

## **Independent terminal review**

### **Preparatory project to facilitate the implementation of the legally binding instrument on mercury (Minamata Convention) in Argentina to protect health and the environment**

Project ID: 130001, GEF ID: 5496



UNITED NATIONS  
INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

Distr. GENERAL  
ODG/EVQ/IEV/16/R.15

March 2017

Original: English

This evaluation was managed  
by the responsible  
UNIDO Project Manager  
with quality assurance by the  
Independent Evaluation Division

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Mention of company names and commercial products does not imply the endorsement of UNIDO.

The views and opinions of the team do not necessarily reflect the views of the Governments and of UNIDO.

This document has not been formally edited.

# Contents

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	IV
GLOSSARY OF EVALUATION RELATED TERMS	V
1. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES, METHODOLOGY AND PROCESS	6
1.1 Scope and objectives of the evaluation	6
1.2 Evaluation Approach and Methodology	6
2. COUNTRY AND PROJECT BACKGROUND	9
2.1 Information on the Minamata Convention. Context in Argentina. Main information on the project context	9
2.2. Project summary	10
3. EVALUATION FINDINGS	11
3.1 Implementation arrangements	11
3.1 Key activities	13
4. CONCLUSIONS	15
4.1 Scenario	15
4.2 Obstacles to overcome along the project to reach the goals proposed	15
4.3 Implementation of a preparatory process	17
4.4 Strategy implemented: inter-sectorial spaced of dialogue	17
4.5 Federalization of the actions of the project	17
4.6 Success factors	18
4.7 Key partners to this project	19
5. RECOMMENDATIONS	21
ANNEX A: TERMS OF REFERENCE	22
ANNEX B: PERSONS AND INSTITUTIONS MET	45

## Abbreviations and acronyms

AAMMA	Asociacion Argentina de Medicos por el Medio Ambiente
ARS	Asociación para el Estudio de Residuos Sólidos
BCRC	Basel Convention Regional Centre for South America
CIQyP	Chamber of the Chemical and Petrochemical Industry
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IEV	UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division
INTI	National Institute of Industrial Technology
ITBA	Instituto Tecnológico Buenos Aires
MADS	Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sustentable
PAHO	Pan American Health Organization
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organisation
WHO	World Health Organisation

## Glossary of evaluation related terms

Term	Definition
Baseline	The situation, prior to an intervention, against which progress can be assessed.
Effect	Intended or unintended change due directly or indirectly to an intervention.
Effectiveness	The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved.
Efficiency	A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.
Impact	Positive and negative, intended and non-intended, directly and indirectly, long term effects produced by a development intervention.
Indicator	Quantitative or qualitative factors that provide a means to measure the changes caused by an intervention.
Lessons learned	Generalizations based on evaluation experiences that abstract from the specific circumstances to broader situations.
Log-frame (logical framework approach)	Management tool used to facilitate the planning, implementation and evaluation of an intervention. It involves identifying strategic elements (activities, outputs, outcome, and impact) and their causal relationships, indicators, and assumptions that may affect success or failure. Based on RBM (results based management) principles.
Outcome	The likely or achieved (short-term and/or medium-term) effects of an intervention's outputs.
Outputs	The products, capital goods and services which result from an intervention; may also include changes resulting from the intervention which are relevant to the achievement of outcomes.
Relevance	The extent to which the objectives of an intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donor's policies.
Risks	Factors, normally outside the scope of an intervention, which may affect the achievement of an intervention's objectives.
Sustainability	The continuation of benefits from an intervention, after the development assistance has been completed.
Target groups	The specific individuals or organizations for whose benefit an intervention is undertaken.

## **1. Review objectives, methodology and process**

This terminal review was conducted by Mr. Alberto Bozzolo (National Evaluation Consultant), supported during the field mission to Argentina by Mr. Javier Guarnizo, UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division.

### **1.1 Scope and objectives of the Review**

The purpose of the final review is for the GEF, UNIDO and the partners of the host country to:

- a) Review:
  - activities, project results and achievements through their indicators;
  - relevance of objectives and other design elements of the project;
- b) Draw recommendations and lessons learned in the process to replicate the experience in other projects.

The reviewed Terms of Reference for this evaluation are presented in Annex A. After the evaluation inception discussions, and given the size of this project, it was agreed by the project manager, the executing agency in Argentina, and the UNIDO independent evaluation division, to conduct this evaluation in the form of a reduced independent review, while keeping the main evaluation elements and criteria and guiding evaluation questions.

### **1.2 Review Approach and Methodology**

#### **Contact and interview with AAMMA (Asociación Argentina de Médicos por el Medio Ambiente)**

For this GEF project AAMMA was the Executory Agency working along with UNIDO as Implementing Agency.

The first step was to contact the team leader of AAMMA for this project.

Three interviews in three different opportunities took place with the team leader of the project to get familiar with the project as well as with the related information and documents.

During these interviews information on the different sources and actors (who is who) and references were collected to contact them for this evaluation.

AAMMA both collaborated and facilitated the information requested as well as oriented and helped providing complementary documents, facilitating the research and any other references useful to this evaluation.

## **Identification and gathering information on the background and the project itself**

Research activities were conducted to identify and collect information, compose and understand the scenario at the time the project was designed.

The understanding of this baseline helped to better evaluate the advances, outcomes and outreaches emerged from the project activities.

## **Identification of main actors and organization of the agenda of interviews**

Based on the information emerged during the interviews with AAMMA as well as within the consulted documents, the main actors were identified and a list of main interviews was agreed.

As a next step, place and time of the interviews was established to organize the agenda of the meetings.

## **Review and analysis of the documents of the project:**

The following documents were provided by AAMMA and the project manager:

- i. GEF project Identification Form
- ii. Project Progress Reports elaborated by AAMMA.  
First Report (July 2014), Second Report (February 2015) and Third Report (August 2016).
- iii. Final Report (November 2016), including 6 annexes containing the following attached documents:
  - ❖ Steering Committee Meeting Acts
  - ❖ Legal report on the identified existing legal framework in Argentina
  - ❖ Abstract of the Legal Report ( in English )
  - ❖ Technical report identifying the existing technologies in Argentina
  - ❖ Abstract of the Technical Report ( in English )
  - ❖ Conclusions and recommendations emerging from the Second National Consultation Meeting
  - ❖ Abstract of the Conclusions and Recommendations Emerging from the Second National Consultation Meeting ( in English )
- iv. Letter of Intent for a GEF Pilot project: “Pilot project for mercury containing waste final enclosure” (known in Spanish as “Recinto INTI”)
- v. Working agendas plus list of participants of the First and Second National Consultation Meetings
- vi. Flier for the dissemination of information on the project

- vii. Clearing House of the project (for interchange and dissemination of documents and publication related to the Minamata Convention or the activities of project itself as well as other documents of interest on the topic)

These documents were analysed and information was organized to get the idea of the roles and responsibilities of the Team Leader and Consultants the project as well as the participation and roles of the other involved actors. For example, in this specific project, due the importance of the creation of a multi-sectorial and participative dialogue, the roles and responsibilities of the Steering Committee members are definitely important to evaluate the likelihood of impact and achievement of the outcomes of this project.

## **2. Country and project background**

### **2.1 Information on the Minamata Convention. Context in Argentina. Main information on the project context**

In Geneva, on 19 January 2013 the text of the future Minamata Convention on Mercury<sup>1</sup> was agreed.

The governments recognized that, to better protect health, reduce exposure and protect the environment, it was urgent to both close the gaps related to the available information on main sources of emissions, identify technologies and effective measures to promote the implementation of the Best Available Technologies (BAT) and Best Environmental Practices (BEP), and to develop implementation plans and policies, while giving adequate technical and financial assistance.

The Argentinean Society of Doctors for the Environment (AAMMA) and the Basel Convention Regional Centre for South America (BCRC) held preliminary discussions with members of mercury-dependent industries, chambers of chemicals producers, representatives of mercury waste management services, and different governmental areas in order to coordinate activities and to inform and include the different stakeholders within the process.

These efforts established a dialogue baseline upon which this project built further capacity and awareness building.

Under this framework, it was necessary to take action to generate capacity and awareness raising amongst stakeholders (including decision making and private sector) to call attention to this important problem, explore possible solutions, adapt the legal regulatory framework, identify and apply tools and technical solutions, and share experiences.

Argentina signed on the Minamata Convention on 10 October 2013. On 2014 and along 2015, though, Argentina entered in a strong general national election process and the rooms for discussion at the national and provincial levels were occupied mainly by the political discussion. The new administration authorities assumed the government on December 2015.

In this context it was important to sustain and continue informing, working on awareness raising and capacity building of the main stakeholders on issues related to the Minamata Convention. The room for dialogue was created by the Project to facilitate the interaction among main actors and prepare them to participate in the NIP of the Minamata Convention in Argentina.

With this regard, Argentina is finalizing the ratification process and it may be completed in the early 2017.

---

1

[http://www.mercuryconvention.org/Portals/11/documents/Booklets/Minamata%20Convention%20on%20Mercury\\_booklet\\_English.pdf](http://www.mercuryconvention.org/Portals/11/documents/Booklets/Minamata%20Convention%20on%20Mercury_booklet_English.pdf)

## 2.2. Project summary

The objective of the project is to facilitate the implementation of the forthcoming Minamata Convention in Argentina by setting the groundwork and prepare the different sectors to comply with their obligations under the Minamata Convention once it enters into force.

This proposal included strategies and activities to bring the main stakeholders together, raise awareness on the scope of the treaty, conduct an in depth analysis of the existing legal framework and available BAT/BEP in the country and region, promote brainstorming among the sectors and finally prepare a document to feed the discussion under the future National Implementation Plan process.

The project focused on the potential changes to the legal/policy framework for the temporary and final disposal of mercury and mercury containing waste.

In order to achieve these goals the project consisted of three main outcomes as it follows:

### **Outcome 1: Argentina is equipped with tools for the smooth adoption and implementation of the upcoming Minamata Convention.**

The analysis of the current situation in the country consisted in assessing the existing legal/policy framework on mercury and hazardous waste management, and the BAT/BEP available in the country. Both results are reflected in the documents presented by the project.

### **Outcome 2: Awareness is raised on the terms of the recently signed Minamata Convention to facilitate the understanding and implementation of the forthcoming convention.**

The main activity was centered on the establishment of a Clearing House website. The Clearing House posts information which include options of the available BAT/BEP in the country and the region; analysis of the national legal & policy frameworks; advances in other mercury related efforts; the international mercury agenda; as well as learning material on the dangers posed by exposure to mercury, including gender specific health risks of mercury, etc. After project completion the BCRC will continue to maintain the site so as to assure its long term sustainability.

### 3. Review Findings

#### 3.1 Implementation arrangements

**The team leader** in the AAMMA was the responsible for the execution of the project and the final product.

The main strategy implemented in the project was the creation of a multi-sectorial and participative space of dialogue to facilitate the interaction, better knowledge and understanding of the capacities of the different governmental and nongovernmental main stakeholders.

Communication strategies were implemented to disseminate the Minamata Convention and improve sharing and dialogue among stakeholders.

Technical and Legal reports were prepared and disseminated to stimulate the active interaction and discussion on the possible ways to facilitate the implementation of the Minamata Convention. Two National Consultation Meetings were held to facilitate the interaction of the different sectors as well as with the experts in the different fields involved. As a result, a document containing the main Conclusions and Recommendations was produced collecting the main aspects of the multi-stakeholder's dialogue. This document is considered one of the main outcomes as it will be feeding the discussion when the National Implementation Plan discussion process finally starts.

**The National Consultant** was responsible for the overall organization of the activities, the administrative support and acted as the focal point to facilitate the interaction among the different participants of the project.

The National Consultant was the main support for the Team Leader, the Consultants and the members of the Steering Committee, and, at the same time, she was responsible for the day to day implementation, logistic and infrastructure to facilitate the activities of the project.

The National Consultant had the responsibility to organize the Steering Committee Meetings, to take notes and draft reports of these meetings as well as to organize the logistic of the First and Second National Consultation Meetings (identified the focal points for a representative area at the provincial level and national level, contacted them and provided the means for their participation in both National Consultation Meetings).

Some difficulties were found during the project implementation activities as on 2015 Argentina went through an intense political election process and mayor changes in the government took place on 2016. This situation demanded more efforts as there were a duplication of the activities to identify, re-contact and inform the new governmental members and representatives to the Steering Committee on the project issues , to sustain the timing and keep their active involvement.

The role of the National Consultant was central as the success of this project was based on the participation of national/provincial governmental representatives and main nongovernmental stakeholders in both National Consultation Meetings, as well as to assure the participation of representative sectors in the Steering Committee all along the project. These objectives were accomplished, and they are well reflected in the Steering Committee Acts and in the list of participants to both National Consultation Meetings. The National Consultant explained that this turned out to be a mayor task that required sustained work and a strategic and intense continued effort.

**The Legal Consultant** was responsible to identify, organize and analyse the already existing legal framework in Argentina. This analysis was presented in the Legal Framework Report.

The legal Consultant identified the challenges for the practical implementation of Minamata Convention under the existing legal framework and under a federal administration system. It was explained that, even if the Constitution and a Legal Framework is sufficient and practical, the provincial autonomies and internal organization (local governments and municipalities) may represent a challenge for the effective field implementation and local regulations.

The Legal Consultant worked in collaboration with the other consultants as well as participated to both Consultation National Meetings interacting with the participants to facilitate the interactive process for the better understanding of the technical information.

**The Technical Consultant** worked on the identification and organization of technical scenario while being also responsible for the preparation of the Technical Report.

In Argentina there was no other technical document bringing together the necessary technical information to feed the decision making process necessary for the successful implementation in the field of the Minamata Convention.

The Technical Consultant organized and presented the Technical Report in an easy-to-read way so to facilitate the understanding of complex technical issues by the different stakeholders involved in the implementation process of the Minamata Convention (decision makers and other main sectors).

The Technical Consultant also worked in collaboration with the other consultants and participated to both Consultation National Meetings interacting with the participants to facilitate the interactive process for the better understanding of the technical information.

**The Communication Consultant** played a key role for the project implementation as the main project goal was exactly the dissemination of information to facilitate the implementation of the Minamata Convention. This Consultant participated since the beginning when the communication strategy was designed and the communication tools were selected.

The Clearing House is a communication tool thought to be sustained on time even after the project is over as the Basel Convention Regional Centre for South America will take it under their electronic structure and administration (as BCRC already did in the past with other websites of previous projects related to mercury in products).

The Communication Consultant was responsible for the coordination of the communication activities as well as the production of the project visual material and in general every communication piece.

The informative materials were thought and developed to serve to the main goals of the project. Dissemination and informative materials build up on other materials produced by AAMMA in previous projects on mercury preparatory for the Minamata convention negotiation process. These materials were disseminated and are currently available under the Basel Convention Regional Centre for South America.

Being the central part of a project based on a communication strategy, the role and responsibilities of the Communication Consultant in facilitating the dialogue and interchange of information was a key one all along the project to accomplish the objectives.

### **3.1 Key activities**

#### **Meetings with the main actors convened by the project, members of the Steering Committee.**

The members of the Steering Committee were convened by the Executory Agency (AAMMA) and the Basel Convention Regional Centre for South America to be part of the Steering Committee.

The Basel Convention Regional Centre for South America was invited to be the Coordinator of the Steering Committee as that is a recognized organization involved in the process and naturally responsible for the promotion and implementation of the process for the National Implementation Plan in the near future.

The composition of the Steering Committee was put together with the purpose of improving and enhancing the participation and interaction of the main sectors involved in the process, representing governmental and nongovernmental main stakeholders, with clear responsibilities or involvement in the implementation of the Minamata Convention in Argentina.

In this framework, invitations were issued to the following governmental sectors: Environment and Sustainable Development, Public Health, Labour, Industry, Energy, Mining, Foreign Office, Customs, Science and Technology, National Institute of Industrial Technology (INTI).

Invitations were also issued to other nongovernmental relevant involved stakeholders such as: associations and chambers of hazardous waste treaters, main mercury and mercury containing waste producers, academy and technical professionals' associations with experience in hazardous waste management and disposal as well as other important non-profit organizations involved.

Immediately the invitation was accepted by almost all sectors, except by the Customs sector that never responded to the invitation.

The Steering Committee was co-coordinated by the Basel Convention Regional Centre for South America and AAMMA. It was integrated by members representing the following governmental and nongovernmental sectors:

- Ministry Environment and Sustainable Development.
- Ministry of Health (The Public Health governmental sector -represented by the Direction of Determinants of Health- in a first time accepted the invitation and participated to the Steering Committee meetings, later on it explained that it will only be an observer of the process and after the First National Consultation Meeting they did not participate at all in any activity even if they continued to be formally informed and invited.)
- Super-intendancy of Risks at Work.
- Secretary of Industry.
- Secretary of Energy (The Secretary of Energy participated of the first part of the project when the organization and authorities of this governmental sector changes and even if the information and invitations were delivered all along the time of the project, no other representative of this sector participated to the Steering Committee again.)
- Secretary of Mining (The Secretary of Mining, that did not react to the invitations to be part of the Steering Committee in the first part of the project, was incorporated to the Steering Committee after the election process in 2016 and also actively participated of the Second National Consultation Meeting.)
- Foreign Office.
- Ministry of Science and Technology.
- National Institute of Industrial Technology (INTI).
- Instituto Tecnológico Buenos Aires (ITBA) (private university with expertise in industrial technology).
- Chamber of the Chemical and Petrochemical Industry – CIQyP.
- Fundación Biodiversidad.

## **4. Conclusions**

### **4.1 Scenario**

As a first and umbrella conclusion, a point to highlight is that the Project “Mercury in Argentina” played an important role in Argentina by informing, awareness raising, opening the discussion and mobilizing the participation of the different stakeholders to strength the implementation process of the Minamata Convention. The positive impact of the multi-participatory strategy implemented opened the road that Argentina has to transit towards the National Implementation Plan.

The room for dialogue created by this project (Mercury in Argentina) allowed, facilitated and sustained the interaction among main actors involved, as well as advanced the issues to prepare the new authorities to understand the importance and timing under the framework of the Minamata Convention, and finally to accelerate the ratification and the discussion of the NIP.

All actors involved agreed on the need to establish a space of dialogue among the different stakeholders to identify the existing scenario and baseline to better define the problem, technical capacity and legal framework as well as the different existing alternatives for the management and disposal of mercury and mercury-containing waste under the Minamata Convention.

All of them agreed that the outcomes of the project (reflected in the three main informative documents: Technical and Legal Reports and Conclusions and Recommendations) are central to establish a baseline to address the discussion and feed the process to design the National Implementation Plan.

This baseline is a decision making tool useful to governmental as well non-governmental stakeholders that will also define the actions, policies and investments (human and financial resources) and identify the technical and professional gaps.

### **4.2 Obstacles to overcome along the project to reach the goals proposed:**

Three main issues were identified as obstacles along the implementation of the project:

#### **a) Identification of professionals with technical expertise in the technologies and practical problems in the field for the management of mercury and mercury containing waste**

As a first option, technical experts were selected pointing at a background on technical research. The first drafts of the Technical Report though did not fulfil the needs of the project. Changes were immediately introduced in the selection process considering the need of field experience very important for the goals of this project. A second Technical Advisor was contracted with excellent reflected in the Technical Report.

## **b) Changes in the governmental political arena in Argentina**

The project was implemented between March 2014 and December 2016. On 2015 Argentina entered in an intense election process involving all levels of government. The results of the election process led to a strong change in the policies and governmental structures, at national and provincial levels.

Even so, the members of the Steering Committee representing the different governmental areas continued participating and informing on the changes to maintain the original agenda. The Second National Consultation Meeting was delayed for eight months to assure the participation of representatives sectors of the provincial governments and the renewal of the commitment of the national governmental sectors.

To accomplish this, the communication with the national and provincial authorities was reinforced. The collaborative work of the Executive Agency of the project (AAMMA), the Basel Convention Regional Centre for South America and the sectors represented in the Steering Committee was central.

Finally, with so many changes in the different provincial and national government administration, the project helped to sustain the activities related to strengthening the implementation of the Minamata Convention in Argentina by keeping a line of multi-stakeholder collaboration and dialogue.

## **c) Involvement of the Public Health sector**

In general lines, even though the Minamata Convention is informally considered to be a “Public Health Convention” due the importance to protect health, historically the participation of the Health Sector in the negotiation process at the international and national level was always weak.

Several efforts were done during the development of this project to get the interest and sustain the participation of the Public Health governmental area. As described before, the reaction of the Ministry of Health was positive at the beginning, although its active participation in the project decreased with time.

The interest and actions identified and presented by Health Sector were mainly centred in actions oriented to limit the purchase and use of thermometers and sphygmomanometers in the national hospitals. This program and campaign of collection of these items, being not prepared for organized collection, management and disposal system, is the origin of a bigger not solved problem: pile of hazardous mercury and mercury containing waste in the hospitals waiting for a solution to the final disposal.

PAHO was also invited to participate in the project and, in fact, so they did in the First Nacional Consultation Meeting. Later on, due the change of the National Representative, the participation declined claiming that they have no experts in the area to represent PAHO in the meetings or within the Steering Committee.

It is clear this is an issue where PAHO/WHO has to reinforce the collaboration to improve the involvement of the governmental Health Sector as a main actor for the successful implementation of the Minamata Convention.

### **4.3 Implementation of a preparatory process**

All the members of the Steering Committee interviewed agreed on the very positive outcomes of the actions implemented along the project.

They also underline the importance of executing activities meant to prepare the stakeholders to participate in the discussion of the National Implementation Plan Process to contribute to the successful implementation of the Minamata Convention.

### **4.4 Strategy implemented: inter-sectorial space of dialogue**

All the interviewed expressed the idea that the creation of a space of dialogue among the different stakeholders involved representing governmental and nongovernmental sectors was a good strategy.

The multi-sectorial dialogue enriched the sharing process and mutual knowledge facilitating the necessary interaction for a successful implementation of changes and collaboration for the new scenario.

Dialogue spaces, as the Steering Committee and both National Consultation Meetings, were valuable interaction opportunities for expression of the different point of view of the stakeholders and promoted “brain storming” process on the different issues analysed in a collaborative and open way.

### **4.5 Federalization of the actions of the project**

Due to the federal administrative organization of Argentina, the responsibilities of the implementation of actions in the field are split among national, provincial and municipal levels.

Additional efforts will be required to identify the responsible authorities at local level as well as the opportunities for the implementation of the best available technologies and best environmental practices (BAT/BEP).

The project accomplished the goals set and played an important role by promoting spaces of dialogue, improving the multi-sectorial participation, interchanging information and enhancing the collaboration in technical and legal aspects.

The project had a key role in promoting dialogue and awareness raising on the Minamata Convention as well as on Mercury issues highlighting the important problem that mercury exposure represents for health as well as the need to protect as soon as possible the most vulnerable and the populations at risks.

The work of the Project was built on previous activities and former projects on “Mercury in Products” and “Mercury Inventory” (implementation of Mercury Toolkit) to keep the coherence of the actions.

Important efforts were made to identify and include representatives of the different geographic areas of Argentina (far from Buenos Aires) and stimulate them to participate in the Project.

To reinforce the dialogue at national level, taking into account the federal organization of Argentina, the Project reached out and brought to the two National Consultation Meetings representatives from all the provinces of Argentina, governmental and non-governmental actors involved (academia and private sector among others).

## **4.6 Success factors**

### **Representation and participation:**

The role and responsibilities of the different participating sectors and actors as well as the scope of their representation was evaluated. To sum up and not repeat the already-mentioned concepts, the most important issue to be highlighted is the importance to capitalize the experience in relation to the involvement of the Ministry of Health and the Public Health in general.

In this sense is also important to mention the important role played by the regional and national representation of the UN agencies (as PAHO/WHO and UNEP) to engage this important sector by improving activities and engage this sectors with international processes and political international decisions at local level.

### **Inclusive activity**

The inclusion of important sectors such as mining, has to be capitalized and sustained in time due the importance of this activity in the national, regional and provincial economies.

### **Legal framework**

The Legal Framework itself points clearly at the main strong and weak points of this approach.

A gap was identified in relation to the full life cycle of mercury approach and the possible need for a specific legal framework for its regulation to facilitate the full implementation of the Minamata Convention in Argentina.

### **Sustained implementation of activities:**

The ratification of the Minamata Convention is still an ongoing process and it is expected to be finalized soon. Once the ratification process is accomplished, the discussion to define the National Implementation Plan will start.

This time gap may last still some month. The different stakeholders expressed their worries on the leadership to keep in motion the preparatory process already initiated by this project without weakening the active participation and interest of the main sectors.

It is clear that actions taken in collaboration, including or emerging from nongovernmental sectors with active participation of governmental sectors, are important to increase the collaboration of the different sectors as well as to explore capacities and possible problems to be overcome for the successful implementation of the Minamata Convention.

**Cost- benefit efficiency:** last but not least is important to highlight that, considering the short budget adjudicated to the Project (smaller medium size GEF Grant: 350.000 USD), the goals proposed were accomplished without mayor problems and the results impacted importantly in the implementation of the Minamata Convention in Argentina by sustaining the issue in the political agenda in the lapse between the signature and ratification.

Even due the short budget adjudicated, the Project was able to facilitate the implementation of the Minamata Convention by reaching and stimulating the participation of the main stakeholders all along the country, introducing the discussion of the technical and legal framework to facilitate the better knowledge of the scenario and sustain the discussion on the topic by raising awareness working with the main actors in the country.

#### **4.7 Key partners to this project**

It is important to highlight the concepts highlighted by the project Team Leader with regard to the main partners contributing to the successful implementation of the actions of this project.

Looking at the results of this project, important concepts emerging from the interviews need to be taken into account.

##### **GEF**

In this specific case, GEF Regional Coordinator (at the time the Letter of Intent of the project was presented to GEF and UNIDO) played an important role by interacting with the different NGOs participating in the Minamata Convention negotiation process.

The Regional Coordinator at this time identified, interacted and supported the initiatives related to sustain and strengthen the Minamata Convention at the national level to prepare the different partners during the time gap between the signature and the ratification of the Convention.

##### **UNIDO**

UNIDO, through its officers, was always available and supporting.

UNIDO advised and accompanied the process by facilitating the administrative procedures.

Its partnership, as Implementing Agency, was central to reach the goals.

### **Basel Convention Regional Centre for South America**

This Centre played a central role by collaborating all along the project, strengthening the participation of the governmental sectors and spreading the information and outcomes of the project.

The Centre was an important partner and chaired the Steering Committee meetings validating the activities of the NGO.

### **Seed funds**

Even if this project received a small financial support, the results were sustained on time resulting in an important impact, mobilizing local resources from different partners. It is also important to highlight that GEF facilitated the financial procedure by accepting one-to-one co-financing, very important to include a small NGO capacity.

## **5. Recommendations**

### **Continuity of the actions**

A major risk is to lose the motion and level of visibility and sensitization of the main stakeholders on the implementation of the Minamata Convention in Argentina established by the activities of the project.

Governmental actors should accelerate the ratification process and invite the stakeholders to participate in the preliminary discussion of the National Implementation Plan to take advantage of the favourable conditions accomplished by the activities carried out under this project.

Government should consider establishing and identifying an office or national institution for the follow-up and coordination of the implementation of the Minamata Convention.

### **Improvement of multi-sectorial participation of main actors**

The Government should further work on increasing the participation , identifying and enlarging the number of actors from important sectors who are able to contribute with their capacity and voluntary work to accelerate and strengthen the process.

Sectors as mining, energy, hazardous waste management (including urban hazardous waste) are relevant to consolidate and widen the space of dialogue on alternatives to improve the mercury and mercury- containing waste management and implementation of actions to protect health and the environment.

### **Public Health sector involvement**

Government should support the measures, strategies and activities to involve the Public Health sector as well as to strengthen its capacity to improve their participation.

Their understanding of the problem will allow them to interact and lead participation in a process with a final clear target: to protect human health.

## **Annex A: Terms of reference**

**DRAFT**

### **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

#### **Independent terminal review of the UNIDO project:**

Preparatory project to facilitate the implementation of the legally binding instrument on mercury (Minamata Convention) in Argentina to protect health and the environment

UNIDO SAP ID 130001  
GEF ID:5496

**NOVEMBER 2016**

## **CONTENTS**

- I. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW
- II. SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION
- III. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY
- IV. PROJECT EVALUATION PARAMETERS
- V. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION
- VI. TIME SCHEDULE
- VII. DELIVERABLES AND REPORTING
- VIII. QUALITY ASSURANCE

Annex 1 - Outline of an in-depth project evaluation report

Annex 2 – Checklist on terminal evaluation report quality

Annex 3 – Job descriptions

Annex 4 – Project results framework

## I. Project background and overview

### 1. Project factsheet

<b>Project Title</b>	Preparatory project to facilitate the implementation of the legally binding instrument on mercury (Minamata Convention) in Argentina to protect health and the environment
<b>UNIDO SAP ID</b>	SAP ID: 130001
<b>Region</b>	LAC
<b>Country(ies)</b>	Argentina
<b>GEF project ID</b>	5496
<b>GEF focal area(s) and operational programme</b>	Persistent Organic Pollutants
<b>Project GEF CEO endorsement / Approval date</b>	29/07/2013
<b>Implementing agency(ies)</b>	UNIDO
<b>Executing partner(s)</b>	Asociación Argentina de Médicos por el Medio Ambiente, AAMMA (Argentinean Society of Doctors for the Environment).
<b>Project size (FSP, MSP, EA)</b>	MSP
<b>Project implementation start date (First PAD issuance date)</b>	September 2013
<b>Original implementation end date (for GEF projects, as indicated in CEO endorsement/Approval document)</b>	September 2015
<b>Donor(s):</b>	GEF
<b>Actual implementation end date</b>	End of 2016
<b>Project Budget (for GEF project grant) - (excluding PPG)</b>	USD 350 0000
<b>Total co-financing at design (cash and in-kind)</b>	In-kind: 530,000 USD
<b>Materialized co-financing at project completion (cash and in-kind)</b>	
<b>Planned terminal evaluation date</b>	November 2016

(Source: Project document)<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Project information data throughout these TOR are to be verified during the inception phase.

## 2. Project background and context

Dating back till 2001 Governments, through the UNEP Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum (GC/GMEF) have regularly discussed the need to address mercury pollution at a global level given its significant adverse impacts on human health and the environment. In February 2009 the GC of UNEP agreed on the development of a global, legally binding instrument on mercury. Subsequently a series of five Intergovernmental Negotiation Conferences (INC) took place, and culminated on January 19, 2013 in Geneva when the Governments agreed to the text of the future Minamata Convention on Mercury.

Once released into the environment, mercury behaves as a highly mobile and persistent environmental pollutant that is toxic towards humans and wildlife even at low levels. The toxicity of mercury is dependent on the form, amount and pathway of exposure and methylmercury is particularly harmful towards the developing nervous system. In terms of human health, consumption of freshwater or marine fish with high methylmercury levels is the most common pathway of exposure. Methylmercury easily passes from the mother's bloodstream into that of the fetus and its neurotoxic properties can adversely affect the development of the brain. Effects on adults include disruption to the nervous system, cardiovascular disease, cancer incidence and genotoxicity .

Exposure to mercury affects brain development from the time of conception altering the brain structure and intellectual functions such as memory, learning and intelligence that last for life. The impact this exposure has on the productivity of the population and the costs to the health sector can have a significant negative impact on local economies and development especially in developing countries and countries with economies in transition.

The governments recognized that to better protect health, reduce exposure and protect the environment it is urgent to close the gaps related to the information on main sources of emissions, identify technologies and effective measures to promote the implementation of the Best Available Technologies (BAT) and Best Environmental Practices (BEP), develop implementation plans and policies, and give adequate technical and financial assistance.

Under this framework, it is necessary to take action to generate capacity and awareness raising amongst the decision making sector to call attention to this important problem, explore possible solutions, adapt the legal regulatory framework, identify and apply tools and technical solutions, and share experiences.

This project is designed so that it can be then replicated in other developing countries through the Clearing House website. The dissemination of information of the project results will encourage the governments and communities to promote the development of these types of activities in their own areas and countries, whether at a local, national and/or regional level inviting the different sectors, including private, health and workers sector, decision makers, civil society and the community, to participate on a voluntary basis.

Argentina has already conducted some work in the field of mercury; however more is needed to ensure that awareness is raised amongst all relevant stakeholders so that the country is prepared for the entry into force of the mercury treaty. The Argentinean Society of Doctors for the Environment (AAMMA) and the Basel Convention Regional Centre for South America (BCRC) have held preliminary discussions with members of mercury-dependent industries, chambers of chemicals producers – particularly chlor-alkali plants -, and representatives of mercury waste management services, in order to coordinate activities with a view to the entry into force of the mercury Convention. The following work with regards to mercury have been or are being conducted in Argentina; these efforts have helped establish a baseline upon which this project can build further capacity and awareness.

**The overall objective of the project is** to facilitate the implementation of the forthcoming Minamata Convention on mercury in Argentina. It will do this by setting the groundwork so that the country is prepared to comply with its obligations under the Convention once it has entered

into force. This will be achieved by bringing together the main stakeholders, raising awareness on the dangers of mercury and the scope of treaty, conducting an in depth analysis of the existing legal framework and available BAT/BEP in the country and region and then using all of this information to prepare a proposal for potential changes to the legal/policy framework and a proposal for a small scale, pilot demonstration project for the temporary and final disposal of mercury and mercury containing waste. In order to achieve these goals the project consists of three outcomes, including one on Monitoring & Evaluation.

Project implementation started in October 2013 and the initial project end date was in October 2015. The same was revised to March 2016. Actual implementation end date is December 2016.

### **3. Project objective and structure**

In general terms, the project outcomes consist of the following:

a) Outcome 1: Argentina is equipped with tools for the smooth adoption and implementation of the upcoming Minamata Convention. Component/Outcome 1 has two main goals, one is to conduct an overall analysis of the country situation with regards to mercury; the analysis will be both at a policy and technical level, and when possible gender disaggregated data will be collected during the analysis. The project will bring together the key stakeholders through two national consultations. These consultations will serve both to inform the stakeholders of the current situation in the country and the obligations under the convention, and also to receive their input on how to deal with mercury and mercury waste in the country. A broad range of stakeholders will be invited to participate in the National Consultations, although the consultations will focus on the technical and regulatory aspects of mercury and mercury waste management it must also take into account the social, economic and gender considerations. The second goal of this outcome will be to use the information gathered during the in-depth analysis and the national consultations to develop a proposal for changes to the national regulations on mercury and a pilot project for a small scale demonstration on mercury management.

b) Outcome 2: Awareness is raised on the terms of the recently accorded Minamata Convention to facilitate the understanding and implementation of the forthcoming convention. The main activity is the creation of a Clearing House website, which will be housed in the BCRC's website. The Clearing House will post information which includes, but is not limited to: options of the available BAT/BEP in the country and the region; analysis of the national legal & policy frameworks; advances in other mercury-related efforts in the region; the international mercury agenda; as well as learning material on the dangers posed by exposure to mercury, including gender specific health risks of mercury, etc. The Clearing House will provide information primarily in Spanish, so that it caters to the national and regional audience, as well as to fill a gap with regards to the limited information available in Spanish; however, material will also be translated into English so that it can reach a broader audience. Through this component, the project will continuously publish and disseminate information and results to both a national and international audience.

This component will also conduct an e-training course to inform and train users on the different services provided by the Clearing House. The project will develop the webpage, which will be housed on the BCRC website and will be linked to the SAyDS website, who may also contribute informative material on mercury, environmental regulations, project-related activities, etc.. After project completion the BCRC will continue to maintain the site so as to assure its long term sustainability.

c) Outcome 3: Monitoring and Evaluation

UNIDO will be responsible for the overall monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of the project, as well as reporting progress to the donor. The AAMMA, as national executor, will be responsible for the day to day implementation of the project and the coordination with the other partners.

AAMMA will submit periodic progress and financial reports to UNIDO, who will in turn report to the GEF, including yearly Project Implementation Reports (PIR). Progress will be measured based on a yearly work plan and its corresponding indicators. UNIDO's co-financing will be used for yearly monitoring visits and will contribute towards the project final evaluation.

One of the first steps of the project will be the establishment of a steering committee (SC). The SC will be composed of the most relevant actors and stakeholders of priority sectors. It will be a multi-sectoral committee, including both the private and public sectors; it will consist of approximately a dozen members including: the SAyDS, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the private sector (representatives from the chloro-alkali industry, hazardous waste management service providers, importers, mining and chambers of industry) and the project implementation partners (AAMMA, BCBR-INTI and UNIDO). They will meet regularly (at least 3 times per year) and provide guidance and expertise for the other project components. The composition of the SC is important in that it will create a continuous dialogue on the most important concerns related to the environmentally sound management and disposal of mercury and the implications of the upcoming treaty, and it will bring together a diverse group of experts that can feed critical information into the other components of the project.

#### **4. Project implementation and execution arrangements**

The project will bring together a wide variety of stakeholders in order to inform them of the upcoming requirements of the new mercury treaty; assess the quantities of mercury and mercury in waste that the country will have to manage under the terms of the treaty; determine what is the existing capacity in the country (or region) to deal with mercury and mercury containing waste; and explore ways to address mercury in an environmentally sound manner. The following lists the different sectors that will be involved; the list is not exhaustive as more may be incorporated throughout the project:

- Waste Management Industries: service providers for the collection, transport, management, temporary storage and disposal of hazardous wastes;
- Industrial sectors that have stockpiles of mercury or mercury containing waste such as chloro-alkali industries or industrial mines which produce mercury as a byproduct;
- Steel industry or other smelters which must take into account mercury emissions;
- Government sectors both in terms of support to municipalities, who are responsible for urban waste management, as well as national level Secretariats who are responsible for developing the legal framework to deal with mercury, including the SAyDS, Ministry of Industry, Ministry of Health, etc.. The project will also reach out to the local governments of Argentina's 24 provinces;
- Industrial Chambers, including the Chamber of Chemical and Petrochemical Industries (Camara de la Industria Químicas y Petroquímica);
- Public and private health providers (hospitals, clinics, etc.)

In terms of project implementation, the main executing agency is the Argentinean Society of Doctors for the Environment (AAMMA, Asociación Argentina de Médicos por el Medio Ambiente). They will work closely with both the Basel Convention Regional Centre for South America (BCRC), located in Buenos Aires and the National Institute of Industrial Technology (Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Industrial, INTI). The following describes these institutions in more detail, highlighting their expertise in the field of environment and chemicals management. The project has been developed jointly with AAMMA. AAMMA is an independent, non-governmental, non-profit organization created on July 1992. They are members of the International Society of Doctors for the Environment- ISDE, created in 1990 with member organization in over 35 countries. AAMMA is a professional, scientific, non-governmental organization undertaking advocacy on environmental impacts and health effects; promoting healthy environments and chemical safety; climate change mitigation; studies on anthropogenic actions which adversely affect human health and ecosystems; and creation of sustainable environments for humans and wildlife. The main purpose of AAMMA is to help defend the environment to prevent illnesses, ensure the necessary conditions for a healthy environment, and improve the quality of life in order to safeguard the health of our own generation and of future ones.

#### BCRC Basel Convention Regional Center for South America

The BCRC-Argentina is a tool that serves to push forward sound hazardous waste management in the South American region through capacity building efforts in the fields of training, information dissemination, awareness-raising and technology transfer. The BCRC functions at the National Institute for Industrial Technology (INTI), in the City of Buenos Aires and operations began in 2002 as a result of an agreement with INTI.

The BCRC for South America acts as a liaison for the countries in the region through focal points, national authorities and the Regional Coordination Center for Latin America and the Caribbean, which is located in Uruguay. The BCRC-SA provides assistance to the following countries: Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Colombia, Chile, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, Venezuela and Uruguay.

#### National Institute of Industrial Technology:

The mission of the Environmental Sector of INTI is to act as a reference for society and contribute to the development of national industry by providing technical assistance, promoting services and developments which preserve and optimize the use of natural resources, the quality of outdoor environments, the welfare of the people and the preservation of property, the quality of the work environment and workers' health and the integrated environmental management systems, quality, safety and occupational health, meeting the needs of users, the interests of the community and professionals and institutional ethics. Its main fields of action and services are: liquid effluent, air and working environment, chemical laboratory, biological laboratory, environmental management and organic pollutants.

INTI works in cooperation with the Secretaría de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sustentable, SAyDS; different governmental areas of sanitary services; General Directorate of Environmental Policy and Assessment of the City of Buenos Aires; National Administration of Drugs, Food and Medical Technology (ANMAT); National Food Institute (INAL); National Atomic Energy Commission (CNEA); Ministry of Environment of the Province of Entre Rios; Provincial Agency for Sustainable Development of the Province of Buenos Aires (OPDS); and the Argentine Standards Institute (known as IRAM from the Spanish denomination) with participation in the Environmental Quality Committee and Subcommittee on Water Quality, Soil Quality and Air Quality; Environmental Management Committee and Subcommittee on Environmental Audits as well as in the Safety Committee.

Although not directly executing activities the Secretaría de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible, SAyDS, will have an important role in their capacity as the governing body on national environmental policy, responsible for the national strategy on international environmental policy (through multilateral environmental agreements) and as focal point of the GEF in Argentina; and as such will be informed of the project's progress and results. The SAyDS will be a permanent member of the SC and will be actively involved in the coordination, organization and leading of the SC meetings and the national consultations. Their active participation in these activities will facilitate their contribution to the in depth analysis of the existing legal/policy framework and BAT/BEP in Argentina, the subsequent development of a proposal for improvements/modifications to the framework and the preparation and dissemination of publications, informative material, etc

## **5. Relevant project reports/documents**

Summary of results / monitoring reports (Project Implementation Reports – PIRs) / consultant reports / back-to-office mission reports / progress reports.

## **6. Budget information**

Some financial details are shown below:

Project outcomes	GEF (USD) Donor(s)	UNIDO contribution (USD)	Co-Financing (USD)	Total (USD)
1. Argentina is equipped with tools for the smooth adoption and implementation of the upcoming Minamata Convention	183,000		280,000	<b>463,000</b>
2. Awareness is raised on the terms of the recently accorded mercury treaty to facilitate the understanding and implementation of the forthcoming convention	90,000		85,000	<b>175,000</b>
Monitoring and Evaluation	47,000		103,000	<b>150,000</b>
Project Management	30,000	30,000	2,000	<b>62,000</b>
<b>Total USD</b>	<b>350,000</b>	<b>30,000</b>	<b>500,000</b>	<b>850,000</b>

(Source: Project document and approvals)

Expected co-financing source breakdown is as follows:

Name of Co-financier (source)	Classification	Type (Specify Cash or In-kind)	Project USD
<b>UNIDO</b>	Implementing Agency	In-kind	30,000
Asociación Argentina de Médicos por el Medio Ambiente	CSO	In-kind	200,000
Basel Convention Regional Center for South America	Other multilateral agency	In-kind	300,000
<b>Total Co-Financing USD</b>			<b>530,000</b>

(Source: Project document)

**UNIDO GEF-grant disbursement breakdown:**

Item	Disbursement in 2014	Disbursement in 2015	Disbursement in 2016	Total disbursement (in USD) (2014-present)
Contractual Services	167,500	100,500	33,500	301,500
Other Direct Costs			4.58	4.58
<b>Total (in USD)</b>	<b>167,500</b>	<b>100,500</b>	<b>33,500</b>	<b>301,504.58</b>

(Source: SAP database, 31 Oct. 2016)

## II. Scope and purpose of the review

The terminal review (TR) will cover the whole duration of the project from its starting date to the estimated completion date in December 2016. It will assess project performance against the evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

The TR has an additional purpose of drawing lessons and developing recommendations for UNIDO and the project stakeholders and partners, that may help improving the selection, enhancing the design and implementation of similar future projects and activities in the country and on a global scale upon project completion. The terminal evaluation report should include examples of good practices for other projects in the focal area, country, or region.

The TR should provide an analysis of the attainment of the project objective(s) and the corresponding technical components or outputs. Through its assessments, the terminal evaluation should enable the Government, the national counterparts, the donors, UNIDO and other stakeholders and partners to verify prospects for development impact and promoting sustainability, providing an analysis of the attainment project objectives, delivery and completion of project outputs/activities, and outcomes/impacts based on indicators, and management of risks. The assessment includes re-examination of the relevance of the objectives and other elements of project design according to the project evaluation parameters defined in this ToR.

The key questions of the TR is whether the project has achieved or is likely to achieve its main objective and to what extent the project has also considered sustainability and scaling-up factors for increasing contribution to sustainable results and further impact.

## III. Evaluation approach and methodology

The TR will be conducted in accordance with the UNIDO Evaluation Policy<sup>3</sup>, the UNIDO Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Programme and Project Cycle<sup>4</sup>, as well as the GEF Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations<sup>5</sup>, the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy<sup>6</sup> and the GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards for GEF Implementing and Executing Agencies<sup>7</sup>.

The review will be conducted by an independent evaluation team, and It will be carried out as an independent evaluation using a participatory approach whereby all key parties associated with the project are kept informed and regularly consulted throughout the evaluation. The evaluation team will liaise with the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (ODG/EVQ/IEV) on the conduct of the evaluation and methodological issues.

The evaluation team will be required to use different methods to ensure that data gathering and analysis deliver evidence-based qualitative and quantitative information, based on diverse sources, as necessary: desk studies and literature review, statistical analysis, individual interviews, focus group meetings, surveys and direct observation. This approach will not only enable the evaluation to assess causality through quantitative means but also to provide reasons for why certain results were achieved or not and to triangulate information for higher reliability of findings. The specific mixed methodological approach will be described in the inception report.

---

<sup>3</sup> UNIDO. (2015). Director General's Bulletin: Evaluation Policy (UNIDO/DGB/(M).98/Rev.1)

<sup>4</sup> UNIDO. (2006). Director-General's Administrative Instruction No. 17/Rev.1: Guidelines for the Technical Cooperation Programme and Project Cycle (DGAI.17/Rev.1, 24 August 2006)

<sup>5</sup> GEF. (2008). Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations (Evaluation Office, Evaluation Document No. 3, 2008)

<sup>6</sup> GEF. (2010) The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy (Evaluation Office, November 2010)

<sup>7</sup> GEF. (2011). GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards: Separation of Implementation and Execution Functions in GEF Partner Agencies (GEF/C.41/06/Rev.01, 3 November 2011, prepared by the Trustee)

The evaluation team will develop interview guidelines. Field interviews can take place either in the form of focus-group discussions or one-to-one consultations.

The methodology will be based on the following:

1. A desk review of project documents, including, but not limited to:
  - (a) The original project document, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNIDO and Donor(s)/Partners, annual Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)), progress reports, mid-term review (MTR) report, output reports (case studies, action plans, sub-regional strategies, etc.), back-to-office mission report(s), end-of-contract report(s) and relevant correspondence.
  - (b) If applicable, notes from the meetings of committees involved in the project (e.g. approval and steering committees).
  - (c) Other project-related material produced by the project.
2. The evaluation team will use available models of (or reconstruct if necessary) theory of change for the different types of intervention (enabling, capacity, investment, demonstration). The validity of the theory of change will be examined through specific questions in interviews and possibly through a survey of stakeholders.
3. Counterfactual information: In those cases where baseline information for relevant indicators is not available, the evaluation team will aim at establishing a proxy-baseline through recall and secondary information.
4. Interviews with project management and technical support including staff and management at UNIDO HQ and in the field and – if necessary - staff associated with the project's financial administration and procurement.
5. Interviews with project partners and stakeholders, including, among others, government counterparts, project stakeholders, and co-financing partners as shown in the corresponding sections of the project documents, as well as the national GEF focal point
6. On-site observation of results achieved by demonstration projects, including interviews of actual and potential beneficiaries of improved technologies.
7. Interviews and telephone interviews with intended users for the project outputs and other stakeholders involved in the project. The evaluation team shall determine whether to seek additional information and opinions from representatives of any donor agency(ies) or other organizations.
8. Interviews with the relevant UNIDO Field Office(s) to the extent that it was involved in the project, and the project's management members and the various national and sub-regional authorities dealing with project activities as necessary.
9. Other interviews, surveys or document reviews as deemed necessary by the evaluation team and/or UNIDO, ODG/EVQ/IEV for triangulation purposes.
10. The inception report will provide details on the methodology used by the evaluation team and include an evaluation matrix.

#### **IV. Project review parameters**

The evaluation team will assess the project performance, achievement of outputs, outcome(s) and likelihood of attainment of results (long term outcomes, impact) guided by the parameters and evaluations questions provided in this section.

## **A. Project identification and design**

Project identification assessment criteria derived from the logical framework approach (LFA) methodology, establishing the process and set up of steps and analyses required to design a project in a systematic and structured way, e.g. situation, stakeholder, problem and objective analyses.

## **B. Implementation Performance**

Implementation assessment criteria to be applied are shown below and correspond to DAC criteria, as well as to good programme/project management practices.

### **a) Relevance and ownership**

The evaluation will examine the extent to which the project is relevant to the:

- i. National development and environmental priorities and strategies of the Government and the population, and regional and international agreements. See possible evaluation questions under “Country ownership/drivenness” below.
- ii. Target groups: relevance of the project’s objectives, outcomes and outputs to the different target groups of the interventions (e.g. companies, civil society, beneficiaries of capacity building and training, etc.).
- iii. Focal areas/operational programme strategies: In retrospect, were the project’s outcomes consistent with the Donor’s programmes/strategies (e.g. GEF focal area(s)/operational program strategies?) Ascertain the likely nature and significance of the contribution of the project outcomes to the specific Donor focal area/programme.
- iv. Does the project remain relevant taking into account the changing environment?
- v. A participatory project identification process and broad consultation including all main stakeholder groups (e.g. the national counterpart and target beneficiaries) was instrumental in selecting problem areas and counterparts requiring technical cooperation support.

### **b) Effectiveness**

The evaluation will assess to what extent results at various levels, including outcomes and outputs, have been achieved. The following issues will be assessed:

- i. Delivery of outputs: How do the stakeholders perceive the quality of outputs? Were the targeted beneficiary groups actually reached?
- ii. Achievement of expected outcomes:
  - To what extent have the expected outcomes, outputs and long-term objectives been achieved or are likely to be achieved?
  - Has the project generated any results that could lead to changes of the assisted institutions?
  - Have there been any unplanned effects?
  - Are the project outcomes commensurate with the original or modified project objectives?
  - If the original or modified expected results were described as merely outputs/inputs, were there any real outcomes of the project and, if so, were these commensurate with realistic expectations from the project?
  - If there was a need to reformulate the project design and the project results framework given changes in the country and operational context, were such modifications properly documented?
- iii. Longer-term impact: What were the actual and/or potential longer-term impacts or at least indicate the steps taken to assess these (see also below “monitoring of long term changes”)? Wherever possible, evaluators should indicate how findings on impacts will be reported in future.

- iv. Catalytic or replication effects: The evaluation will describe any catalytic or replication effect both within and outside the project. If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out. No ratings are requested for the project's catalytic role.

### **c) Efficiency**

The extent to which:

- i. The project cost was effective: Was the project using the most cost-efficient options?
- ii. Outputs and outcomes: Has the project produced results within the expected time frame? Was project implementation delayed, and, if it was, did that affect cost effectiveness or results? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the costs incurred and the time taken to achieve outcomes with that for similar projects. Were the project's activities in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the project team and annual work plans? Were the disbursements and project expenditures in line with budgets?
- iii. Have the inputs from the donor, UNIDO and Government/counterpart been provided as planned, and were they adequate to meet the requirements? Was the quality of UNIDO inputs and services as planned and timely?
- iv. Was there coordination with other UNIDO and other donors' projects, and did possible synergy effects happen?
- v. Were there delays in project implementation and if so, what were their causes?

### **d) Assessment of processes affecting achievement of project results**

Among other factors, when relevant, the evaluation will consider a number of issues affecting project implementation and attainment of project results. The assessment of these issues can be integrated into the analyses of project design, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and management as the evaluators deem them appropriate (it is not necessary, however it is possible to have a separate chapter on these aspects in the evaluation report).

### **e) Project coordination and management**

The extent to which:

- i. The national management and overall coordination mechanisms have been efficient and effective? Did each partner have assigned roles and responsibilities from the beginning? Did each partner fulfil its role and responsibilities (e.g. providing strategic support, monitoring and reviewing performance, allocating funds, providing technical support, following up agreed/corrective actions)?
- ii. The UNIDO HQ-based management, coordination, monitoring, quality control and technical inputs have been efficient, timely and effective (e.g. problems identified timely and accurately; quality support provided timely and effectively; right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix and frequency of field visits)?

## **V. Evaluation team composition**

The evaluation team will be composed of one or two national consultants. The consultants will be contracted by UNIDO. The tasks of each team member are specified in the job descriptions in Annex 3 to these terms of reference.

The evaluation team might be required to provide information relevant for follow-up studies, including terminal evaluation verification on request to donors/partners up to three years after completion of the terminal evaluation.

Members of the evaluation team must not have been directly involved in the design and/or implementation of the projects/programme under evaluation.

The UNIDO project manager and the project teams in the participating country/-ies, will support the evaluation team.

## **VI. Time schedule**

The review is scheduled to take place in 4rd Quarter 2016. An evaluation field mission will be arranged during the evaluation conduct.

At the end of the evaluation field mission, a local debriefing should be conducted inviting local stakeholders (incl. government and parties involved in the evaluation). After the evaluation mission, the international evaluation consultant will come to UNIDO HQ for debriefing and presentation of the preliminary findings of the terminal evaluation. The draft TE report will be submitted 2 to 4 weeks after the end of the mission.

The draft TR report is to be shared with stakeholders (e.g. the UNIDO PM, ODG/EVQ/IEV and other relevant stakeholders). The ET is expected to revise the draft TR report based on the comments received, edit the language and form and submit the final version of the TR report in accordance with UNIDO Evaluation standards.

## **VII. Deliverables and Reporting**

### **Inception report**

These terms of reference (TOR) provide some information on the review methodology, but this should not be regarded as exhaustive. After reviewing the project documentation and initial interviews with the project manager, the evaluation team will prepare a short inception report that will operationalize the TOR relating to the evaluation questions and provide information on what type of and how the evidence will be collected (methodology). It will be discussed with and approved by the responsible in the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division.

### **Evaluation report and review procedures**

The draft report will be delivered to UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division (the suggested report outline is in Annex 1 and circulated to relevant UNIDO staff and national stakeholders associated with the project for factual validation and comments. Any comments or feedback on any errors of fact to the draft report provided by the stakeholders will be sent to the evaluation team (c.c. ODG/EVQ/IEV) for their consideration and any necessary revisions. On the basis of this feedback, and taking into consideration the comments received, the evaluation team will prepare the final version of the terminal evaluation report.

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

Findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete, logical and balanced manner. The review report shall be written in English and follow the outline given in Annex 1.

## Review work plan and deliverables

The “Review Work Plan” includes the following main phases and products/deliverables:

1. Desk review, briefing by project manager and development of methodology: Following the receipt of all relevant documents, and consultation with the Project Manager about the documentation, including reaching an agreement on the methodology, the desk review could be completed.
2. Field mission: The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation lies with UNIDO. It will be responsible for liaising with the project team to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field missions, coordinate with the Government. At the end of the field mission, there will be a presentation of preliminary findings to the key stakeholders in the country where the project was implemented.
3. A draft terminal review report will be submitted electronically to the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division and circulated to main stakeholders. For feedback and factual validation
4. Final terminal review report: considering/incorporating comments/feedback received.

Evaluation phases	Deliverables
Desk review	Inception evaluation report, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development/fine-tuning of methodology approach and evaluation tools</li> <li>• Interview notes, detailed evaluation schedule and list of stakeholders to interview during field mission</li> </ul>
Briefing with UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division, Project Managers and other key stakeholder at HQ	
Data analysis	
Field mission Present preliminary findings and recommendations to key stakeholders in the field	Presentation of key findings to key stakeholders in the field.
Further Analysis of the data collected and report drafting	Draft terminal review report
Report finalization (on the basis of feedback/comment received from stakeholders)	Final terminal review report

## VIII. Quality assurance

All UNIDO evaluations are subject to quality assessments by the UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division. Quality assurance and control is exercised in different ways throughout the evaluation process (briefing of consultants on methodology and process by the UNIDO, ODG/EVQ/IEV, providing inputs regarding findings, lessons learned and recommendations from other UNIDO evaluations, review of inception report and evaluation report by UNIDO, ODG/EVQ/IEV). The quality of the evaluation report will be assessed and rated against the criteria set forth in the Checklist on evaluation report quality, attached as Annex. The applied evaluation quality assessment criteria are used as a tool to provide structured feedback. UNIDO, ODG/EVQ/IEV should ensure that the evaluation report is useful for UNIDO in terms of organizational learning (recommendations and lessons learned) and is compliant with UNIDO’s evaluation policy and these terms of reference..

## **Annex 1 - Outline of the project review report**

### **I. Evaluation objectives, methodology and process**

- Information on the evaluation: why, when, by whom, etc.
- Scope and objectives of the evaluation, main questions to be addressed
- Information sources and availability of information
- Methodological remarks, limitations encountered and validity of the findings

### **II. Country and project background**

- Brief country context: an overview of the economy, the environment, institutional development, demographic and other data of relevance to the project
- Sector-specific issues of concern to the project<sup>8</sup> and important developments during the project implementation period
- Project summary:
  - Fact sheet of the project: including project objectives and structure, donors and counterparts, project timing and duration, project costs and co-financing
  - Brief description including history and previous cooperation
  - Project implementation arrangements and implementation modalities, institutions involved, major changes to project implementation
  - Positioning of the UNIDO project (other initiatives of Government, other donors, private sector, etc.)
  - Counterpart organization(s)

### **III. Project assessment**

This is the key chapter of the report and should address all evaluation criteria and questions outlined in the TOR (see section VI - Project evaluation parameters). Assessment must be based on factual evidence collected and analyzed from different sources. The evaluators' assessment can be broken into the following sections:

### **IV. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned**

This chapter can be divided into three sections:

#### **A. Conclusions**

This section should include a storyline of the main evaluation conclusions related to the project's achievements and shortfalls. It is important to avoid providing a summary based on each and every evaluation criterion. The main conclusions should be cross-referenced to relevant sections of the evaluation report.

#### **B. Recommendations**

This section should be succinct and contain few key recommendations. They should be:

- Based on evaluation findings
- Realistic and feasible within a project context
- Indicating institution(s) responsible for implementation (addressed to a specific officer, group or entity who can act on it) and have a proposed timeline for implementation if possible
- Commensurate with the available capacities of project team and partners
- Taking resource requirements into account.

---

<sup>8</sup> Explicit and implicit assumptions in the logical framework of the project can provide insights into key-issues of concern (e.g., relevant legislation, enforcement capacities, government initiatives)

Recommendations should be structured by addressees:

- UNIDO
- Government and/or counterpart organizations
- Donor

**C. Lessons learned**

- Lessons learned must be of wider applicability beyond the evaluated project but must be based on findings and conclusions of the evaluation
- For each lesson, the context from which they are derived should be briefly stated

**Annexes** should include the evaluation TOR, list of interviewees, documents reviewed, a summary of project identification and financial data, including an updated table of expenditures to date, and other detailed quantitative information. Dissident views or management responses to the evaluation findings may later be appended in an annex.

## Annex 2 – Checklist on terminal evaluation report quality

### Independent terminal evaluation of UNIDO GEF project:

**Project Title:** Preparatory project to facilitate the implementation of the legally binding instrument on mercury (Minamata Convention) in Argentina to protect health and the environment

**UNIDO SAP ID:** 130001

**GEF ID:** 5496

**Evaluation team leader:**

**Quality review done by:**

**Date:**

### ➤ CHECKLIST ON EVALUATION REPORT QUALITY

Report quality criteria	UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV assessment notes	Rating
A. Was the report well-structured and properly written? (Clear language, correct grammar, clear and logical structure)		
B. Was the evaluation objective clearly stated and the methodology appropriately defined?		
C. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives?		
D. Was the report consistent with the ToR and was the evidence complete and convincing?		
E. Did the report present a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes or did it explain why this is not (yet) possible? (Including assessment of assumptions, risks and impact drivers)		
F. Did the evidence presented support the lessons and recommendations? Are these directly based on findings?		
G. Did the report include the actual project costs (total, per activity, per source)?		
H. Did the report include an assessment of the quality of both the M&E plan at entry and the system used during the implementation? Was the M&E sufficiently budgeted for during preparation and properly funded during implementation?		
I. Quality of the lessons: were lessons readily applicable in other contexts? Did they suggest prescriptive action?		
J. Quality of the recommendations: did recommendations specify the actions necessary to correct existing conditions or improve operations ('who?' 'what?' 'where?' 'when?'). Can these be immediately implemented with current resources?		

Report quality criteria	UNIDO ODG/EVQ/IEV assessment notes	Rating
K. Are the main cross-cutting issues, such as gender, human rights and environment, appropriately covered?		
L. Was the report delivered in a timely manner? (Observance of deadlines)		

Rating system for quality of evaluation reports

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

## Annex 3 – Job descriptions



### UNITED NATIONS INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

#### TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PERSONNEL UNDER INDIVIDUAL SERVICE AGREEMENT (ISA)

<b>Title:</b>	National evaluation consultant
<b>Main Duty Station and Location:</b>	Home-based
<b>Mission/s to:</b>	No travel foreseen under this contract
<b>Start of Contract:</b>	November 2016
<b>End of Contract:</b>	December 2016
<b>Number of Working Days:</b>	35/40 days spread over 2 months

#### ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

The UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division is responsible for the independent evaluation function of UNIDO. It supports learning, continuous improvement and accountability, and provides factual information about result and practices that feed into the programmatic and strategic decision-making processes. Evaluation is an assessment, as systematic and impartial as possible, of a programme, a project or a theme. Independent evaluations provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful, enabling the timely incorporation of findings, recommendations and lessons learned into the decision-making processes at organization-wide, programme and project level. The UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division is guided by the UNIDO Evaluation Policy, which is aligned to the norms and standards for evaluation in the UN system.

#### PROJECT CONTEXT

The national evaluation consultant will evaluate the projects according to the terms of reference (TOR). S/he will perform the following tasks:

<b><u>MAIN DUTIES</u></b>	<b>Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved</b>	<b>Expected duration</b>	<b>Location</b>
Review and analyze project documentation and relevant country background information (national policies and strategies, UN strategies and general economic data); in cooperation with the international evaluation consultant: determine key data to collect in the field and prepare key instruments in both English and local language (questionnaires, logic models) to collect these data through interviews and/or surveys during and prior to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of detailed evaluation questions to be clarified; questionnaires/interview guide; logic models; list of key data to collect, draft list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions</li> <li>Drafting and presentation of brief assessment of the adequacy of the country's legislative and regulatory</li> </ul>	7/8 days	Home-based

<b><u>MAIN DUTIES</u></b>	<b>Concrete/measurable outputs to be achieved</b>	<b>Expected duration</b>	<b>Location</b>
the field missions; Coordinate and lead interviews/ surveys in local language and assist the team leader with translation where necessary; Analyze and assess the adequacy of legislative and regulatory framework, specifically in the context of the project's objectives and targets;	framework in the context of the project.		
Review all project outputs/ publications/feedback; Briefing with the evaluation team leader, UNIDO project managers and other key stakeholders. Coordinate the evaluation mission agenda, ensuring and setting up the required meetings with project partners and government counterparts, and organize and lead site visits, in close cooperation with the Project Management Unit.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interview notes, detailed evaluation schedule and list of stakeholders to interview during the field missions.</li> <li>Inception Report.</li> </ul>	8/10	Home-based (telephone interviews)
Coordinate and conduct the site visits in cooperation with the Project Management Unit, where required;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluation field mission conducted.</li> </ul>	6/7 days (including travel days)	Buenos Aires
Prepare the draft review report according to TOR	Draft evaluation report submitted to IEV.	8/10 days	Home-based
Revise the draft project review report based on comments from UNIDO Independent Evaluation Division and stakeholders and edit the language and form of the final version according to UNIDO standards.	Final review report prepared.	4/5days	Home-based
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>35/40 days</b>	

## REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

### **Core values:**

1. Integrity
2. Professionalism
3. Respect for diversity

### **Core competencies:**

1. Results orientation and accountability
2. Planning and organizing
3. Communication and trust
4. Team orientation
5. Client orientation

6. Organizational development and innovation

**Managerial competencies (as applicable):**

1. Strategy and direction
2. Managing people and performance
3. Judgement and decision making
4. Conflict resolution

**MINIMUM ORGANIZATIONAL REQUIREMENTS**

**Education:** Advanced university degree in science, engineering or other relevant discipline like developmental studies

**Technical and functional experience:**

- Exposure to the needs, conditions and problems in developing countries.
- Familiarity with the institutional context of the project is desirable.
- Experience in the field of project management, including evaluation of development cooperation in developing countries is an asset

**Languages:** Fluency in written and spoken English and Spanish is required.

**Absence of conflict of interest:**

According to UNIDO rules, the consultant must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project (or theme) under evaluation. The consultant will be requested to sign a declaration that none of the above situations exists and that the consultants will not seek assignments with the manager/s in charge of the project before the completion of her/his contract for this Evaluation

## Annex 4 – Project results framework

Results	Indicators	Means of verification	Assumptions & Risks
<b>Objective</b>			
Facilitate the implementation of the forthcoming Mercury Treaty (Minimata Convention) by creating a space of dialogue and strengthening cooperation amongst Governments, NGOs and the private sector	Argentina has signed the Minimata Convention and initiated the process of ratification by project end.	Reports submitted by Argentina, through the SAyDS, to the Secretariat of the Minimata Convention	Argentina signs and ratifies the Minimata Convention
<b>Outcomes</b>			
1. Argentina is equipped with tools for the smooth adoption and implementation of the upcoming Minimata Convention	<p>A proposal for changes to the legal/regulatory framework is agreed upon with the in-line Ministry and other key stakeholders.</p> <p>Priorities and approach for a follow-up pilot project is agreed upon by main stakeholders, including identification of potential donors.</p>	<p>Draft of the proposed changes to the regulatory framework</p> <p>Pilot project proposal document.</p> <p>Project final report</p>	<p>Participation of stakeholders, primarily national Ministries with relevant mandate</p> <p>Public &amp; private sectors are supportive of a follow up pilot project.</p>
2. Awareness is raised on the terms of the recently accorded Minimata Convention to facilitate the understanding and implementation of the forthcoming convention.	% of key stakeholders reporting that their awareness of mercury issues increased	Feedback from key consultants/project staff	Information is available and shared by relevant stakeholders
<b>Outputs</b>			

1.1 Argentina has an updated, in-depth analysis of the existing legal/policy framework and available BAT/ BEP	Reports documenting the current legal/policy framework and BAT/ BEP available in Argentina	Report on legal/policy framework	Political will and stakeholder support to prepare the proposed draft regulation
1.2 Multi-sectoral stakeholders participate and contribute to two National Consultations	The analysis includes specific needs and role of women and men	Report on available BAT/BEP	
1.3 Proposal for changes to legal/regulatory framework are formulated	Two national consultations are held	Report/minutes of national consultations	
1.4 Pilot, small scale, demonstrative project proposal for transitory and final disposal of mercury and mercury containing waste is developed.	No. of gender knowledgeable members of civil society present at consultations  Proposed changes to regulatory framework are drafted.  One pilot demonstration project proposal is drafted	Proposal to changes in regulatory framework is prepared  Pilot demonstration project proposal/document	
2.1. Online Clearing House on mercury is established	The Clearing house webpage is established.	Website counter/server	BCRC hosts the Clearing House on their website
2.2 Awareness on mercury and the Minimata Convention is raised through the dissemination of informative material	No of visits to Clearing house webpage  No. of informative material to facilitate the understanding and implementation of the Convention that is developed and disseminated	Bi-monthly bulletins	Sufficient information is available and is shared by relevant stakeholders

## **Annex B: Persons and Institutions Met**

### **Persons Interviewed**

❖ ***Interview with the Project Team Leader:***

**Lilian Corra**, responsible for the execution of the Project and the final product. Lilian Corra is paediatrician and neonatologist and senior expert on health and environment.

Dr. Corra participated actively in the Minamata Convention preparation process, international negotiation and regional meetings. She was and is deeply involved in the political process and technical aspects of the negotiation and implementation in the field.

❖ ***Interview with the National Consultant:***

**Mariana Leoni**, responsible for the overall organization of the activities and the administrative support. She is also the focal point to facilitate the interaction among the different participants of the Project.

❖ ***Interview of the interview with the Legal Consultant:***

**María José Alzari**, Lawyer specialist in Environmental Law.

❖ ***Interview of the interview with the Technical Consultant:***

**Diana Carrero**, Chemical Engineer with both specializations: on Environment and on Hygiene and Safety.

*Eng. Diana Carrero is familiar with the different industrial processes involving mercury as well as producing mercury containing waste and the existing problems in the filed for managing mercury and mercury containing waste in Argentina.*

❖ ***Interview of the interview with the Communication Consultant:***

**Sofia Lomazzi**, Specialist in Communication, with post-degree university studies on Politics and Communication on Science and Technology.

❖ **Members of the Steering Committee interviewed:**

**Juan Simonelli**. Adviser. Secretary of Environmental Control and Monitoring of the **Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development of Argentina**. (Asesor en la Planta del Gabinete de la Secretaría de Control y Monitoreo Ambiental del Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sustentable de la Nación - MADS)

**Diana Vega**, GEF Focal Point. **Direction of International Cooperation and Financing of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development of Argentina**. (Punto Focal GEF; Dirección Nacional de Cooperación y Financiamiento Internacional del Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sustentable de la Nación - MADS).

**Cristina Briel**, Counsellor. General Direction of Environmental Issues, **Argentine Foreign Office**. (Consejera en la Dirección General de Asuntos Ambientales de la Cancillería Argentina)

**Alejandro Machado**, Coordinator PREVENTOX (Advising and Information Centre on Labour Toxicology). **Super-intendancy of Work Risks of the Ministry of Labour and Social Safety**. (Coordinador del Centro de Información y Asesoramiento en Toxicología Laboral – PREVENTOX de la Super-intendencia de Riesgos del Trabajo del Ministerio de Trabajo y Seguridad Social de la Nación).

**Adriana Rosso**, Deputy Manager. Area of Quality, Metrology and Environment of the **National Institute on Industrial Technology** - ITBA. (Subgerente de Ambiente, Gerencia de Calidad, Metrología y Ambiente del Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Industrial – INTI).

**Leila Devia**, Executive Director, **Basel Convention Regional Centre for South America**. (Directora Ejecutiva. Centro Regional del Convenio de Basilea para America del Sud - CRCB)

**Ricardo Rolandi**, Executive Director. **Association for the study of Solid Waste** (Asociación para el Estudio de Residuos Sólidos – ARS) ARS is member of the International Solid Waste Association - ISWA. ARS is responsible for the Master on Solid Waste Management (Maestría para el Manejo de Residuos Sólidos) dictated in the private university ISALUD.

**Liliana Bertini**, Expert and professor of the Post-degree on Environmental Management of the private university **Technological Institute of Buenos Aires** - ITBA. (Experto y Profesor del Posgrado en Gestión Ambiental, de la universidad privada Instituto Tecnológico de Buenos Aires –ITBA)

**Hector Benavidez**, Coordinator of the Environmental Responsibility Program of the **Chamber of the Chemical and Petrochemical Industry** – CIQyP. (Coordinador del Programa Responsable del Medio Ambiente de la Cámara de la Industria Química y Petroquímica – CIQyP)

**Obdulio Menghi**, President. **Fundación Biodiversidad**.

**Members of the Steering Committee representing the following institutions were interviewed:**

**1.-** Secretary of Environmental Control and Monitoring. Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development of Argentina.  
(Secretaría de Control y Monitoreo Ambiental. Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible de la Nación - MADS)

**2.-** GEF Focal Point. Direction of International Cooperation and Financing. Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development of Argentina.  
(Punto Focal GEF; Dirección Nacional de Cooperación y Financiamiento Internacional. Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sustentable de la Nación - MADS.

- 3.-** General Direction of Environmental Issues. Argentine Foreign Office.  
(Dirección General de Asuntos Ambientales. Cancillería Argentina)
- 4.-** PREVENTOX (Advising and Information Centre on Labour Toxicology).  
Super-intendancy of Work Risks of the Ministry. Labour and Social Safety.  
(Centro de Información y Asesoramiento en Toxicología Laboral – PREVENTOX.  
Super-intendencia de Riesgos del Trabajo. Ministerio de Trabajo y Seguridad  
Social de la Nación).
- 5.-** Area of Quality, Metrology and Environment. Posdegree on Environmental  
Management. National Institute on Industrial Technology - ITBA.  
(Gerencia de Calidad, Metrología y Ambiente. Posgrado en Manejo Ambiental.  
Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Industrial – INTI).
- 6.-** Basel Convention Regional Centre for South America.  
(Centro Regional del Convenio de Basilea para America del Sud - CRCB)
- 7.-** Association for the study of Solid Waste. Member of the International Solid  
Waste Association – ISWA.  
(Asociación para el Estudio de Residuos Sólidos – ARS)
- 8.-** Environmental Responsibility Program. Chamber of the Chemical and  
Petrochemical Industry – CIQyP.  
(Coordinador del Programa Responsable del Medio Ambiente. Cámara de la  
Industria Química y Petroquímica – CIQyP)
- 9.-** Fundación Biodiversidad.

