THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA

THE UGANDA/UNDP/UNEP PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC APPROACH TO INTERNATIONAL CHEMICALS MANAGEMENT (SAICM) PROJECT

(APRIL, 2008 – OCTOBER, 2009 – *EXTENDABLE*)

MID-TERM EVALUATION

FINAL REPORT

APRIL, 2010

BY

FRANK MABIRIIZI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ANNEXES

ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS

ALD	Aid Liaison Department
APR	Annual Project Report
AWP	Annual Work Plan
CDF	Comprehensive Development Framework
CO	Country Office
CP	Country Program
ENR	Environment and Natural Resources
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FPED	Finance, Planning and Economic Development
GOU	Government of Uganda
HELI	Health and Environment Linkages Initiative
ICCM	International Conference on Chemicals Management
ICM	Inter-agency Coordination Mechanism
IWG	Inter-agency Working Group
KII:	Key Informant Interview
Logframe	Logical Framework
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MoFPED	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
MoV	Means of Verification
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NDP	National Development Plan
NEMA	National Environmental Management Authority
NEX	National Execution
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NPA	National Planning Authority
NPM	National Project Manager
NSC	National Steering Committee
OVI	Objectively Verifiable Indicator
PAT	Participatory Analytical Techniques
PD	Project Document
PEAP	Poverty Eradication Action Plan
PMU	Project Management Unit
POP	Persistent Organic Pollutants
QQT	Quality, Quantity & Time
QSP	Quick Start Program
SAICM	Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound
SMC	Sound Management of Chemicals
SME	Small & Medium-size Enterprise
TE	Terminal Evaluation
TOR	Terms of Reference
TPR	Tripartite Project Review
UMA	Uganda Manufacturers Association
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program
WHO	World Health Organization

0.0. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

0.1. Introduction

This assignment was commissioned by the United Nations Development Program Country Office to carry out the Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) project. The main objective of the MTE was to: "provide assessment of project implementation; identify project achievements and challenges; measure project performance against objectives; and provide indications of progress". The project is implemented by the National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA) on behalf of the Government of Uganda; with the Ministry of Finance, Planning & Economic Development (MoFPED) being its Executing Agency.

Accordingly, this document presents the main overall output/deliverable of the assignment, which was: *"a Mid-term evaluation report on progress of the project to-date, analyzing progress, activities and outcomes of the project based on documentation and information provided in progress reports, by the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), stakeholders, or other relevant actors involved in chemicals management activities"*. Also included herein were identified major challenges and constraints that characterized the project at the time of the MTE and their implications for project performance and success. The report further documents the major conclusions reached by the Evaluation; its recommendations for the way forward; lessons learnt; as well as the general approach to work and methodology employed in carrying out the MTE exercise.

0.2. Approach to Work and Methodology Employed

In general, a participatory, flexible and iterative approach to data/information gathering and analysis were employed throughout the assignment execution process. Therein, *rapid* Participatory Analytical Techniques (PAT) were employed; with Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and semi-structured Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) constituting the major ones. This approach was considered to be the most appropriate to the nature of the tasks at hand and the essence of the outputs pursued. This included the consideration that participation of stakeholders was absolutely necessary in order to ensure "ownership" of the findings, conclusions and recommendations that would be arrived at; with a view to facilitating their fruitful and sustainable application in pursuit of project success.

Given the multi-dimensional nature of this assignment and its requirements, and this being a participatory process, the Evaluation carried out in-depth consultations with a wide-range of stakeholders/collaborating partners at all levels of the Client system. This was done in addition to all the other processes of data/information processing, analysis, and report preparation.

0.3. Summary of the Main Findings

The main findings of the MTE and their interpretations are presented under section 5.0 of the main report. However, the bulk of the summarized findings on the actual implementation and performance of the SAICM project (goal; objectives and output by output) are presented in Matrix 1 (Annex 5). The latter were the summary findings on all the basic/fundamental elements of the project in accordance with the original project design/plan.

The section presents the details of the findings and their interpretations/analysis in terms of the main dimensions of the project and its performance. These included: the project design and underlying philosophy; the institutional set-up and management arrangements for project implementation; as well as the assessment of actual project performance. This assessment covered the detailed analysis and interpretations of overall project performance, including project achievements; as well as project shortcomings and limitations up to the time of the MTE. Also included therein were the major challenges and constraints that characterized the SAICM project and their implications for project performance and success.

It should, however, be noted that with particular regard to the MTE findings on project performance, it was not possible to quantitatively 'measure' project performance (output by output) in percentage terms; which is a popularly used method. This was mainly due to the absence of three critical project design factors, which are documented in detail under sub-section 5.3.2 of the main report. Accordingly, the Evaluation was left with no choice other than *innovatively* employing a *quasi-qualitative* approach to 'measurement', using a *combination* of two feasible methods. These methods were: (1) the number (and therefore, proportion) of outputs fully accomplished at the time of the MTE, out of the total number of planned project outputs; and (2) the *cumulative deviations* with regard to output accomplishment between the originally set completion *target dates* and actual, or expected *completion dates*.

Accordingly, using the performance measurement method *of number of outputs fully accomplished*, the Evaluation's assessment was as follows. Given that out of the seven project outputs, two had been accomplished (including the most central and time consuming one, namely; the SMC national situational analysis), this would have constituted approx. 30% overall performance. This would be especially so if these outputs had been accomplished by the actual mid-term (i.e. by the 9th month). Now that the two outputs had been fully accomplished by the 15th month; the *adjusted performance assessment* was reasonably put at 25% level of performance/achievement. Using the performance measurement method of *cumulative deviations with regard to output accomplishment dates*, the Evaluation's assessment was as follows. The implementation of the SAICM project had registered unusually large *'general' and 'expected' deviations* between originally set, and even revised Completion Target Dates on the one hand; and actual, as well as expected (future) accomplishment dates on the other, for all the seven outputs. The completion dates for five of the outputs actually still lay in the future, at the time of the MTE.

In the light of all the foregoing considerations, the Evaluation's assessment was that overall project performance had so far been significantly mediocre and its implementation was considerably behind schedule. This also took into consideration the original project objectives; as well as the corresponding project steps and activities that had been planned to be executed in pursuit of project outputs. It also took into consideration the fact that the MTE had been carried out at the end of the 15th month of an 18-month project (which, ideally, was expected to terminate in October, 2009).

A number of factors, which had also been the major shortcomings, challenges and constraints that had characterized the project, were identified as having been largely responsible for the above-noted performance over the period under review. The most central ones included some project design and execution shortcomings, as well as delayed disbursement of project funds. They also included low availability and instability of human resources in both the project Implementing Agency (NEMA) and UNDP (hence, leading to *inadequate and untimely aggregate human resource time and effort input* into

SAICM project work). They further included bureaucratic processes and systems in NEMA; practical challenges in operationalizing the cross-sectoral and multi-stakeholder approach to project implementation; as well as in formation and effective management of sectoral teams. They, furthermore, included challenges and delays in procurement and management of consultants; as well as challenges relating to the case-study-based economic analysis of the project.

The project had, however, also registered some important achievements, including, inter alia, the following. A national cross-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism for SMC had been put in place in accordance with project design and was functional. In addition, as a consequence of the national SMC situational analysis, the country had become more informed and aware, in a relatively more comprehensive and holistic manner than ever before, about the use; level of risk and handling/management that characterized chemicals. There had also emerged greater understanding of the weakness of the existing national SMC governance regime; as well as their implications across sectors and for people's livelihoods. Furthermore, despite the implementation delays, project Management had so far endeavored to exhibit fairly good adherence to the Project Technical Guidelines. It had also performed quite well in fulfilling most of the requirements of periodic work planning and monitoring and evaluation stipulated in the PD.

The project's identified major shortcomings and limitations, included the facts that civil society organizations had not been adequately involved at the very beginning and the private sector was also not as well represented in project implementation as ought to have been. They also included the fact that Economists had not been as adequately brought on board as appropriate. They, furthermore, included some (albeit few) unaccomplished obligations in the area of monitoring and evaluation, in accordance with the requirements stipulated in the PD.

0.4. Overall Conclusions and Recommendations

The main overall conclusions drawn by the Evaluation from the entire MTE process (section 6.0 of the main report), were as summarized below. First, it was concluded that indeed, the SAICM project had so far registered significantly mediocre performance and its implementation was considerably behind schedule. Secondly, that the major factors that were responsible for the mediocre performance of the project included some project design and execution short-comings/limitations, as well as challenges and constraints experienced in project implementation during the period under review. These are already documented above and, therefore, need not be repeated here. Thirdly, it was concluded that the project, nevertheless, had a good chance of reaching a satisfactory level of achievement and, therefore, it could and should, be fruitfully completed. This conclusion was, inter alia, based on the significant achievements that had so far been registered by the project (at the time of the MTE), as well as the rather unusual constraints, challenges and circumstances that had characterized project implementation.

The Evaluation, accordingly, made a number of recommendations for the way forward under section 7.0 of the main report. These recommendations were built around a number of premises and viewpoints. First, that Project Management should urgently arrange for a joint ICM-UNDP way forward retreat, or if not possible, a joint meeting. In that meeting, they should first and foremost, using this MTE report as the main reference document, critically and objectively discuss project performance and agree on a joint position. They should also jointly agree on *adjusted realistically achievable objectives* and *final outputs*

for SAICM 1. In the same meeting, they should, furthermore, agree on the correct approach, strategy and a focused, as well as time-bound action plan for ensuring reasonably expeditious completion of the SAICM project under a negotiated arrangement. This should include agreeing on appropriate project life extension. The Evaluation recommended an extension of six months from the time the project was *ideally* due for termination. All these should be aimed at building a firm foundation for the eventual comprehensive mainstreaming of SMC at a later stage. Secondly, a set of further and related recommendations were focused on a range of other actions/interventions that should be carried out by various appropriate stakeholders/collaborating partners. All these actions/interventions were recommended to be carried out in pursuit of fruitful completion of SAICM 1 in particular, and moving the SMC agenda forward, in general.

The report is closed with some lessons learnt and relevant annexes.

1.0. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Overview

This assignment was commissioned by the United Nations Development Program Country Office to carry out the Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) project; implemented by the Project Management Unit (PMU) within the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), on behalf of the Government of Uganda. The Ministry of Finance, Planning & Economic Development (MoFPED) is the Executing Agency of the project. The principal objective of the MTE, according to the TORs, was to: "provide assessment of project implementation; identify project achievements and challenges; measure project performance against objectives; and provide indications of progress". Accordingly, the main overall output/deliverable of the assignment was: *"a Mid-term evaluation report on progress of the project to-date, analyzing progress, activities and outcomes of the project based on documentation and information provided in progress reports, by the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), stakeholders, or other relevant actors involved in chemicals management activities"*.

Against the above background, this report presents the main findings of the MTE exercise, as well as their analysis and interpretations with regard to overall project performance during the period under review; including project achievements, shortcomings and limitations. The report also documents identified major challenges and constraints that characterized the project and their implications for project performance and success. It further documents the major conclusions reached by the Evaluation, as well its recommendations for the way forward; with a view to facilitating fruitful completion of the project at a satisfactory level of objective achievement. Also included in the report are lessons learnt, which were expected to be of benefit to the subsequent phases of the pursuit of the SMC agenda in Uganda and elsewhere. The same report, furthermore, presents the general approach to work and methodology that were employed in carrying out the MTE exercise.

1.2. Context and Background to the Mid-term Evaluation

According to the TORs (Annex 1) and related documents, the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management was adopted by the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM) on 6th February, 2006 in Dubai, United Arab Emirates. Its goal was to ensure that by the year 2020, chemicals would be produced and used in ways that minimize significant adverse impacts on the environment and human health. It is a policy framework for international action on chemical hazards. Two major value-added features of the Strategic Approach, relative to the international management of chemicals work that preceded it were:

- *"A strengthened focus on improved cross-sectoral governance for the sound management of chemicals at the national and local levels (i.e. rather than addressing chemicals on a chemical by chemical for chemicals class basis exclusively)"*; and
- Recognition that: *"for sound management of chemicals to be advanced significantly beyond the pre-SAICM situation, there will need to be much stronger links established with the development planning priorities, processes and plans of developing countries"*.

It is was understood that in support of these two prominent value-added features of SAICM, UNEP and UNDP had developed the Partnership Initiative to help client countries to pursue a set of strategic actions/interventions, which were clearly articulated

in the TORs. The same TORs also outlined the unique support services that could be provided by the cooperating agencies (UNEP and UNDP).

It was further understood that the Uganda/UNDP/UNEP Partnership Initiative for the Implementation of SAICM was advanced to assist the Government, through the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), to take up the second and third strategic priorities of the SAICM Quick Start Programme (QSP).

The 18-month SAICM project in Uganda, which is described in greater detail under section 2.0 of this report, was launched in November, 2007, though its effective operationalisation commenced in April, 2008. It had, therefore, been under effective implementation for approximately 15 months by the time of the MTE, and was *ideally* expected to terminate in October, 2009, but negotiations for extension of its life were on-going.

It was against the above background, inter alia, that the UNDP contracted the services of a Consultant to carry out a Mid-term evaluation of the project.

2.0. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

According to the Project Document (PD), the SAICM project in Uganda (whose total budget was USD 270,000), was aimed at developing strategies to assist Government in incorporating Sound Management of Chemicals (SMC) into the national development policies and planning to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

In the absence of a clear and well-articulated underlying logic theory in the Project Document, however, suffice it to place the SAICM project in its appropriate perspective in the manner summarized in the paragraphs that follow.

The project was conceived against the background of recognition that over time in Uganda, an extensive array of chemical substances, which had never existed in the environment, and for which the environment could not provide natural conditions for their degradation or break-down, predominated in the name of development. This had consequences at the public health, environmental health and socio-political levels and, therefore, called for a sound mechanism for managing the chemicals for the benefit of people's livelihoods. It had been established that the legal framework in general was inadequate and that there was no national policy on chemicals management. Hence, there was immediate need for development of a comprehensive package in order to address all aspects of chemicals management. It had, furthermore, been established that information in relation to SMC was fragmented and scattered in various sectors. There was, thus, an urgent need for a multi-stakeholder integrated management approach, which would strengthen the national capabilities and capacities for SMC in the country and fulfill the objectives of Agenda 21.

The project was, furthermore, conceived against the background that Uganda was a signatory to various international chemical related agreements and initiatives, which the SAICM Project sought to harmonize and provide synergies. These included the Basel Convention on the Control of Trans-boundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes and the Vienna Convention on the Protection of the Ozone Layer. They also included the Convention on the Prohibition of Development, Production, Stockpiling, Transfer and Use of Chemical Weapons and their Destruction. The project would, thus, fit in well with building upon earlier initiatives like the National Profile to Assess the Chemical

Infrastructure in Uganda (2003) prepared by NEMA. The same would apply to other chemicals management initiatives, such as those under the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs).

The primary beneficiaries of the project were identified by the PD to include Government departments; local experts; and multi-sectoral ministry level policy makers consistent with SMC. The main project stakeholder/collaborating partner institutions within the cross-sectoral arrangement, that would constitute the desired national SMC coordinating mechanism, were identified to include, at least, the following: Ministry of Health; Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry; Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development; Ministry of Water and Environment; Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries; Ministry of Internal Affairs; Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development; academic and research institutions; private sector; and NGOs.

The Strategic Results Matrix in the PD (Annex 2), articulated the goal; the long-term objective; as well as the (immediate) objective of the SAICM project.

The immediate objective of the project was considered to be entirely consistent with advancing the overall objective of QSP to use trust funds to "support initial enabling capacity building and implementation activities in developing countries, least developed countries, Small Island Developing States and countries with economies in transition".

The project strategy as conceived in the PD, was that the project would be delivered through a partnership approach. Through this approach, government officials, local experts and UNEP/UND experts would work closely together as a team in order to share experiences, information and knowledge to support delivery of concrete results against the various project activities.

Guided by, and in pursuit of the above objectives and strategy, the project was originally designed to pursue the delivery of seven outputs, which were articulated in the Strategic Results Matrix in the PD (Annex 2).

Accordingly, the delivery of the seven outputs was originally planned to be achieved by implementing the project through the following major steps, which were stipulated in the PD:

a) Qualify the links between major chemical management problem areas and human health and environmental quality in Uganda.

b) Identify which areas of Uganda's national SMC governance regime need strengthening most urgently.

c) Develop a realistic phased plan for strengthening Uganda's national SMC governance regime.

d) Quantify costs of inaction/benefits of action in planning/finance/economic language regarding major chemical management problem areas drawn from step (a) above.

e) Propose a path forward to mainstream the highest priority SMC issues in Uganda's development planning processes and plans.

In line with the above project steps, summarized below were originally planned (in the PD) to be the major project activity areas (together with their corresponding major tasks in each case):

1) Designating a National Project Manager and project initiation.

2) Establishing a cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder coordinating mechanism.

3) Research, analysis and planning in support of improved SMC governance consistent with the strategic objective of SAICM.

4) Planning to implement priority actions, including via mainstreaming in national development plans.

All the outputs were planned to be pursued through the execution of the above activities, articulated in a series of Annual Work Plans (AWPs). The two initial AWPs were presented in the PD, while subsequent ones were to be (and were actually) prepared by the PMU/NEMA. In addition, project implementation was also designed to be largely guided by the UNDP Project Technical Guidelines that constituted a major part of project modalities.

As regards the institutional and management set-up/arrangement for project implementation, the project was designed to be executed under the National Execution (NEX) modality, in accordance with the National Execution guidelines. Under this arrangement, NEMA was designated the Implementing Agency of the project; with the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development being its Executing Agency.

At the project level, however, the institutional and management set-up/arrangement was largely characterized by the cross-sectoral and multi-stakeholder approach. Under this approach, the Inter-agency Coordination Mechanism (ICM) was designed to be at the centre of the policy, strategic direction and technical dimension. The ICM was mainly made up of the National Steering Committee (NSC); the Inter-agency Working Group (IWG); and sectoral teams. The Project Management Unit (PMU) under the immediate guidance of the top management of the NEMA, was designed to, and actually performed the day to day implementation function of the project.

Lastly, according to the PD, the M&E function of the project was originally designed to have a routine internal component, mainly characterized by quarterly; half-year and annual work plans and progress reports; all to be submitted to the Executing Agency. It was also designed to have an external component, comprising of, inter alia, an annual Tripartite Project Review (TPR); an MTE; and a Terminal Evaluation (TE).

Further project dynamics during its implementation period under review, vis a viz its original design as described in summary above, as well as the Evaluator's comments on the above aspects where necessary, are documented in Matrix 1 (Annex 5).

3.0. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION

3.1. Purpose

The purpose/overall objective of the MTE was to*: "provide assessment of project implementation; identify project achievements and challenges; measure project performance against objectives; and provide indications of progress"*.

3.2. Scope

Accordingly, the TORs (Annex 1) also further defined the scope of the MTE by stipulating the tasks and expected outputs/deliverables of the assignment, as well as some methodological requirements. The main outputs/deliverables of the assignment that were agreed upon between UNDP and the Evaluator are as summarized below:

1) ‘A draft evaluation report to be presented to stakeholders and analyzing progress, activities and outcomes of the project, based on documentation and information provided in progress reports, by the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), stakeholders, or other relevant actors involved in chemicals management activities’.

2) ‘A Final Mid-term evaluation report on progress of the project to-date and integrating stakeholders’ comments’.

4.0. APPROACH TO WORK AND METHODOLOGY EMPLOYED

4.1. Overview

In general, a participatory, flexible and iterative approach to data/information gathering and analysis was employed throughout the assignment execution process. This approach was considered to be the most appropriate to the nature of the tasks at hand.

4.2. Assignment Execution Strategy and Procedure

4.2.1. Data/Information Gathering Procedure and Techniques

Given the multi-dimensional nature of this assignment, a combination of largely Participatory Analytical Techniques (PAT) of data/information gathering and analysis were employed, with a view to addressing all the key dimensions of the MTE adequately. Using these techniques, the Evaluation endeavored to gather adequate amounts of two major kinds of data/information as follows:

(a) Secondary data/information in the forms of relevant documents, reports and other records. Included herein, among others, were the PD; the project launch/inception workshop report and Technical Guidelines documents. They also included the national situational analysis report on chemicals and SMC in Uganda, as well as the report of the stakeholders’ workshop that adopted the report. They further included the seven sectoral situational analysis reports on the same subject; as well as related documents on chemicals. They, furthermore, included all AWPs for 2007, 2008 and 2009; as well as all quarterly work plans and progress reports for 2008. Also included therein were: two half-year progress reports (for January – June, 2008 & July to December, 2008); the annual progress report for the same year; the quarterly work plans and progress reports for the first two quarters of 2009; as well as minutes of key meetings. The detailed list of all documents and other materials that the Evaluation consulted and reviewed are presented in Annex 6.

The relevant documents and reports were obtained from and/or through the assistance of the coordinators of the assignment both in the UNDP and PMU/NEMA, upon request by the Evaluator.

b) Primary data/information, which included all *first hand* information/data that was elicited directly from the various stakeholders/collaborating partners at all levels consulted. These included, inter alia, UNDP; SAICM project NSC and IWG; NEMA top Management; PMU; and sectoral teams. These took the forms of facts, viewpoints, opinions, evaluations or assessments, proposals and the like. Annex 7

presents the list of stakeholders/collaborating partners consulted during the data/information collection phase.

Here, largely participatory and *rapid appraisal* techniques of data/information gathering, with Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) constituting the major ones, were employed. The FGD technique was mainly employed in the following consultative/information collection sessions:

- Two formal sessions with members of the PMU/NEMA, the first one of which also included the Executive Director, NEMA and the Director, Finance & Administration, NEMA. The second session also included the Deputy Executive Director, NEMA.
- The formal session held with members of the Inter-agency Working Group (IWG) of the SAICM project at NEMA.
- The formal session held with the team-leader of the Industry sector, whom the Evaluator met with two of his colleagues.

In almost all the rest of the consultative/information collection sessions, where the respondent was one team-leader, or stakeholder representing his/her team, or institution, KIIs were employed.

4.2.2. Data/Information Processing and Analysis

Data/information processing and analysis were largely carried out qualitatively (with minimal quantitative analysis), mainly using matrices. The processing and analysis of secondary data/information mainly involved summarization of relevant issues to the tasks at hand and the interpretation of their implications for the outputs of the assignment. Thus, in short, *in-depth document content analysis* was the technique employed with regard to this category of data/information.

It must be pointed out, however, that data/information processing and analysis were beset with major limitations, which largely dictated the kind of data/information processing and analysis indicated above. These limitations were mainly in the form of the absence of three critical project design factors, which are documented under sub-section 5.3.2 of this report.

Due to these limitations, for instance, it was not possible to quantitatively carry out the actual 'measurement'/assessment of project implementation and performance (output by output) in percentage terms, which is a popularly used method. Accordingly, the Evaluation was left with no choice other than *innovatively* employing a *quasi-qualitative* approach to 'measurement', using a *combination* of two feasible methods. These methods were: (1) the number (and therefore, proportion) of outputs fully accomplished at the time of the MTE, out of the total number of planned project outputs; and (2) the *cumulative deviations* with regard to output accomplishment between the originally set completion *target dates* and actual, or expected *completion dates*.

5.0 FINDINGS AND THEIR INTERPRETATIONS

5.1. Overview

This section presents the main findings of the entire MTE exercise, as well as their interpretations.

Accordingly, therein, the Evaluation documents the relevant facts that were established through the MTE exercise on each relevant and important dimension of the SAICM project. It also presents the assessment and necessary comments that were made on each dimension; with a view to ultimately arriving at a comprehensive overall evaluation of the project over the period under review.

The main dimensions of the project, therefore, covered by the analysis and interpretations in this section are as summarized below:

- Project design and underlying philosophy.
- Institutional set-up and management arrangements for project implementation.
- Assessment of actual project implementation and performance. This, inter alia, covers:
  - The summary analysis of the basic/fundamental elements of the project (Matrix 1 – Annex 5); and
  - The detailed analysis and interpretations of overall project performance. This also includes:
    - Project achievements;
    - Project shortcomings and limitations; and
    - Major challenges and constraints that characterized the SAICM project, as well as their implications for project performance and success.
- Further findings on the SAICM Project and SMC, as well as their implications.

5.2. Project Design and Underlying Philosophy

5.2.1 General Assessment

The project design and underlying philosophy were widely believed by project stakeholders consulted to be largely appropriate (and the Evaluation concurred). This was in view of the pervasive nature and importance of the subject of SMC; particularly taking into account the fact that chemicals do form a major part of socio-economic activities in all sectors and variously affect the livelihoods of people of all categories. In particular, the design and underlying philosophy were considered to be largely appropriate given that the overall project goal was: *"Developing strategies for integration of sound management of chemicals into national development plans and programmes through MDG-based planning for enhancement of environmental sustainability"*. This was coupled with the cross-sectoral and multi-stakeholder approach to project implementation. These elements were considered to be crucial in facilitating opportunities for holistic and sustainable pursuit of SMC.

It was established, however, that the project design and underlying philosophy were characterized by the following major practical and feasibility-related limitations:

- The funds provided for the implementation of SAICM under the QSP arrangement (the USD 270,000), were considered to be significantly inadequate for effective and results-oriented project implementation. This took into consideration the scope and magnitude of the actual outputs that the project was ultimately designed to deliver.
- The time frame of 18 months within which to deliver the seven project outputs was also considered to be inadequate and unrealistic. This was particularly so given the well-known typical realities of the durations and dynamics of the processes of formulating national legislations, policies, plans and programs in most developing countries, including Uganda. The main objective of the SAICM project was to mainstream SMC in national development policies, plans and programs; and aiming to achieve this within SAICM's project life of 18 months was too ambitious.
- The cross-sectoral and multi-stakeholder approach to, and institutional arrangement for project implementation (with the ICM designed to be at the centre of it all), was conceptually a good idea. However, the assumptions made about the extent of availability; commitment to; as well as time and effort investment by the participating institutions and their individual representatives in SAICM project work, were proven to be largely incorrect. Much less than the envisaged levels of that much-needed commitment, as well as time and effort investment had been achieved in reality. This had significantly affected project implementation.
- The project had been designed at the international level and, to a large extent, based on the success story of Slovenia, without much consideration of the specific Ugandan context within which it was to be implemented. This was also believed to have contributed to some of the challenges that had been faced, as well as the performance shortcomings that had been experienced.

Furthermore, some comments merited making about some other important aspects of project design/planning and some aspects of execution that were found by the Evaluation. The design/plan of the SAICM project in the PD was characterized by some rather unusual aspects (in terms of typical project planning and management practice), as summarized below:

1) In the Strategic Results Matrix (pp. 9 – 10 of the PD), three major project elements or *'building blocks'* were articulated, namely; the goal; the long-term objective; and seven project outputs; all with their 'Indicators'; 'Means of Verification'; as well as 'Risks and Assumptions'. However, the logical and hierarchical relationships among the above three major project *'building blocks'* were not clear (such as is normally the case in the *Logical Framework*). At the same time, the seven project outputs in this Matrix did not have their respective key project activities systematically assembled under them. Yet this was also not done elsewhere in the PD.
2) All the key project activities were stated in the Annual Work Plan Budget Sheets for 2007 and 2008 in the PD (pp.11 & 12). However, all these project activities were assembled under one 'Expected Output': *"Develop strategies for integration of sound management of chemicals into national development plans and programmes through MDG-based planning for enhancement of environmental sustainability"*.

Interestingly, this same 'Expected Output' was also stated as the 'Goal' in the Strategic Results Matrix (p. 9 of the PD).

3) All project outputs in the PD and in almost all the work plans (outside the PD), were phrased unconventionally (i.e. *as if they were activities*), within the context of the '*Logical Framework* terminology/language'. The only exceptions to this anomaly were Annual Outputs 1 – 6 in AWP 2009 submitted by PMU/NEMA to UNDP.

4) Furthermore, the pre-determined M&E timeframes for the 'Goal' and 'Long-term objective' were not indicated anywhere in the PD. These would be crucial in providing benchmarks/points of reference for their proportionate interim and terminal 'measurement' (particularly in terms of impacts/outcomes). These M&E timeframes would, similarly, be crucial for the assessment of the desired contribution of the SAICM project to the ultimate achievement of the 'Goal' and 'Long-term objective'.

In the Evaluation's assessment, the major implications of the above project design/planning anomalies, were that they also, to varying degrees, affected project implementation, as well as Monitoring & Evaluation, including this MTE. Indeed, such anomalies, had inevitably contributed significantly to making accurate continuous monitoring of project performance, as well as the corresponding appropriate project focusing rather difficult. They, similarly, contributed to making accurate 'measurement' during this MTE quite difficult.

5.2.2 Institutional Set-up and Management Arrangements

The institutional and management set-up/arrangements for project implementation have already been briefly described under section 2.0 of this report. Suffice it here to present a summary assessment that was done by the Evaluation of the performance of the main organs that constituted the institutional and management set-up/arrangements over the period under review. This assessment was done using the Terms of Reference for each organ, which were stipulated in the PD, as the point of reference. The assessment was also largely based on the reports sought and obtained by the Evaluation from the PMU and IWG as summarized below:

As regards the ICM, which was essentially made up of the NSC; IWG and sectoral teams, its main role was to provide overall policy guidance and strategic direction to the project. The performance of the ICM by the time of the MTE, according to the PMU, had been relatively good. From its minutes reviewed by the Evaluation, the ICM had since project inception, held three meetings, all of which had mainly focused on the functions for which it was established.

As regards the NSC, it was within the ICM, most directly responsible for policy and functional guidance, as well as overall coordination of project activities among the national stakeholders. PMU's assessment was that the NSC had been able to execute its functions relatively well. This was on the basis of the fact that it had provided the necessary guidance in the implementation of project activities. These activities had included the formation of sectoral teams; as well as reviewing and approving periodic work plans; sectoral reports; and the national situational analysis report.

Assessment of the performance of the IWG, which was done by the PMU and also in the consultative session held between the Evaluator and the IWG; led to the conclusion that it had also been relatively good. This also took into account the circumstances that had characterized the project. The above assessment was largely based on the fact that the IWG had been able to effectively review periodic work plans and guide the development

of a database for SMC. It had also effectively participated in ICM meetings to review and provide guidance on various reports, including sectoral reports and the national situational analysis report.

PMU's assessment of its own performance was that it has executed its functions, involving day to day implementation of the project, reasonably well. These included, among others, organizing and facilitating project meetings and workshops; preparing work plans, as well as progress and financial reports; and coordinating with UNEP/UND personnel involved in the project.

The Evaluation largely agreed with all the above qualitative and relative assessments, (especially taking into account the circumstances that had characterized the project). However, in absence of documented pre-determined quantitative and time-bound targets and indicators on each set of tasks that each organ had to have executed by the time of the MTE, it was not possible to make quantitative 'measurements' of performance with regard to the respective organs.

5.3. Project Implementation and Performance

5.3.1. Overview

In this sub-section, the central part of assessments of the actual implementation and performance of the SAICM project from its inception to the time of the MTE, as well as the interpretations of such assessments, are documented. It, therefore, largely constitutes the basis upon which the subsequent conclusions of the MTE; the corresponding recommendations for the way forward; as well as lessons learnt were drawn.

5.3.2. Summary Analysis of Basic/Fundamental Elements of the SAICM Project

Matrix 1 (Annex 5) presents the bulk of the summarized findings on the actual implementation and performance of the SAICM project in terms of all the basic/ fundamental elements of the project. This was in accordance with the original project design/plan (in the PD and AWPs), as well as the subsequently agreed upon and authorized modifications to the original design. Accordingly, the matrix presents the summarized 'measurement' and assessment/analysis of project performance along the lines of the basic *'building blocks'* of the project. These were the project 'results' and related planning aspects, namely; the goal; long-term objective; output by output, as well as activities. The summary analysis also included actors/stakeholders responsible for each 'result'; evaluation indicators per 'result'; and originally set completion target dates Vs. actual completion dates. It further included assessment of proportionate mid-term target achievement and actual proportionate mid-term deviations from set targets. Lastly, the analysis provided for necessary summary narratives/remarks about the various assessments made; as well as for documenting the major factors responsible for deviations from set proportionate targets. All the above elements were considered to constitute a *complete package* of the summary MTE analysis at the basic/fundamental level, with a view to clearly bringing out the evaluation findings in a holistic and logical manner.

The detailed analysis and interpretation of the summary findings in Matrix 1; as well as of all the other findings of the MTE, are presented under the next sub-section (5.3.3) of this report.

It should, however, be noted at the outset, that quantitative 'measurement' of the proportionate performance of the project (output by output), using the popularly employed method of percentages, proved to be very difficult, if not almost impossible. This was mainly due to the absence of three major project design factors as follows:

1) The M&E system in-built into the project design at the planning stage, did not incorporate consciously pre-determined proportionate mid-term targets for each project output. These would, ideally, serve as the appropriate benchmarks/points of reference in the precise quantitative 'measurement' of project performance (output by output), at the time of the MTE.

2) All the indicators of performance/achievement that were assigned to each project output in all the AWPs, both in the PD and those subsequently prepared and submitted by the PMU/NEMA to UNDP, did not meet the basic standards of the ideal Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs). These standards are normally instrumental in facilitating precise 'measurement' of actual project performance at any point in the project cycle (including the MTE stage). These ideal standards/attributes of OVIs are: Quality, Quantity & Time (QQT); and Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic & Time-bound (SMART).

3) Each of the outputs (in their respective AWPs), had one or two block/broad project activity(ies) aligned with it, without logically/sequentially broken down specific and time-bound activities, or sub-activities. In fact, many of them were referred to as *'activity areas'*. This made it impossible to work out or 'measure' the proportionate mid-term achievement/performance in a meaningful way, using the proportion of specific activities or sub-activities completed at the time of the MTE.

5.3.3. Analysis and Interpretations of Findings on Project Implementation and Performance

First, it should be recapitulated here that in the absence of the three project design factors already indicated under sub-section 5.3.2 of this report, it was technically not possible to quantitatively arrive at the overall project performance in percentage terms, as a sum-total of performance of all the seven outputs of the SAICM project. In view of the above realities, the Evaluation opted for *innovatively* employing a *quasi-qualitative* approach to 'measurement' of the overall mid-term performance of the project, using a *combination* of two feasible methods re-stated below:

1) The number (and therefore, proportion) of outputs fully accomplished at the time of the MTE (August, 2009), out of the total number of project outputs; and

2) The *cumulative deviations* with regard to output accomplishment between the originally set completion *target dates* and actual, or expected *completion dates*.

It should also be noted, however, that, as is evident throughout Matrix 1 (Annex 5), which summarizes the bulk of the MTE findings (output by output), even the above *innovative* methods were not without their inherent limitations as summarized below:

First, the MTE itself, was started after the 15th month of the SAICM project's life, instead of the ideal 9th month (given that the originally planned project life was eighteen (18) months). Accordingly, the technically ideal 50% benchmark/point of reference in the precise 'measurement' of actual project performance at the time of the MTE would not be applicable in the actual situation on the ground. Rather, at the 15th month of the 18-month project life, this benchmark/point of reference would technically be approximately 83%. This reality was, of course, not without legitimate and understandable reasons, which are well summarized (output by output), throughout Matrix 1, and need not be repeated here.

Secondly, using *cumulative deviations* with regard to output accomplishment noted in (2) above, was also beset with the limitation that, in fact, the majority of the seven project outputs had actually not yet been embarked on at all.

In view of the above considerations and limitations, the assessment of the proportionate mid-term performance of the SAICM project that was done using the *combination* of methods (1) and (2) above, was as documented below:

1) Using the performance measurement method *of number of outputs fully accomplished* indicated under (1) above, the assessment was as follows:

   The two fully accomplished outputs[1] (at the time of the MTE) were the following:

   a) Output 1: "Establish or strengthen a functional national cross-sectoral, inter-ministerial coordination body in support of sustainable SMC mainstreaming".

   b) Output 2: "Qualify links between priority chemical management problems and human health, food security and environmental effects".

   The five outputs that had not yet been embarked on, and hence, were still outstanding (at the time of the MTE), were the following:

   a) Output 3: "Identify requirements for strengthening SMC governance regime"; *also interpreted by PMU to mean:* "Priorities for strengthening the SMC governance regime identified".

   b) Output 4: "Develop a phased plan for strengthening national SMC governance regime"; *also interpreted by PMU to mean:* "National Action Plan for strengthening national SMC governance prepared".

   c) Output 5: "Quantify costs of inaction/benefits of action in management of chemical issues"; *also interpreted by PMU to mean:* "Economic Analysis of costs of inaction/benefits of action in management of chemicals prepared".

   d) Output 6: "Mainstream priority SMC issues in national development policies and plans"; *later narrowed down by PMU to read:* "SMC issues integrated in the National Development Plan (NDP)". This was finally, *further narrowed down by PMU to read:* "Priority SMC issues integrated in the National Development Plan (NDP)".

   e) Output 7: "Produce replicable results"; *which was omitted by PMU and replaced with another output that read:* "Terminal Project Evaluation exercise completed".

   Thus, given that out of the seven project outputs, two had been accomplished, this would have constituted approx. 30% of overall performance; if these outputs had been accomplished by the actual mid-term (i.e. by the 9th month). Now that the two outputs had been fully accomplished by the 15th month; the *adjusted performance*

[1] See details for each output in Matrix 1

assessment was reasonably put at 25% level of performance/achievement. This also took into account the fact that whereas in terms of numbers, five outputs were still outstanding by the 15th month of an 18-month project, the two accomplished ones were more complex, more central and more strategic. They were also more determinant of project success than the outstanding ones, since they had laid the critically needed foundation upon which the rest could be quickly accomplished. Furthermore, the accomplished ones were also more demanding in terms of time required to produce them.

It should, however, be made clear that the above performance assessment in no way disregarded the factors responsible for the way project implementation had taken place; which largely explained its level of performance at the time of the MTE. Rather, this performance assessment was done in keeping with the scientific M&E measurement practice of clearly separating actual, objective and evidence-based performance recorded on the one hand, from the factors responsible for such performance, on the other. These are two separate, yet relatable aspects in M&E, and treating them as such was so important in ensuring focused, measurable and results-oriented project planning and management.

2) Using the performance measurement method of *cumulative deviations with regard to output accomplishment dates,* indicated under (2) above, the assessment of the proportionate Mid-term performance of the SAICM project, was as follows:

As is evident throughout Matrix 1 (Annex 5), only Output 1 had been accomplished before the ideal Mid-term *checkpoint* of nine months. However, as indicated in the Matrix, this was, in any case, by design, a start-up output, far distant from the Mid-term *checkpoint*. Its accomplishment, therefore, before the ideal Mid-term *checkpoint* of nine months technically had little impact on the assessment of the proportionate Mid-term performance of the SAICM project. In fact, due to factors clearly indicated in Matrix 1, there occurred a *'general' deviation* of one month between the originally set completion target date of December, 2007 and the actual completion date of January, 2008 for this output.

Output 2 (whose relative quality was widely positively rated – see Matrix 1), had been accomplished with an approved national SMC situational analysis report, duly adopted at the stakeholders' workshop held on 15th April, 2009. In terms of the project's life, this was approximately thirteen (13) months from the originally set Completion Target Date of March, 2008 (according to AWP '08 in the PD & NEMA AWP '08). Hence, there had occurred a *'general' deviation* of thirteen (13) months between March, 2008 and April, 2009. This also implied that this output had been accomplished three months after the ideal Mid-term *checkpoint* of nine months; when April, 2008 was taken as the actual project commencement date.

The rest of the project outputs (3 – 7), as is evident in Matrix 1, had not been embarked on at the time of the MTE in August, 2009. Their Original Completion Target Dates; their 2nd Completion Target Dates (as per their respective AWPs); as well as their Newly set (future) Completion Target Dates by PMU (during the MTE); are clearly documented in the Matrix. It may be noted here, that against the above background, for outputs 3 – 7, the *'general expected' deviations* between their Originally set Completion Target Dates; and their Newly set (future) Completion Target Dates by PMU (during the MTE); ranged between four and fifteen (15) months. The actual status of each output at the time of the MTE is presented in Matrix 1 (Annex 5).

In view of the foregoing analysis, it was summed up as follows. In general project performance terms (*rather than* the *Proportionate Mid-term performance terms*), the implementation of the SAICM project had registered unusually large *'general' and 'expected' deviations* between originally set, and even revised Completion Target Dates, on the one hand; and actual, as well as expected (future) accomplishment dates on the other, for all the seven outputs. The completion dates for five of the outputs actually still lay in the future at the time of the MTE.

Following the performance measurement method of *cumulative deviations with regard to output accomplishment dates* indicated under (2) above, therefore, led to the assessment that the performance of the SAICM project had been rather below expectations both at the proportionate Mid-term level and the general project implementation level.

Accordingly, using *the combination* of both methods (1) and (2) above; it was summed up that clearly, overall project performance had so far been significantly mediocre and project implementation was considerably behind schedule. This also took into consideration the project objectives, as well as the corresponding project steps and activities that had been planned to be executed in pursuit of the project outputs.

Besides the foregoing assessment of basic/fundamental project aspects, however, further assessment of overall performance of the SAICM project during the period under review, was carried out with regard to its achievements and shortcomings/limitations. These assessments are documented under sub-sections 5.3.4 and 5.3.5 that follow.

5.3.4. Project Achievements

It was established that whereas the technical performance of the SAICM project had been rather below expectations by the time of the MTE, the project had so far registered some important and strategic achievements. The main ones identified and about which considerable consensus existed among a diversity of stakeholders, are as summarized below:

1) A national cross-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism for SMC had been put in place in accordance with project design, and was functional. This mechanism mainly comprised of the ICM (made up of the NSC; the IWG and sectoral teams), as well as the PMU within NEMA.

2) A national situational analysis on chemicals and SMC in Uganda (albeit largely indicative), had been carried out; its report completed; approved by the NSC; and duly adopted at a duly convened stakeholders' workshop. This had followed sectoral situational analysis studies and reports on the same subject. These studies and reports had created a significant basis upon which more comprehensive, rigorous and in-depth studies could be carried out in future.

   As a result of (1) and (2) above, the country had become more informed and aware, in a relatively more comprehensive and holistic manner than ever before, about the use; level of risk and handling/management that characterized chemicals. There had also emerged greater understanding of the weaknesses of the existing national SMC governance regime; as well as their implications across sectors and for people's livelihoods. It was reported that, through SAICM, some sectors had demonstrated more enthusiasm about SMC than others. Agriculture; Health; Education & Research; as well as Water & Environment were leading. Energy & Mining was still mid-way,

though moving in the positive direction; while Industry and Trade & Transportation still needed considerable work to bring them fully on board. It was reported that in the Industry and Trade & Transportation sectors, many actors had not yet positively appreciated SAICM as a well-meaning intervention to address chemicals management. Rather, they had so far viewed the intervention with a lot of suspicion and skepticism.

3) It was also established that despite the delays, project Management had so far endeavored to exhibit fairly good adherence to the Project Technical Guidelines that constituted a major part of project design and implementation modalities. This was true with regard to the two accomplished outputs; and the planning that had been done for the implementation of the outstanding ones. The exception to this state of affairs, however, was in situations where fully adhering to certain technical guidelines for certain specific outputs or activities would have resource implications that would be beyond the funds provided in the project budget for the respective outputs or activities.

4) As regards periodic work planning, as well as monitoring and evaluation, the Evaluation established that Project Management had performed quite well in fulfilling most of the requirements stipulated in the PD. These were, inter alia, that: *"self-evaluation of program activities, with partners, coordinated by the PMU, will be undertaken on a quarterly basis"*. From the documents studied by the Evaluation, all quarterly work plans for the year 2008, as well as the annual work plan for the same year had been prepared and submitted to UNDP. Similarly, all the quarterly progress reports for the year; two half-year progress reports (January – June, 2008 & July – December, 2008); as well as the annual progress report for the same year had been prepared and submitted to UNDP. Furthermore, the quarterly work plans for the first two quarters of 2009, as well as the quarterly progress reports for the same period had also been submitted.

5.3.5. Project Shortcomings and Limitations

The major shortcomings and limitations, which had characterized the project by the time of the MTE, that were found by the Evaluation, are as summarized below:

1) Despite the key role that civil society organizations could play in a project like SAICM, they had not been adequately involved at the very beginning. These organizations would, inter alia, be crucial in enhancing the already created awareness; championing advocacy for SMC and its mainstreaming; as well as play a crucial role in mobilizing communities to operationalise SMC, particularly at the grassroots level.

2) Similarly, the private sector was also not as well represented in project implementation as ought to have been, considering the centrality of its role in the entire chemicals cycle. The attempt that had been made to bring Uganda Manufacturers' Association (UMA) on board had not adequately achieved the involvement of the informal sector (including the small-scale local artisans, also locally referred to as the *'Jua-Kali'* group).

3) It was further established that Economists had not been adequately brought on board as appropriate. An assumption had been made that one Economist would be able to isolate all economic implications of SMC from all the sectors and integrate them into

the situational analysis. It was further established that in fact, MoFPED had been erroneously only brought on board to help in integrating SMC in the NDP, but not to offer guidance on economic analysis and interpretation.

4) Whereas Project Management had performed well on most other aspects of periodic work planning, as well as monitoring and evaluation, the following shortcomings in that area were found by the Evaluation:

   - The formats of the periodic progress reports were not consistent. In the two Half-year Progress Reports (January – June, 2008 & July – December, 2008), as well as in the 1st and 2nd Quarter Progress Reports of 2008, the format (particularly the column heads) of the 'Project Status' Table was different from that of the Tables of the 3rd and 4th Quarter Progress Reports of 2008; the Annual Progress Report (January – December, 2008); as well as of the 1st Quarter Progress Report (January – March, 2009). Accordingly, the corresponding information sought by these two different formats was also not the same. In addition, whereas in the above-noted two Half-year Progress Reports, the 'Project Status' Table was accompanied by a questionnaire form seeking further information on a range of project implementation and performance issues, all the other Progress Reports received and studied by the Evaluation had none.
   - Two activities that had been prescribed by the PD under *'on-going project monitoring and reporting'* (p. 15 of the PD), had not yet been carried out as scheduled at the time of the MTE. Accordingly, their corresponding sub-outputs had also not yet been produced. Hence, they were still outstanding. These were:
     - The *Tripartite Project Review (TPR)* meeting, which was supposed to be carried out once a year, as the highest policy-level meeting of the parties directly involved in the implementation of the project; and
     - The *Annual Project Report (APR)*, which was supposed to be prepared by the NPM and submitted to the UNDP-CO; the Government of Sweden and UNDP MPU/Chemicals for review and comments. This too was still outstanding.

5.3.6. Major Challenges and Constraints that Characterized the Project and their Implications for Project Performance and Success

During the MTE process, a number of factors, constraints and challenges were established as having been largely responsible for the mediocre project performance. These factors and challenges were reported from a diversity of sources and verified by the Evaluation. While some of them had been circumstantial; some had emanated from project design; while others were related to certain aspects of the project implementation modalities/arrangements. Below, the major ones (most of which are already summarized in Matrix 1), are further elaborated; while additional ones are also documented.

1) Delays in Disbursement of Project Funds

There had been two major delays in the disbursement of funds from UNDP to the Project Account since the inception of the project. They were: the initial delay and the subsequent one during the period January – April, 2009. These had considerably contributed to the slowing down and delay in project implementation. It was

established that the *estimated total cumulative delay* in project implementation attributable to both delays in disbursement of project funds was approximately eight months. This, by any standards, was a significant delay; particularly in a project whose life was only eighteen (18) months. As a partial consequence of the above-noted eight-months *cumulative delay*, inter alia, the timing of implementation of project activities in pursuit of all the seven project outputs was sequentially pushed forward in the manner elaborated in Matrix 1 (output by output), and needs not be repeated here.

2) Human Resource Issues

It was established that one of the important factors that contributed to delays in project implementation and production of planned outputs was the fact that both UNDP and NEMA were characterized by low availability and instability of human resources during the period under review. This had led to *inadequate and untimely aggregate human resource time and effort input* into SAICM project work, as summarized below:

First, in NEMA, the relatively long illness and subsequent death of the pioneer Project Manager/Coordinator (between October and December, 2008), had significantly affected project implementation. He had reportedly done a good job in getting the project off the ground. This was later exacerbated by the subsequent departure of the pioneer Project Technical Assistant, in June 2009. The new respective replacement staff also needed time to take full charge of the project. The reported estimated time loss due to the above factors was approximately four months.

Secondly, still in NEMA, the PMU had since project inception, been characterized by the fact that the Project Manager/Coordinator had not been full-time. The pioneer Project Manager/Coordinator was also a full-time officer of NEMA, as an Environmental Audit & Monitoring Officer. The same applied to his successor, who was also a full-time Environmental Inspector, while at the same time striving to balance his mainstream job demands with the equally demanding requirements of the SAICM project. This reality was significant because SAICM was designed as a relatively ambitious project (given its objectives and scope of outputs); in addition to being a cross-sectoral and multi-stakeholder project, yet with a short life of eighteen (18) months. Therein, the central role and duties of the Project Manager/Coordinator, according to project design, would include, inter alia, intensive and time-bound coordination; follow-up and facilitation of the activities of a multitude of actors/stakeholders; as well as over-seeing the processing and distribution of numerous reports and other documents. To effectively and timely execute such duties would ideally demand that such an engagement was full-time.

Hence, whereas it was clearly explained by Project Management that it would have been very difficult to hire a well-qualified and competent full-time Project Manager/Coordinator for such a short tenure; the reality remained that it had also contributed, in part, to the lower than desired speed of project implementation.

It was, similarly, established that UNDP was also characterized by similar human resource-related challenges as NEMA, which had also significantly affected the speed and effectiveness of project implementation. First, almost throughout the period under review, all the UNDP officers that had been assigned to be responsible for SAICM matters were also executing this duty as an *'add on'* to their other duties and responsibilities. Thus, while they strove to facilitate expeditious project

implementation, they were often only able to achieve this objective at a modest level. Indeed, in order to facilitate the desired level of expeditious project implementation would demand much more time than what seemed to be available to these officers.

Secondly, it was reported that the pioneer Program Officer and his supporting Intern, who had originally worked with the project (reasonably effectively) as the representatives of UNDP, had suddenly left the institution. It was reported that this departure also caused a temporary, but significant *'vacuum'*, until new program staff fully took over. Though, the 'new' officers also tried their best to get the project back on track, they were also seemingly very busy.

3) Bureaucratic Systems and Processes

It was established that lengthy bureaucratic procedures within NEMA had also variously contributed to delays in project implementation. This was largely because NEMA was a government institution, which had to follow standard government procedures of public institutional management in general, and of public financial management in particular. For instance, the Finance Department was (rightly), more interested in ensuring that the necessary financial controls were in place and fully enforced than in the flexibility demanded by PMU to expedite activity implementation in pursuit of delivery of certain outputs. Such flexibility could possibly have been permissible under a different funding mechanism and institutional management system.

It was, in addition, reported that the same centralized financial management system, which served all NEMA's mainstream functions and various projects, had on some occasions, been overstretched and delayed to finalize processing of various payments that were vital for speedy project implementation. These included payments meant for facilitation of sectoral teams that carried out the sectoral SMC situational analyses; as well as other allowances for some meetings of the various organs of the ICM. Some stakeholders considered such delays to have been de-motivating. The delays had also occurred in effecting payments for some private service providers, particularly some Consultants, which had also contributed to delays in completion of their assignments. Yet, much of the SAICM project work had been designed to be executed through consultancy assignments.

4) Practical Challenges of Operationalizing the Cross-Sectoral and Multi-Stakeholder Approach to Project Implementation

The cross-sectoral and multi-stakeholder approach to, and institutional arrangement for project implementation was conceptually a good idea. Indeed, as reported under sub-section 5.2.2, the PMU gave a relatively positive assessment of the performance of the ICM as a whole. Similar assessment was given to the performance of ICM's constituent organs, namely; the NSC; IWG; and sectoral teams. It was established, however, that in absolute terms and with particular focus on concrete outputs, the actual performance of the above organs had also contributed to delays in project implementation in particular, and the overall mediocre project performance in general.

It was established, for instance, that some of the cross-sectoral actors and multi-stakeholders serving on the various SAICM organs had not played their roles expeditiously enough so as to facilitate speedy decision-making and delivery of

outputs in a timely manner. This, in some cases, was due to laxity; lack of adequate commitment; and lack of investment of adequate time and effort on the part of those actors/stakeholders.

Another major discovery in this regard, however, was the genuine and practical challenge that had actually been experienced by many of the institutional representatives on the SAICM project, who were consulted. It was reported that they had been torn between the often urgent, as well as demanding SAICM work on the one hand, and the demands of their own mainstream duties and responsibilities in their institutions, on the other. It was reported that this particular phenomenon had been one of the major causes of some delays, especially among many members of sectoral teams during sectoral situational analysis studies. Some of them had actually pre-maturely pulled out, or contributed minimally to teamwork. It was also reported to have been partly responsible for the irregularity of some members of the IWG and NSC in attending meetings, or for delays in reading important documents and giving timely feedback.

Yet, no specific arrangements had been made to ensure that institutional representation by individual officers on SAICM project organs was not personalized, but rather institutionalized. That is, ensuring that institutional or departmental heads would demand or require that their representatives on the SAICM project would regularly update them and other technical officers in their institutions. This would have been crucial in ensuring that in the event that their originally designated representatives became too busy, or unavailable, their institutions would continue to be effectively and timely represented on the project to minimize implementation gaps and delays.

5) Formation and Management of Sectoral Teams

Sectoral teams were an important pillar of the SAICM project under the cross-sectoral and multi-stakeholder approach. It was established, however, that the manner in which they had been constituted, facilitated and managed had left a lot to be desired. This had affected motivation and morale, as well as the speed and quality of their work and outputs; hence, significantly contributing to delays.

First, it was found that the method used and procedure followed in the formation of sectoral teams had been less rigorous and less consultative than ought to have been. This included the selection of team members and determining their leadership. In many cases, PMU had simply written to what had been considered to be appropriate sectoral institutions, requesting their heads to nominate officers/persons to represent them on various teams, which the respective institutions did. It was established, therefore, that little, or no effort had been made to ensure that the specific delegates representing the requested institutions on the sectoral teams were adequately interested in, and committed to effectively participating in the work of their respective teams.

Secondly, team leaders had neither participated in team member selection, nor had been given real authority to actually be in charge of their teams. It was reported that each team member of any sectoral team had signed his/her service contract directly with PMU, independent of his/her respective team leader. Accordingly, all contractual matters relating to the respective team member's work, including payments and logistics, had actually been handled between the respective team member and PMU without any involvement of his/her team leader. This had

effectively made team leaders almost totally powerless in their relationship with their team members. They were, hence, unable to demand specific behaviors from their members, particularly the timely delivery of quality outputs, especially data/information, or report drafts. They had simply lacked any power and authority to apply any form of sanctions. Accordingly, it was reported that those teams that had done reasonable studies and produced reasonable reports, a few of their members had made it possible out of personal commitment and determination to deliver.

Thirdly, it was reported by all sectoral teams that the terms and conditions under which they had been facilitated to carry out their respective sectoral SMC situational analysis studies were very unfavorable. In particular, all of those consulted complained that the package that had been offered to each individual team member as facilitation under their contracts, was considerably inadequate for the scope of work that was required of them. The same applied to the sum-total of all individual packages of all team members of any given team. This, they argued, had limited their geographical coverage; scope and depth; as well as rigour with regard to their data/information collection, compared to the levels they had wished to achieve. This was, however, clarified by Project Management that given the limited funds in the project budget for this output, among other factors, the national SMC situational analysis had been consciously intended to be a scoping/indicative study; and not an extensive, rigorous and in-depth one.

Lastly, another commonly voiced complaint was that payment of the respective installments of facilitation to sectoral team members under their contracts, had, in most cases, been effected considerably late. This had affected them negatively.

It was, therefore, deduced that largely as a consequence of all the above factors, the levels of reliability and contribution exhibited by a considerable number of members of sectoral teams had been found to be wanting. In fact, in almost all the sectoral teams, the actual sectoral situational analysis work had been done by just a proportion of the original team – ranging between 20% and 50%. The rest had pulled out pre-maturely. For instance, in the Mining & Energy sectoral team, out of the original ten members, only two active members had remained. It was these that had actually done most of the situational analysis work, including production of the sectoral report. In other cases, even where some members had not actually pulled out, they had left the bulk of the work to be done by a few, particularly the team leaders. In two extreme cases (namely, Trade & Transportation and Industry sectoral teams), the original team leaders had actually abdicated their leadership responsibilities. They had left a team member in each case to assume the responsibility of team-leader to complete the team's work to some extent. In the most extreme case, namely, the sectoral team for Water & Environment, the original team had actually been completely disbanded. A replacement one had to be put in place two weeks to the deadline to carry out the sectoral situational analysis work almost afresh and compile the report.

All the foregoing factors and developments also negatively affected project implementation to varying degrees.

6) Procurement and Management of Consultants

The SAICM project was designed in such a way that most of its outputs were to be produced through execution of consultancy assignments and/or with the guidance of Consultants. It was established, however, that the processes of procurement and management of consultants had been characterized by a number of challenges. These

had also contributed, in varying degrees, to delays in project implementation. The major challenges identified were as summarized below:

a) During the initial period (i.e. from inception to end of 2008), PMU/NEMA had directly handled the entire process of identifying and contracting necessary Consultants for the various assignments of the project, as well as carrying out service contract management. The major challenges that were found to have characterized this period were that some of the Consultants that had been contracted had delayed to deliver their outputs. A few of them had fallen short of the desired quality of outputs that had been expected of them in accordance with their contracts. The two major management-oriented factors that had been responsible for this state of affairs were reported to have been the following:

   i) Less than adequate speed on the part of Project Management to effectively facilitate and follow-up the work of the contracted Consultants, with a view to ensuring that they would deliver their outputs in time.

   ii) Less than optimum speed in processing various payments for contracted Consultants in accordance with the terms agreed upon in their service contracts. This had partly affected their motivation and commitment to deliver their outputs in time.

b) Effective from the beginning of 2009, UNDP had changed its guidelines governing the procurement of goods and services for its projects, including Consultants. This had also affected the SAICM project. This change involved a shift from NEMA directly procuring the required services for SAICM, to UNDP procuring those services for the project, which had significantly contributed to delays in project implementation. It was reported that the delays had mainly emanated from a combination of factors. These included, inter alia, lack of adequate staff at UNDP to expeditiously process and follow-up the procurement of Consultants; including processing of their TORs; selecting them and contracting them.

7) The Paradox of *'Low Absorption Capacity'* of *'Inadequate'* Project Funds

An issue was raised by UNDP that the SAICM project had been characterized by *'low absorption capacity'* of project funds. This *'low absorption capacity'* had been indicated by the fact that funds (amounting to UShs.73,223,103) had had to be returned by PMU/NEMA to UNDP at the end of the Calendar Year 2008)[2]; and had been requisitioned again, in accordance with UNDP's financial management regulations. *Low absorption capacity'* had further been indicated by significant unspent balances by the project at the end of June, 2008 (UShs111,882,344); and at the beginning of October, 2008 (UShs.103,500,344). Similar unspent balances had also been recorded in December, 2008 (UShs.86,442,934); and at the beginning of May, 2009 (UShs.53,964,656).

Given that the total funds allocated to the project had themselves, been considered to be inadequate, this *'low absorption capacity'* appeared to the Evaluation to constitute a *paradox.* In view of all the foregoing findings, however, it was deduced that this *'low absorption capacity* must have been a consequence of the cumulative delays and slow speed of project implementation caused by a combination of all the factors documented under (1) to (6) above.

[2] Source: Funds Flow Record from the UNDP, a copy of which is herewith attached as Annex 4.

8) The Case-study-based Economic Analysis

Another significant challenge that had characterized the project concerned the case-study-based economic analysis, which was of major importance within the strategy of mainstreaming SMC in the NDP. First, it was reported that the technical guidelines for this analysis that had been issued in June, 2009, were so rigorous that if it was to be carried out to the ideal standards (in accordance with those guidelines), it would require more funds than those that had been provided for in the SAICM project budget. PMU had so far, experienced considerable difficulty (since June, 2009), in identifying a competent Expert willing to carry out the economic analysis for the pay package and other terms affordable by the project. Secondly, the analysis also required a substantial amount of time to be done properly (approximately three months). In such circumstances, the Evaluation was concerned at the time of the MTE, that PMU might find itself in a situation where it would be practically unable to afford having the economic analysis carried out ideally in accordance with the above-noted guidelines.

5.3.7. Further Findings on the SAICM Project and SMC

Besides all the foregoing findings, which more directly focused on project design, implementation and performance over the period under review; the Evaluation also endeavored to seek the opinions of key stakeholders regarding the central subject matter of the SAICM project. This was *mainstreaming of SMC in the NDP*. Documented below is the summary of the findings and their implications for the success of the SAICM project, in particular and the SMC agenda, in general.

1) One of the key findings was that the legislative, policy and institutional frameworks for SMC in Uganda were still weak and inadequate; with some policies overlapping, yet many of the existing scattered and fragmented laws and policies were characterized by poor enforcement. After analyzing the various opinions given by stakeholders, the Evaluation reached the conclusion that there would be need (at the appropriate time), to carry out a focused, comprehensive and rigorous study of the existing legislative, policy and institutional frameworks for SMC in Uganda. This would be necessary in order to establish which of the following options would be most appropriate for ensuring effective and sustainable SMC in all sectors of the country:

   a) Formulation of a new national policy and enactment of a new national level piece of legislation (from which sectoral policy and legislative guidelines would be derived); as well as setting up a new neutral statutory central agency (with adequate capacity). This agency would be specifically responsible for coordinating, regulating and overseeing SMC (i.e. the entire chemicals cycle from production/importation; transportation; use; up to disposal) in the whole country. The agency would be empowered by, and also implement/enforce the policy and legislation.

   b) Formulation of a new policy and enactment of a new piece of legislation (from which sectoral policy and legislative guidelines would be derived); and designating an appropriate existing central government agency (with adequate capacity). This agency would be responsible for coordinating, regulating and overseeing SMC (i.e. the entire chemicals cycle from production/importation;

transportation; use; up to disposal) in the whole country. It would be empowered by, and also implement/enforce the above-noted policy and legislation.

c) Reviewing all existing sectoral policies and pieces of legislation that have a bearing on SMC, with a view to amending them to fully accommodate SMC issues. Then, compulsorily task each sectoral ministry to ensure that SMC is mainstreamed and effected in their respective sectors. They should, however, be facilitated with conditional grants from central government specifically for funding SMC work, rather than requiring them to fund such work from their 'traditional' budgets.

The above options, as well as any other plausible ones, would need to be fully examined, with a view to agreeing on the best course of action for the way forward.

2) Another important subject matter issue that was commonly raised by almost all stakeholders consulted, was that there was urgent need for putting in place national comprehensive and state-of-the art facilities for proper disposal of chemical waste from all sectors and institutions. It was established that the only incinerator at Nakasongola, which belonged to the Ministry of Defence, was both inadequate and not easily accessible. It was also emphasized that because industries polluted directly into the ecosystems and in largest volumes, building capacity for addressing their waste disposal was most urgent and needed to be given first priority.

3) Lastly, on the project subject matter, it was emphasized by stakeholders that in order to achieve sustainability, in the long-term, mainstreaming of SMC should not be limited to the NDP at the centre. Rather, it should be made comprehensive and bottom-up, starting from the grassroots, namely; the general public – where it is most crucial. It would then go all the way to local government councils; and ultimately to the central government level (via the NDP). This would be in line with the prevailing national development planning system in the country, within the framework of the decentralization policy. Their plausible argument was that it would only be through this approach that SMC would be sustainably prioritized in planning and resource allocation; as well as operationalisation at all levels.

6.0. CONCLUSIONS

In view of all the foregoing findings of the MTE exercise and their interpretations documented at the various levels in this report, it was concluded as follows:

1) After fifteen (15) months of implementation, by the time of the MTE, the 18-month SAICM project had, in standard project management terms, so far registered significantly mediocre performance and its implementation was considerably behind schedule.

2) The major factors that were responsible for the mediocre performance of the project, whose details have already been given, included: some project design and execution short-comings/limitations; as well as delays in the flow of project funds. They also included challenges and constraints relating to human resources both in NEMA and UNDP. These factors also included further delays due to bureaucratic systems and processes within NEMA; practical challenges of operationalizing the cross-sectoral and multi-stakeholder approach to project implementation; as well as challenges relating to the case-study-based economic analysis of the project. They, furthermore,

included challenges and delays that emanated from formation and management of sectoral teams; as well as those experienced in the procurement and management of consultants.

3) It was, nevertheless, also the Evaluation's conclusion that the project had a good chance of reaching a satisfactory level of achievement and, therefore, it could and should, be fruitfully completed. This conclusion was, inter alia, based on the significant achievements that had so far been registered by the project at the time of the MTE. It also took into consideration the rather unusual constraints, challenges and circumstances that had characterized project implementation. These have already been documented and need not be repeated here. In addition, Project Management had expressed confidence that they had the resolve and capacity to complete the project at no extra cost, once they would be supported to do so.

7.0. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE WAY FORWARD

In the light of all the foregoing conclusions; the Evaluation recommended as summarized below.

1) First, that Project Management should urgently arrange for a joint ICM-UNDP way forward retreat (for at least 2 working days), or if not possible, a joint meeting, in which to address, inter alia, the following critical matters:

   a) Using this MTE report as their main reference document, critically and objectively discuss project performance and conclude the process with a formally agreed and documented joint position.

   b) On the basis of the agreed joint formal position on project performance, agree on the way forward, particularly with regard to the following:

      i) *Adjusted realistically achievable objectives* and *final outputs for SAICM 1*, vis a viz those stipulated in the PD. This should take into account the realities established by the MTE, which are documented in this report.

      ii) The correct approach and strategy, as well as a focused and time-bound action plan (with SMART indicators and targets), for ensuring reasonably expeditious completion of the SAICM project under a negotiated arrangement with the donor partners. This should be done building on the fast-track strategy and work plan that had already been drafted by PMU.

      iii) The appropriate optimum timeframe within which to expeditiously accomplish the agreed upon *adjusted realistically achievable objectives* and *final outputs for SAICM 1*. Accordingly, one of the key matters that should be discussed and agreed upon would be the issue of formal extension of the project life; which would then be subsequently presented as a formal request to the project's donor partners for consideration. The Evaluation recommended that an extension of, at least, six months (if this would be feasible and acceptable), should be sought in order to ensure the achievement of a reasonably fruitful completion of *SAICM 1*. Such project completion should be able to provide a solid foundation for moving the SAICM agenda forward in a meaningful and strategic manner. It should, accordingly, also be adequate to facilitate the eventual comprehensive mainstreaming of SMC at a later stage.

2) The Evaluation also recommended that serious consideration should be given by PMU/NEMA and UNDP to addressing the following issues and factors, which were critical to project success, using the most effective means available to them. This should be done as a part of the overall joint strategy for ensuring successful completion *of SAICM 1*:

   a) Ensuring timely release of project funds, with a view to facilitating the fast-tracking of output delivery during the extension phase of SAICM 1. Without ensuring that this issue is sorted out, all the other strategy actions would be rendered un-workable.

   b) NEMA Management should internally address the issue of lengthy bureaucratic administrative and financial procedures within NEMA, at least, for the duration of the fast-track project extension phase. This would be necessary to ensure that all activities would be executed in time and their corresponding outputs accomplished on schedule. This should, of course, be done without compromising the internal control and accountability functions that these procedures were designed to perform.

   c) The top Management of NEMA should seriously consider the possibility of designating or seconding the current Project Manager/Coordinator as a full-time officer of the PMU for the duration of the fast-track extension phase of SAICM 1. This would enable him to have adequate time to effectively play the central role expected of him in ensuring the successful execution of the recommended approach and strategy, as well as the focused and time-bound action plan. These would be critical in ensuring successful completion of the project.

   d) Given the centrality of the role played by the UNDP officers directly in charge of the SAICM project, the Management of UNDP should also seriously consider the possibility of re-aligning the duties of these officers during the fast-track extension phase of the project. This should be done with a view to creating for them more space and time, in order to enable them to expeditiously facilitate and support SAICM project implementation.

   e) The UNDP and NEMA should develop and agree on an effective strategy to ensure that within UNDP's procurement guidelines and procedures, the needed Consultants could be expeditiously procured; contracted and managed. This would be necessary to ensure that the outstanding assignments would be quickly and effectively executed. This could be achieved through, among others, PMU/NEMA and UNDP making deliberate and conscious efforts to cooperate more closely, with the aim of minimizing, or eliminating delays.

3) The Evaluation further recommended that during the fast-track project extension phase, operationalization of the cross-sectoral and multi-stakeholder approach to project implementation needed to be drastically improved in order to minimize further delays. It was, accordingly, recommended that during the joint ICM-UNDP way forward retreat, or joint meeting, as well as through other channels, efforts should be consciously and collectively made by the two parties to effectively address this important matter.

4) Subsequently and building on the joint decisions that would have been reached by the two parties, the NSC and PMU (with the back-up support of the Management of NEMA), should take all the necessary follow-up actions. These should include lobbying the participating SAICM stakeholder institutions to co-operate more favorably with the project. These actions should aim at, inter alia, ensuring that, for

any project implementation responsibility, or task that would be assigned to the ICM as a whole, or any of its organs, all the necessary efforts would be made to ensure the following:

a) That the method used and procedure followed in the selection of institutional representatives to serve on such organs, as well as in determining their leadership would be rigorous and consultative enough. This would be necessary so as to ensure that the persons so selected would be interested in, and committed to effectively participating in executing the work of the respective organs.

b) That those chosen to serve as organ/team leaders would be given the opportunity to participate in team member selection, and also be given adequate authority to actually be in charge of their teams/organs in the pursuit of their stated objectives.

c) All such organs/teams that would be assigned important project work should be adequately motivated. The PMU should also endeavor to ensure that they would, at all times, be well-coordinated and equipped with all the facilities they would need to expeditiously execute their assignments.

d) In all cases of engaging organ/team members, efforts should be made (including adequate briefing), to ensure that each member has fully understood the TORs for the assignment, as well as the terms of engagement, before committing him/herself.

5) The Evaluation, furthermore, recommended that the important issue of awareness raising, sensitization and advocacy for SMC needed to be given serious consideration and also addressed effectively. This should not only be done during the remainder of SAICM 1, but should also be well planned for post-SAICM phases of pursuing the SMC agenda. It was, accordingly, recommended that the ICM, through the NSC, IWG and PMU should consider designing and operationalizing a comprehensive and focused SMC awareness creation and advocacy strategy. The aim of this endeavor should be to educate, sensitize, and ultimately '*recruit'* all relevant sectors and the entire public to be effective advocates and promoters of SMC. The strategy should also target policy makers, community leaders, as well as other categories of leaders.

6) Lastly, it was considered to be crucial for all SAICM project stakeholders/collaborating partners to seriously consider and chart the way forward for the *post-SAICM 1* phase of the SMC agenda. Of particular concern was the fact that project design had not made concrete provisions for the post-SAICM 1 phase, particularly with regard to funding. It was considered to be crucial to have in place clear plans, strategies and resources for ensuring the operationalization and further pursuit of the outputs and way forward recommendations of SAICM 1. It was, accordingly, recommended that conscious and deliberate efforts should be made as soon as possible, championed by the NSC, PMU/NEMA and UND, to constructively engage the Government of Uganda together with the current and other potential donors on this important matter. The main focus of this engagement should be on working out in a concrete manner, the way forward for SMC as a follow-on effort for SAICM 1; with a view to ensuring continuity.

8.0. LESSONS LEARNT

Against the background of the findings, conclusions and recommendations of this MTE documented in the foregoing sections of this report, in this section, the Evaluation documents the key lessons that had been learnt in the process of implementing the SAICM project over the period under review. These lessons were expected to be of benefit to the subsequent stages of pursuing the mainstreaming of SMC in Uganda. The same lessons were also expected to be useful in the implementation of similar projects within and outside Uganda. The main lessons learnt were as summarized below:

1) In order to avoid delays in project start-up, and hence, also avoid the undesirable consequences of such delays; it is crucial to first ensure that all the key pre-requisite arrangements have been made. One of these is to ensure that the project implementing agency and executing agency, as well as the local donor Country Office responsible for handling the project funds and related matters, have understood each other's operational systems and can easily work together. It should only be subsequent upon achieving the above state of affairs that project launch should take place; with a view to minimizing the gap between project launch and its actual operationalization.

2) In order to avoid inadequate funding for pilot projects, as well as its undesirable consequences, it is crucial to ensure that the actual scope and requirements of such projects are not under-estimated on the grounds that they are *'pilot'*. This is because experience on the ground indicated that the basic stages and processes that characterize both *'pilot'* and *'main phase'* projects, happen in reality, to be largely the same, or similar. Hence both *'pilot'* and *'main phase'* projects tend to demand more-or-less the same volume of resources. In determining the level of funding for any project, therefore, it is crucial to first carry out an in-depth and realistic assessment of the actual scope of outputs that the project aspires to deliver, as well as the actual circumstances on the ground. Both of these factors are major determinants of the actual resource requirements of a project.

3) Another major lesson learnt was that if success of any project is to be achieved, under-estimation of its human resource requirements should be avoided. This is particularly so with regard to the levels of coordination and monitoring needed, besides other critical engagements during the life of the project. Similarly, the assumption that the local donor Country Office responsible for handling the project funds and related matters has adequate human resource capacity to take on any number of extra projects without special support arrangements, should be avoided.

4) It was, furthermore, learnt that even with pilot projects, or QSPs, it is crucial to first carry out an in-depth and realistic assessment of the goal and actual scope of outputs that the project aspires to deliver before determining the project life. The same should be done with regard to the nature of the project subject matter (such as those involving mainstreaming into national legislation, policies, plans and programs). The actual circumstances on the ground in the host country also need to be first studied and well-understood. All the above aspects are important in order to ensure that the timeframe given to the project is not too short; with such possible consequences as portraying it as being too ambitious, or a failure.

5) Lastly, it was learnt that if a project is as diverse, cross-sectoral and multi-stakeholder, yet with a short project life as SAICM, its Manager/Coordinator should be full-time. This is mainly because, in such a project, its Manager/Coordinator plays such a central role that he/she needs to be given enough space and time to concentrate on project work, which tends to be multi-faceted, very intensive and demanding.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1:

Terms of Reference
For Mid-Term Evaluation of the Uganda/UNDP/UNEP Partnership Initiative for the Implementation of SAICM

1. Background

The Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM), adopted February 2006 with a goal to ensure that, by the year 2020, chemicals are produced and used in ways that minimize significant adverse impacts on the environment and human health. Two major value-added features of the Strategic Approach, relative to the international management of chemicals work that preceded it, are:

- A strengthened focus on improved cross-sectoral governance for the sound management of chemicals at the national and local levels (i.e. rather than addressing chemicals on a chemical by chemical for chemicals class basis exclusively); and
- Recognition that for sound management of chemicals to be advanced significantly beyond the pre-SAICM situation, there will need to be much stronger links established with the development planning priorities, processes and plans of developing countries.

In support of these two prominent value-added features of SAICM, UNEP and UNDP have developed a Partnership Initiative to help client countries to:

- Assess their sound management of chemicals regimes relative to the strategic objectives of the SAICM Overarching Policy Strategy, and put in place a plan to begin addressing gaps in the national regime; and,
- Improve the incorporation of national sound management of chemicals priorities into the national development discourse and planning agenda.

This partnership initiative draws on the unique support services that can be provided by the cooperating agencies:

UNDP Support Services

- Capacity development
- Integrated policy design
- Support to MDG-based national development assessment and investment planning processes
- Implementation at the country level

UNEP Support Services

- Normative development
- Technical analysis
- Piloting of innovative approaches – synergies with the UNEP-WHO Health and Environment Linkages Initiative (HELI)
- Science-based guidance and knowledge services

2. Objectives of the overall process

The Uganda/ UNDP/UNEP Partnership Initiative for the Implementation of SAICM is being advanced to assist the Government, through the National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA), to take up the second and third strategic priorities of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) Quick Start Programme (QSP), namely:

- "the development and strengthening of national chemicals management institutions, plans, programmes and activities to implement the Strategic Approach, building upon

work conducted to implement international chemicals-related agreements and initiatives"; and,

- "Undertaking analysis, interagency coordination, and public participation activities directed at enabling the implementation of the Strategic Approach by integrating – i.e. mainstreaming – the sound management of chemicals in national strategies, and thereby informing development assistance cooperation priorities".

The activities listed above will be executed by the National Project Management Unit (PMU) within the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) which is the national implementing agency for the project. The PMU will be managed by the National Project Manager (NPM). During the implementation of the project, NEMA shall seek the expertise of national consultants in the relevant fields for the proper and effective implementation of the SAICM project.

3. Objectives of the Consultancy

For this purpose, NEMA, on behalf of the UNEP-UNDP Partnership Initiative for the Implementation of SAICM, requires a National Consultant/ a neutral third party to:-

- provide assessment of project implementation,
- to identify project achievements and challenges,
- to measure project performance against objectives and
- to provide indications of progress.

4. Activities

The consultant will:

a) Study the project background materials, including the project description, work plan and application to the QSP trust fund, the guidelines and forms for evaluation of QSP trust fund projects, SAICM texts and QSP general materials.

b) Study the general national chemicals, management information, including, when available, a National Chemicals Profile, existing relevant policies and legislation and reports of other relevant international and national projects.

c) Analyze the project activities and outcomes, through contact with the project management Unit and/or other relevant stakeholders, in order to regularly gather information and documentation on implementation of planned project activities, including meeting documents, reports and participants' lists, developed public information and training materials, publication and other relevant reports.

d) Undertake interviews of and/or sending questionnaires to stakeholders involved in the project in preparation of the evaluation report(s), using the guidelines and suggested format of the SAICM secretariat.

e) Draft the evaluation report(s) using all previously obtained information and documents in relation of the project and by filling the specific templates provided by the SAICM secretariat.

f) Timely submission of the finalized progress and/or final report to the SAICM secretariat on the agreed dates.

g) Provide additional information or correction on the report(s) after submission.

5. Expected Outputs and deliverables:

Deliverable 1: Inception report

Deliverable 2: A draft evaluation report to be presented to stakeholders and analyzing progress, activities and outcomes of the project based on documentation and information provided in progress reports, by the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), stakeholders or other relevant actors involved in chemicals management activities.

Deliverable 3: A Final Mid term evaluation report on progress of the project to-date and integrating stakeholder comments.

Methodology

The consultancy shall include the following methodology:-

- The Consultant shall review relevant documents
- The Consultant shall coordinate with NEMA, other relevant sectors and stakeholders involved in chemicals management activities, particularly the SAICM project steering committee. NEMA will facilitate the Consultant's access to relevant materials and documents within its responsibility and assist in securing clearance for access to materials and documents from other sources belonging to other ministries, sectors and relevant stakeholders;
- The consultant shall facilitate consultation meetings/workshops with NEMA SAICM steering committee, UNDP and UNEP officials and other sectors relevant for Sound chemicals management such as health, agriculture, development, environment, industry and trade, defence among others.
- Consolidate the inputs from all those consulted
- Presentation of the refined draft Mid term evaluation report

Note that: The Consultant cannot release nor communicate to anyone any unpublished information made known to them in the conduct of the activity without consent of NEMA.

6. Reporting and supervision

The consultant shall provide his/ her services under the supervision of the Project Coordinator of SAICM in NEMA who will provide day to day backstopping to the consultant and who will report to the Executive Director of NEMA. The Consultant will also maintain regular contact with the Environment Specialist of UNDP.

7. Qualifications

- The consultant or organization MUST have relevant experience and expertise in project Monitoring and Evaluation. Knowledge of chemicals is a bonus.
- The Consultant must be familiar with the various provisions of the Stockholm Convention on POPs, Basel Convention, Montreal Protocol, Rotterdam Convention,
- The consultant or organization should have general knowledge of the national chemicals situation or should have access to such information when available.
- The consultant/organization should demonstrate strong skills and background in the monitoring and evaluation of international projects relating to different sectors, such as agriculture, development, environment, health, industry and labour.
- Excellent communication and writing skills.

To facilitate the evaluation, the curriculum vitae of the Consultant should highlight the following areas.

- Educational attainment;
- Relevant trainings;
- Relevant experience Monitoring and Evaluation

8. Duration of the Work

It is expected that the assignment with be completed within 1 month, starting from the official date of the contract. All expected outputs should be submitted to NEMA according to the agreed plan/schedule of activities.

9. Duty Station

The Consultant will hold office outside NEMA but should be available for discussion on the progress of the activities and to address any outstanding issues for the duration of the project and submit the reports as agreed in the plan/schedule.

10. Schedule of Payments

The consultant will be paid a lump sum figure upon successful completion of the assignment and after submission of the final Mid term evaluation report to UNDP.

11. Commencement of Work

The successful Consultant shall commence the work immediately after receiving the Notice to Proceed, which shall be issued after the signing of the Contract and the transfer of the first payment.

The consultant will be expected to work closely and in an iterative fashion with the project management team, international consultant and designated UNDP managers.

12. Annexes to the Terms of Reference:

- The Uganda/ UNDP/UNEP Partnership Initiative for the Implementation of SAICM project document.
- SAICM Annual / Quarterly work plans and progress reports.
- Technical Guide for Mainstreaming the Sound Management of Chemicals (SMC) in MDG-Based Policies and Plans.
- Other related literature.

ANNEX 2:

THE STRATEGIC RESULTS MATRIX OF THE PROJECT DOCUMENT (PD)

Strategic Result Matrix (in the SAICM Project Document)

UNDAF Outcome	Increased opportunities for people, especially the most vulnerable, to access and utilize quality basic services and realize sustainable employment, income generation and food security.		
UNDAF Output	Poor people have increased access to and use of productive assets, technologies and energy		
CPAP Output	National and local government plans integrate environment		
Narrative summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators		
Goal	Develop strategies for integration of sound management of chemicals into national development plans and programmes through MDG-based planning for enhancement of environmental sustainability.		
	Indicators	**Means of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
Long Term Objective: Strengthen focus on improved cross-sectoral governance for SMC at the national and local levels and establish stronger SMC links with national development planning priorities, processes and plans to achieve the MDGs.	➢ SMC adopted by government OR a process clearly established to achieve this ➢ Development policies, plans and programmes that reflect prioritization and mainstreaming of chemicals management	➢ Documentation of development policies, plans and programmes	➢ Time constraints ➢ Revision of policies, plans and programs is based on fixed schedules
Output 1: Establish or strengthen a functional national cross-sectoral, inter-ministerial coordination body in support of sustainable SMC mainstreaming.	➢ National Project Manager and Technical Assistant appointed ➢ National Steering Committee and Inter-agency Working Group established. ➢ Briefing package distributed to key government decision-making bodies and other stakeholders. ➢ Electronic stakeholder list, roles and responsibilities available for project use.	➢ Review of all documented information and correspondences (letters of invitation of stakeholders and corresponding assignment as NSC members) ➢ Inception meeting report and reports of other meetings ➢ Project documents specifying roles and responsibilities of stakeholders ➢ The briefing package produced. ➢ Stakeholder nomination of representatives. ➢ Documentation of stakeholders by category. ➢ Attendance lists in minutes and reports of stakeholders' meetings/workshops/seminar.	➢ Inadequate representation of stake holders ➢ Inadequate communication among stakeholders ➢ Package not easily understood by stakeholders ➢ Inadequate stakeholder analysis ➢ Stakeholders may not be able to fully participate ➢ Project management weakness as a result of not getting a competent project management unit

Output 2: Qualify links between priority chemical management problems and human health, food security and environmental effects	➢ National SMC Situation Report, with readers' comments sheet, available in electronic format and discussed with stakeholders in cross-sectoral inter-ministerial meetings ➢ Decision taken on the application of the HELI methodology for subsequent analysis ➢ Workshop held. Report produced.	➢ TORs and contracts for national and international consultants ➢ Assignment letters for Technical Sectoral Teams ➢ TORs and contracts endorsement by NSC ➢ Report on workshop of stakeholders to adopt the HELI methodology ➢ Report of the workshop ➢ List of participants	➢ Delay in recruitment of competent consultants and task teams due to lack of expertise, procurement laws, procedures ➢ Not all sources of information are covered by the Situation Report. ➢ Short exposure to HELI methodology for participants to make adequate contributions and decision ➢ Inadequate preparations and involvement/participation of stakeholders
Output 3: Identify requirements for strengthening SMC governance regime	➢ Decision taken by the National Steering Committee to proceed with the development of a phased plan for strengthening the national SMC governance regime	➢ Minutes of NSC meeting ➢ TORs and contract for international consultant ➢ Multi-stakeholder workshop to identify gaps and prioritization ➢ Priority setting background document ➢ Brainstorming workshop summary report	➢ Delays in procurement of competent consultant ➢ Inadequate stakeholder representation in the workshop ➢ Review may not be adequate
Output 4: Develop a phased plan for strengthening national SMC governance regime	➢ Endorsement of SMC Plan of Action secured at national and local levels.	➢ Multi-stakeholder workshop SMC Plan of Action document ➢ Brainstorming workshop report ➢ Action plan workshop report ➢ Final SMC Plan of Action	➢ Inadequate stakeholder representation in the workshop ➢ Work plan and time schedules inconsistent with each other
Output 5: Quantify costs of inaction/benefits of action in management of chemical issues	➢ Agreement from central planning and finance agencies on the relevance of the methodology tested for costing SMC priorities into national development planning processes.	➢ TORs and contract for national and international consultants. ➢ Economic analysis document ➢ Minutes of meetings to discuss economic analysis document (NSC, finance and planning agencies)	➢ Delays in procurement of competent consultants. ➢ Delays in obtaining comments and meetings to discuss economic analysis documents
Output 6: Mainstream priority SMC issues in national development policies and plans	➢ Government willing to explore national budgetary commitments in partnership with donor assistance to implement programmatic and project opportunities	➢ Mainstreaming and buy-in meetings/workshop reports ➢ Project concept documents ➢ A plan and schedule of national development plans to influence/Road map	➢ Inadequate stakeholder representation in meetings/workshops ➢ Project Concept documents inadequate in content ➢ National development plans have fixed schedule.
Output 7: Produce replicable results	➢ Interest generated in other countries to adopt the SMC mainstreaming methodology	➢ Lessons learned report ➢ Methodology and guidance documents	➢ Countries inertia to buy-in into lessons learned, methodologies and guidance documents developed in another country

ANNEX 3:
THE SAICM PROJECT ANNUAL WORK PLANS (AWPs)

ANNUAL WORK PLAN BUDGET SHEET 2007

Year: 2007
Project Number: **00057870**
Project Title: **Uganda/UNDP/UNEP partnership Initiative for the Implementation of SAICM**

Expected Output	Key Activities	Time Frame				Implementing Agency	Planned Budget				
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		Fund	Donor	Budget	Description	Amount
Develop strategies for integration of sound management of chemicals into national development plans and programmes through MDG-based planning for enhancement of environmental sustainability.	Designating a National Project Manager and Project Initiation			x	x	NEMA		UNDP	71300	National consultants	7,500
						NEMA		UNDP	71100	National staff salaries	6,000
						NEMA		UNDP	72200	Office equipment	2,481
						NEMA		UNDP	74500	Sundries	2,667
						NEMA		UNDP	73100	Rental of office space	2,000
	Subtotal										**20,648**
	Establishing a Cross-sectoral, Multi-stakeholder Coordinating Mechanism			x	x	NEMA		UNDP	72100	Contractual services: meetings & workshops	2,000
						NEMA		UNDP	71600	Travel: PMU & sectoral teams	5,000
						MPU-chemicals		UNDP	71600	Travel: UN staff	4,000
	Subtotal										**11,000**
	Research, analysis and Planning in Support of Improved SMC Governance Consistent with the Strategic Objectives of SAICM				x	NEMA		UNDP	72100	Contractual services: NGO and other participation	3,750
						NEMA		UNDP	72100	Contractual services: meetings & workshops	0
						MPU-chemicals		UNDP	71200	International consultants	6,750
						NEMA		UNDP	71600	Travel: PMU & sectoral teams	4,000
	Subtotal										**12,500**
Total budget for 2007											**44,148**

ANNUAL WORK PLAN BUDGET SHEET 2008

Year: 2008
Project Number: **00057870**
Project Title: **Uganda/UNDP/UNEP partnership Initiative for the Implementation of SAICM**

Expected Output	Key Activities	Time Frame				Implementing Agency	Planned Budget				
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		fund	Donor	Budget	Description	Amount
Develop strategies for integration of sound management of chemicals into national development plans and programmes through MDG-based planning for enhancement of environmental sustainability.	Designating a National Project Manager and Project Initiation	x	x	x	x	NEMA		UNDP	71300	National consultants	22,500
						NEMA		UNDP	71100	National staff salaries	18,000
						NEMA		UNDP	72200	Office equipment	0
						NEMA		UNDP	74500	Sundries	5,333
						NEMA		UNDP	73100	Rental of office space	0
	Subtotal										**45,833**
	Research, Analysis and Planning in Support of Improved SMC Governance Consistent with the Strategic Objectives of SAICM	x	x	x		NEMA		UNDP	72100	Contractual services: NGO and other participation	11,250
						NEMA		UNDP	72100	Contractual services: meetings & workshops	23,000
						MPU-Chemicals		UNDP	71200	International consultants	20,250
						NEMA		UNDP	71600	Travel: PMU & sectoral teams	6,000
	Subtotal										**62,500**
	Planning to Implement Priority Actions, including via Mainstreaming in National Development Plans		x	x	x	NEMA		UNDP	72100	Contractual services: meetings & workshops	15,000
						MPU-Chemicals		UNDP	71200	International consultants	30,000
						MPU-Chemicals		UNDP	71600	Travel: UN staff	4,000
						MPU-chemicals		UNDP	71400	Contractual services: Report	20,000
						MPU-Chemicals		UNDP	72100	Contractual services: Evaluation	10,000
	Subtotal										**79,000**
Total budget for 2008											**187,333**

ANNUAL WORK PLAN (AWP) 2008 (BY PMU/NEMA)

Uganda/UNDP/UNEP partnership Initiative for the Implementation of SAICM

UNDAF Output: Poor people have increased access to, and use of productive assets, technologies and energy

UNDAF Indicator: Number of strategies developed & number of analytical policy position papers produced and used in sectoral planning processes.

UNDAF Outcome: Increased opportunities for people, especially the most vulnerable, to access and utilize quality basic services and realize sustainable employment, income generation and food security.

Expected CP Outcome(s): Improved conservation and access to sustainable energy technologies

Expected CP Output(s): Increased access to energy services, new technologies, electricity, or cleaner fuels for the rural and urban poor

Executing agency: Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (Aid Liaison Department)

Implementing agency: National Environment Management Authority (NEMA)

Collaborating partners: Ministry of Health, Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry; Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development; Ministry of Water and Environment; Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries; Ministry of Internal Affairs; Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development; Academic and research institutions; Private sector and NGOs.

Project Summary: Over time in Uganda, an extensive array of chemical substances, which never existed in the environment, and for which the environment cannot provide natural conditions to cause their degradation or break down, now predominates in the name of development. This has had consequences at the public health, environmental health and socio-political levels, and calls for a sound mechanism of managing the chemicals for the benefit of people's livelihoods.

Uganda is a signatory to various international chemical related agreements and initiatives which the SAICM Project seeks to harmonize and provide synergies. This would fit in well with building upon earlier initiatives like the National Profile to Assess the Chemicals Infrastructure in Uganda (2003) prepared by the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) and other chemicals management initiatives such as those under the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs).

The one and a half year pilot project aims at developing strategies to assist government in incorporating sound management of chemicals (SMC) into the national development policies and planning to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). This will allow for a strengthened focus on improved cross-sectoral governance for the sound management of chemicals at national and local levels (i.e. rather than address chemicals on a chemical by chemical basis exclusively). The project will bring to the fore the recognition that for sound management of chemicals to be advanced significantly beyond the pre- SAICM situation, there will need to be much stronger links established with the development planning priorities, processes and plans of the country.

The primary beneficiaries in this project will be (i) Government departments (ii) local experts and (iii) multi-sectoral ministry level policy makers consistent with sound chemicals management. The project will be implemented by NEMA in close collaboration with the Ministry of Water and Environment and other collaborating institutions over one and half year period.

Programme Period: 2006 – 2010
Programme Component: Energy and Environment for Sustainable Development
Project Title: Uganda/UNDP/UNEP Partnership Initiative for the Implementation of SAICM
Project ID:
Project Duration: 1.5 Years (2007-2009)
Management Arrangement: National Execution

Agreed by (Implementing Partner):
Agreed by UNDP:

Budget: $ 133, 105.77

Other Allocated Resources:

Government (In kind)	
UNDP (SAICM QSP TF)	$ 133, 105.77
Total	$ 133, 105.77

Annual Work Plan (AWP) YEAR 2008

EXPECTED CP OUTPUTS and indicators including annual targets	PLANNED ACTIVITIES *List all activities including M&E to be undertaken during the year towards stated CP outputs*	TIME FRAME				RESPONSIBLE PARTY	PLANNED BUDGET (USD)		
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		Source of Funds	Budget Description	Amount
Stronger SMC links with national development planning priorities, processes and plans to achieve the MDGs **Project output 2:** Qualify links between priority chemical management problems and human health ,food security and environment effects **Quarterly target 1:** One national SMC Situation Report produced **Indicator 1:** National SMC Situation Report with readers comments sheet, and discussed with stakeholders in a cross-sectoral inter-ministerial meetings.	**Project activity area 3 Research analysis and planning to determine medium/long term priorities. Information gathering and analysis: National situation report (Jan-March 08)** **Priority action for fast track PRSP planning**: Planning to implement short term priorities 1. Sectoral teams undertake inventories to develop a National SMC situation analysis report for addressing short term priority gaps in the National chemical regime (Jan 2008)	X				NEMA	UNDP	71300 National Consultants	22,500
							UNDP	71100 National staff salaries	6,667
							UNDP	72200 Office equipment	2,481
							UNDP	74500 Sundries	5,333
							UNDP	73100 Rental of office space	2,000
							UNDP	71600 Travel: PMU & Sectoral Teams	15,000
							UNDP	72100 Contractual services: NGO and other participation	11,250
							UNDP	72100 Contractual services: meetings & workshops	18,874.77

EXPECTED CP OUTPUTS and indicators including annual targets	**PLANNED ACTIVITIES** *List all activities including M&E to be undertaken during the year towards stated CP outputs*	**TIME FRAME**				**RESPONSIBLE PARTY**	**PLANNED BUDGET (USD)**		
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		Source of Funds	Budget Description	Amount
<u>Indicator 2:</u> HELI Methodology adopted **<u>Indicator 3:</u>** Workshop held. Report produced.	**2**. Economic analysis for these priorities undertaken (Feb-March, 2008) **3.** Mainstreaming highest priorities into national development goals and programmes (March 2008)								
<u>Project output 3:</u> Identify requirements for strengthening SMC governance regime <u>Annual target 2:</u> Priority setting Document **<u>Indicator 1</u>** Decision taken by the NSC to proceed with the development of a phased plan for strengthening the national SMC governance regime	**<u>Project activity area 3</u>** **Research, Analysis and planning to determine medium/long term priorities. Information gathering and analysis: National situation report** Identify national SMC- specific opportunities and priorities to address gaps in the national SMC regime.	x				NEMA	UNDP	71100 National staff salaries	4,000
								71200 International consultants	27,000
								72100 Contractual Services: Meetings & Workshops	10,000
<u>Project Output 4</u> Develop a phased plan for strengthening national SMC governance regime	**<u>Activity area 4:</u>** Plan to implement priority actions, including via mainstreaming in National Development Plans.			x		NEMA	UNDP		

EXPECTED CP OUTPUTS and indicators including annual targets	**PLANNED ACTIVITIES** *List all activities including M&E to be undertaken during the year towards stated CP outputs*	**TIME FRAME**				**RESPONSIBLE PARTY**	**PLANNED BUDGET (USD)**		
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		Source of Funds	Budget Description Amount	
Annual target 3. National Plan of Action Indicator Incomes of the rural communities increased	Produce a national Plan of Action for addressing priority gaps in the national SMC regime							71100 National staff salaries	4,000
Project Output 5: Quantify costs of inaction/benefits of action in management of chemicals **Annual target 4** Economic Analysis Report Indicator 1. Agreement from central planning and finance agencies on the methodology for costing SMC priorities into national development planning process 2. Report produced and discussed with stakeholders	**Activity area 4:** **Planning to implement priority actions, including via mainstreaming in National Development Plans** Demonstrate an approach/methodology for building an economic case for mainstreaming a high priority SMC issue in national development planning				x			71100 National staff salaries	4,000
									133,105.77

ANNUAL WORK PLAN (AWP) 2009 (BY PMU/NEMA)

Uganda/UNDP/UNEP partnership Initiative for the Implementation of SAICM

UNDAF Output: Poor people have increased access to, and use of productive assets, technologies and energy

UNDAF Indicator: Number of strategies developed & number of analytical policy position papers produced and used in sectoral planning processes.

UNDAF Outcome: Increased opportunities for people, especially the most vulnerable, to access and utilize quality basic services and realize sustainable employment, income generation and food security.

Expected CP Outcome(s): Improved conservation and access to sustainable energy technologies.

Expected CP Output(s): Increased access to energy services, new technologies, electricity, or cleaner fuels for the rural and urban poor

Executing agency: Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (Aid liaison department)

Implementing agency: National Environment Management Authority (NEMA)

Collaborating partners: Ministry of Health, Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry; Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development; Ministry of Water and Environment; Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries; Ministry of Internal Affairs, Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development; Academic and research institutions; Private sector and NGOs.

Project Summary: Over time in Uganda, an extensive array of chemical substances, which never existed in the environment, and for which the environment cannot provide natural conditions to cause their degradation or break down, now predominates in the name of development. This had consequences at the public health, environmental health and socio-political levels, and calls for a sound mechanism of managing the chemicals for the benefit of people's livelihoods.

Uganda is a signatory to various international chemical related agreements and initiatives which the SAICM Project seeks to harmonize and provide synergies. This would fit in well with building upon earlier initiatives like the National Profile to Assess the Chemicals Infrastructure in Uganda (2003) prepared by the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) and other chemicals management initiatives such as those under the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs).

The one and a half year pilot project aims at developing strategies to assist government in incorporating sound management of chemicals (SMC) into the national development policies and planning to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). This will allow for a strengthened focus on improved cross-sectoral governance for the sound management of chemicals at national and local levels (i.e. rather than address chemicals on a chemical by chemical basis exclusively). The project will bring to the fore the recognition that for sound management of chemicals to be advanced significantly beyond the pre- SAICM situation, there will need to be much stronger links established with the development planning priorities, processes and plans of the country.

The primary beneficiaries in this project will be (i) Government departments (ii) local experts and (iii) multi-sectoral ministry level policy makers consistent with sound chemicals management. The project will be implemented by NEMA in close collaboration with the Ministry of Water and Environment and other collaborating institutions over one and half year period.

Programme Period: 2006 – 2010
Programme Component: Energy and Environment for Sustainable Development
Project Title: Uganda/UNDP/UNEP Partnership Initiative for the Implementation of SAICM
Project ID:
Project Duration: 1.5 Years (2007-2009)
Management Arrangement: National Execution

Agreed by (Implementing Partner):
Agreed by UNDP:

Budget: $ 152, 987

Other Allocated Resources:

Government (In kind)		
UNDP (SAICM)	$	152, 987
Total	$	152,987

EXPECTED CP OUTPUTS and indicators including annual targets	**PLANNED ACTIVITIES** *List all activities including M&E to be undertaken during the year towards stated CP outputs*	**TIME FRAME**				**RESPONSIBLE PARTY**	**PLANNED BUDGET (USD)**		
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		Source Of Funds	Budget Description	Amount
<u>Output 1:</u> SMC situation report finalized. <u>Annual target 1:</u> One National SMC Situation Report produced **<u>Indicator 1</u>** National SMC situation report with readers comments sheet **<u>Indicator 2:</u>** Workshop report	Conduct information gathering and analysis to determine SMC priorities. NGOs to participate in awareness raising	10,000				NEMA	UNDP	71300 National Consultants	10,000
		5,946.92				NEMA	UNDP	72100 NGO and other Participation	5,947
	Conduct awareness raising for stakeholders	10,000				NEMA	UNDP	72100 Meeting and workshops	10,000
	Printing situation analysis report	20,000				UNDP	UNDP	71400 Printing report	20,000
<u>Output 2:</u> Priorities for strengthening SMC governance regime identified.	Identify national SMC specific opportunities and priorities to address gaps in the national SMC regime.	27,000				UNDP	UNDP	71200 International consultants	27,000

EXPECTED CP OUTPUTS and indicators including annual targets *<u>Annual target 2:</u>* Priority setting document **<u>Indicator 1</u>** Priority setting document developed	**PLANNED ACTIVITIES** *List all activities including M&E to be undertaken during the year towards stated CP outputs*	**TIME FRAME**				**RESPONSIBLE PARTY**	**PLANNED BUDGET (USD)**		
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		Source of Funds	Budget Description	Amount
	Review SMC priority setting document	3,185.13					UNDP	72100 Meetings and Workshops	3,185
<u>Output 3:</u> National Action Plan for strengthening national SMC governance prepared. **<u>Annual target 3</u>** National plan of action for SAICM governance finalized **<u>Indicator 1:</u>** National Plan of Action developed. **<u>Indicator 2</u>** Workshop report.	Review SMC priority setting document to produce Action Plan.	4,683.45				NEMA	UNDP	71300 National Consultants	4,683
	Conduct stakeholders' workshop to validate Action Plan.	4,025.23				NEMA	UNDP	72100 Meeting and workshops	4,025

EXPECTED CP OUTPUTS and indicators including annual targets	**PLANNED ACTIVITIES** *List all activities including M&E to be undertaken during the year towards stated CP outputs*	**TIME FRAME**				**RESPONSIBLE PARTY**	**PLANNED BUDGET (USD)**		
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		Source of Funds	Budget Description	Amount
Output 4: Economic analysis of cost of inaction/benefits of action in management of chemicals prepared.	Conduct an assessment on the costs and benefits of action/inaction in management of chemicals		7,000			NEMA	UNDP	71300 National Consultants	7,000
Annual target 4: Economic Analysis Report and Health Situation Analysis Report **Indicator:** 1. Economic Analysis Report 2. Health Situation Analysis report	Conduct stakeholders Workshop to validate report		4,000			NEMA	UNDP	72100 Meeting and Workshops	4,000
Output 5: SMC issues integrated in the NDP	Prepare SMC issues paper.					NEMA	UNDP		

EXPECTED CP OUTPUTS and indicators including annual targets	**PLANNED ACTIVITIES** *List all activities including M&E to be undertaken during the year towards stated CP outputs*	**TIME FRAME**				**RESPONSIBLE PARTY**	**PLANNED BUDGET (USD)**		
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		Source of Funds	Budget Description	Amount
Annual target 5: Integrate SMC issues in the NDP **Indicator 1** SMC issue in the NDP	Create awareness among other sectors on SMC issues.		3100			NEMA	UNDP	72100 Meeting and Workshops	3,100
Output 6: Terminal Project Evaluation exercise completed. **Annual target 6** Terminal evaluation report produced by August Indicators Terminal Project report	Conduct Terminal Evaluation exercise	10,000	15,284.8			NEMA	UNDP	71600 Travel: PMU & UN staff	15,285
						UNDP	UNDP	71400: Hire Evaluation Consultant	10,000
Budget description applies to all activity areas		9,031.4	9,031.4			NEMA	UNDP	71100 National staff salaries	18,063
		2,481				NEMA	UNDP	72200 Office equipment	2,481
		1,000	1,000			NEMA	UNDP	73100 Rental of office space	2,000

EXPECTED CP OUTPUTS and indicators including annual targets	**PLANNED ACTIVITIES** *List all activities including M&E to be undertaken during the year towards stated CP outputs*	**TIME FRAME**				**RESPONSIBLE PARTY**	**PLANNED BUDGET (USD)**		
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		Source Of funds	Budget Description	Amount
		3,108.87	3,108.87			NEMA	UNDP	74500 Sundries	1,629.74
.3% ISS							UNDP		4,589
GRAND TOTAL		**110,462.05**	**42,525.09**						**152,987**

ANNEX 4:

THE SAICM PROJECT FUNDS FLOW RECORD FROM UNDP

UGANDA/UNDP/UNEP PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVE FOR THE STRATEGIC APPROACH TO INTERNATIONAL CHEMICALS MANAGEMENT (SAICM)

Below is the Flow of Advances Released to the Project *(As at the time of the MTE – August to September, 2009)*:

	Details	Funds in UGX
1	Jan-March 08 1st Advance was given out on 26th February 2008 UGX	143,989072
2	Jan-March 08 expenditure was UGX	4,919,000
3	The balance at the end of March 2008 was UGX	139,079,072
4	April – May 08 advance was given on 30th May 2008 of UGX	17,100,000
5	At the beginning of June 2008 the project had total amount of	156,179,072
6	April- June 2008 the project accounted for	44,296,728
7	The project balance at the end of June 08 was	111,882,344
8	At the beginning of October the project had a balance of	103,500,344
9	October – Dec 08 the project utilized/accounted funds amounting to UGX	17,057,4100
10	At the end of December 08 the project had un-utilized funds totaling to UGX	86,442,934
11	31 Dec 2008 the project refunded funds totaling to UGX	73,223,103
12	At the beginning of 2009 the project had a balance of UGX	13,219,831
13	Jan-March 2009 opening balance was UGX	13,219,831
14	Jan-March 2009 on 28th March 09 project received an advance of UGX	70,000,000
15	Jan-March 09 project had funds totaling to UGX	83,219,831
16	Jan- April 09 the project accounted for UGX	29,255,175
17	At the beginning of May 09 the project had un-utilized funds totaling UGX	53,964,656
18	May – June 09 the project had utilized UGX	39,472,425
19	At the beginning of July – Sept 09 the project had a balance of UGX	18,219,250
20	July – Sept 09 the project received an advance of 83,000,000 totaling UGX	101,219,250
21	*At the time of the MTE – August to September, 2009* the project had un-ACCOUNTED for funds totaling UGX	101,219,250

Source: UNDP Country Office, Kampala

ANNEX 5:

MATRIX 1: THE MID-TERM EVALUATION MATRIX FOR THE SAICM PROJECT (*SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF BASIC/FUNDAMENTAL ELEMENTS OF THE SAICM PROJECT)*

MATRIX 1: THE MID-TERM EVALUATION MATRIX FOR THE SAICM PROJECT
(SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF BASIC/FUNDAMENTAL ELEMENTS OF THE SAICM PROJECT)

Originally Planned Project Life: <u>18 months</u> (Nov. '07 – April '09); Actual Commencement Date: April, 2008; Mid-Term Evaluation Period: April, 2008 to July, 2009.

SAICM Project Results (Goal, Long-term Objective and Outputs) **&** **Actors/Stakeholders Responsible**	**Evaluation/Assessment Indicators (ref. Strategic Results Matrix in PD)[3]** **&** **Originally Set Target Dates Vs. Actual Completion Dates**	**Proportionate Mid-term Target Achievement (With QQT & SMART)** ***(Out of 83%)[4]***	**Proportionate Mid-term Deviation from set Proportionate Target (%)**	**Summary Narrative** **&** **Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation**
Goal: Develop strategies for integration of sound management of chemicals into national development plans and programmes through MDG-based planning for enhancement of environmental sustainability. ***Actors/Stakeholders Responsible:*** ➢ UNDP/UNEP ➢ GOU ➢ ICM ➢ PMU	**Target Date(s):** There was consensus among various project actors/stakeholders that the achievement of this highest level objective in the project plan hierarchy could only be targeted during the post-SAICM 1 period, given that the actual (*ultimate*) outputs for SAICM 1 (whose life was only 18 months), were planned to culminate into **mainstreaming (*only*) priority SMC issues** in the National Development Plan (NDP). It was also understood that SAICM was only expected to contribute to this goal.	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	The Evaluation shared the stakeholders' views on '**Target Date(s)'** in column 2, but further advised that the Project Terminal Evaluation should 'measure' the proportionate level of achievement that would have been registered. This would, however, inter alia, necessitate prior determination of the target date for achievement of this goal; the desired contribution of SAICM to it; as well as precise & measurable indicators.

[3] A copy of the Strategic Results Matrix in the PD is attached to this report as Annex 2 for ease of reference.

[4] Ideally, the mid-term evaluation ought to have been carried out half-way during the project life cycle. SAICM being an 18 month project, this would have been at the end of **the 9th month**, or thereabout, in the project life cycle. At that stage, **approx. 50%** of project outputs, or approx. 50% of the activities leading to the delivery of the respective project outputs would be the ideal point of reference in the 'measurement'/evaluation of project performance at the mid-term *checkpoint* against pre-set proportionate targets. However, the **MTE of this project** took place at the end of **the 15th month** of the project's life, **technically** making the ideal point of reference in the 'measurement' of project performance **83%**.

(Continued…)

SAICM Project Results (Goal, Long-term Objective and Outputs) **&** **Actors/Stakeholders Responsible**	**Evaluation/Assessment Indicators (ref. Strategic Results Matrix in PD)** **&** **Originally Set Target Dates Vs. Actual Completion Dates**	**Proportionate Mid-term Target Achievement (With QQT & SMART)** ***(Out of 83%)***	**Proportionate Mid-term Deviation from set Proportionate Target (%)**[5]	**Summary Narrative** **&** **Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation**
Long-term Objective: Strengthen focus on improved cross-sectoral governance for SMC at the national and local levels and establish stronger SMC links with national development planning priorities, processes and plans to achieve the MDGs. ***Actors/Stakeholders Responsible***[6]***:*** ➢ UNDP/UNEP ➢ GOU ➢ ICM ➢ PMU	**Indicator(s):** • SMC Plan adopted by Government, or a process clearly established to achieve this. • Development policies, plans and programs that reflect prioritization. **Target Date(s):** Just as was the case with *'the Goal'* (above), there was consensus among various project actors/stakeholders that the achievement of this 2nd highest level objective in the hierarchy could also only be targeted during the post-SAICM 1 period; with SAICM (whose life was only 18 months), only expected to contribute to it.	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	In the same way as was the case with regard to *'the Goal'* (above), the Evaluation shared the stakeholders' view in column 2, but further advised that efforts should be made during the Project Terminal Evaluation to 'measure' the proportionate level of achievement of this objective that would have been registered; as well as SAICM's proportionate contribution to it. This too would, however, inter alia, necessitate prior determination of the target date for achievement of this long-term objective; the desired contribution of SAICM to it; as well as precise & measurable indicators.

[5]While the Evaluation wished to employ the popularly used percentage-based method of 'measuring' proportionate performance, this was hampered in this particular project mainly by lack of precise pre-set proportionate mid-term targets (at project planning stage); and lack of performance indicators that were SMART and were characterized by QQT.
[6] Source: Project Management Unit (PMU)

(Continued…)

SAICM Project Results (Outputs) **&** **Actors/Stakeholders Responsible**	**Evaluation/Assessment Indicators (Strategic Results Matrix in PD)** **&** **Originally Set Target Dates Vs. Actual Completion Dates**	**Proportionate Mid-term Target Achievement (With QQT & SMART)** ***(Out of 83%)***	**Proportionate Mid-term Deviation from set Proportionate Target** **(%)**	**Summary Narrative** **&** **Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation**
Output 1: Establish or strengthen a functional national cross-sectoral, inter-ministerial coordination body in support of sustainable SMC mainstreaming. ***Actors/Stakeholders Responsible:*** ➢ PMU ➢ Executive Director, NEMA	**Indicator(s):** • National Project Manager and Technical Assistant appointed. • National Steering Committee and Inter-agency Working Group established. • Briefing package distributed to key government decision-making bodies and other stakeholders. • Electronic stakeholder list, roles and responsibilities available for project use. *According to the PMU, the above were appropriate & sufficient indicators.* **Completion Target Date:** December, 2007 (AWP '07 – PD). **Actual Completion Date:** January, 2008.	The entire output was accomplished/produced during the month of January, 2008.	**No deviation** in terms of **the mid-term *'checkpoint'*** (as it was even one of the initial project start-up outputs – very distant from the mid-term *'checkpoint')*. However, there was a ***general deviation*** of **1 month**[7] between the originally set completion target date of December, 2007 and the actual completion date of January, 2008.	It was argued, however, that the NSC & IWG should have been formed through a more rigorous selection process to ensure that both the sectors/ /institutions on these organs would be appropriate (which they were); and the specific delegates representing them thereon would be adequately committed to, and value-adding with regard to project matters in accordance with their TOR. E.g., the level of reliability & contributions made by the delegates representing Trade & Transport; Water & Environment; Education & Research; FPED; & NPA had been below expectation, negatively affecting project implementation at that level.

[7] Like almost all the other project start-up outputs/activities, accomplishment of this output was achieved later than the originally targeted completion date, i.e. in January, 2008, instead of December, 2007, with the project having been formally launched on 7th – 8th Nov. 2007.

(Continued…)

SAICM Project Results (Outputs) **&** **Actors/Stakeholders Responsible**	**Evaluation/Assessment Indicators (ref. Strategic Results Matrix in PD)** **&** **Originally Set Target Dates Vs. Actual Completion Dates**	**Proportionate Mid-term Target Achievement (With QQT & SMART)** ***(Out of 83%)***	**Proportionate Mid-term Deviation from set Proportionate Target** **(%)**	**Summary Narrative** **&** **Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation**
Output 2: Qualify links between priority chemical management problems and human health, food security and environmental effects. ***Actors/Stakeholders Responsible:*** ➢ PMU ➢ ICM ➢ Sectoral teams ➢ Consultant for the Health & Environment Linkages	**Indicator(s):** ➢ National SMC Situation Report with readers' Comments Sheet; available in electronic format and discussed with stakeholders in cross-sectoral inter-ministerial meetings. ➢ Decisions taken on the application of the HELI methodology for subsequent analysis. ➢ Workshop held. Report produced	• At project design/planning stage, no Proportionate Mid-term Target was set. • Yet because one block/broad '***project activity area No. 3***' was aligned with this output (just like all the other outputs) in the AWPs[8], without logically/sequentially broken down specific & time-bound activities/sub-activities, it was not possible (at the time of the MTE) to work out/'measure' the **Proportionate Mid-term Achievement/performance** in a meaningful way.	Not Applicable	• Given that the national SMC situational analysis was planned to be a scoping/indicative (and not a rigorous & in-depth study), largely due to resource and time constraints, it was widely assessed (in that context), by many stakeholders (including PMU; NSC; IWG; and sectoral teams) to be a reasonably good report (approx. 80% good), in view of the purpose for which the study was carried out. • The Evaluation largely agreed, but put its assessment of its contextual quality at 70%.

[8] Four Annual Work Plans (AWPs) were used in this MTE as the major points of reference with regard to targets that were set within the framework of SAICM project design/planning (and the corresponding performance 'measurement'), namely; (1) AWP 2007 & (2) AWP 2008 (in the PD); and (3) AWP 2008 & (4) AWP 2009 (subsequently prepared and submitted by NEMA to UNDP). Copies of all the AWPs are attached to this report in Annex 3 for ease of reference.

(Continued…)

SAICM Project Results (Outputs) **&** **Actors/Stakeholders Responsible**	**Evaluation/Assessment Indicators (ref. Strategic Results Matrix in PD)** **&** **Originally Set Target Dates Vs. Actual Completion Dates**	**Proportionate Mid-term Target Achievement (With QQT & SMART)** ***(Out of 83%)***	**Proportionate Mid-term Deviation from set Proportionate Target** **(%)**	**Summary Narrative** **&** **Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation**
Output 2 (Continued…)	➢ According to the PMU, the above were appropriate & sufficient indicators, except *'the application of the HELI methodology'*, which was omitted and replaced with the following indicators: • An approved national SMC situational analysis report; and • A stakeholders' workshop to adopt the report held. **Completion Target Date:** March, 2008 (AWP '08 – PD & NEMA AWP '08) **Actual Completion Date:** April, 2009	The output was accomplished/produced with an approved national SMC situational analysis report, duly adopted at the stakeholders' workshop held on 15th April 2009.	**Approx. 13 Months** (between March, 2008 and April, 2009)[9]	• The report's major relative strengths (also reflected in its corresponding sectoral situational analysis reports), lay in the chapters on the Agricultural; Health; Energy & Minerals; and Education & Research sectors; while its major weaknesses lay in the chapters on the Industry; Water & Environment; and Trade & Transportation sectors.

[9] Like almost all the other project outputs & activities, implementation of this output commenced much later than originally planned (in April 2008), which became the actual project commencement date, largely due to late release/transfer of the initial funds to the SAICM project Account in March, 2008, although the project was formally launched on 7th – 8th Nov. 2007. The **start-up delay**, therefore, was of **approx. 5 months**.

(Continued…)

SAICM Project Results (Outputs) **&** **Actors/Stakeholders Responsible**	**Evaluation/Assessment Indicators (ref. Strategic Results Matrix in PD)** **&** **Originally Set Target Dates Vs. Actual Completion Dates**	**Proportionate Mid-term Target Achievement (With QQT & SMART)** ***(Out of 83%)***	**Proportionate Mid-term Deviation from set Proportionate Target** **(%)**	**Summary Narrative** **&** **Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation**
Output 2 (Continued…)	- DO -	- DO -	- DO -	The report's quality was also relatively low on the analysis of the economic & health implications of the weak SMC regime in Uganda's sectors; cross-cutting issues; as well as on concrete interventions to address the legislative; policy & institutional framework weaknesses in the SMC regime. **Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation:** ***It was reported & verified that:*** • Actual project implementation commenced in April, 2008, although the project was formally launched on 7^{th} – 8^{th} Nov. 2007, due to late release/transfer of the initial funds to the SAICM project Account in March, 2008.

(Continued…)

SAICM Project Results (Outputs) **&** **Actors/Stakeholders Responsible**	**Evaluation/Assessment Indicators (ref. Strategic Results Matrix in PD)** **&** **Originally Set Target Dates Vs. Actual Completion Dates**	**Proportionate Mid-term Target Achievement (With QQT & SMART)** ***(Out of 83%)***	**Proportionate Mid-term Deviation from set Proportionate Target** **(%)**	**Summary Narrative** **&** **Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation**
Output 2 (Continued…)	- DO -	- DO -	- DO -	***Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation (Cont'd…):*** • The initial delay was followed by a further major delay[10] in disbursement of project funds to the Project Account during the project's life before the commencement of the MTE, which further contributed to the cumulative and sequential pushing forward of the timing of implementation of the logical project activities in pursuit of this output. This partly led to such a long delay/big deviation in completing it.

[10] It was reported that the further major delay to release/transfer project funds to the Project Account occurred during the period January to April, 2009, causing a **delay in project implementation** of **approx. 3 months**. Further analysis of this issue is presented under sub-section 5.3.6 of the main report.

(Continued…)

SAICM Project Results (Outputs) **&** **Actors/Stakeholders Responsible**	**Evaluation/Assessment Indicators (ref. Strategic Results Matrix in PD)** **&** **Originally Set Target Dates Vs. Actual Completion Dates**	**Proportionate Mid-term Target Achievement (With QQT & SMART)** ***(Out of 83%)***	**Proportionate Mid-term Deviation from set Proportionate Target** **(%)**	**Summary Narrative** **&** **Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation**
Output 2 (Continued…)	- DO -	- DO -	- DO -	***Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation (Cont'd…):*** • Data/information collection alone took between 6 & 8 months, instead of the 2 months that had been estimated in the original project plan (in the PD) to be adequate for both data collection and analysis[11]. • In many cases: some of the *private sector* (data source) institutions did not cooperate in providing the required information; it was not available at all; or it was recorded/stored in a form that was difficult to utilize.

[11] It was further reported by PMU that, besides the delays in the release/transfer of project funds to the project, coupled with some internal bureaucratic delays and staffing capacity constraints within the PMU in particular, and NEMA as a whole (all of which collectively slowed project implementation); the two months that had been estimated to be adequate for data/information collection & analysis at project planning stage, had been based on an assumption that turned out to be incorrect. That was that the required data/information for the scoping/indicative SMC situational analysis would be readily available in the various sectoral institutions and in such a form that they would easily be retrieved and used for analysis. Data/information collection & analysis were also expected to be easy and take a short time, based on the assumption that, within the framework of SAICM's cross-sectoral and multi-stakeholder institutional arrangement, such data/information would be collected by the situational analysis sectoral team members. These would themselves, be members of the participating sectoral institutions, which would be the sources of the required data/information, hence facilitating maximum cooperation, ease and speed. The actual reality turned out to be to the contrary in most cases.

(Continued…)

SAICM Project Results (Outputs) **&** **Actors/Stakeholders Responsible**	**Evaluation/Assessment Indicators (ref. Strategic Results Matrix in PD)** **&** **Originally Set Target Dates Vs. Actual Completion Dates**	**Proportionate Mid-term Target Achievement (With QQT & SMART)** ***(Out of 83%)***	**Proportionate Mid-term Deviation from set Proportionate Target** **(%)**	**Summary Narrative** **&** **Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation**
Output 2 (Continued…)	- DO -	- DO -	- DO -	• The limited funds in the project budget for this output could only facilitate sectoral teams to achieve very limited geographical coverage; scope; depth & rigour with regard to data/information collection. • Data/information analysis was also more complex and time-consuming due to various factors, the most important of which being that some of the data/information gathered were not aggregated, or in a form that was readily usable in the national SMC situational analysis. Thus, processing the obtained data/ information to a level that would be usable consumed a lot of time[12].

[12] It was, for instance, reported that in some cases, some SMC situational analysis sectoral teams had to be sent back to the field many times before the data analysts could get satisfied that some reasonable quality of data/information usable for purposes of the situational analysis had been achieved.

(Continued…)

SAICM Project Results (Outputs) **&** **Actors/Stakeholders Responsible**	**Evaluation/Assessment Indicators (ref. Strategic Results Matrix in PD)** **&** **Originally Set Target Dates Vs. Actual Completion Dates**	**Proportionate Mid-term Target Achievement (With QQT & SMART)** ***(Out of 83%)***	**Proportionate Mid-term Deviation from set Proportionate Target** **(%)**	**Summary Narrative** **&** **Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation**
Output 3: Identify requirements for strengthening SMC governance regime. ***Also interpreted by PMU to mean:*** 'Priorities for strengthening the SMC governance regime identified' *And accordingly re-phrased and stated as such in **AWP 2009** (submitted by NEMA to UNDP) as **Annual Output 2*** ***Actors/Stakeholders Responsible:*** ➢ PMU ➢ ICM ➢ National Consultant for Priority setting and Action Plan	**Indicator:** Decisions taken by the National Steering Committee to proceed with development of a phased plan for strengthening the national SMC governance regime ***(ref. Strategic Results Matrix: PD: pp. 9-10)*** *Participatory review of the PD & AWPs with PMU during the MTE process concluded that the above indicator **was difficult to use** in **guiding implementation**, as well as **M&E/measurement of performance**[13].*	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

[13] During the Participatory Project Performance Review session with the PMU, the Evaluator, inter alia, discussed some project design/planning issues with members of the PMU, including, inter alia, their own appreciation and assessment of the appropriateness, as well as usability of some original output targets and indicators in project implementation and M&E/performance measurement. This was done with a view to achieving consensus on the basis used for measuring achievement of already completed outputs; for ensuring a clear basis for re-planning those outputs, whose activities were not yet implemented; as well as appropriately monitoring and evaluating/measuring them during and after implementation.

(Continued…)

SAICM Project Results (Outputs) **&** **Actors/Stakeholders Responsible**	**Evaluation/Assessment Indicators (ref. Strategic Results Matrix in PD)** **&** **Originally Set Target Dates Vs. Actual Completion Dates**	**Proportionate Mid-term Target Achievement (With QQT & SMART)** ***(Out of 83%)***	**Proportionate Mid-term Deviation from set Proportionate Target** **(%)**	**Summary Narrative** **&** **Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation**
Output 3 (Continued…)	**Preferred indicator:** A complete set of properly identified and documented priorities for strengthening the SMC governance regime, determined through a prescribed appropriate procedure; and approved by the NSC of SAICM. **Original Completion Target Date:** June, 2008 (AWP '08 – submitted by NEMA to UNDP) **2nd Completion Target Date:** March, 2009 (AWP '09 – submitted by NEMA to UNDP) **New Completion Target Date by PMU (During MTE):** 1st week of October 2009.	• As was the case with all the other outputs, at project design/planning stage, no Proportionate Mid-term Target was set; and two **broad** '***project activities*** were aligned with this output in the AWP 2009 (NEMA). • At the time of the MTE, actual work on this output, to be executed by a Consultant, was just about to start (during the 2nd week of September, 2009).	**1st Deviation (at the time of the MTE):** **Approx.13 Months** (between June, 2008 and July, 2009). **Expected 2nd Deviation** (based on the **New Completion Target Date by PMU, i.e.** 1st week of October 2009**)**: **Approx. 15 months**.	***It was reported & verified that:*** • The already reported initial project start-up delay (from Nov. 2007 to April 2008); followed by a further major delay in disbursement of project funds during the latter part of the project's life, significantly contributed to the cumulative and sequential pushing forward of the delivery of project outputs 1 & 2; which were designed to logically precede output 3. In particular, output 3 could, logically, only be embarked on after completion of the SMC situational analysis, which was completed in April, 2009.

(Continued…)

SAICM Project Results (Outputs) **&** **Actors/Stakeholders Responsible**	**Evaluation/Assessment Indicators (ref. Strategic Results Matrix in PD)** **&** **Originally Set Target Dates Vs. Actual Completion Dates**	**Proportionate Mid-term Target Achievement (With QQT & SMART)** ***(Out of 83%)***	**Proportionate Mid-term Deviation from set Proportionate Target** **(%)**	**Summary Narrative** **&** **Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation**
Output 3 (Continued…)	- DO -	- DO -	- DO -	• There was a delay in procuring the Consultant to execute the assignment to deliver this output. This was largely due to the change in guidelines and procedure of procuring goods & services (including Consultants) in UNDP, during the period under review, which also affected SAICM. This change involved a shift from NEMA directly procuring the required services for SAICM, to UNDP procuring the services for the project, which significantly contributed to delays in project implementation[14].

[14] It was reported that the delays mainly emanated from a combination of factors, including lack of adequate staff at UNDP to expeditiously process & follow-up the procurement of services; including processing of TORs & selection of service providers (Consultants); as well as the lengthy process of consultations between PMU (NEMA) and UNDP in pursuing this process.

(Continued…)

SAICM Project Results (Outputs) **&** **Actors/Stakeholders Responsible**	**Evaluation/Assessment Indicators (ref. Strategic Results Matrix in PD)** **&** **Originally Set Target Dates Vs. Actual Completion Dates**	**Proportionate Mid-term Target Achievement (With QQT & SMART)** ***(Out of 83%)***	**Proportionate Mid-term Deviation from set Proportionate Target** **(%)**	**Summary Narrative** **&** **Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation**
Output 4: Develop a phased plan for strengthening national SMC governance regime. ***Also interpreted by PMU to mean:*** 'National Action Plan for strengthening national SMC governance prepared' *And accordingly re-phrased and stated as such in **AWP 2009** (submitted by NEMA to UNDP) as **Annual Output 3*** ***Actors/Stakeholders Responsible:*** ➢ PMU ➢ ICM ➢ National Consultant for Priority setting and Action Plan	**Indicator:** Endorsement on SMC Plan of Action secured at national and local levels. ***(ref. Strategic Results Matrix: PD: pp. 9-10)*** *As was the case with the indicator for Output 3, participatory review of the PD & AWPs with PMU during the MTE process concluded that the above indicator **was also difficult to use** in **guiding implementation**, as well as **M&E/measurement of performance.***	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

(Continued…)

SAICM Project Results (Outputs) **&** **Actors/Stakeholders Responsible**	**Evaluation/Assessment Indicators (ref. Strategic Results Matrix in PD)** **&** **Originally Set Target Dates Vs. Actual Completion Dates**	**Proportionate Mid-term Target Achievement (With QQT & SMART)** ***(Out of 83%)***	**Proportionate Mid-term Deviation from set Proportionate Target** **(%)**	**Summary Narrative** **&** **Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation**
Output 4 (Continued…)	**Preferred indicators:** • A finalized Action Plan for strengthening national SMC governance, prepared through a prescribed appropriate procedure; approved by the NSC of SAICM; and endorsed by multi-stakeholders at national and local levels. • A multi-stakeholders' workshop to study & endorse the Action Plan and the workshop report. **Original Completion Target Date:** September, 2008 (AWP '08 – submitted by NEMA to UNDP) **2nd Completion Target Date:** March, 2009 (AWP '09 – submitted by NEMA to UNDP) **New Completion Target Date by PMU (During MTE):** End of October, 2009.	• As was the case with all the other outputs, at project design/planning stage, no Proportionate Mid-term Target was set; and two **broad *project activities*** were aligned with this output in the AWP 2009 (NEMA). • At the time of the MTE, actual work on this output, to be executed by a Consultant, was scheduled to start during the 1st week of October, 2009.	**1st Deviation (at the time of the MTE):** **Approx.10 Months** (between September, 2008 and July, 2009). **Expected 2nd Deviation** (based on the **New Completion Target Date by PMU, i.e.** End of October 2009): **Approx. 13 months**.	***It was reported & verified that:*** • The cumulative project implementation delays (combining the start-up and subsequent delays, partly due to untimely disbursement of project funds already reported), contributed to the delay & the sequential pushing forward of the delivery of project output 4 in the same way as was the case with Outputs 1, 2 & 3; which were designed to logically precede output 4. Technically, output 4 immediately depended on the completion of output 3, which, was expected to be completed in the 1st week of October 2009.

(Continued…)

SAICM Project Results (Outputs) **&** **Actors/Stakeholders Responsible**	**Evaluation/Assessment Indicators (ref. Strategic Results Matrix in PD)** **&** **Originally Set Target Dates Vs. Actual Completion Dates**	**Proportionate Mid-term Target Achievement (With QQT & SMART)** ***(Out of 83%)***	**Proportionate Mid-term Deviation from set Proportionate Target** **(%)**	**Summary Narrative** **&** **Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation**
Output 4 (Continued…)	- DO -	- DO -	- DO -	• Given the reported fact that outputs 3 & 4 were to be sequentially produced mainly through the execution a combined consultancy assignment[15] (by one Consultant), the delay in procuring consultancy services, already reported with regard to Output 3, would also directly affect Output 4. This was largely due to the change in guidelines and procedure of procuring Consultants in UNDP during the period under review, which also affected SAICM, by contributing to delays in project implementation.

[15] According to PMU, a combined consultancy assignment to sequentially produce the two closely related outputs, was a part of its strategy to compensate for lost time and fast-track the implementation of the outstanding project activities in pursuit of the outstanding outputs.

(Continued…)

SAICM Project Results (Outputs) **&** **Actors/Stakeholders Responsible**	**Evaluation/Assessment Indicators (ref. Strategic Results Matrix in PD)** **&** **Originally Set Target Dates Vs. Actual Completion Dates**	**Proportionate Mid-term Target Achievement (With QQT & SMART)** ***(Out of 83%)***	**Proportionate Mid-term Deviation from set Proportionate Target** **(%)**	**Summary Narrative** **&** **Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation**
Output 5: Quantify costs of inaction/benefits of action in management of chemical issues. ***Also interpreted by PMU to mean:*** 'Economic Analysis of costs of inaction/benefits of action in management of chemicals prepared'. *And accordingly re-phrased and stated as such in **AWP 2009** (submitted by NEMA to UNDP) as **Annual Output 4*** ***Actors/Stakeholders Responsible:*** ➢ PMU ➢ ICM ➢ National Consultant for Economic Valuation of SMC priority areas.	**Indicator:** Agreement from central planning and finance agencies on the relevance of the methodology tested for costing SMC priorities into national development planning processes. ***(ref. Strategic Results Matrix: PD: pp. 9-10).*** *In the same way as was the case with the indicators for Outputs 3 & 4, participatory review of the PD & AWPs with PMU during the MTE process concluded that the above indicator **was also difficult to use** and **not clear/precise enough** in **guiding implementation**, as well as **M&E/measurement of performance.***	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

(Continued…)

SAICM Project Results (Outputs) **&** **Actors/Stakeholders Responsible**	**Evaluation/Assessment Indicators (ref. Strategic Results Matrix in PD)** **&** **Originally Set Target Dates Vs. Actual Completion Dates**	**Proportionate Mid-term Target Achievement (With QQT & SMART)** ***(Out of 83%)***	**Proportionate Mid-term Deviation from set Proportionate Target** **(%)**	**Summary Narrative** **&** **Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation**
Output 5 (Continued…)	**Preferred indicators:** • A finalized report on the economic analysis of costs of inaction/benefits of action in management of chemicals, prepared through a prescribed appropriate procedure and approved by the NSC of SAICM. • A Health Situation Analysis report. **Original Completion Target Date:** December, 2008 (AWP '08 – submitted by NEMA to UNDP) **2nd Completion Target Date:** June, 2009 (AWP '09 – submitted by NEMA to UNDP) **New Completion Target Date by PMU (During MTE):** December, 2009.	• At project design/planning stage, no Proportionate Mid-term Target was set for this output, and two **broad *project activities*** were aligned with it in the AWP 2009 (NEMA). At the time of the MTE, actual work on this output, to be executed by a Consultant, was scheduled to start by end of September, 2009, and estimated to last approx. three months.	**1st Deviation (at the time of the MTE):** **Approx. 7 Months** (between December, 2008 and July, 2009). **Expected 2nd Deviation** (based on the **New Completion Target Date by PMU,** i.e. End of December, 2009): **Approx. 12 months**.	***It was reported & verified that:*** The cumulative project implementation delays (combining the start-up and subsequent delays, already reported), which contributed to the delay & the sequential pushing forward of the delivery of project outputs 1, 2, 3 & 4; in the same way affected output 5 in terms of delay to be accomplished/produced; as it was logically & technically designed to be embarked on after outputs 1 – 4, which themselves delayed.

(Continued…)

SAICM Project Results (Outputs) **&** **Actors/Stakeholders Responsible**	**Evaluation/Assessment Indicators (ref. Strategic Results Matrix in PD)** **&** **Originally Set Target Dates Vs. Actual Completion Dates**	**Proportionate Mid-term Target Achievement (With QQT & SMART)** ***(Out of 83%)***	**Proportionate Mid-term Deviation from set Proportionate Target** **(%)**	**Summary Narrative** **&** **Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation**
Output 5 (Continued…)	- DO -	- DO -	- DO -	• In the same way as was the case with outputs 3 & 4; the delay in procuring the Consultant to execute the assignment to deliver this output (largely due to the change in guidelines for procuring Consultants at UNDP), already reported; also affected output 5. • However, the procurement of the Consultant for this particular output, which began in June, 2009, was further delayed by the difficulty to secure a competent Consultant willing to execute the unusually complex & demanding assignment [16] for the financial package & other terms affordable by the SAICM project.

[16] It was reported that the kind of economic analysis of costs of inaction/benefits of action in management of chemicals required in accordance with the SAICM technical guidelines was unusually complex & challenging, and also required certain expertise that would normally be supplied at a higher cost than the package affordable in the SAICM project budget.

(Continued…)

SAICM Project Results (Outputs) **&** **Actors/Stakeholders Responsible**	**Evaluation/Assessment Indicators (ref. Strategic Results Matrix in PD)** **&** **Originally Set Target Dates Vs. Actual Completion Dates**	**Proportionate Mid-term Target Achievement (With QQT & SMART)** ***(Out of 83%)***	**Proportionate Mid-term Deviation from set Proportionate Target** **(%)**	**Summary Narrative** **&** **Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation**
Output 6: Mainstream priority SMC issues in national development policies and plans. ***This output was narrowed down by PMU to read:*** 'SMC issues integrated in the National Development Plan (NDP)'. *And accordingly stated as such in* ***AWP 2009*** *(submitted by NEMA to UNDP) as* ***Annual Output 5*** ***However, during the participatory review of the PD & AWPs with PMU during the MTE process, it was further concluded that the realistically feasible output in the prevailing circumstances was:*** 'Priority SMC issues integrated in the National Development Plan (NDP)'. ***Actors/Stakeholders Responsible:*** ➢ PMU ➢ ICM ➢ Environment Sector Working Group.	**Indicator:** Government willing to explore national budgetary commitments in partnership with donor assistance to implement programmatic and project opportunities. ***(ref. Strategic Results Matrix: PD: pp. 9-10).*** *Again, in the same way as was the case with the indicators for Outputs 3, 4 & 5, participatory review of the PD & AWPs with PMU during the MTE process led to the conclusion that the above indicator* ***was also difficult to use*** *and* ***not clear/precise enough*** *in* ***guiding implementation****, as well as* ***M&E/measurement of performance.***	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

(Continued…)

SAICM Project Results (Outputs) **&** **Actors/Stakeholders Responsible**	**Evaluation/Assessment Indicators(ref. Strategic Results Matrix in PD)** **&** **Originally Set Target Dates Vs. Actual Completion Dates**	**Proportionate Mid-term Target Achievement (With QQT & SMART)** ***(Out of 83%)***	**Proportionate Mid-term Deviation from set Proportionate Target** **(%)**	**Summary Narrative** **&** **Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation**
Output 6 (Continued…)	**Preferred indicators:** • A finalized Priority SMC Issues (for integrating) Paper, prepared through a prescribed appropriate procedure; approved by the NSC of SAICM and submitted to Government of Uganda. • Formally stated Government of Uganda willingness to take up the Priority SMC Issues from the submitted Issues Paper for integrating in the NDP. **Original Completion Target** Date: December, 2008 (AWP '08 – PD) **2nd Completion Target Date:** June, 2009 (AWP '09 – submitted by NEMA to UNDP) **New Completion Target Date by PMU (During MTE):** December, 2009.	No proportionate Mid-term Target was set. However, it was partially done by April, 2008. As a strategy to fast-track integration of priority SMC issues, the initial priority issues were submitted in a PEAP Revision Paper[17], mainly extracted from the *'National Profile on the Assessment of Chemicals Management Infrastructure in Uganda: Final Report' (2003)*; and the *'National Implementation Plan of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants for Uganda' (December 2008)*.	**1st Deviation (at the time of the MTE):** **Approx. 7 Months** (between December, 2008 and July, 2009). **Expected 2nd Deviation** (based on the **New Completion Target Date by PMU, i.e.** End of December, 2009**):** **Approx. 12 months.**	**Note:** The PEAP had been Uganda's PRSP & Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF) since 1997, and it had been SAICM's original target for mainstreaming SMC. The PEAP was then in the process of being replaced by the NDP, which had become the target for mainstreaming SMC. It was planned that following the completion of the National situational analysis; the economic quantification of costs of inaction/benefits of action in management of chemicals; priority setting & preparation of the Issues Paper; a final submission of SMC priorities for integrating in the NDP would be made to update & refine the initial ones.

[17] The Paper was titled: *'The Sound Management of Chemicals Sub-sector Paper for the sector's Paper on Environment, Natural Resources and Climate Change' (February, 2008).*

(Continued…)

SAICM Project Results (Outputs) **&** **Actors/Stakeholders Responsible**	**Evaluation/Assessment Indicators (ref. Strategic Results Matrix in PD)** **&** **Originally Set Target Dates Vs. Actual Completion Dates**	**Proportionate Mid-term Target Achievement (With QQT & SMART)** ***(Out of 83%)***	**Proportionate Mid-term Deviation from set Proportionate Target** **(%)**	**Summary Narrative** **&** **Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation**
Output 6(Continued…)	- DO -	Otherwise, it was established that prior to the completion of outputs 3, 4, 5 & 6; culminating into submission of the finalized Priority SMC Issues (for integration) Paper to GOU; & besides the sub-sector PEAP revision paper already reported; the following major actions had been taken by PMU to prepare the ground for integrating priority SMC issues in the NDP: • Following up to ensure that the ENR sector Working Group mainstreams SMC issues in the NDP. • Tasking the NPA rep. on NSC to follow-up mainstreaming of SMC issues in the NDP.	- DO -	***It was reported & verified that:*** Like project outputs 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5, project output 6 was also pushed forward by the cumulative project implementation delays (combining the start-up and subsequent delays, already reported), particularly since it was logically & technically designed to be embarked on after outputs 1 – 5, which themselves had delayed.

(Continued…)

SAICM Project Results (Outputs) **&** **Actors/Stakeholders Responsible**	**Evaluation/Assessment Indicators (ref. Strategic Results Matrix in PD)** **&** **Originally Set Target Dates Vs. Actual Completion Dates**	**Proportionate Mid-term Target Achievement (With QQT & SMART)** ***(Out of 83%)***	**Proportionate Mid-term Deviation from set Proportionate Target** **(%)**	**Summary Narrative** **&** **Major Factors Responsible for the Deviation**
Output 7: Produce replicable results. ***In the participatory review session of the PD & AWPs with PMU during the MTE process, it was reported that the above output had been dropped in the course of project implementation, largely due to its loss of critical relevancy.*** *Accordingly, it was omitted in the final* ***AWP 2009*** *(submitted by NEMA to UNDP), and replaced by another output stated as* ***Annual Output 6****, which read:* 'Terminal Project Evaluation exercise completed'. ***Actors/Stakeholders Responsible:*** ➢ UNDP ➢ PMU ➢ ICM	**Indicator** Interest generated in other countries to adopt the SMC mainstreaming methodology. *The indicator for the 'new' output was:* Terminal Project report. **Original Completion Target Date:** August, 2009 (AWP '09 – submitted by NEMA to UNDP) **New Target date (at MTE):** January, 2010.	No proportionate Mid-term Target was set.	**1st Deviation (at the time of the MTE):** No deviation, but the output had not yet been embarked on. **Expected 2nd Deviation** (based on the **New Completion Target Date by PMU,** i.e. January, 2010: **Approx. 4 months.**	The expected deviation would be due to, inter alia, the fact that because it was, logically (by design), the last output of this project, output 7 would have to delay following the sequence of the delay/pushing forward that would have characterized outputs 1 – 6, for the reasons already explained.

ANNEX 6:

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER MATERIALS CONSULTED AND REVIEWED

1. Inter-agency Coordinating Mechanism (ICM) 2008: Minutes of the First SAICM Meeting Held in NEMA Main Boardroom (14th March 2008)
2. Inter-agency Coordinating Mechanism (ICM) 2008: Minutes of the Second SAICM Meeting Held at Imperial Royale Hotel (30th October, 2008)
3. Inter-agency Coordinating Mechanism (ICM) 2009: Minutes of the Third SAICM Meeting Held in NEMA Main Boardroom (20th January 2009)
4. National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) 2007: Proceedings of the SAICM Project Launch/Inception Workshop Sessions One & Two
5. National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) 2009: Accountability for the 1st Quarter of SAICM Project Funds (April, 2009)
6. National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) 2009: Accountability for the 2nd Quarter and Request for Advance of 3rd Quarter Activities: SAICM Project Funds (July-Sept 2009)
7. SAICM Project (2007): Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the Sectoral Team Coordinator to Gather and Analyze Information to Develop the National Sound Management of Chemicals Situation Report
8. SAICM Project (2008): Annual Progress Report, January-December 2008
9. SAICM Project (2008): Annual Work Plan for 2008
10. SAICM Project (2008): First Quarter Progress Report, Jan – Mar 2008
11. SAICM Project (2008): Fourth Quarter Progress Report, October – December 2008
12. SAICM Project (2008): Quarterly Work Plan, April – June 2008
13. SAICM Project (2008): Quarterly Work Plan, July - September 2008
14. SAICM Project (2008): Quarterly Work Plan, October – December 2008
15. SAICM Project (2008): Second Quarter Progress Report, April – June 2008
16. SAICM Project (2008): Third Quarter Progress Report, July – September 2008
17. SAICM Project (2009): Agricultural Sector Situation Analysis Report on Sound Management of Chemicals
18. SAICM Project (2009): Education and Research Sector Situation Analysis Report on Sound Management of Chemicals
19. SAICM Project (2009): Energy and Mining Sector Situation Analysis Report on Sound Management of Chemicals
20. SAICM Project (2009): First Quarter Progress Report, Jan – Mar 2009
21. SAICM Project (2009): Health Sector Situation Analysis Report on Sound Management of Chemicals
22. SAICM Project (2009): Industry Sector Situation Analysis Report on Sound Management of Chemicals
23. SAICM Project (2009): National Situation Analysis Report for the Seven Sectors Combined on Sound Management of Chemicals
24. SAICM Project (2009): Trade and Transportation Sector Situation Analysis Report on Sound Management of Chemicals
25. SAICM Project (2009): Water and Environment Sector Situation Analysis Report on Sound Management of Chemicals
26. Thomas J. Conway (2009): Supplemental Cost – Benefit Economic Analysis Guide: (Revised) RFI Draft Presented to UNEP Chemicals Branch, Resource Futures International

27. Uganda/UNDP/UNEP Partnership for the Implementation of SAICM: Annual Work Plan (AWP) 2009
28. Uganda/UNDP/UNEP Partnership for the Implementation of SAICM: Project Document (PD)
29. Veerle Vandeweerd (2009): UNDP Technical Guide for Integrating the Sound Management of Chemicals in MDG-Based Policies & Plans

ANNEX 7:

LIST OF KEY STAKEHOLDERS/COLLABORATING PARTNERS CONSULTED/MET

No.	Name	Institution	Designation/Role
1	Dr. H. Aryamanya-Mugisha	NEMA	Executive Director,
2	Dr. Gerald M. Sawula	NEMA	Deputy Executive Director
3	Mr. Augustine Wandera	UNDP	Project Team Member
4	Mr. Daniel Omodo-MacMondo	UNDP	Project Team Member
5	Mr. Justine Ecaat	UNDP	Project Team Member
6	Ms. Jenesta Nuwagaba	UNDP	Project Team Member
7	Mr. Isaac Ntujju	NEMA	SAICM Project Manager/Coordinator
8	Ms. Enid Turyahikayo	NEMA	SAICM Project Technical Assistant
9	Mr. Bahati Godfrey	Department of Geological Surveys, Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development	Sectoral Team Leader (Energy & Mining)
10	Mr. David Mugisa	Occupational Health & Safety, Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development	Sectoral Team Leader (Health)
11	Mr. Emmanuel Kaye	Government Analytical Laboratory	Sectoral Team Leader (Education & Research)
12	Mr. Grace Birikadde	NEMA	Sectoral Team Leader (Water & Environment)
13	Mr. Norman Ojamuge	Ministry of Tourism, Trade & Industry	Sectoral Team Leader (Industry)
14	Mr. Robert Baganda Tuwesigye	Pro-Biodiversity Conservationists, Uganda	Sectoral Team Leader (Trade & Transportation)
15	Mr. Stephen Byantwale	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries	Sectoral Team Leader (Agriculture)
16	Dr. Agaba E.F.	Ministry of Health	Member, ICM
17	Dr. Ogaram David	Ministry of Gender, Labour & Social Development	Consultant
18	Mr. Kalele Ronald	NEMA	
19	Mr. Mwesigwa Denis	National Drug Authority	Member, ICM
20	Ms. Sunny Mbabazi Byakagaba	Government Analytical Laboratory	Member, ICM

Continued…

No.	Name	Institution	Designation/Role
21	Mr. James Ludigo	Uganda Cleaner Production Centre	Member, ICM
22	Mr. Nyakahuma Edward	Climate Development Initiative	Member, ICM
23	Ms. Aguti Caroline	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development	Member, ICM
24	Ms. Kijagulwe Immaculate		Consultant
25	Mr. Barnabus Kabanda	NEMA	IT
26	Mr. Kazungu Bob	Ministry of Water and Environment	Member, ICM
27	Mr. J.B Kavuma	National Planning Authority	Member, ICM
28	Mr. Fred Onyai	NEMA	IM&E Specialist
29	Mr. Ssemanda Kassim	Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry	Member, ICM
30	Mr. Onesimus Muhwezi	NEMA	D/EMC
31	Mr. Ronald Kaggwa	NEMA	PMU
32	Ms. Katerega Eseza	Makerere University	Senior Economist
33	Mr. John Othieno	UETCL	Member, ICM
34	Mr. Charles Olaker	Ministry of Local Government	Member, ICM
35	Ms. Judith Nabankema	NEMA	Intern
36	Dr. Festus Bagoora	NEMA	Member, ICM
37	Mr. Martin Imalingat	UNBS	Member, ICM
38	Mr. Paul Sajabi	Total Uganda	Member, ICM
39	Mr. Kasenkende Aristaco	NEMA	D/F&A