mechanisms are in place for the destruction of identified existing stockpiles.

The project was instrumental in providing up-to-date information regarding existing stockpiles (data used to revise official inventory figures, as well for input for the NIP update currently ongoing), but also in providing guidance and support to owners as regards best available options for their destruction.

As well, a major co-benefit was delivered as poor communities not initially contemplated by the project were decontaminated, therefore delivering on the goal of the project of reduced exposure to PCBs (Nuevo Mercurio, Zacatecas and, Alpuyeca, Morelos).

The above assertions are supported by the SEMARNAT’s PCB Destruction Database, by the projects’ own PCB management registry and projections, and by the results of the outputs (detailed below).

2.3.2 Relevance

The project was assessed as being **Relevant**, as detailed below.

Overall the project is considered to be relevant at different levels including policy, environmental, economic and is overall considered to have provided an appropriate and timely response to a clearly defined and urgent challenge, that of facilitating compliance with the Stockholm Convention.

In particular, as was clearly established in the project document, the project is consistent with Mexico’s priorities for PCBs as identified within its National Implementation Plan (NIP) on POPs “with regard to a reliable and statistically verified national inventory, review of legislation and regulation to address gaps, improving with respect to ability to track PCBs from use through to destruction, outreach to raise awareness among generators of their legal obligations, and guidance on best

practices to enhance capacity for environmentally sound life-cycle management of PCB waste equipment and materials undertaken in a cost-effective manner"[12].

It is also consistent with Mexico's federal legislation for PCBs and toxic and hazardous wastes, as well as with the objectives of Mexico's National Development Plans for 2007-2012 and 2012-2018, which include promotion of development that is in harmony with nature and the environment, increased citizen confidence in Mexico's institutions, and support for decentralization.

This project approach is relevant as regards Mexico's emphasis on sustainable development and further integration of Mexico's SMEs, which represent three quarters of Mexico's employment. Mexico's emphasis on SME integration is also cited with the UNDAF situational analysis and the Country Assistance Strategy with the World Bank.

The project is considered to have been relevant to UNDP 2008-2012 Country Programme and 2008-2011 Strategic Plan as was mentioned earlier, and in addition, the project is also considered to be fully aligned and relevant for the current UNDP SP 2014-2017, in particular with Area of Work 1: Sustainable development pathways as it promotes in particular scalable initiatives on sustainable productive capacities through effective maintenance and protection of natural capital: "Other possibilities will be assistance for integrated water resources management and efficient use of water, efforts to protect and restore the health, productivity and resilience of oceans and marine ecosystems, sustainable land management and restoration of degraded land, and management of chemicals and waste.

Moreover, the Project is also aligned with and relevant to the 2014-2016 Country Programme document for Mexico through UNDAF's outcome No. 6: The three branches of Government, the private sector, academia and civil society will have enhanced their capacity to check environmental degradation and use natural resources sustainably and equitably by mainstreaming environmental sustainability, low-emission development and green economy into the legislative process, planning and decision making.

Finally, the relevance to the target groups is clear and interviews and visits provided ample evidence that, in general, these demonstrated a good understanding of the functions and objectives of the project.

[12] National Implementation Plan (NIP) SEMARNAT, First Edition, October 2007 http://www.ine.gob.mx y http://www.pni-mexico.org

2.3.3 Effectiveness & Efficiency

The effectiveness of the project was assessed against the expected outcomes, as stated in the project document, and effectiveness has been determined to be **Highly Satisfactory**, based on the review of outputs detailed below. Efficiency was assessed as Satisfactory given that most project outputs were delivered on target, and were implemented in a cost-effective and efficient manner. This rating is notable in light of the fact that the project suffered implementation delays, however the results and in particular the unintended co-benefits, have pushed the overall project rating up.

Component 1: Strengthened institutional capacity within Mexico's central and state governments for environmentally sound and safe management and destruction of PCBs project)

The expected outputs have been achieved in a highly satisfactory manner.

At the time of the writing of the evaluation, the update to Regulation (Standard) NOM-133-SEMARNAT-2000 "Environmental protection-PCBs-Management Specifications" (known as Norma 133) was ready to be signed into force and this was expected to take place end of June 2015.

The process to develop this standard was lengthy and required the negotiation of 3 different versions of the document, which were facilitated by the high-level working group. This followed an extensive and consultative development process (including a public review) and overall is reported to have not only facilitated discussion with the main stakeholders, including in particular the industrial and electrical sectors, but also of having, in the words of one interviewee: "reactivated the process 13 years after the signature of the Stockholm Convention". The Regulation now includes definitions for a number of important terms, including the concepts of retro-filling, and an extended hazardous waste definition (now including waste containing less than 50ppm of PCBs), to name a few. As well, previously unregulated workshops will now be required to maintain a registry of operations, amongst other requirements.

As regards capacity building, activities were undertaken on several fronts and included approximately 270 Federal and state level inspectors who were trained following a train-the-trainers approach, and a number of major workshops took place in 2009, 2011 and 2013, which were attended by approximately 1,150 participants whose capacities are reported as having been substantially strengthened. In addition, 745 enterprises, chambers of commerce, associations and enterprises owning and/or operating equipment also saw their capacities strengthened, as well as 235 maintenance workshops, and 216 laboratories. In total close to 3,000 attended these workshops and trainings, of which it is interesting to note 1,156 were men, and 1,784 were men.

For the inventory, 906 sites were sampled ("inspected") and a database of 2,770 transformers was subsequently developed. The objective was to take samples at a statistically significant number of enterprises in the 6 most consumption-intensive and/or sensitive sectors. The three successive waves of inspections and sample analysis provided sufficient certainty to be able to affirm that this would be representative of 95% of the total quantity of PCBs to be found in the estimated 2.2 million transformers in Mexico.

An Integrated Services management System (ISMS) web based platform has been developed and tested in the State of Guanajuato and in the municipality of Cuautitlán Izcalli. It was then further tested and refined in 3 other states: Nuevo Leon, Chiapas and Distrito Federal (Mexico City) and the System will, amongst its benefits, allow a large number of PCB possessors to pool their waste and achieve environmentally sound disposal of PCBs at a reasonable cost.

Results so far demonstrate that the unit cost of destruction for pooled PCB waste (where companies can bring as little as one piece of equipment) is already 25% lower than before the project, and starting to approach the cost for large possessors of PCB-containing equipment like Mexico's Federal Electricity Commission (CFE).

Component 2: Safe regional and/or central interim PCB storage facilities established/upgraded (in particular, interim storage accessible to PCBs decommissioned from Small and Medium Enterprises

The expected outputs initially described in the Project Document have been revised as this component was determined to not be necessary.

A detailed study was carried out in 2011-2012 to assess countrywide capacities for storage (enterprise capacities, logistics and, economic evaluation). 14 registered sites13 were identified at the national level, and further to discussions with the main stakeholders, it was concluded that no additional storage capacities were required in Mexico to attend to the present and/or future needs of the country.

Component 3: Establishment and demonstration of a nationally coordinated comprehensive service system for PCB management (from generator to final destruction) via state and municipal pilots

The expected outputs have been achieved in a highly satisfactory manner.

Pilot projects in the State of Guanajuato and in Cuautitlán Izcalli were undertaken in mid 2009. These included an analysis of existing capacities, as well as sampling of sites, which were used as the basis for an evaluation conducted with PCB laboratories. Further to this, the Integrated Services Management System (ISMS -

[13] Registered by the SEMARNAT and possessing the required permits to handle and store PCBs

SISG for its acronym in Spanish – Sistema Integrado de Servicios de Gestión) was developed and is designed to facilitate reporting related activities ranging from identification of PCBs, storage and transport through to destruction (labeling, transport, storage, decontamination, end of life disposal, insurances, etc.).

The ISMS also includes capacity building for inspection authorities and analytical laboratories in the pilot states (aptitude tests were carried out for 10 laboratories, of which 3 are currently ready for certification) as well as an awareness-raising and communication strategy, which has included the development of a number of guidelines[14]. In addition, a contacts platform has also been included to facilitate engagement between stakeholders and management of information. The web ISMS based system has now been developed and tested and is ready for full deployment.

One activity that can be considered as a side benefit of the project stands out from the rest, and is of importance; through the activities undertaken in the development of the ISMS platform and its information database[15], information was compiled that allowed the project team to establish with a high degree of precision the inventory of PCB in existence in Mexico. This information is now reflected in the official inventory of the SEMARNAT, which has gone from 2,725.07 tons, to 16,720 tons of PCBs.

A study was elaborated to assess the actual management and destruction capacities (and associated costs) of the enterprises treating PCBs wastes. The study identified 7 companies[16] dedicated to the destruction of PCBs on the national territory, 5 private in operation, one belonging to Pemex and one in the process of obtaining the required authorizations. From this, it appeared that of the total authorized treatment/destruction capacity of 19.55 tons per year, less than 10% were used.

Upon review, and further to the closing of one of the main enterprises, it appeared that in reality only one of these meets all of the requirements and could certify the efficient and environmentally friendly destruction of the incinerated substances.

The destruction objective of the project was approved at 3,215 tons, which were surpassed by approximately 66% given that in total 5,350 tons were effectively destroyed. These are comprised of 933 tons directly destroyed with the support of the project (funded in part under the ISMS), and by 4,170 tons destroyed by the CFE, as well as 275 tons that in addition were destroyed further to the clean up operation that the project undertook in the village of Nuevo Mercurio, in Zacatecas. It is worthy of

---

14 Guidelines on Development of State Wide PCB Inventories; on Good Transformers Inspection Practices; and, on Good Practices in Transformer Repair and Maintenance Workshops

15 This included the elaboration and detailed analysis of 274 individual enterprise "cases"

16 1. Sem-Tredi, S.A. de C.V. ; 2. Sistemas Integrales en el Manejo de Residuos Industriales ; 3. SD MYERS, S.A de C.V.; 4. NEUCHTENICK, S.A de C.V.; 5. Desechos Biológicos e Industriales, S.A de C.V.; 6. PEMEX Petroquímica, Complejo Petroquímico Pajaritos; 7. Regioacciones, S.A de C.V

note that purchase of transformers as temporary replacements where financed by the project, while decontamination was ongoing; another adaptive management example as this was not initially contemplated by the project.

As regards maintenance enterprises – one of the identified main sources of cross contamination – the project undertook and effort to identify the universe of active enterprises and determined that approximately 1,300 of these exist, in varying form (ie one person informal operation to workshops with several employees). Of these, approximately 382 electrical maintenance workshops were identified as potential candidates for certification, and over the course of 2 years 55 were offered consulting support services by the project and undertook the rigorous training process, leading to 13 having at present been certified in best practices[17].

Component 4: Communication outreach strategy developed and implemented to improve societal engagement, in particular SME generators and those responsible for/involved with sensitive site management, project beneficiaries, including for co financing

The expected outputs have been achieved in a highly satisfactory manner.

An awareness-raising and communication strategy was developed and implemented, and included workshops, preparation and dissemination of brochures and documentation for key target groups (defined as industrial and services organizations, association of municipal governments, associations of drinking water operators and government medical services). Hence the main focus was not on the general public, but rather on SMEs and public or private enterprises owning a transformer.

To this effect information was made available through a variety of media and notably, the web page of the project18 reported almost 100,000 entries over the life of the project. As regards the public at large, reportedly 187 newspapers contained articles related to PCBs during this timeframe, representing a potential 54 million readers – for an equivalent monetary value of approximately $170,000, should these have been commissioned and paid by the project.

Component 5: Project management (Learning, evaluation, and adaptive management increased)

The expected outputs have been achieved in a highly satisfactory manner.

[17] 1. AFQET, S.A. de C.V.; 2. Asistencia Técnica Prado, S.A. de C.V. (SERVELEC); 3. Centro de Servicios y Reconstrucciones Eléctricas, S.A. de C.V.; 4. Corporaciones Elektron, S.A. de C.V.; 5. De La R Asesoría en Servicios & Laboratorio, S.A. de C.V.; 6. Delta Transformadores, S.A. de C.V.; 7. Electricidad Industrial Y Mantenimiento, S.A. de C.V. (EIMSA); 8. Ingeniería en Electricidad Especializada, S.A de C.V.; 9. Ingeniería en Transformadores, S.A. de C.V.; 10. Mantenimiento de Transformadores de Potencia, S.A. de C.V.; 11. Octavio Alberto Barrera Calva (Persona Física); 12. Oil Reclaiming, S.A. de C.V.; 13. Técnica Dieléctrica de México, S.A. de C.V

[18] www.bpcsmexicoundp.com

As described throughout this document, the structures and tools required for the day-to-day implementation and assiduous management of the project have unequivocally been established; without these, the achieved results would not have been possible.

Management systems are in place and have assisted and facilitated the reporting processes (Progress reports, Project Implementation Reports (PIR), Mid Term Evaluation, Independent Terminal Evaluation, etc.), which have been prepared as/when required by UNDP. This has also included facilitating and documenting the meetings of the National Advisory Committee, the PSC (as well as the four State Advisory committees in the 4 pilot states), of the Technical Committees, the workshops, training sessions, etc. required to ensure the successful delivery of the results.

2.3.4 Country ownership

As has been mentioned above, the development of the project proposal followed a participatory approach, and this clearly contributed to the build up of a high sense of ownership, which was documented at all levels i.e. Federal, State and, of the enterprises. The Inception Workshop for the project, which was attended by 85 representatives of all of the stakeholder categories contributed to reinforce the sense of ownership and allowed for an open and frank dialogue.

Although other examples have been highlighted throughout this report, the deployment of the Integrated Services Management System (ISMS) stands out; information provided to the evaluator indicates that this system has directly contributed to the mainstreaming of POPs, and hence, to a heightened sense of ownership of the project in Mexico. This has been clearly evidenced at the level of the SEMARNAT, and the evaluator also noted references to the fact that this sense of ownership has permeated to other ministries, agencies and departments (Ministry of Health, for example).

Finally, the country's ownership of the project is evidenced by the endorsement of the GEF/UNDP project itself, but also by the contribution of significant financial resources in support of the project, including in-kind contributions. The government has also provided necessary technical and legal expertise to the project from national organizations, facilities for data collection, and/or office and meeting space, as required for the successful implementation of the project.

2.3.5 Mainstreaming

The approval of NOM-133 directly contributes to the mainstreaming of PCB related issues in the country; although this is principally at the level of the main stakeholders, with appropriate support, this could easily pave the way for the successful

vulgarization of the issue. Reaching not only the specialized audience, but also the population in general, which would significantly contribute to mainstreaming “at large”.

Through the approval of this norm, the project has successfully mainstreamed this with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, and improved governance.

2.3.6 Sustainability

The project’s design seeks to create a co-operative framework, together with the necessary capacities, thereby enabling Mexico to address the issues at hand in a sustainable way.

The ET considers that the sustainability of project outcomes is Likely – as it appears in particular that the conditions for replication of the pilots are present - however additional resources and support will be required in order for these to be disseminated and reach all of the states. The same can also be said of other initiatives, including the ISMS, the network of laboratories and workshops, awareness raising, etc. as Mexico has a large territory to cover and needs to comprehensively improve capabilities, to ensure that no states are left behind.

It is said that the past can be a good indication of the future, and in this sense the ET considers that the clear expressions it received from government (Federal and State level) regarding the intention of continuing to support project related activities --in addition to the demonstrated and high rate of cofinancing mobilized by the project-- can be assessed as being a very positive factor in support of sustainability.

The longer-term sustainability of the project, which is also supported by development and deployment of strong awareness and basic EHS information, is considered to be Likely, even though, in financial terms the project's sustainability after GEF will depend on the importance attached to future actions, particularly as framed in the 2012-2018 National Development Plan of the Government of Mexico. In this case however, the fact that a second phase for the project is supported by the country, has been developed and, is being considered positively by the GEF, contributes to reinforce this rating and in particular its institutional framework and governance elements.

2.3.7 Impact

At this stage it is too early to assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts. Although demonstrating these would add value to the learning experience provided by an evaluative framework, impacts will only be measurable – at least in part - in the near to medium term future; what is clear however is that the results of this project indicate it is progressing towards the achievement of the sought goal i.e., the minimization of exposure to PCBs both for the population and the environment.

The above is supported by evidence indicating that the project has contributed to the reduction in stress on ecological systems, which will likely lead to improvements in ecological status, in the longer term. It is at this time only possible to infer that the contribution of this project to the reduction of releases of POPs into the environment will likely also have a measurable impact on the population, at least in terms of avoided releases and hence, exposure.

What will be challenging to demonstrate and eventually measure/quantify would be the causal linkages between avoided releases and the actual minimization of the risk of exposure to the population and, the magnitude/value of the resulting avoided negative health effects and/or untainted natural resources. This will prove to be challenging not only because of the inherent difficulty in demonstrating this type of link, but also given the fact that the project design did not include, in the results framework, indicators to measure the achievement of the overarching goal of the project. Moreover, the project document also does not define the actual expected impact(s) and it is only possible to assume that these would have been along the lines of improved health of humans, aquatic and terrestrial species, and improved health of ecosystems/environment.

3 Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

Overall the project, and in particular the generated co-benefits described above, have set the stage for future collaborative opportunities. The strong cross-sectorial links developed, and the trust established between stakeholders at the local, municipal and federal levels provide a time-tested foundation that can only facilitate future efforts in this area of cooperation. These efforts and successes should not be allowed to go to waste.

3.1 Corrective actions for the evaluation of the project

UNDP should consider, when carrying out evaluation of FSPs, contracting a team of two evaluators, one international and one national, in a timely manner. These should be provided with sufficient time to carry out the evaluation and mission (visiting a representative sample of activities on the ground such as pilot sites) and to ensure that close linkages are established with both the UNDP Country Office Evaluation Unit, as well as with the GEF evaluation staff.

3.2 Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project

The following are recommendations that UNDP is encouraged to pursue in order to ensure the longer-term sustainability of the project and the mainstreaming of the achieved results.

- Active participation of all key Federal and state level stakeholders should continue to be encouraged after the project ends to ensure, in particular that the momentum gained be maintained and/or supported during the transition period between projects;
- Active participation of the private sector (hospitals, sensitive sectors, etc.) should continue to be encouraged and/or supported during the transition period between projects;
- Mechanisms should be put in place to facilitate the transfer and/or internalization of capacities built by the project management unit; as the projects progress in time, and in particular, well before they come to an end the risk always exists that this institutional memory and established network of contacts will fade and/or loose interest.
- UNDP should also actively explore opportunities to integrate the results achieved by this project into other cross cutting activities both in Mexico and regionally/internationally as it seeks to lay the foundation for future Stockholm Convention related interventions for all POPs.

Finally it is suggested to identify, amongst those having benefitted form the awareness and capacity building activities, a set of “ambassadors” to further

disseminate results and engage stakeholders at all levels. Incentives to pursue these actions could take the form of diplomas or stipends (per diems) to cover participation at selected events and forums.

3.3 Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

Awareness raising activities should - with a certain sense of urgency - be expanded to the general population. This would help to avoid situations where from a lack of knowledge/information, the owner of equipment/oils suspected of containing PCB could be tempted to dispose of these in an unsound manner, rather than facing perceived/real consequences and/or "sanctions". This was unfortunately already reported to the evaluator as having taken place in several instances in the only State visited during the field visits (Chiapas).

Promoting the use of the mechanisms recently approved by the country for the establishment of private-public partnerships (PPP - Alianza Publico Privada) for suppliers (Laboratories, Workshops, Destruction facilities) could facilitate the strengthening of capacity and should actively be supported in future phases of implementation of the Stockholm Convention in Mexico.

3.4 Lessons

Although a number of lessons could be extracted from the above report, it appears most worthy of mention to note that defining the goals of a project is not sufficient to contribute to measurable results. In order to truly assess the longer term results of a project, the goal(s) and clear indicator(s) have to be defined; this should only take place once the sought after impact(s) has/have been clearly defined and indicators to benchmark and eventually assess progress have been established.

4 Annexes

4.1 ToR
4.2 Steering Committee Members
4.3 List of persons interviewed
4.4 Executive Summary of the Mid-Term Evaluation
4.5 List of documents reviewed
4.6 Evaluation Question Matrix
4.7 Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

4.1 ToR

Al servicio
de las personas
y las naciones

Terms of Reference (TORS)
Individual Consultant
Annex I

Date: May 2015

Services required: Consultancy services to carry out the Terminal Evaluation of the project "Environmentally Sound Management and Destruction of Poly Chlorinated Bipheniles in Mexico".

Time of contract: 1 month **Begins:** 01/06/2015 **Ends:** 30/06/2015

Number and project Name: 00059701 Environmentally Sound Management and Destruction of PCBs in Mexico

Objective: The overall objective of the Terminal Evaluation is to analyze the implementation of the project, review the achievements made by the project to deliver the specified objectives and outcomes. It will establish the relevance, performance and success of the project, including the sustainability of results.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects. http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/gef/undp-gef-te-guide.pdf

Name of supervisor of products and services: Edgar González, Programme Officer – UNDP / Luis Eduardo de Ávila Rueda – Directorate-General for the management of hazardous materials and activities- Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources

Travel requirements: Travel to Mexico City (1)
Work place: Home-based and Mexico City
Payments: According to TOR's

1. BACKGROUND

In accordance with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Global Environment Fund's (GEF) monitoring and evaluation policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation.

These terms of reference set out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Environmentally Sound Management and Destruction of PCBs in Mexico Project.

Project Information

Country:	MEXICO
ATLAS Award ID:	00049136
PIMS Number:	4371
GEF Focal Area	POPs
GEF Strategic Objective:	POPs SP-1 and POPs SP-2
GEF Budget (USD):	$4,630,000.00
Co-Financing Budget (USD):	$14,060,000.00
Project Document Signature date:	Mexico City, 2009
Date of first disbursement:	2009
Original Planned Closing Date:	2013
Executing Agency:	Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources. (SEMARNAT)
Date Mid Term Evaluation took place:	March-June, 2011

Objective and Scope

This Terms of Reference is for the conduct of a Terminal Evaluation UNDP project-- Environmentally Sound Management and Destruction of PCBs in Mexico, funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), with a grant of US$4,630,000. UNDP is the GEF implementing agency for the project.

The central objective of this project is to minimize risks of exposure from PCBs to Mexicans, including vulnerable populations, and to the environment, while promoting Mexico's compliance with Stockholm Convention requirements for PCB management and destruction.

The project, led by Mexico's Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT), would achieve this objective through creation of an enabling environment for decommissioning and destruction of Mexico's remaining estimated inventory of 30.639 tons of PCB wastes. PCB wastes to be destroyed during the project period would include Mexico's official (reported) inventory of 3.215 tons and part of those wastes identified and decommissioned within three industrialized states and one municipality. The enabling environment would be established via four project components: (1) development and implementation of strategies and activities for strengthening Mexico's institutional capacity within central and state governments for environmentally sound management and destruction of PCBs, including legislation and enforcement (2) facilitation of expansion and/or upgrading of interim storage so that Mexico has adequate safe central and regional interim PCB storage facilities for its national PCB inventory, with particular emphasis on access to facilities by small- and medium-size enterprises (SMEs) (3) establishment and demonstration of a nationally-coordinated, comprehensive servicing system for PCB management, and (4) raising awareness of legal obligations and best practices for PCB management and destruction in the private and public sectors through outreach and training.

The project components are tested in one state and one municipal pilot, refined and applied in these jurisdictions and replicated in three other states during the project to provide a sound basis for continued implementation beyond the project life.

The main stakeholders of this TE are:

- SEMARNAT (Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources)
- SENER (Secretariat of Energy)
- Governments of four (pilot) Mexican States: Chiapas, Distrito Federal, Guanajuato and Nuevo Leon

- NGO: “México Comunicación y Ambiente”
- Final users of Project results: enterprises, organizations, universities

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluators are expected to use the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact in the evaluation, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects. A suggestive set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included in Annex D, however the evaluators are expected to amend, complete, discuss, validate, justify and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, UNDP Country Office, SPREP, project country teams, UNDP GEF staff (both in the region and at HQ) and other key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct field missions to the selected project countries - identified in Annex A. Interviews will be held with the key organizations and individuals, a list of stakeholders to consult will be provided for the evaluators, and consultations will be held with key stakeholders on the ground. If possible, the consultants will liaise with M&E consultants that are assisting the PACC and PACC+ country project management units. The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, log frames, project reports – including project implementation reviews (PIR), project budget revisions, midterm review and associated management response, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for the conduct of an evidence-based Terminal Evaluation. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex C of this Terms of Reference. Any additional documentation that the evaluator seeks will be made available by UNDP and its partners where available. If any are not available, the evaluator will be provided an explanation as to why the requested documentation is not available and this will also be taken into account in the final terminal evaluation including rating for overall performance of the project.

The project evaluation will be undertaken in accordance with UN evaluation norms and policies and should maintain a clear focus on results. The evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary and present its methodological proposal as part of their inception report to UNDP on the progress of the terminal evaluation. Evaluation methods should be selected for their rigor in producing conclusions based on evidence against the evaluation criteria. The evaluation team will also respond to the questions and comments raised on the evaluation by internal and external reviewers of the results ascertained.

Evaluation criteria & ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see Annex A), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The competed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in TOR Annex D.

Rating Project Performance		
Criteria		Comments
Monitoring and Evaluations: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall quality of M&E	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
M&E design at project start up	(rate 6 pt. scale)	

M&E plan implementation	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
IA & EA Execution: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall Quality of Project Implementation / Execution	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Implementing Agency Execution	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Executing Agency Execution	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Outcomes: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall Quality of Project Outcomes	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Relevance: relevant (R) or not relevant (NR)	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Effectiveness	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Efficiency	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability: Likely (L), Moderately Likely (ML), Moderately Unlikely (MU), Unlikely (U)		
Overall likelihood of risks to Sustainability	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Financial resources	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Socio-economic	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Institutional framework and governance	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Environmental	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Impact: Significant (S), Minimal (MS), Negligible (N)		
Environmental Status Improvement	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Environmental Stress Reduction	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Progress towards stress/status change	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Overall Project Results	(rate 6 pt. scale)	

Project finance / co-finance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures.

Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US$)		Government (mill. US$)		Partner agency (mill. US$)		Total (mill. US$)	
Grants	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Loans/Concessions								

In-kind support								
Other								
Totals								

Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender. In addition, the evaluation will be included in the country office evaluation plan.

Impact

The evaluator will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Mexico. The evaluator will be responsible for liaising to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Deliverables
Preparation	3 days including travel time	• Acquaintance with the project document and other relevant materials with information about the project (PIRs and other evaluation reports, products, etc.); • Familiarization with overall development situation of country (based on reading of UNDP- Common Country Assessment and other reports on the country). • Detailed mission programme preparation, including methodology,

		in cooperation with the UNDP Country office. • Initial telephone discussion with UNDP CO and UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor
Evaluation Mission	5 days **The dates for the mission have to be: 8 – 12 June 2015**	• Meeting with UNDP Country office team and SEMARNAT staff; • Meetings with key stakeholders in country • Joint review of all available materials with focused attention to project outcomes and outputs • Interviews with key beneficiaries and stakeholders, including representatives of local authorities, local environmental protection authorities, local community stakeholders, etc.
Draft Evaluation Report	7 days	• Final interviews / cross checking with UNDP CO, UNDP RCU and SEMARNAT. • Drafting of report in proposed format • Telephone review of major findings with SEMARNAT, UNDP CO and UNDP-GEF RTA • Completing of the draft report and presentation of draft report for comments and suggestions within 2 weeks.
Final Report	2 days	• Presentation of final evaluation report within 1 week.

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report *	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

* When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

Team composition

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international evaluator. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The evaluator must present the following qualifications:

- At least 2 years of expertise POP's issues
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Bachelor's Degree in Environment, Chemistry, Engineering, Administration, Science or related fields.
- The evaluator must be able to work in English, with reading knowledge of Spanish.

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'.

Payment modalities and specifications

%	Milestone
40%	Following submission of first drat terminal evaluation report and an oral presentation of main findings of the evaluation to UNDP CO and Project Team before the mission is concluded in order to allow for clarification and validation of evaluation findings: • Review key documentation of the project. UNDP Guidelines for Evaluations and carry out a meeting with SEMARNAT and UNDP to agree on dates and other issues to develop and inception report. • Review documentation, prepare and carry out interviews with key actors, and present a first draft of the evaluation reports a well as an oral presentation of the main findings.
60%	Following submission and approval (UNDP CO and UNDP RTA) of the final

	terminal evaluation report: • Integrate comments received from SEMARNAT and UNDP into the final Evaluation Report. • Evaluation Report which is to be in line with the Report Outline described in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects (approved by UNDP and SEMARNAT)

Application process

Applicants are requested to send their proposals to the following address: rm@undp.org. Proposals will be received until May 25th at 11:59 am. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these position. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact, a P11 form (annex) and an Offer's letter to UNDP confirming interest and availability for the IC assignment (annex). Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer Lump-sum, indicating the total cost of the assignment with taxes included (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

Annex A – Project logical framework

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
GOAL	Minimize risks of exposure from PCBs to Mexicans, including vulnerable populations (e.g., school children and workers), and to the environment to enable Mexico, in line with its international obligations for PCBs under the Stockholm Convention, while promoting timely compliance with PCB management, including decommissioning, and destruction provisions within Mexico.				
Objective of the project: Strengthened capacity within Mexico for environmentally sound and safe PCB management and phase out, with a particular emphasis on government coordination and facilitation of services in support of	Tons of PCBs destroyed (per compound), and mode of destruction (tons and cost/ton) Tons of PCBs phased out from use (per compound) (tons and cost per ton)	30,639 tons PCBs in Mexico PPG reported and estimated inventory 4,641 tons of PCBs at sensitive sites 9,591 SMEs 5,157 electrical utilities *(as derived from*	Full reported waste inventory of 2007 (3.215 tons) destroyed; Project to put in place mechanisms for 100% destruction of Mexico PCBs in full statistically verified national PCB inventory by or before 2025	Database of certifications of destruction provided to SEMARNAT Increased no. of PROFEPA inspections Contrasting inventory results each year against inventory and mass balance Transparency of results (*e.g., generator/transport*	Government coordination of waste management services, especially for SMEs & Sensitive Sites. Because the project is pioneering in nature and taking into account that the system developed will be applicable to a complex situation, mid-course corrections and/or /adjustments regarding how coordination is

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
environmentally sound PCB management & phase out by small-and-medium generators, and from sensitive sites.		*Preparatory Phase inventory: SMEs and sensitive sites figures estimated)*		*registrations & manifests, certificates related to PCB waste management*)	approached and supported financially may be required. The key risk is that changes, adjustments could be viewed as problematic, when, in fact, flexibility in testing and revisions to the system, as required, should be anticipated and viewed as a feature of system development that will needed to promote success. Mexico will invite international experts to share experiences with public coordination of generator access to

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
					hazardous waste management services **RISK: low**
Component 1: Strengthened institutional capacity within Mexico's central and state governments for environmentally sound and safe management and destruction of PCBs	Development of proposed legislative/regulatory amendments to respond to NIP recommendations & preparatory phase legislative gap analysis (2009-2010 Consultation & awareness raising with stakeholders on proposed amendments (2009)	Gaps in legislation, including for SME holders of small quantities; for environmentally safe low-concentration PCB disposal and re-use of low-level PCB oils, e.g., in food processing facilities	Comprehensive PCB legislation (2009-10)	Official Gazette (*diario oficial* http://dof.terra.com.mx/default.htm.=)	Legislative changes are contingent on approval by Chamber of Deputies, Senate and Presidential signature **Risk: low**

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
	Amendments forwarded to National Assembly (2009-10)	(permitted under current law as low-level PCB oils (< 50 ppm) not classified as hazardous waste) Inspections performed for 40% of large industry; none for SMEs			
Component 1: Strengthened institutional capacity within Mexico's central and state	Increased no. of inspections each year of project	Inspections performed for 40% of large industry participating in	Inspection of 70% of large generators (principally electrical utilities,	PROFEPA inspectors & custom officials: training course completed Training trainers	Mexico will have to budget adequate funds each year to support staffing and resource requirements for

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
governments for environmentally sound and safe management and destruction of PCBs project)		voluntary program; none for SMEs	steel & petroleum sectors) by 2009) Progressive percentage increase in SME inspections each year of project, attaining 70% by 2011 within 3 project states and D.F.	course with industry associations, for PCB identification & generator best practices and Training SEMARNAT managers in PCB tracking system developed: course completion Training operators and administrators in operations of transfer facilities (interim storage, packaging, transport, etc.): certification PROFEPA Records of	inspections. **Risk: low to medium** PROFEPA's priority setting for inspections will need to include PCBs and adequate budgetary support. PROFEPA has indicated its commitment for PCB inspections and enforcement (using facility management plans as required, and, where not met, legal action). **Risk: low** Continued government support for favourable

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
				inspections SEMARNAT annual inventory updates through life of project Number of company management plans & where provisions of plans are not met, number of prosecutions	regulatory regime **Risk: Low**
Component 2 Safe regional and/or central interim PCB storage facilities established/upgraded (in particular, interim storage	Inter-service agreements negotiated (e.g., to enable interim storage within government-owned facility(ies) interim storage) facilities	No coordinated service system exists for SMEs or other generators SMEs find it difficult to pay	Inter-service agreements between government and parastatals in place by 2010 Guanajuato and Cuautitlán Izcalli	Records of inter-service agreements EIA reports Website databases and reports Public consultation	SMEs and electrical utilities (owners of sensitive site equipment) are willing to participate and supportive of the project **Risk low**

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
accessible to PCBs decommissioned from Small and Medium Enterprises	enhanced and/or constructed as required to address inventory capacity, with emphasis on SME inventory* ** As coordinated with electrical utilities regarding sensitive site and other units and PCB wastes that require treatment, decontamination and/or destruction/disposal* SME participation in system (2008-2011)	for existing services because of cost barriers; lack of technical capacity (disincentive to declare full inventory) Currently private sector has no access to use of services provided by parastatals (e*.g., incineration facility for hazardous wastes owned and operated by*	demonstration pilots completed with lessons learned report, including on interim storage experiences: EIA of existing storage facilities available is completed Transparent results of site sampling and analysis of a shortlist of potential sites Selection of a site	meetings on site selection process & subsequently on results Legislation Authorizations and operational permits of interim storage facilities SME generator declarations measured against inventory at interim storage facilities; survey responses from state municipalities National SME user	Discussions during mission and PPG activities indicate support from parastatals CFE, LyFC, and PEMEX, and strong interest from SMEs surveyed by Municipality of Cuautitlán Izcalli and Guanajuato. Interest is likely to be similar among SMEs (as associated with awareness raising regarding compliance). Provision of adequate budgetary support for maintenance of system over time (training;

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
		PEMEX)	or sites based on results of a transparent selection process Legal provisions and formalized agreements in place for access to facilities by private sector Enhancement/construction of interim storage or (inter-municipal/state transfer facilities) Environmentally sound authorized	surveys (system use; access) SME destruction certifications increase each year	staffing; overhead, etc.) must be available, as applicable to jurisdictional levels and SMEs (.e.g., through waste handling fees; and via incentives, such as escrow account for SMEs make payment over time feasible, i.e., as condition of receipt of certification certificates after destruction is completed). *Principally, budgetary support at State & municipal levels* Tracking systems and transparency of data

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
			interim storage facilities for SME and sensitive site PCB inventories are adequate to capacity, in place and operating (by 2010-2011)		populating the systems will be required for effective system operation and accountability (certitude). **Risk: Low (SEMARNAT commitment is high)** Estimating adequacy of interim storage is contingent upon cooperation from Mexico's largest utility, CFE, which services 80% of country. **Risk: medium to high.** PROFEPA inspections as applicable to parastatal

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
					facilities will be important. **Risk: Low.** *PROFEPA is committed to inspections but needs more staff for increased number of inspections.* Electrical utilities allow project contractors assessing adequacy of facilities access to all of their storage facilities **Risk: Medium to high** Legislation allows for EIAs of existing and new facilities **Risk: Low**

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
					Construction of interim storage facilities, if required, will need to take into account adequate public consultation. Opposition to construction can occur because of "NIMBY" syndrome: consultation with NGOs and CSOs and their engagement will be important aspect of outreach strategies. (*An important aspect of the system will be limitations on how long PCB wastes can remain in storage prior to destruction/disposal; essentially these will*

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
					function as transfer stations for PCB wastes and contaminated waste equipment) **Risk: Medium.** Distrust by public can be anticipated and mitigated through quality of outreach efforts and commitment to its implementation. The technology risk per se is low as best practices design guidance is readily available. Adequate oversight during monitoring and construction will be

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
					required to ensure contract specifications are met. **Risk: Medium to High**
Component 3 Establishment and demonstration of a nationally coordinated comprehensive service system for PCB management (from generator to final destruction) via state and municipal pilots.	Inter-jurisdictional agreements negotiated as required for waste management with States & Municipalities (2009) State-coordinated PCB managerial system pilots tested in a Mexican State (Guanajuato) and municipality (Cuautitlán Izcalli)	Adequacy of interim storage and destruction services is not well characterized (taking into account location of facilities relative to transport options, costs as these affect client base of	Persons hired from private sector, as required by system (e.g., administrators; concessionaires) Workshop with international experts held (lessons learned from government involvement in hazardous waste	Destruction certificates, generator and transport manifests; use of Escrow funds by SMEs Continuous reduction each year of PCBs and equipment at sensitive sites (of total inventory, 25% reduction achieved each year over 4 four years with 100 %	Legal amendments are anticipated to extend deadline for destruction of in-service PCBs held by SMEs Legislation is adequate regarding reporting provisions (who reports; what must be reported, how and when, etc.) **Risk: low to medium**: political lobbying pressure could weaken

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
	(2010) State-coordinated system refined and applied in the pilot state of Guanajuato and two other states and in the municipality of Cuautitlán Izcalli) (2011) Destruction of PCB stocks from large generators as per SEMARNAT official inventory (by 2009) Decommissioning and destruction of in-use PCBs and	service providers) NIMBY syndrome has affected service provision (i.e., as applicable to a licensed destruction facility in NW Mexico) Large generators lack confidence in some destruction firms based on past experiences Most SMEs are	management) Participation by SMEs is in compliance with Mexican law and Stockholm provisions for destruction 100% of sensitive site and SME equipment has been decommissioned 100% of PCB-contaminated waste 100% destruction of 2006 inventory	decommissioning by legal deadline or 2012, whichever comes first	intent to have comprehensive legislation Range of verification tools will depend to some extent on legislation and regulatory tools developed during course of project Generators comply with surveys, self reporting and provision of legislated requirements **Risk: low** as the project should provide financial incentives given that they must meet legal provisions already in

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
	equipment held by large generators, inclusive of sensitive sites (by nationally legislated deadline) Decommissioning and destruction of in-use PCBs and equipment held by SME generators.	not aware/using services Government & service providers require improved & verifiable inventory for SMEs and sensitive sites to perform their roles (administration; service delivery) and, in case of private sector, to determine economic	(large generators) by 2009 Percentage decrease toward 100% destruction of PCBs in storage and in service within the candidate states and D.F.		place for disposition of PCB wastes or risk punitive damages. Financing mechanisms to provide incentives for generators (in particular for SMEs relative to instalment payments for services) and with respect to financial incentives for accelerated decommissioning to promote pollution prevention will be explored; financial institutions will need to be able to enforce contracts and manage risks for any options that

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
		viability, which will also serve clients through enhanced cost-efficiencies.			may be implemented .**Risk: Medium to high**
Outcome 4 Communication outreach strategy developed and implemented to improve societal engagement, in particular SME generators and those responsible for/involved with sensitive site	Communications Outreach strategy developed and implemented (e.g., purpose of and access to system. (to SMEs, and also to parastatals, service industry, NGOs, jurisdictions) (2008-2011) Consultation	SME entities not engaged to date and low awareness of PCB legal provisions; weak technical capacity and financial barriers prevent timely compliance with	Target groups identified: 2009 Initial outreach on project purpose during development phase to stakeholders, especially SMEs and sensitive sites (2008-9)	Feedback surveys from target groups throughout course of project (e.g., SMEs, schools and hospitals) Consultation mechanism in place Number consultations held	A strategy will need to be developed and applied early in project start-up phase for outreach to the public and media on nature of project, beneficiaries (including public and workers via reduced risk of exposure). The technological advances and legislative

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
management. Project beneficiaries, including for co-financing.	mechanisms developed and implemented (generators; jurisdictions; service providers; NGOs and civil society, including education sector; where service facilities exist or are contemplated)	Mexican law No national outreach strategy with SME's or parastatals exists Public does not understand risks, exposure pathways associated with PCBs Decision makers have low awareness of need for more comprehensive	SME-specific outreach strategy developed and implemented (2008) General public: outreach strategy developed and implemented (2010-2011) Decision makers: outreach strategy developed and implemented (2009-2010) Outreach and consultation strategy relative	Media coverage Communications and outreach financing	safeguards to reduce risk of PCB exposure posed by destruction/disposal options in Mexico as contrasted to status quo will need to be conveyed to media, NGOs and CSOs and municipalities where infrastructure for destruction/disposal is or will be located. Experiences with State-coordinated toxic and hazardous waste management (e.g., Denmark) will be important to take into consideration.

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
		PCB legislation; low to medium awareness of need for hazardous waste management budget Experience within Mexico with NIMBY syndrome indicates new infrastructure could face opposition.	to service construction/improvements relative to improved health and safety		**Risk: Medium** NGOs and media need to be educated beyond press release communications, especially in the benefits the project will provide as contrasted to the *status quo*. Accountability requires that results of monitoring be transparent and public and in place beyond the life of the project activity, including as supported by legislation (e.g., regulatory requirements for transport and facility

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
					registration and generator manifests; transparent databases, etc. project. It will be important to impart to senior ministry officials how the system (and lessons learned from its application) could subsequently be adapted to and inform environmentally sound management of a wide range of toxic and hazardous wastes in Mexico (and have applicability to other developing countries). Relevant stakeholders

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
					and target groups are interested in participating and cooperating in the design, development and implementation of the project
Outcome 5 Project management (Learning, evaluation, and adaptive management increased)	Mechanisms and processes in place for improved inter-ministerial information sharing Process in place and budgeting formula and supports for public PCB coordination servicing, including	Process for information sharing between SEMARNAT and PROFEPA needs to be improved and made more transparent Budgeting processes to support PCB	Training of key administrative staff, generators and other stakeholders on timely basis Lessons learned as part of M&E reports	Project advisory and steering committees established Assessments and feedback surveys to inform lessons learned (government; generators; NGOs, etc.)	Monitoring and evaluation activities planned under the project are fully supported and implemented Mexico is moving toward an increasingly transparent governance model, including as affected by SEMARNAT

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators				
	Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Sources of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
	beyond project life Evaluation tools developed and tested Training needs identified and budgeted for, including beyond life of project Training PIU unit	waste management coordination need to be determined Formal mechanisms & processes for coordination & tracking needed.			and PROFEPA. This will support adaptive management so long as senior managers (including political levels) recognize the need for financial support and inter-ministerial cooperation and transparency.

Annex B – List of documents to be reviewed by the evaluator

- Project Document
- Cooperation agreements signed between UNDP and donors
- Project Technical Reports
- Annual work plans including budgets
- Annual Project Reports (APR)
- Project Implementation Review (API/PIR)
- Quarterly/six monthly Progress Reports (QPRs) and quarterly Financial Reports (FRs)
- Multipartite Review Meeting (MPR) Reports
- Project board meetings/Project board meeting minutes,
- Mid-term evaluation report

Annex C – Evaluation questions

Relevance: How does 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?

Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?

Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?

Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?

Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?

Annex D – Ratings

Rating scores		
Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution	Sustainability ratings: Relevance ratings	Relevance ratings
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency 5: Satisfactory (S): There were only minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS):there were moderate shortcomings 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): the project had significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): there were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R) 1. Not relevant (NR) Impact Ratings: 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)

Annex E – Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.

2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.

3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.

4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.

5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.

6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.

7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of

Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at (place) on date Signature:

Annex F – Evaluation Report Outline

i. Opening page:
- Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
- UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
- Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
- Region and countries included in the project
- GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
- Implementing Partner and other project partners
- Evaluation team members
- Acknowledgements

ii. Executive Summary
- Project Summary Table
- Project Description (brief)
- Evaluation Rating Table
- Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations (See: UNDP Editorial Manual)

1. Introduction
- Purpose of the evaluation
- Scope & Methodology
- Structure of the evaluation report

2. Project description and development context
- Project start and duration
- Problems that the project sought to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Baseline Indicators established
- Main stakeholders
- Expected Results

3. Findings
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated[19])

3.1 Project Design / Formulation
- Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Replication approach
- UNDP comparative advantage
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

[19] Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally, Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory

The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total

3.2 Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)

- Relevance(*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- Impact

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

COA

ACCOUNT	O.UNIT	FUND	DEPART.	B UNIT	PROJECT	ACTIVITY	IMP-AG.	DONOR
71205	MEX	62000	51405	MEX10	00059701	5	001831	10003

By the Project

GUILLERMO ROMÁN MOGUEL
PROJECT COORDINATOR

By UNDP

EDGAR GONZÁLEZ
DIRECTOR DE PROGRAMA
PNUD MÉXICO

4.2 Steering Committee Members

Members of the National Project Steering Committee
Project UNDP 0059701

		Name	Position	Email	Telephone	Address
1	Comisión Federal de Electricidad - CFE	M. en C. Francisco Javier Hernández Alvarez	Encargado de la Gerencia de Protección Ambiental	francisco.hernandez@cfe.gob.mx	52 29 44 00 Ext. 44000	Blvd. Adolfo Ruiz Cortinez No. 4156-5o. Piso, Col. Jardines del Pedregal, C.P. 01900. Alvaro Obregón, DF.
	Comisión Federal de Electricidad - CFE	Ing. Francisco Javier Hernández Viciconti	Jefe del Departamento de Gestión y Diagnóstico Ambiental	francisco.hernandez19@cfe.gob.mx	52 29 44 00 Ext. 44220	Blvd. Adolfo Ruiz Cortinez No. 4156-5o. Piso, Col. Jardines del Pedregal, C.P. 01900. Alvaro Obregón, DF.
2	Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo	Edgar Rafael González González	Oficial de Programa de Desarrollo Sustentable	edgar.gonzalez@undp.org	40 00 97 51	
3	Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo	Dr. Guillermo Román Moguel	Coordinador Nacional del Proyecto UNDP 00059701	guillermo.roman@semarnat.gob.mx	56 24 36 07	

4	Dirección General de Sustentabilidad Subsecretaría de Planeación Energética y Desarrollo Tecnológico Secretaría de Energía	Ing. Adrian Cordero Lovera	Director de Sustentabilidad Energética	acordero@energia.gob.mx	50 00 60 47 50 00 60 00 Ext. 1096	Insurgentes Sur No. 890, Piso 3, Col. del Valle, C.P. 03100 Benito Juárez, DF.
5	Consejo Nacional de Industriales Ecologistas, A.C. - (CONIECO)	Ing. Carlos Sandoval Olvera	Presidente	ecologia@conieco.com.mx; csandoval@conieco.com.mx	55 75 39 51	Gabriel Mancera No. 1141, Col. Del Valle, C.P. 03100, Benito Juárez, DF.
6	Confederación de Cámaras Industriales (CONCAMIN)	Sr. Francisco Funtanet Mange	Presidente	presidencia@concamin.org.mx	51 40 78 20	Manuel María Contreras No. 133, P.B., Col. Cuauhtémoc, C.P. 06500, Cuauhtémoc, DF.
7	Asociación Nacional de la Industria Química (ANIQ)	Ing. Rubén Muñoz García	Director de Medio Ambiente	rgarcia@aniq.org.mx; malbarran@aniq.org.mx	52 30 51 31	Angel Urraza No. 505, Col. Del Valle, C.P. 03100, Benito Juárez, DF.
	Asociación Nacional de la Industria Química (ANIQ)	Ing. Javier Pérez Gómez	Gerente de Medio Ambiente	jgomez@aniq.org.mx	52 30 51 33	Angel Urraza No. 505, Col. Del Valle, C.P. 03100, Benito Juárez, DF.

8	Cámara de la Industria Azucarera	Lic. Humberto Jasso Torres	Director General	hjasso@camaraazucarera.org.mx	50 62 13 80 Ext. 1384	Río Niagara No. 11, Col. Cuauhtémoc, C.P. 06500, Cuauhtémoc, DF.
9	Centro de Análisis y Acción en Tóxicos y sus Alternativas (CAATA)	Ing. Fernando Bejarano González	Director	coordinacion@caata.org.mx	(595) 954 77 44	Amado Nervo No. 23, Col. San Juanito, C.P. 56121, Texcoco, Estado de México
10	Asociación Nacional de Autoridades Ambientales Estatales (ANAAE)	Ing. Fernando Guitiérrez Moreno	Coordinador General	fernando.gutierrez@nuevoleon.gob.mx; mcavazosv@gmail.com	81 20 20 67 58 81 20 20 67 59	
11	Asociación de Municipios de México, A.C. (AMMAC)	Adriana Solorzano	Directora Ejecutiva	jjlopez@ammac.org.mx	55 24 40 20 55 34 44 48 55 34 44 51 55 24 31 41 55 34 02 06 Ext. 104	Circuito Circunvalación Oriente No. 10, Col. Ciudad Satélite, C.P. 53100, Naucalpan de Juárez, Estado de México
12	Procuraduría Federal de Protección al Ambiente	M. en C. Arturo rodríguez Abitia	Subprocurador de Inspección Industrial	arodrigueza@profepa.gob.mx; mlmontes@profepa.gob.mx	54 49 63 00 Ext. 16350 y 16351	Camino al Ajusco No. 200, 4o. Piso, Ala Norte, Col. Jardines en la Montaña, C.P. 14200 Tlalpan, DF.

13	Centro Interdisciplinario de Investigaciones y Estudios sobre Medio Ambiente y Desarrollo (CIIEMAD) Instituto Politécnico Nacional	Dra. Rosa Laura Meraz Cabrera	Directora Interina	rlmeraz@hotmail.com	57 29 60 00 Ext. 52709 y 52711	30 de Junio de 1520 S/N, Col. Barrio de la Laguna Ticomán, C.P. 07340, Gustavo A. Madero, DF.
14	México, Comunicación y Ambiente, A.C.	Ing. Carlos Alvarez Flores	Presidente	carlosalvarezflores@gmail.com	*Nextel:* 24 75 09 75 Sra. Lourdes Martinez (asistente): 53 35 06 79 53 35 06 07	Calle Gabriel Mancera No. 1114, Col. Del Valle, C.P. 03100, Benito Juárez, DF.
15	Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales	Ing. Rafael Pacchiano Alaman	Subsecretario de Gestión para la Protección Ambiental	rafael.pacchiano@semarnat.gob.mx; fernanda.romo@semarnat.gob.mx	(55) 56 24 33 00 Ext. 23526, 4201 ó 4305	

4.3 List of persons interviewed

	Contact	Position	Address	City	Telephone	Celular	e-mail
Proyecto 00059701	Guillermo Román	Coordinador	Av. Revolución 1425, Nivel 30, Col. Tlacopac san Angel	D.F.	56 24 36 07	55 8533 1241	guillermo.roman@semarnat.gob.mx
	Laura Beltrán	Coordinadora Sist. Integrado Serv. Gestión			56 24 33 44	55 8533 1238	laura.beltran@semarnat.gob.mx
PNUD México	Edgar González	Director Desarrollo Sostenible	Av. Montes Urales 440, Col. Lomas de Chapultepec	D.F.	40 00 97 61		
Servicios Corporativos FRISCO, S.A. de C.V.	Ing. Yanet Manzo Hernández	Gerente General de Medio Ambiente		D.F.	(55) 21 22 26 94		ymanzo@minerafrisco.com.mx
Sem Tredi	Dra. Claire van Ruymbeke D.	Directora General	Amores 707-502, Col. Del Valle, C. P. 03100	D.F.	55 43 26 77	55 5432 8921	direcciongeneral@semtredi.com
Hospital General de México	Ing. Miguel Angel Porras Padrón	Subdirector de Conservación y Mantenimiento		D.F.	27 89 20 00 Ext. 1225 Dir.50 04 38 40		mapptol-2000@hotmail.com; juan_galindo@salud.gob.mx
ALBEHOL Servicio Múltiples	Ing. Silverio Centeno Uvalle	Gerente Técnico		D.F.		Cel. 55 20 95 36 11	silveriocenteno@aol.com

Industrias Cabañas	Ing. Alfonso Ruíz Cabañas Izquierdo	Propietario del Predio		D.F.	Of. 55 93 87 86 Cel. 55 22 12 16 67		arcizquierdo54@gmail.com
México, Comunicación y Ambiente	Carlos Alvarez	Presidente	Calle Gabriel Mancera No. 1114, Col. del Valle, Del. Benito Juárez, C.P. 03100	D.F.	53 35 06 79 53 35 06 07	Nextel: 24 75 09 75	carlosalvarezflores@gmail.com
Secretaría de Medio Ambiente e Historia Natural (SEMAHN) Gobierno del Estado de Chiapas	Ing. Yazmín Colado Altamirano	Coordinadora del Laboratorio de Monitoreo Ambiental	Calle Rio Usumacinta #851, Fracc. Los Laguitos, CP.29020, Tuxtla Gutiérrez, Chiapas	Tuxtla Gtz	(961) 602 02 36 Ext. 58228	Cel. 961 101 46 02	labdecalidad@hotmail.com
Taller mantenimiento Electricidad Industrial Y Mantenimiento, S.A. de C.V. (EIMSA)	Ing. Bárbara Adriana Rodríguez Bucio		Calle 3ª Poniente Norte 159, Col. Francisco I. Madero (Sur), C.P. 29090, Tuxtla Gutiérrez, Chiapas	Tuxtla Gtz	(961) 612 72 95 (961) 611 03 66	Cel. 961 579 42 36	eimsa.barbie@hotmail.com
Sistema Municipal de Agua Potable y Alcantarillado de Tuxtla Gutiérrez	Ing. Amilkar Bezares	Jefe de Mantenimiento	Rebombeo Norte: Col. 24 de Junio, rebombeo pegado a la USEP Tuxtla Gutiérrez, Chiapas	Tuxtla Gtz	(961) 618 71 70	Cel. 961 579 40 56	bezares25@hotmail.com

Instituto Politécnico Nacional	Dr. Héctor Mayagoitia Domínguez	Coordinador Politécnico para la Sustentabilidad	Unidad Profesional “Adolfo López Mateos” Edificio de la Bibilioteca Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología, 2do piso Av. Instituto Politécnico Nacional Esq. Av. Wilfrido Massieu, Col. Zacatenco, C.P. 07738, Gustavo A. Madero, D.F.	D.F.	(55) 57 29 60 00 Ext. 54452 y 54453		hmaydom@hotmail.com; lcobian@ipn.mx
Promotora Azucarera, S.A. de C.V. (PROASA)	Ing. Edher Alberto Hernández Rivera	Coordinador Ambiental y RSE	Rio Panuco No.38 8° piso Colonia Cuauhtemoc , espaldas de la bolsa de valores	D.F.	(55) 52 00 19 00 Ext. 1214		ehernandez@sistemaazucar.com.mx
DGGIMAR-SEMARNAT	Alfonso Flores	Ex Director General	Av. Revolución 1425, Nivel 16, Col. Tlacopac San Angel	D.F.	56 24 36 12		alfonso.flores@semarnat.gob.mx
PNUD México	Edgar González	Director Desarrollo Sostenible	Av. Montes Urales 440, Col. Lomas de Chapultepec	D.F.	40 00 97 61		edgar.gonzalez@undp.org
PNUD México	Paloma Somohano	Gerente Desarrollo Sostenible	Av. Montes Urales 440, Col. Lomas de Chapultepec		40 00 97 68		paloma.somohano@undp.org
PNUD México M&E	Paloma Somohano	Gerente Desarrollo Sostenible	Av. Montes Urales 440, Col. Lomas de Chapultepec		40 00 97 68		paloma.somohano@undp.org

Proyecto 00059701	Guillermo Román	Coordinador	Av. Revolución 1425, Nivel 30, Col. Tlacopac san Angel	D.F.	56 24 36 07	55 8533 1241	guillermo.roman@semarnat.gob.mx
	Laura Beltrán	Coordinadora Sist. Integrado Serv. Gestión			56 24 33 44	55 8533 1238	laura.beltran@semarnat.gob.mx

4.4 Executive Summary of the Mid-Term Evaluation

In accordance with the provisions of the draft document "Management and environmentally sound destruction of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) in Mexico" and the policies in place for monitoring and evaluation of UNDP / GEF, MIE was subjected to a mid-term evaluation 2009 -2011. This evaluation sought to provide a review of implementation progress, identify potential problems, assess compliance with the objectives and requirements of the first half of the project, identify and document lessons learned and make recommendations on specific actions that can be considered in the second half of the project.

This evaluation covers the period from March 25, 2009 to June 30, 2011, although we see that the first disbursement was on April 28, 2009. The overall project design is current and valid from the original development and can identify their contribution to achieving the objectives set, and this makes it possible to measure its scope, objectives, goals, is sustainable over time and most important still have the option to replicate to some other POPs or reproduced in Latin America.

The progress of the project is satisfactory based on the expected impact since its inception. Its implementation makes the international community take notice since it has been shown that both the UNDP and SEMARNAT are participating in a draft medium-term (4 years) and sharing responsibilities and obligations in its implementation.

It should be noted that the SENER, who should have a more active role in the project, has not participated as it should have been expected. Furthermore, PROFEPA and SEMARNAT should communicate more closely for the development of the project.

Additionally, the timeframe reflected in the project design may not be achievable due to the natural course of an implementation process. Although the implementation may be properly executed, normal project occurrences may result in delays.

One of the most important achievements of the project is to have an increasingly real inventory which generates a greater certainty of the scope of the project, coupled with the ability to locate areas where the PCBs are present.

Another important fact is that the maintenance or repair shops do not have the training or the infrastructure to treat PCBs and, more importantly, the exposure to the materials creates a danger to them and to the people within proximity.

What gives significance to the project is the Integrated Management Services (SISG) which gives perpetuity to the project even if UNDP has completed its project of PCBs, since the system will be responsible for regulating the management processes for PCBs.

“Considering the varying political parties at the state level in Mexico, and the fact that the Project appears as a federal government initiative, the implementation of this project is a significant achievement.”

We emphasize the achievement of the implementation of the system because in a country the size of Mexico there are differing political and social circumstances by State of the Republic because the project looks like a work of the Federation which is governed by a particular political party and some federal states are governed by opposing parties, which makes it difficult relations to carry out the many measures required for deployment or implementation of the project.

Another discovery is in the evaluation of company's oil treaties or destruction of equipment. It was found that in some cases companies do not have the infrastructure necessary to make an environmentally sound disposal of what the authority should have higher requirements so they do not disposal into the environment.

Finally, the above must be reflected in the law. We found some legal loopholes that need to be amended so that this project is sustainable and will result in a better environment for the Mexican population in all parts of the country.

4.5 List of documents reviewed

- Project documents
- Project progress reports and self-assessments (PIRs)
- Minutes of the meetings of the Steering Committee and of the Technical Advisory Group
- Power Point presentations delivered by the project
- Mid-Term Evaluation
- Back-to-office reports of project managers

4.6 Evaluation Question Matrix

Evaluation Criteria	Guiding evaluation questions	Source of Information						Evaluation Tools			
		Counterpart	Donor	PM	Beneficiaries	Experts		Doc Review	Interview	Field Obs.	
Relevance	• **How does 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?**	x		x		x		x	x		
	• Why/how were government agency and/or company selected to partner with UNDP?	x	x	x					x		
	• To what extent are the problems that originated the project still relevant today? • Have there been changes in the context that affected the project significantly?	x		x	x	x			x	x	
	• To what extent the project is relevant to intended target groups/beneficiaries?	x		x	x				x	x	
Effectiveness	• **To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?**	x		x	x	x		x	x	x	
	• To what extent outputs established in the project document are delivered?			x	x	x			x	x	
	• To what extent outcomes established in the project document are being achieved (or likely to be)?			x	x	x			x	x	
	• To what extent outputs are/were sufficient to achieve the outcome?			x		x		x	x	x	

Evaluation Criteria	Guiding evaluation questions	Source of Information						Evaluation Tools			
		Counterpart	Donor	PM	Beneficiaries	Experts		Doc Review	Interview	Field Obs.	
	• To what extent were SMART performance indicators established and measured?			x		x		x	x	x	
	• To what extent has the project reached the intended beneficiaries?			x	x	x			x	x	
Efficiency	• **Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?**	x		x	x	x			x	x	
	• To what extend were resources/inputs converted into outputs in a timely and cost-effective way?			x	x	x			x	x	
	• What were the main factors influencing the delivery of outputs? (Issues / context that facilitated implementation?)			x	x	x			x	x	
	• What were the main barriers, if any, encountered during project implementation?	x		x	x	x			x	x	
	• How has the project management addressed barriers / challenges?			x	x	x			x	x	
	• How was the project monitoring conducted?			x		x		x	x	x	
	• To what extent were project progress reports updated/recorded systematically?	x	x	x				x	x	x	
	• Has the in-country presence improved project monitoring and supervision?	x	x	x		x			x	x	

Evaluation Criteria	Guiding evaluation questions	Source of Information						Evaluation Tools			
		Counterpart	Donor	PM	Beneficiaries	Experts		Doc Review	Interview	Field Obs.	
	• To what extent is the UR involved in supervising and monitoring projects?	x		x					x	x	
Sustainability / Ownership	• **To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?**	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	
	• What is the level of local/national funding/financing?	x	x	x				x	x		
	• What has been the involvement of government counterparts / private sector in implementation?	x		x					x	x	
	• Are the main stakeholders taking effective leadership in the project implementation? Why or why not?	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	
	• To what extent were government counterparts and key stakeholders involved in the project design?	x		x	x			x	x	x	
Project Design Process (Situation, gap, problem analysis, objectives analysis, formulation process, LFA and RBM approach)	• What do you see as strengths / weaknesses of the project design?		x	x	x			x	x	x	
	• How was the consultation process during the project design?	x	x	x	x				x	x	
	• What would you change regarding the project design?	x	x	x	x				x	x	
	• To what extent project has been designed using the LFA?	x	x	x	x			x	x		
	• To what extent have evaluations been used and drawn on in the design of projects and / or to learn lessons?	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	

Evaluation Criteria	Guiding evaluation questions	Source of Information						Evaluation Tools			
		Counterpart	Donor	PM	Beneficiaries	Experts		Doc Review	Interview	Field Obs.	
	• Overall quality of project design (clarity, consistency and logic. Results chain, SMART indicators, Realistic and meaningful outputs and outcome)							x			
Overall / Cross-cutting	• What have been in your view the strengths and weaknesses of UNDP with respect to this project?	x	x	x	x	x			x	X	
	• To what extent has the project contributed to empowerment of women and gender equality?	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	X	
	• To what extent has the project contributed (positively or negatively) to environmental sustainability?;	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	
	• How has this project contributed to the One UN Programme objectives. (for DaO projects)	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	
	• How were coordination/synergies among UNDP activities at the national level?	x		x	x				x	x	
	• How were projects/programmes integrated/coordinated with other UN project/programmes?. Have synergies with other initiatives been developed and exploited by UNDP?	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	
	• What could be learned from the experiences of other UN agencies in the country?	x	x	x	x				x	x	
	• To what extent UNDP financing or co-funding was part of the budget and what the UNDP financing was used for?	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	

Evaluation Criteria	Guiding evaluation questions	Source of Information						Evaluation Tools			
		Counterpart	Donor	PM	Beneficiaries	Experts		Doc Review	Interview	Field Obs.	
	• To what extent has the management structure and procedures adequate (structure, information flows, decision making, procurement) and contributed to generate the planned outputs and achievement of outcome?	x		x	x	x		x	x	x	
	• What could be improved (if any) on UNDP's model of intervention?	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	
	• To what extent UNDP GF activities nurtured national knowledge and dialogue globally and with regard to industrial development in the country?	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	
Impact	• **Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?**	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	
	• To what extent is the project contributing to international development priorities?	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	
	• How can these contributions (if any) be measured?	x	x	x	x				x	x	

4.7 Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: Cristóbal Vignal

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): CV&A International Consulting

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed in Montreal on 13 August 2015

Signature: