TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

PROJECT ON PROMOTING CHEMICAL SAFETY FOR CHILDREN IN RURAL AGRICULTURAL COMMUNITIES OF UGANDA

IMPLEMENTING AGENCY: PRO-BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATIONISTS IN UGANDA (PROBICOU)

EXECUTING AGENCY: UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (GEF) SMALL GRANTS PROGRAM – UGANDA

QSP PROJECT No.: IX.07.NGO.PROBICOU

COST TO UNEP: US$250,000

TOTAL COST: US$369,290

DURATION: MAY 2010 – MAY 2013

JUNE 2014

Consultant: Andrew Othieno
Table of Contents

Executive Summary .......................................................................................................................... 3

I. Introduction ............................................................................................................................... 5
   A. Background and Context .......................................................................................................... 5
   B. Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation .................................................................................. 6
   C. Executing Modalities of the Programme or Project .......................................................... 7
   D. Methodology .......................................................................................................................... 7
   E. Limitations to the Evaluation ............................................................................................... 9

II. Major Findings and Analysis .................................................................................................. 10
   A. Desk/Literature Review and Questionnaires/Interviews .................................................. 10
   B. Field Visits ............................................................................................................................. 11
   C. Summary Matrix of Findings, Supporting Evidences & Recommendations .................. 14

III. Outcomes, Impact and Sustainability .................................................................................. 14

IV. Lessons Learned and Best Practices .................................................................................... 16

V. Recommendations .................................................................................................................. 17

VI. Conclusions ............................................................................................................................ 18

Annex 1: Terms of Reference ...................................................................................................... 19
Annex 2: Key documents that were reviewed .......................................................................... 23
Annex 3: Work/Activity Plan ....................................................................................................... 31
Annex 4: Findings Matrix/ Evaluation Assessment .................................................................. 32
Annex 5: List of Persons interviewed and field visit schedule .............................................. 37
Annex 6: QUESTIONNAIRES & Interview Questions ............................................................. 43
Annex 7: Work-plan PROBICOU _UGANDA ............................................................................ 48
Abbreviations and Acronyms

APR : Annual Progress Report
CBO : Community Based Organization
COFTU : Central Organization of Free Trade Unions
CPAP : Country Program Action Plan
GEF : Global Environment Facility
DWD : Directorate of Water Development
EA : Environmental Audit
EIA : Environment Impact Assessment
IA : Implementing Agency
ILO/IPEC : International Labour Organization/International Project on Elimination of Child Labour
MAAIF : Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries
MDG : Millennium Development Goals
ME&S : Ministry of Education and Sports
M&E : Monitoring and Evaluation
MFPED : Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development
MoH : Ministry of Health
MOU : Memorandum of Understanding
MWE : Ministry of Water and Environment
NEMA : National Environment Management Authority
NGO : Non-governmental Organizations
NSC : National Steering Committee
PEAP : Poverty Eradication Action Plan
PMU : Project Management Unit
PPE : Personal Protective Equipment
RUDMEC : Rural Development Media Communication
SAICM : Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management
TOR : Terms of Reference
UNDP : United Nations Development Program
UWCM : Uganda Women Concern Ministry
QSP : Quick Start Program
PROBICOU : Pro-biodiversity Conservationists in Uganda
RUDMEC : Rural Development Media Communication
POPS : Persistent organic pollutants
WHO : world health organization
UNEP : United Nations Environment Program
UWESO : Uganda Women's Effort to Save Orphans
NUPAWU : National Union of Plantation and Agricultural Workers
IEC : Information Education Materials
NSC : National Steering Committee
SGP : Small Grants Program
Executive Summary

Pro-biodiversity conservationists in Uganda (PROBICOU) and its partners in collaboration with the National Steering Committee on Child Labour under the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MGLSD) implemented at twenty four (24) month project aimed at promoting chemical safety for children at work in rural agricultural communities. This project was funded by the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) Quick Start Program (QSP). The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) was the executing agency of the project.

The project aimed at putting in place a minimum program to prevent ill health arising from pesticides use and exposure with particular focus on children at work in rural agricultural settings. The project focus was on: developing an up-to-date information/inventory on chemicals in agriculture, their uses, the associated dangerous processes as well as end point discharges; developing manpower amongst the workers, employers and the general public for dissemination of safety measures in use of toxic chemicals; and building a comprehensive public awareness and education on the alternatives to toxic chemicals and careful use when it is necessary to use them.

It is important to note that the project was on the quick start format and therefore priorities under this focused on plans, policy formulation, awareness raising and setting up of structures. Intervention was therefore not directly targeting children but rather stakeholders, workers, parents etc who in one way or another influence the extent of chemical exposure to children. Consequently also, policy and regulatory framework development could only be supported by the project up to the draft stage.

PROBICOU was able to fully deliver on a majority of the project objectives. Overall the project performance is rated as SATISFACTORY. The project was relevant as it addressed a critical area with resultant significant impact. The overall sustainability of the project is rated moderately likely presenting a moderate sustainability risk. A summary evaluation table is provided at the end of this Executive Summary that indicates the evaluation rating based on selected criteria.

More than 500 leaders and members of trade unions, employers and government officials were trained on chemical safety issues; an inventory of dangerous chemicals, processes & end point discharges likely to affect working children and their environment was developed and disseminated; institutional capacity was built (to an extent) in form of developed technical capabilities of existing institutions (trade unions, employer's federation and government ministries) to implement chemical safety programs and finally, the level of awareness of workers, workers leaders, employers, communities and government officers on the safety measures in use of chemicals was raised through seminars, courses and workshops.

The activities strengthened the capacity for the management of agricultural chemicals and minimization of ill health arising from exposure of children to chemicals particularly amongst the plantation enterprises targeted in western Uganda. The activities also increased the capacity of targeted institutions, stakeholders, civil society representatives, and ministry officials, in form of developed technical capabilities to implement chemical safety programs, aimed at risk reduction, risk assessment, characterization and management, as well as safety measures in the use of chemicals. Furthermore, the activities increased the knowledge and understanding of district local government officials (particularly in Mbale district), institutions such as MGLSD and stakeholders and developed their technical capabilities to implement chemical safety programs in the use of chemicals. It can be argued now that children as a vulnerable segment of the population are expected to increasingly benefit from an improved agricultural system that manages chemicals.

Apart from an aware and trained workforce at various levels, the consultant was able to verify that there is an actual change in mind-set not only amongst the plantation management and workers but even at the district level where for instance, in Mbale district buy-in was obtained from both the technical and political leadership. This resulted in setting up of structures such as district coordination committees drawing representation from the agricultural, health, environmental, administration, women civil society sectors responsible for promotion of chemical safety issues at the district level. Other structures such as a Regional District Chemicals Use and Management Committee have also been put in place. More telling perhaps has been the mainstreaming of chemical safety issues in the district planning and budgetary process as well as the drafting of a by-law and ordinance that incorporates aspects of safe chemical use.
Table 1: Summary Evaluation Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Ratings*</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>2. IA&amp; EA Execution</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory</td>
<td>Quality of UNDP Implementation</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E design at entry</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Quality of Execution - Executing Agency</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E Plan Implementation</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Overall quality of M&amp;E</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of M&amp;E</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Overall quality of Implementation / Execution</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Overall Assessment of Outcomes</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>4. Sustainability</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Financial resources:</td>
<td>Moderately Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Socio-political:</td>
<td>Moderately Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Institutional framework and governance:</td>
<td>Moderately Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Project Outcome Rating</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Environmental:</td>
<td>Moderately Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall likelihood of sustainability:</td>
<td>Moderately Likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: Analysis considered aspects such as effectiveness in meeting the project objectives, efficiency related to the cost of meeting the objectives, adequacy in relation to the resources availed, impact to create the desired change, sustainability to ensure that project benefits will continue after project closure.

I. Introduction

A. Background and Context

Uganda is an agriculture-based economy characterised by a growing use of chemicals as major inputs to increase productivity. As such, there is increasing understanding in government, non-governmental organizations and among the general public that human health and the environment are being compromised by the current arrangements for managing chemicals and their wastes. In the specific case of the agricultural sector, children are involved in the application of pesticides and other agricultural chemicals. This exposure of children to toxic chemicals is considered an aspect of one of the worst forms of child labour in the country.

With agricultural exports representing over 60% of the total annual values, the need to address the role of chemicals as a factor in the national economy is clear. These concerns take on a new level of urgency as the quantity and range of new and existing chemicals rapidly grows in developing countries. The potentially hazardous nature of the chemical industry has caused the industry to become heavily regulated and Uganda is a party to many of the multilateral agreements that seek to manage chemicals. However, the fragmented nature of Uganda’s regulatory framework for chemicals management poses one of the greatest challenges to the safe management of chemicals.

It is against this background that PROBICOU sought support from SAICM to implement a 24 month project entitled: “Promoting Chemical Safety for Children in Rural Agricultural Communities of Uganda” as an effort to put in place a minimal program to prevent ill health arising from pesticides use with particular focus on children at work in agricultural settings.

The specific objectives of the project were to:

(i) Train workers, workers’ leaders, government officers and communities in the safety measures in the use of chemicals through courses, seminars and workshops;
(ii) Develop a national inventory of dangerous chemicals, dangerous processes and endpoint discharges likely to affect working children in agriculture;
(iii) Institutionalise chemical safety education motivation and training programmes of the trade unions, employer’s federation and government ministries; and,
(iv) Raise awareness of workers, workers’ leaders, employers and government officers on the safety measures in use of chemicals through courses, seminars and workshops.

The project particularly focused on developing up-to-date information on chemicals in agriculture, their uses, the dangerous processes and end point discharges; developing manpower among the workers, employers and the general public for the dissemination of safety measures in use of toxic chemicals; and building a comprehensive public awareness and education on the alternatives to toxic chemicals and careful use when it is necessary to use them.

Consequently the expected outcomes of the project included the following:

- Awareness created on chemical safety issues among 5,600 leaders of Trade Union, Employers, Government Officials and the public;
- A developed inventory of dangerous chemicals, dangerous processes and endpoint discharges likely to affect working children in agriculture and their environment; and,
- Institutional capacity through developed technical capabilities of existing institutions such as district leadership to implement chemical safety programmes.

---

1 ADELEKE, S., ABDUL, B. KAMARA and ZUZANA B. (2010) Small holder agriculture in East Africa: Trends, constraints and opportunities, ADB Group working paper No. 105
2 KRAYBILL, D. and KIDOIDO, M (2009) Analysis of relative profitability of key Ugandan agricultural enterprises by agricultural production zone. USSP background paper No. 4
3 MADSEN, K., and QUIBLIER, P. (2012) Global chemicals outlook, towards sound management of chemicals UNEP
The 24-month project was designed to cover the whole country and adopt a participatory approach. This was divided into three phases as follows:

Phase I: Four (4) months of organisational preparation, consultations with target institutions, purchases and training for project staff.

Phase II: Eighteen (18) months for the direct activities of capacity building and awareness creation.

Capacity building activities and awareness creation were designed for implementation at two levels including the horizontal institutional inter-phase and the vertical inter-phase. They were also tailor-made to suit each category. The highest level involved national level actors from government departments, workers and employers whose role extends throughout the country. The next level targeted enterprises, trade union and district level actors including the Chief Administrative Officers (CAOs), District Labour Officers (DLOs), District Agricultural Officers (DAOs), District Population Officers (DPOs), District Medical Officers (DMOs), and Resident District Commissioners (RDCs).

Phase III: Two (2) months for reporting.

The project sought to place extra emphasis on building capacity within government departments in the responsible line ministries, workers and employers’ institutions, and the districts. Correspondingly, a bigger share of awareness creation, training and other forms of capacity building were focused at the districts.

The total project budget was US$ 369,290 with US$250,000 coming from the Quick Start Program (QSP) Trust Fund and contributions from PROBICOU in the form of administration fees, personnel, training equipment and related expenses.

PROBICOU collaborating partners included Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (Occupational Safety and Health Department), UNDP/GEF Small Grants Programme-Uganda, National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), Department of Crop Protection - Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries, Rural Development Media Communications (RUDMEC), National Organization of Trade Unions (NOTU), National Union of Plantation and Agricultural Workers (NUPAWU), The Federation of Uganda Employers (FUE) and the Central Organization of Free Trade Unions (COFTU).

B. Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation of the project aimed to provide a terminal assessment of project implementation, identify project achievements and challenges, measure project performance against objectives and provide an indication of progress. This evaluation will be used to further address chemicals management issues and guide policy and intervention with regard to chemical safety for children in rural agriculture in Uganda and the region.

The consultant specifically focused on:

(i) Conducting a comprehensive study of all the project background materials, including the project description and work plan;
(ii) Studying the general national chemicals management information;
(iii) Monitoring and reviewing the project activities and outcomes. This was done based on information and documentation from the Project Management Unit and other stakeholders on implementation of planned project activities, including meeting documents, reports and participants’ lists, developed public information and training materials, publication as well as other relevant reports;
(iv) Undertaking interviews of and/or administering questionnaires to stakeholders involved in the project in preparation of the monitoring and evaluation report(s), using the guidelines and suggested format advised by UNDP and SAICM secretariat;
Drafting evaluation report(s) using all previously obtained information and documents in relation to the project and by filling the specific templates provided by UNDP, and SAICM secretariat;

Timely submission of the final terminal evaluation report to UNDP on the agreed dates, upon completion of all project activities;

Provision of additional information or correction on the report(s) after submission.

The geographic scope of this evaluation covered Kampala, Fort Portal, Mbale and Mukono districts. The evaluation was conducted over a period of 20 working days (from 1st to 20th December 2013) following which a terminal evaluation report was produced.

C. Executing Modalities of the Programme or Project

A four person Project Management Unit (PMU) was established to handle implementation of project activities and was responsible for ensuring the achievement of specified results.

This unit was headed by a National Project Coordinator and supported by an Assistant National Project Coordinator, a Financial Administrator as well as a Secretary. One international and two local consultants were hired to fill the positions of Pesticide Management & Training Specialist and Chemical Safety Specialist. The consultants were responsible for aiding the kick-off of the project by training the PMU and the steering committee on materials and other issues related to the project. Their roles included providing technical advice throughout the process via email and teleconference; reviewing and providing guidance and technical comment on project documents at various stages of the project; as well as extending technical guidance in developing project documents, training manuals and other content. The PMU was hosted by PROBICOU.

The PMU worked in close collaboration with the National Steering Committee (NSC) on Child Labour. The Government of Uganda established this multi-stakeholder NSC with support from ILO/IPEC. The member stakeholders included the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Local Government, Association of Uganda Women Lawyers (FIDA), Africa Network for Protection and Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (ANPPCAN), Friends of Children Association (FOCA), Federation of Uganda Employers (FUE), National Organisation of Trade Unions (NOTU), Department of Sociology, Makerere University, and Ministry of Justice. The committee also had ex-officio members including National Council for Children, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), Department of Child Protection, Red Barnet, United Nations Educational Scientific Cultural Organization (UNESCO), German Technical Cooperation (GTZ), Save the Children Fund (UK), and Uganda Child Rights NGO Network (UCRNN). The NSC served as a coordinating mechanism alongside the PMU and took charge of overseeing project implementation. In addition, NSC specifically provided policy input and functional guidance and coordination of national stakeholders in support of the project’s goals.

UNDP served as the Executing Agency for the project given that UNDP works in partnership with United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) in executing SAICM QSP Projects in Uganda. The Global Environment Facility – Small Grants Program (GEF-SGP) Uganda contributed to execution of the project. UNDP managed the disbursement of funds as well as receiving and approving financial reports and disbursements. The project funds were disbursed through UNDP–Uganda as per the budgets and disbursement schedule of the approved projects by the NSC.

UNDP monitored project implementation and received periodic monitoring reports from the project manager as per UNDP reporting formats. These reports were also shared with the SAICM secretariat, UNEP and GEF.

D. Methodology

The consultant utilised a customised methodology and approach. The outline of the methodology primarily consisted of four distinct phases namely:
In general the approach was designed to include the following elements:

(i) Evaluation questions – either through face to face interviews or questionnaires;
(ii) Indicators – as provided for in the project description, however the consultant identified additional indicators as well;
(iii) Data collection and analysis – most of the data was collected from the reports and collaborated with independent information sources (both from literature and interviews). Analysis considered aspects such as effectiveness in meeting the project objectives, efficiency related to the cost of meeting the objectives, adequacy in relation to the resources availed, impact to create the desired change, sustainability to ensure that project benefits will continue after project closure;
(iv) Sampling – was undertaken to provide a representative data set as appropriate;
(v) Preliminary findings – which were presented for input and comments from the client and comments incorporated;
(vi) Limitations to the evaluation – were clearly articulated.

1. Evaluation questionnaires
The evaluation questionnaire developed and administered by the consultant is detailed in Annex 6 of this report. The questionnaire cannot in any way be regarded as exhaustive and was used mainly as a guidance tool – particularly during the interviews to assist the consultant.

2. Indicators
The following specific, measureable, achievable, relevant and time bound (SMART) indicators was built into questionnaires and formed the basis for evaluation of attainment of project objectives and outputs. Whilst the project document already detailed indicators, the consultant developed and used additional ones for the purpose of exhaustive evaluation.

Objective 1: To train workers, workers’ leaders, and government officers in the safety measures in the use of chemicals through courses, seminars and workshops.

Indicators
- The number of training courses/seminars/workshops held;
- The number of persons trained;
- The type and number of institutions involved;
- Number of government departments represented;
- Number of health professionals trained.

Objective 2: Develop a national inventory of dangerous chemicals, dangerous processes and endpoint discharges likely to affect working children in agriculture.

Indicators
- The number and list of enterprises surveyed;
- Number of copies of the inventory produced and distributed;
- Number of results dissemination meetings.

Objective 3: Institutionalise chemical safety education motivation and training programmes of the trade unions, employer's federation and government ministries.

Indicators
- The nature and number of draft policies developed;
- Number of draft bi-laws developed;
- Number of programs put in place by institutions;
- Number of draft legislations developed;
- Number and type of structures developed or adopted to address chemical safety issues in various institutions;
- The number of training and information, education & communication (IEC) materials developed by the institutions.

Objective 4: Raise awareness of workers, workers’ leaders, employers, communities and government officers on the safety measures in use of chemicals through courses, seminars and workshops.
- The number of awareness workshops conducted;
- The number of awareness raising seminars conducted;
- Number of participants;
- Number of radio and TV talk shows conducted;
- Number of IEC materials produced and distributed;
- Number of live callers on talk shows.

3. Methods of Data Collection and Data Analysis
The data collection process was initiated with desk documentation and literature review method. This included studying project materials such as the project description, work plan, general national chemicals management information, meeting documents, project reports, participant lists, developed public information and training materials, publications and other relevant reports. The consultant also conducted interviews with the Project Management Unit and other/relevant stakeholders in order to gather additional information on project implementation and activities undertaken.

The data collection methods used in the field interactions with project beneficiaries and stakeholders included:
(i) Face to face interviews;
(ii) Questionnaires;
(iii) Observation (during site/field visits) and
(iv) Focus group discussions.

In order to triangulate the data collected, findings from project reports were collaborated by independent information sources from other literature and interviews.

The criteria for analysis of data focused on the aspects comprising of the following:
- Effectiveness in meeting the project objectives;
- Efficiency related to the cost of meeting the objectives;
- Adequacy in relation to the resources availed;
- Impact to create the desired change, and
- Sustainability to ensure that project benefits will continue after project closure.

4. Sampling
Sampling was limited to the requirements as detailed in the Terms of Reference where for example the site/field visits had already been predetermined. As much as possible the consultant used varied data collection methods relying on random sampling and in some cases broad-based sampling. The chosen sample size for this project was not considered a critical factor given the nature of focused intervention designed in the project activities.

E. Limitations to the Evaluation
The results of this terminal evaluation are based on information availed to the consultant from the various stakeholders: PROBICOU; UNDP; UNDP/GEF; Trade Union leaders; Plantation Enterprises visited and a varied number of interviewees interacted with. The deductions made were therefore limited to timely information provided to the consultant within the 20 working day span of the consultancy. This therefore cannot be taken as an exhaustive in-depth evaluation of the project however it is a good representation on what the project has been able to achieve in line with the project deliverables. It is assumed that all project reporting documents shared with the consultant carried a true representation of activities completed.
II. Major Findings and Analysis

A. Desk/Literature Review and Questionnaires/Interviews

The results of the desk/literature review, questionnaire administration and interviews are presented here-under against each of the project objectives as a summary. Details are recorded in Annex 4 of this report.

Objective 1: To train workers, workers' leaders, and government officers in the safety measures in the use of chemicals through courses, seminars and workshops.

This was fully achieved. Many courses, seminars and workshops were held targeting the identified stakeholders (workers, their leaders and government officers).

Objective 2: Develop a national inventory of dangerous chemicals, dangerous processes and endpoint discharges likely to affect working children in agriculture.

A survey of plantation enterprises was undertaken and resulted in development of a national inventory of dangerous chemicals, dangerous processes and endpoint discharges. This document has been produced and disseminated. Factsheets drawing specific information from the inventory have also been produced and disseminated. The information from the survey and the inventory has been utilised by stakeholders to develop district profiles and national profiles on children involvement in the use of hazardous materials as well as inform policy. The data collected is now a basis for the development of a sound information base on toxic chemicals used in agriculture to be used to raise awareness countrywide.

Objective 3: Institutionalise chemical safety education motivation and training programmes of the trade unions, employer's federation and government ministries.

Numerous meetings were held with the entire different stakeholder – Trade Union members and leadership, Ministry officials (MGLSD, MoH, and MoE), the employer's federation (FUE) and district leaders. A number of trade unions (four) have developed training manuals for staff that incorporate chemical safety aspects now, other institutions have set up internal chemical safety management units and in districts such as Mbale, by laws have on chemical safety have been drafted and chemical safety issues mainstreamed on the planning and budgeting processes at the district level.

Objective 4: Raise awareness of workers, workers' leaders, employers, communities and government officers on the safety measures in use of chemicals through courses, seminars and workshops.

Numerous awareness raising activities were undertaken both at the national and lower levels (districts and regions). At the national level the policy makers were targeted while at the lower levels, the district leadership, workers leaders and workers, employers, government officers and workers/community were targeted through workshops and meetings.

Up to 100 policy makers in government as well as 280 district leaders and extension workers were targeted and trained in chemical safety aspects. Radio and TV talk shows as well as numerous IEC materials were developed and disseminated to reach various local communities.

Ten district farmer meetings were conducted in selected districts of Kanungu, Bushenyi, Fort portal, Masindi, Arua, Lira, Bukedea, Mbale, Jinja and Mukono. - The 10 one-day district farmer meetings raised awareness among farmers' leaders on safety issues on chemical use in agriculture. The technical competence of these leaders on chemicals used in agriculture was built and will be able to further educate other farmers.
B. Field Visits

(i) Fort Portal

The field visit was undertaken on the 14th and 15th December 2013 for purposes of providing validation. The consultant visited and interacted with the regional NUPAWU office representative Mr. Paddy Twesigomwe who oversees the numerous tea estates in western Uganda including Bushenyi and Kanungu. He indicated that NUPAWU and its membership have benefited greatly from the project by way of training of their staff and raising awareness with respect to chemical safety aspects in general. Staff he said, are now better equipped to act as trainer of trainers and transfer this knowledge down the chain to their membership.

NUPAWU was previously focusing on aspects related to production and quality, however there has now been a marked inclusion of chemicals safety aspects in their agenda. They indicated they have registered tremendous behavioural change in the way management of the tea estates now take an interest in their workers safety in respect to chemicals use and in provision of personal protective equipment (PPE) on a regular basis. The institutional setup with respect to chemical safety has also been improved as evidenced by the institution of chemicals health and safety committees within all the enterprises. These are comprised of representation from the workers and management.

Toro Kahuna tea estate was also visited. The consultant interacted with the estate manager Mr. Abel Insabimana. From him it was clear that as a result of the project, safety has now been considered as an important issue and that management had started paying close attention to and being involved in aspects related to chemical safety in the workplace. He attested to the fact that all their workers had been sensitized and now better appreciate safety aspects particularly those related to chemicals use. This was a paradigm shift compared to the previous status where staff and management alike used to take things for granted. At his estate, health and safety committees have been formed that meet once a month. He however pointed out a challenge related to the seasonal nature of the bulk of his workforce. These essentially come from other districts such as Kabale and as far as Rwanda. They come only during the harvest season for three months before they go back. A new wave that would be expected to be trained would then come the following season and so retention of a fully trained workforce was therefore difficult. He appealed to the NUPAWU to undertake regular and periodic training of these workers for continuity and sustainability.

Mr Insabimana also alluded to the fact that as a result of the sensitization and training derived from the project; the enterprise had moved a step further and was in the process of implementing related associated international standards organization (ISO) and ethical tea partnership (ETP) standards. This will be seen as a good outcome as sustainability of the entire process of health and safety covering not only chemicals but all other aspects will be institutionalised and supported by management. The estate manager indicated that now chemicals safety and safety in general is taken on-board during the budgeting process for the enterprise and as a result, any requisitions for safety related equipment are honoured immediately.

Previously within the enterprise, workers did not want to wear and use the limited PPE provided, however with the sensitization that was undertaken, this is no longer the case. The workers actually now demand for PPE – a very welcome behavioural change. Management at Toro Kahuna has also now started ensuring that dedicated chemical stores are provided in order to segregate offices from chemical storage. Furthermore, at the tea plantations clear signposts now indicate where chemical application should stop, leaving buffer/safety no application zones particularly near water sources and major pathways. Application of herbicides now is undertaken more carefully targeting only the weeds whereas previously, the entire plant used to be sprayed. The consultant was pleased to note that the PPE supplied to workers was changed routinely after approximately 6 months with the requirement to hand in the old PPE for proper disposal at the centre.
(ii) Mbale

This field visit was undertaken on 16th December 2013. The consultant interacted with Messers Abednego Watenga – the Mbale District Community Development Officer and Mackay Nangusya Stephen a retired Senior Community Development Officer and District Labour Officer. These two gentlemen acted as focal point persons and brought onboard their mobilising and outreach capabilities linking PROBICOU to Mbale district local government. Important to note that Mbale had been implementing an ILO IPEC project on child labour and these gentlemen were at the centre of coordinating this project that targeted the same kind of stakeholders as the PROBICOU project essentially providing for an already existing network and in some cases initial working structure.

During the course of the interview, it emerged that 60,000 children in Mbale and associated districts (Sironko; Bududa; Bulambuli; Manafa and Bukedea) are involved in child labour and of these approximately 4,000 are directly involved in aggravated/hazardous labour involving use of hazardous chemicals in agriculture. With the intervention of PROBICOU, the district focal point persons were able to undertaken massive chemical safety sensitization of numerous stakeholders that included district leaders down to the sub-county and village level. They started by targeting the very top – political leaders, senior district technical officials before cascading down to the officer levels particularly officers in the district production units/departments; health departments; natural resource departments, education departments and eventually down to the sub county and village levels. The sensitization was also gender sensitive and targeted specific women organizations such as CRO; Uganda Women’s Effort to Save Orphans (UWESO) and the Uganda Women Concern Ministry (UWCM). Apart from sensitization, a number of stakeholder meetings were held to discuss mainstreaming chemical safety issues.

Successes recorded in Mbale district following project intervention could be summarized to include the following:

a) Buy-in from the political leadership (District Chairpersons);

b) Buy-in from the technical leadership (CAO etc);

c) Increased awareness of all stakeholders from the top to the bottom levels leading to attitude and behavioural change;

d) Setting up of structures such as district coordination committees drawing representation from the agricultural, health, environment, administration, women civil society sectors responsible for promotion of chemical safety issues at the district level. From this set-up each of the six districts (Mbale; Sironko; Bududa; Bulambuli, Manafa and Bukedea) selected a representative to what was named the Mbale Regional District Chemicals Use and Management Committee whose main goal was to take the chemical safety agenda further by ensuring that chemical safety aspects are mainstreamed in the district work plans and budgeted for. Other duties of this committee included monitoring activities engaged in chemical use, development of IEC materials and their translation into local language, awareness raising via TV shows, radio talk shows and field visits, development of appropriate legislation (by-laws);

e) Mainstreaming chemical safety issues in the district planning and budgetary process;

f) Development of a draft by-law and ordinance that incorporates aspects of safe chemical use – this is currently being reviewed by the office of the Attorney General as part of the approval process; and

g) Agreement that each of the six districts come up with a specific bylaw or ordinance at the sub county level on safe chemical use. This by-law/ordinance to also address other aspects of a chemicals lifecycle such as importers, sellers, users and environmentally safe disposal.

In summary it was clear that the capacity of the district staff to handle chemical safety issues at the district and lower levels (to the village) had improved greatly as a result of project intervention clearly manifested by the development of appropriate structures, an understanding of chemical issues from the leadership to
the village level and more importantly the mainstreaming of chemical safety issues in district planning and budgeting. The on-going development of a by-law/ordinance by Mbale district is testimony that a little support can go a long way to changing attitudes and perceptions. This momentum and enthusiasm should quickly be harnessed and Mbale can be used as a successful model for replication country-wide.

Current challenges in Mbale district were also discussed and include:

- Finances to continue with the sensitization and monitoring since districts do not raise enough revenue;
- Few technical officials at the district level as a result of point above and the lack of decentralisation of certain functions;
- A business community that is only interested in the bottom line – profit - at the expense of consumer health and safety.

The wish list for Mbale to move the chemicals agenda forward was also shared as detailed below:

- Increased human resource, sub-county agricultural officers who have been trained in chemical safety and management would go a long way;
- Facilitating the existing structures to work (facilitation) since these structures will die if follow-up is not undertaken while the will and zeal is still high;
- Continue with the community awareness raising programs especially at lower levels (Sub county);
- Support to districts to develop by-laws and ordinances specific to promoting safe chemical use/management;
- Pursue an advocacy strategy at district level to recruit more District Community Development Officers for the sub-county levels;
- Development of a district and eventually countrywide chemical information system.

(iii) Mukono

The field visit to Mukono (Lugazi) was undertaken on 17th December 2013. The consultant interacted with the following: Mr. Joram Bruno Pajobo - General Secretary NUPAWU; Mr. Bruno Musinguzi – General Treasurer NUPAWU Head Office Lugazi; Mr. Kefa Wandera – Administrative Officer NUPAWU; Mr. Francis Mukama –Assistant Branch Secretary/OSH expert; Mr Taaka Wandera –Branch Secretary Lugazi Sugar Corporation of Uganda Lugazi/Occupational Safety and Health (SCOUL/OSH) expert.

All the above mentioned persons are practical people who interact with the workers on a day to day basis, particularly workers who handle and use chemicals in their day to day activities. All confirmed that due to the PROBICOU project, they had been trained and made more aware of the dangers related to handling of hazardous chemicals and how to go about use of such chemicals safely. They indicated that it was their wish that many more staff, particularly the lower cadres be exposed to the same level of sensitization and training for effect and sustainability. There was a clear appreciation of what had been gained from the PROBICOU project.

They indicated that with the drive to obtain more production, chemical use is on the rise. Emphasis has now shifted to the use of PPE and NUPAWU has prevailed upon the plantation management to provide PPE to workers.

As a result of project intervention, NUPAWU and or plantation management had now:

- Introduced chemical safety aspects in their training curriculum;
- NUPAWU was able to urge management of plantations to seek alternative chemicals that were still effective but not as toxic;
- Incorporated chemical safety aspects in the collaborative bargaining agreements that they have signed with all plantation companies;
- Have forced management to translate chemical safety information into local languages;
- Management of lugazi (SCOUL) have now recruited two staff dedicated to health and safety (H&S) issues with a special focus on chemical safety and safe use. Both these staff have been trained on the job as a result of the PROBICOU project;
- Formation of Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) committees amongst the workers so that they are involved in these aspects;
- Plantation management now budgets for chemicals safety activities and inputs and have gone ahead to recruit/designate chemical safety (H&S) officers, training officers, environment officers etc which was not the case before project intervention;
- Started writing agreements in favour of H&S worker aspects;
- Plantation management now provides PPE to workers on a regular basis (once a year) and also trains the workers on proper use of PPE;
- Obtained a general awareness transcending the chemical safety aspects and had now spilled over to environmental protection aspects (such as foul odours/emissions; effluent treatment; fly ash dust management etc) and other areas of concern that are being addressed;
- Consideration is now given to procurement of other alternative chemicals that are less hazardous e.g. use of methyl bromide has been stopped in favour of other less hazardous alternative chemicals;
- There is extensive and proper labelling now of hazards related to various activities and products;
- The plantation has now acquired ISO certification in the Quality and Environment management areas as a result of the PROBICOU sensitization;
- Proper management and disposal of used empty chemical containers which had previously been used by workers themselves for water collection and storage for consumption;
- NUPAWU has lobbied government thru Parliament to waive tax on PPE imported items.

Challenges faced by NUPAWU Lugazi and SCOUL plantation enterprise:
- Lack of monitoring capability to translate the information got during sensitization and training to practical aspects on the ground. There is a need for capability to be built to be able to take samples of the environment; food products; etc to ascertain levels of chemical residue levels from various activities and emissions such as chemical/fertilizer application, incineration of hospital and other wastes;
- Given the high rate of turnover amongst plantation workers, there is need to undertake continuous sensitization and training on a regular basis;
- Disposal of obsolete chemicals still a big concern.

From the interaction, it was clear that there is a lot of enthusiasm for chemical safety issues and this situation best be taken advantage of while it lasts to take chemical safety issues higher on the agenda.

C. **Summary Matrix of Findings, Supporting Evidences &Recommendations**
A summary of the findings of the consultant is provided in Annex 4 (Findings Matrix/ Evaluation Assessment) of this report.

III. **Outcomes, Impact and Sustainability**
As a result of training workers, workers' leaders, and government officers (in safety measures associated with use of chemicals) through courses, seminars and workshops the project has been able to mobilise participation, capability and support in the implementation of activities that involve chemicals use in general. The project has been able to promote awareness about local, regional and global issues concerning children, work and hazardous chemicals in general. This is rated as Satisfactory in achievement.

Following the undertaking of a national survey and collection of data that resulted in the development of a national inventory of dangerous chemicals, dangerous processes and endpoint discharges likely to affect working children in agriculture, the project has been able to realize the following:

i. Development of a sound information base on chemicals by collecting, storing, processing and disseminating information on toxic chemicals in agriculture especially their transportation, storage and application;
ii. Development of district and national profiles on children involvement in the use of hazardous materials;
iii. Continuous and periodic evaluation of all aspects of engagement of children in the use of hazardous chemicals that can be used for the production of regular profiles in future.

By institutionalising chemical safety education motivation and training programmes at the trade unions, employers’ federation and government ministries, the project has provided the basis and foundation for the following:

i. The set up to provide for a coordination mechanism to enable all the stakeholders to effectively participate in elimination of exposure of children to chemical hazards;

ii. Promotion of the ratification of appropriate and relevant regional and international conventions and protocols and promotion of enactment of relevant domestic legislation to implement the said conventions;

iii. Increased communication and collaboration capabilities with counterparts in other countries in the region through existing sub region and regional networks or working groups on issues of common interests;

In raising awareness (through courses, seminars and workshops) of workers, workers’ leaders, employers, communities and government officers on safety measures in use of chemicals the project has resulted in:

i. Increased awareness about national, regional and global issues concerning children, work and hazardous chemicals amongst key stakeholders and the public in general;

ii. Mobilising of communities, workers, employers and the general public, through awareness campaigns, to remove children from handling dangerous chemicals and creating the necessary awareness and respect for such chemicals as was confirmed during interaction with the various enterprise plantation facility managers and Trade Union coordinators and leaders interacted with.

Clearly the project had an appreciable impact in the limited geographic area of its focus. On the ground, the levels of enthusiasm for further training, awareness raising and interaction was clearly high both from the top level officials to the plantation worker cadre. As already detailed above, numerous successes were recorded in Mable district where political and technical buy-in was apparent. Sustainability is certain as the district leadership has mainstreamed chemicals safety issues into their district planning and budgeting process, complete with the adoption of appropriate structures to deliver down to the grass roots. As is the case with all other aspects, the continued success will depend on availability of continued financing and deployment of an appropriately trained workforce. This model can be used to showcase success for development in the rest of the districts in Uganda.

Further in respect of sustainability, during the development of the project PROBICOU interfaced with stakeholders including government, UNDP and UNEP where PROBICOU was selected as the representative of NGOs in NEMA the focal point for SAICM. PROBICOU’s inclusion in the National Steering Committee is part of sustainability and will continue to see its involvement in chemical management issues in Uganda.

PROBICOU received support initially due to support letters from Trade Unions and since then, their interaction with the Trade Unions has increased. PROBICOU now has more leeway to discuss with trade unions when developing projects and whenever there is a chemicals issue PROBICOU is called upon. A newspaper has asked PROBICOU for weekly articles on the environment. PROBICOU has also participated in international meetings in Nairobi and Brazil for IPEN-international POPs elimination network and presented its preliminary findings on this project. This elevated their work on chemicals. Finally, structures have been put in place at the district level (e.g. in Mbale) and will continue with or without funding at district level. Also collective bargaining agreements between employers and workers addressing chemical safety issues have been developed and will continue to be respected and this all reflects aspects of a sustainable impact.
IV. Lessons Learned and Best Practices

Participation of key stakeholders throughout the process was critical including the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MGLSD), Ministry of Health (MoH), Ministry of Education (MoE), Ministry of Finance (MoF), Ministry of Local Government, Association of Uganda Women Lawyers (FIDA), Africa Network for Protection and Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (ANPPCAN), Friends of Children Association (FOCA), Federation of Uganda Employers (FUE), National Organisation of Trade Unions (NOTU), Department of Sociology, Makerere University, and Ministry of Justice. This allowed for all available information to be collected, and ensured broad political support for the project.

In regard to best practices and indeed principles these can be borrowed from SAICMs guidance in respect of sound management of chemicals and built into subsequent interventions - be they legislative (including by-law and ordinance development at the sub county level or national regulations) and/or guidelines. Amongst the main principles for consideration at a policy level are:

- **Prevention**: chemicals should be managed before their negative impacts on health and the environment are observed for more efficiency and cost-effectiveness;
- **Precaution**: Where there are threats of serious or irreversible health and/or environmental damage, cost-effective measures should be used even if some cause-and-effect relationships are not fully established scientifically;
- **Polluter-pays**: The polluter to bear the costs of pollution prevention and control measures;
- **Right-to-know**: Citizens and workers should have the right to know the chemicals to which they may be exposed during their daily life and the related risks for health and the environment;
- **Knowledge-based management**: chemicals management decisions should be based on the most up-to-date available scientific understanding of chemicals properties, hazards and risks, communicated effectively through appropriate media, i.e. labels, safety data sheets, etc.;
- **Transparency**: Public authorities should make rules and measures publicly available; and
- **Sanctions**.

Continuing with lessons learned, it clearly emerged that the capacity of farmers’ leaders to implement chemical safety programs is still lacking. There is also limited coordination between farmer groups and district technical departments. There is a need to ensure increased coordination at the district level for better chemical management. The farmers’ leaders, local council leaders, and district technical departments such as Agriculture, national agricultural advisory services (NAADS) require to work closely.

The capacity of District local governments to implement chemical safety programs is still lacking. There is still less attention on chemical safety issues at district local government level with related interventions still mixed under different departments such as – Agriculture, probation office, Community Development Office, District Labour office. These offices lack defined segregation of duties and roles towards chemical safety. The awareness raising tools are still limited to one section of society-the literate, yet these constitute a less percentage of the people involved in rural agriculture. This limits information flow and is identified as an area of possible future intervention.

The interactive Radio and TV Talk shows demonstrated the need for continued involvement of the media in dissemination of chemical safety issues

There is still limited coordination between civil society and government departments working on chemicals management this calls for increased coordination and stakeholder collaboration both at district and national level.

Involvement of government representatives, line departments and authorities in talk shows promotes public trust in the information dissemination. Such TV talk shows should be more involving and the coverage should be increased to cater for more local languages and regions.
The National Steering Committee on child labour which had the oversight function for the project has limited resources to enable it sit on a routine basis. It therefore had no fixed schedule for meetings, in line with the overall project Work plan. This made it hard for the Project Management Unit to secure timely advice, approvals and technical input. In order to solve this, the project was forced to form a smaller sub-committee from the bigger National Steering committee which acted as the Project Board. This subcommittee that was composed of representatives from the donor/service provider, government, beneficiaries/users, and Implementing Partner was thus able to meet timely and guide the implementation of the project. This committee always reported to the Bigger National Steering Committee. Subsequent projects should ensure that such large steering committees have the means and will to meet as frequently as the project processes require.

V. Recommendations

1. Whilst legislation and some by laws to address chemical safety have been developed these have largely remained on paper. There is need for their implementation to be operationalized through the development of appropriate regulations, standards and guidelines. This can be coupled with a project on translation of relevant regulations and guidelines on safe chemical use into local languages. The current awareness raising tools are still limited to one section of the community – the literate yet they constitute a small percentage of people involved in rural agriculture (including children). The current status limits information flow and is identified as an area for possible future intervention.

2. Consideration can be given to a project to strengthen the capacity of farmers’ leader’s to implement chemical safety programs. This evaluation highlighted limited coordination between farmer groups and district technical departments. A project to ensure and strengthen coordination at district level for better chemical management is recommended. It would target farmers’ leaders, local council leaders and district technical departments such as National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) etc.

3. There must be developed a very clear delineation of obligations and responsibilities of key stakeholders affected by chemicals management. Clear responsibilities should be allocated to public and private sectors stakeholders, taking into account respective mandates, capacities and resources. Many countries have transferred the main responsibilities for safe management of chemicals to companies and enterprises. It is too early for Uganda. At least, producers and importers should have the responsibility to generate and provide information on chemicals properties, hazards, risks and safety measures throughout the supply chain. The need for all stakeholders to build the required capacities for sound management of chemicals has to be addressed. Education and training is crucial – especially for small and medium enterprises (SMEs), but taking into account the allocation of responsibilities between the public and private sectors. This should be clearly elaborated in the current National Environment Act review process currently being spearheaded by NEMA.

4. Following on from the development of a national inventory of dangerous chemicals, dangerous processes and endpoint discharges likely to affect working children in agriculture, it is recommended that this be built upon to create a national Chemical Use Database Clearinghouse which will document where all chemicals are made, where and how they are being used, and include all available safety data as well as identify the chemical constituents of consumer products. This could be a project in itself and its legal requirement could be included in the NEA review process being spearheaded by NEMA as indicated above. Given its broad nature, initial development could be limited to agrochemicals used in plantation agriculture.

5. There is need to require Safer Technology and Alternatives in order to eliminate hazardous chemicals use and emissions by altering processes, substituting safer chemicals, redesigning products and systems, and rewarding innovation. A project along these lines focusing on chemicals used in plantation agriculture is recommended.
6. More non-formal education and training on a wider scale targeting not only plantation workers but all workers who use or handle chemicals nationwide should be implemented while the interest and enthusiasm is still high. A follow-up nationwide project would be recommended ensuring that different approaches can be used for extensive education and training programmes. The success of the Mbale model could be used and replicated nationwide.

VI. Conclusions

The 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) defined that by 2020 chemicals are used and produced in ways that lead to the minimization of significant adverse effects on human health and the environment. Over the past decades, significant progress has been made in chemicals management. Key instruments & processes have been established to address major chemicals management concerns. But these efforts have not been sufficient to protect the environment and health of the populations.

Of particular significance in this regard is the fact that recent trends show changing patterns of global chemicals production and trade, with a progressive shift of portions of chemicals production and markets from Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries to developing countries (DCs) and countries with economies in transition (CEiTs). By 2020, according to research by the OECD, DCs and CEiTs are expected to account for about a third of global chemicals production and consumption. The paradox is that while they are attracting greater production and importing increasing quantities of chemicals, chemical products and consumer goods containing chemical substances, DCs and CEiTs generally lack the technical and financial capacity to manage chemicals soundly.

Acknowledging the need for faster progress in chemicals management, countries participating in the 2006 1st International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM1) that established the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) stated that “fundamental changes are needed in the way that societies manage chemicals ” (Dubai Declaration on International Chemicals Management, para. 7).

SAICM therefore calls for strengthened focus on improved cross-sectoral governance for the development of coherent preventive approaches for managing chemicals throughout their life-cycle at the international, regional, national and local levels.

Crucial for ensuring sound chemicals management are the need for funding at a national level and international funding, bolstering private sector financial and technical participation in meeting the costs of full implementation and enforcement of national chemicals-related laws. Economic instruments – most particularly administrative cost recovery mechanisms are recognized as one set of policy mechanisms that can be utilised in financing chemicals management.

It cannot be emphasised enough that strengthened inter-sectoral collaboration amongst the broad spectrum of national institutions that regulate chemicals both at the centre and at the district level is required for coherent risk reduction strategies to emerge. As well, improved demonstration of economic costs of chemicals mismanagement is required to convince finance policy and decision-makers to invest in sound management of chemical’s (SMC) at all levels. Finally, the development of comprehensive proposals, including realistic budgeting considerations, is required for being able to actually mobilize finance within the budget allocation process for the mainstreamed priorities.

This project has demonstrated that with careful planning and efficient delivery success can be registered with respect to safe use of chemicals not only with respect to children in agricultural settings but also in the broader area of sound management of chemicals. Buy in from the political and technical leadership is essential for sustainability purposes as this will guarantee the mainstreaming of the chemical agenda during planning and budgeting processes at all levels.
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BACKGROUND

The Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM), adopted by the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM) on 6 February 2006 in Dubai, is a policy framework for international action on chemical hazards.

SAICM was developed by a multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral Preparatory Committee and supports the achievement of the goal agreed at the 2002 Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development of ensuring that, by the year 2020, chemicals are produced and used in ways that minimize significant adverse impacts on the environment and human health.

With financial support from the QSP/SAICM, PROBICOU has been implementing a 24 Months project with an aim of contributing to the goal of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM). The project titled “Promoting Chemical Safety for Children at Work in Rural Agricultural Communities” is an effort to put in place a minimal programme to prevent ill health arising from pesticides with particular focus on children at work in agricultural setting. The project has been focusing on: developing an up-to-date information on chemicals in agriculture, their uses, the dangerous processes and end point discharges; developing manpower among the workers, employers and the general public for the dissemination of safety measures in use of toxic chemicals; and building a comprehensive public awareness and education on the alternatives to toxic chemicals and careful use when it is necessary to use them.

Specifically, the project intended to:
(i) To train workers, workers’ leaders, government officers and communities in the safety measures in the use of chemicals through courses, seminars and workshops.
(ii) Develop a national inventory of dangerous chemicals dangerous processes and endpoint discharges likely to affect working children in agriculture.
(iii) Institutionalise chemical safety education motivation and training programmes of the trade unions, employer’s federation and government ministries.
(iv) Raise awareness of workers, workers’ leaders, employers and government officers on the safety measures in use of chemicals through courses, seminars and workshops.

The project was implemented by Pro-biodiversity Conservationists in Uganda (PROBICOU) and executed by United Nations Development Program. Other collaborating partners Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (Occupational Safety and Health Department), UNDP/GEF Small Grants Programme-Uganda, National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), Department of Crop Protection Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries, Rural Development Media Communications (RUDMEC), National Organization of Trade Unions (NOTU), National Union of Plantation and Agricultural Workers (NUPAWU), The Federation of Uganda Employers (FUE) and COFTU.

SCOPE OF WORK AND DELIVERABLES

Scope of Work
For this purpose, Pro-biodiversity Conservationists in Uganda 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.

The consultant will:
a) Study the project background materials, including the project description, work plan.
b) Study the general national chemicals management information.
c) Monitor 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 monitoring and evaluation report(s), using the guidelines and suggested format as shall be advised by UNDP and SAICM secretariat.
e) Draft evaluation report(s) using all previously obtained information and documents in relation of the project and by filling the specific templates provided by the UNDP and SAICM secretariat.
f) Timely submission of the final terminal evaluation report to UNDP on the agreed dates, after upon completion of all project activities.
g) Provide additional information or correction on the report(s) after submission.

Expected Outputs and Deliverables

I. The consultant is expected to follow progress, activities and outcomes of the project based on documentation and information provided by the Pro-biodiversity Conservationists in Uganda), stakeholders or other relevant actors involved in chemicals management activities.

II. A Terminal/ Final Evaluation report at the end of the contract.

<table>
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</tr>
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<tr>
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<td>Team Leaders E&amp;E and MSU; Project Technical Focal Point; UNEP Project Focal Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of draft terminal evaluation report</td>
<td>10 working days from signing of contract</td>
<td>November 21, 2013</td>
<td>Team Leaders E&amp;E and MSU; Project Technical Focal Point; UNEP Project Focal Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final draft terminal evaluation report</td>
<td>From 15 to 20 working days from signing of contract</td>
<td>November 28, 2013</td>
<td>Team Leaders E&amp;E and MSU; Project Technical Focal Point; UNEP Project Focal Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WORKING ARRANGEMENTS

Institutional Arrangement

(a) The consultant is expected to work in an interactive fashion with the Energy and Environment Unit of UNDP, the project Management Unit at PROBICOU, and Department of occupation Safety and Health (Ministry of Gender Labour and Social Development) in the in the process of his assignment.

(b) PROBICOU will ensure 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;

(c) The consultant cannot release nor communicate to anyone any unpublished information made known to them in the conduct of the activity without consent of PROBICOU.

(d) The consultant shall report to UNDP with a copy to PROBICOU.

Duration of the Work

It is expected that the assignment will be completed within one month (20 working days spread between November 1 2013 to November 28 2013, starting from the official date of the contract).
All expected outputs should be submitted to UNDP according to the agreed plan/schedule of activities. Remember to provide of between 3 to 5 days for UNDP, PROBICOU and other partners to review outputs, give comments and certify approvals. The consultant should immediately inform UNDP in writing in case of delay for completion of the work.

**Duty Station**
The Consultant will be based in Kampala with visits to Mukono and Fort Portal Districts. Transport will be provided for official travels in and outside Kampala.

### REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

**Academic Qualifications:**
- Postgraduate degree in chemistry/environment/agriculture/environmental health/public health, biological sciences is an added advantage,
- The consultant should have general knowledge of the national chemicals situation or should have access to such information when available.

To facilitate the evaluation, the curriculum vitae of the Consultant should highlight the following areas.
- Educational attainment;
- Relevant trainings;
- Relevant experience Monitoring and Evaluation

**Experience:**
- The Consultant should have a minimum working experience of at least 7 years
- The consultant should have relevant experience and expertise in project Evaluation, in particular in the field of chemicals.
- The Consultant must be familiar with the various provisions of the Stockholm Convention on POPs, Basel Convention, Montreal Protocol, and Rotterdam Convention.
- The consultant 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.

**Competencies:**
- Demonstrated Analytical skills;
- Communication abilities and;
- Teamwork is added responsibilities.

**Special skills requirements**
- Official language is English

### PRICE PROPOSAL AND SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

The consultant shall obtain a lump sum amount which will be “all-inclusive”. The corresponding percentages of the contract price will be paid per milestone as follows:
- 30% down payment upon signing of the Contract and submission of a satisfactory inception report;
- 40% upon submission and acceptance of the Interim Report; and
- upon submission of and acceptance of the Final Report (30% will be paid after submission and acceptance of both the interim and final reports)

**Notes:**
- The term “All inclusive” implies that all costs (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances, communications, consumables, etc.) that could possibly be incurred by the Contractor are already factored into the final amounts submitted in the proposal.
- Individuals on IC are not UN staff and are therefore not entitled to DSAs. All living allowances required to perform the demands of the TOR must be incorporated in the financial proposal, whether the fees are expressed as daily fees or lump sum amount.

### EVALUATION METHOD AND CRITERIA

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the following methodology:

1. **Cumulative analysis**
   The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:
   a) responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
   b) Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation. Example 70%-30%.
Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70% of the total technical points) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation

### Technical Criteria – Maximum 70 points
- **Criteria A. Relevance of Education** – 5 points
- **Criteria B. Special skills, Language, etc.** – 5 Points
- **Criteria C. Relevance of experience** – 30 points
- **Criteria D. Description of approach/methodology to assignment.** – 30 Points

**DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS**
Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications in one single PDF document:

a) Duly accomplished **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided by UNDP (Annex II).
b) **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.

c) **Technical proposal:**
   a. Brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment
   b. A methodology, on how they will approach and complete the assignment.

d) **Financial proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template provided (Annex II)
e) **Interested applicants should send an email to** Justine.naiga-bagonza@undp.org **and copy** Diana.nabbanja@undp.org **in case of more information regarding this requirement. This should be done before the deadline.**

**ANNEXES** (to be downloaded from UNDP Uganda Website, procurement notices section: [www.undp.or.ug](http://www.undp.or.ug)):
- ANNEX I - Individual Contractor General Terms and Conditions
- Annex II – Offeror’s Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability for the Individual Contractor Assignment
## Annex 2: Key documents that were reviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document/Report reviewed</th>
<th>Document date</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training workshop for project staff on Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>22/11/2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Launch of Project</td>
<td>14/12/2011</td>
<td>Grand Imperial hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of Trade Union leaders</td>
<td>9-10/12/2011</td>
<td>Ntinda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project planning with partners</td>
<td>18/11/2011</td>
<td>Grand Imperial hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training workshop staff of MGLSD</td>
<td>12/03/2012</td>
<td>Grand Imperial hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training workshop government extension workers</td>
<td>19-22/12/2011</td>
<td>Nile Hotel Jinja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training workshop staff of MGLSD</td>
<td>15/03/2012</td>
<td>Grand Imperial hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of Trade Union leaders</td>
<td>15-18/12/2011</td>
<td>Nile Hotel Jinja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training workshop for enterprise plantation workers</td>
<td>16-17/03/2012</td>
<td>Mukono resort hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training workshop for enterprise plantation workers</td>
<td>19-20/03/2012</td>
<td>Mukono resort hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training workshop for MoH officers</td>
<td>23-24/03/2012</td>
<td>Brisk hotel, Jinja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training workshop for enterprise plantation workers</td>
<td>25-26/03/2012</td>
<td>Brisk hotel, Jinja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training workshop for enterprise plantation workers</td>
<td>27-28/03/2012</td>
<td>Mukono resort hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training workshop for trainers</td>
<td>21-22/05/2012</td>
<td>Ministers Village hotel, Kampala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training workshop for enterprise plantation workers</td>
<td>19-20/05/2012</td>
<td>Kopling Hotel, Masindi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training workshop for enterprise plantation workers</td>
<td>17-18/03/2012</td>
<td>Kalya Resort, Fort Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training workshop for trainers</td>
<td>24-25/05/2012</td>
<td>Ministers Village hotel, Kampala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting to review training manuals help</td>
<td>31/05/2012</td>
<td>Mukono Resort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training workshop for district leaders</td>
<td>21/06/2012</td>
<td>Shine on Hotel, Mbale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional meeting for agricultural and trade union workers</td>
<td>06/07/2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripartite awareness raising workshop</td>
<td>06/09/2012</td>
<td>Fairway Hotel, Kampala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District farmer meeting report</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District farmer meeting report</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District farmer meeting report</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District farmer meeting report</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bukedea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District farmer meeting report</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mbale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District farmer meeting report</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kanungu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District farmer meeting report</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bushenyi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District farmer meeting report</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fort Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five departmental meetings with NOTU; COFTU; FUE; NUPAWU and UNTU to establish chemical liaison units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for a Model Village</td>
<td>7-8/12/2012</td>
<td>Kalya Courts Fort Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National awareness raising workshop on pesticide safety for civil society representatives</td>
<td>8/12/2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 3: Work/Activity Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Activity (Work)</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Contract signing, preparation and submission of inception report | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | i) Signed Contract  
ii) Acceptable inception report  
iii) 1st Payment to Consultant |
| Monitor/Review the project activities and outcomes       | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | i) Draft terminal evaluation report |
| Consultations interviews & questionnaires                | 1 2 3 4 5 | Stakeholder comments incorporated into draft report |
| Data analysis & drafting 1st draft evaluation report     | 1 2 3 4 5 | Draft terminal evaluation report  
2nd payment to Consultant |
| Technical Review of Draft Terminal Report                | 1 2 3 4 5 | i) Review comments, amended draft report and additional input |
| Preparation of final terminal report                     | 1 2 3 4 5 | Final Terminal Report incorporating all amendments and comments |
| Submission of Final Terminal Report                      | 1 2 3 4 5 | i) Acceptable Final Terminal Report  
ii) 3rd and final payment to Consultant |

During the activity of undertaking interviews and consultations, the consultant intends to travel to out-of-Kampala stations (up-country) as indicated below:

1. Travel to Fort Portal on 14th December 2013, return on 15th December 2013
2. Travel to Mbale on 16th December, return on 17th December 2013
3. Travel to Mukono on 17th December 2013, return same day
**Annex 4: Findings Matrix/ Evaluation Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1:</strong> To train workers, workers’ leaders, and government officers in the safety measures in the use of chemicals through courses, seminars and workshops.</td>
<td>5,600 members of Trade Unions, Employers and Government officials on safety issues trained as follows;</td>
<td>1. Mobilise participation, capability and support in the implementation of activities</td>
<td>• The number of training seminars held;</td>
<td>• Two training courses for trade union leaders (Training of trainers) undertaken. A total of 120 representatives from educational departments of trade unions were trained and contributed to development of a training manual on chemical safety issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Conduct Training of Trainers at national level</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Promote awareness about regional and global issues concerning children, work and hazardous chemicals</td>
<td>• The number of persons trained.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trade union leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Competence in chemical safety increased in trade union leadership</td>
<td>• The type and number of institutions involved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Government extension workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Competence built in MoH to address chemical safety</td>
<td>• Number of government departments represented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enterprise extension workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Review of labour inspection guidelines to incorporate chemical safety issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Officers from ministry of gender Labour and social development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
also there have been a few bylaws and guidelines on the safe use of chemicals developed.

- Two courses for MGLSD 12 & 15 March 2011. Resulted in the harmonization of priorities and input to the development of chemical safety programs at the Ministry as well as contribution to formulation of the national action plan on child labour in Uganda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 2: Develop a national inventory of dangerous chemicals, dangerous processes and endpoint discharges likely to affect working children in agriculture.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Carry out a survey of enterprise/plantation at national and district levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Workers organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- National survey carried out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Problem areas identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Data collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- An inventory produced and distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conduct training courses for health delivery service providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Doctors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Nurses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Medical officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Training courses for health professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of health professionals trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Training courses for health professionals</td>
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<tr>
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</table>
### Objective 3: Institutionalise chemical safety education motivation and training programmes of the trade unions, employer's federation and government ministries

1. Integrate chemical safety education into institutions/education departments through educators, and motivators trained under Objective 1 above

   - Enterprise/plantation information availed to NOTU
   - Chemical safety education incorporated into the training program of Federation of Uganda Employers and NOTU
   - Chemical safety liaison units established in lead agencies through meetings as detailed above.
   - Existing chemical safety education and occupational safety information expanded

   i. Set up of a coordination mechanism to enable all the stakeholders to effectively participate in elimination of exposure of children to chemical hazards;
   
   ii. Promotion of the ratification of appropriate and relevant regional and international conventions and protocols and promote the enactment of domestic legislation to implement the said conventions

   - The Nature and number of new policies drafted
   - Number of bi-laws drafted
   - Number of programs put in place by institutions
   - Number of legislations drafted for revision
   - Number of training and IEC materials developed by the institutions

   - Information availed to NOTU (inventory data)
   - Chemical safety information incorporated into FUE & NOTU training curricula & existing chemical safety education and occupational safety information updated and expanded
   - Evidence of establishment of chemical liaison units established in MGLSD; NEMA; NUPAWU; various plantation enterprises and Mbale local government
### Objective 4: Raise awareness of workers, workers' leaders, employers, communities and government officers on the safety measures in use of chemicals through courses, seminars and workshops.

| 1. Conduct awareness raising seminars and workshops | One national tripartite awareness workshop on pesticide safety for policy makers and government officers. |
| | 1 National awareness raising workshop for trade union officials and Federation of Uganda Employers (FUE); |
| | 4. Regional awareness meetings for district officials and extension workers. |
| | 4 Regional awareness raising meetings for farmers' representatives, through National Farmers federation. |
| i. Raised awareness of 100 policy makers and government officers on safety issues related to chemical use in agriculture |
| ii. Raised awareness of 280 district leaders & extension staff on chemical safety issues. Also built their technical capacity to incorporate chemical safety issues in the district planning process at local government level |
| iii. Built technical capacity of the above mentioned officers to be able to incorporate chemical safety issues in policy and planning |
| iii. Increased communication and collaboration with counterparts in other countries in the region through existing sub region and regional networks or working groups on issues of common interests; |

- The number of awareness workshops conducted.
- The number of awareness raising seminars/workshops conducted.
- Number of participants

- One national tripartite awareness workshop held 6/09/12
- Two national awareness raising workshop for trade union officials and FUE held 9-10 Dec & 15-18 Dec
- One stakeholder meeting on pesticides safety held attended by representatives from government, & representatives of civil society
- Conducted 4 regional awareness meetings for district officials and extension workers in western, central, northern & eastern Uganda
- One training workshop for government extension workers 19-22 Dec 2011
- Ten district farmer meetings for Masindi; Jinja; Mukono; Arua; Lira; Bukelea; Mbale; Kanungu;
### iv. Raised awareness among farmers leaders and built their technical capacity to address issues of chemical safety in agriculture

- Increased awareness about regional and global issues concerning children, work and hazardous chemicals

### vi. Mobilising the communities, workers, employers and the general public, through awareness campaigns, to remove children from handling dangerous chemicals and create the necessary awareness and respect for such chemicals;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conducting information, education and communication (IEC), activities</th>
<th>iv. Raised awareness among farmers leaders and built their technical capacity to address issues of chemical safety in agriculture</th>
<th>v. Increased awareness about regional and global issues concerning children, work and hazardous chemicals</th>
<th>vi. Mobilising the communities, workers, employers and the general public, through awareness campaigns, to remove children from handling dangerous chemicals and create the necessary awareness and respect for such chemicals;</th>
<th>Bushenyi and Fort Portal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Community</td>
<td>• Number of IEC materials produced and distributed</td>
<td>• Number of radio talk shows conducted,</td>
<td>• One radio talk show conducted</td>
<td>• Two training workshops of trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of live callers on talk shows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extension workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Business men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Industrialists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2 press releases produced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 radio talk shows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 TV talk shows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,000 posters produced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000, magazines produced quarterly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,000 fliers produced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 20 press releases produced
- 10 radio talk shows
- 5 TV talk shows
- 10,000 posters produced
- 2000, magazines produced quarterly
- 20,000 fliers produced
Annex 5: List of Persons interviewed and field visit schedule

Mr. Paul Twebaze – Project Coordinator PROBICOU
Ark Building 1st Floor, Plot 398 Kalerwe
(Next to Total Petrol Station) Gayaza Road
P. O. Box 34407, Kampala, Uganda
Tel: +256-414-532676, +256-782-393912, +256-776-340666
Website: www.probiodiversity.org,
E-mail: probicon@yahoo.com

Mr. Paddy Twesigomwe - regional head NUPAWU
P.O. Box 6902,
Kampala, Uganda,
Tel: +256 (0)414 448 276; Fax: +256 (0)414 448 166,
Email: nupac@infocom.co.ug

Mr. Abel Insabimana -Toro Kahuna estate manager
Toro & Mityana Tea Co. Ltd. (TAMTECO)
P. O. Box 6641 Kampala
Tel: (041) 259885; Fax: (041) 343121

Mr. Abednego Watenga – the District Community Development Officer
Mbale District Local Government
P.o.Box 931 Mbale.
Tel: 045- 33458/33201/33204; Fax: 045- 33458

Mr. Mackay Nangusya Stephen – retired Senior Community Development Officer and District Labour Officer
Mbale District Local Government
P.o.Box 931 Mbale.
Tel: 045- 33458/33201/33204; Fax: 045- 33458

Mr. Joram Bruno Pajobo - General Secretary NUPAWU
P.O. Box 6902,
Kampala, Uganda,
Mr. Bruno Musinguzi – General Treasurer NUPAWU Head Office Lugazi
P.O. Box 6902,
Kampala, Uganda,
Tel: +256 (0)414 448 276; Fax: +256 (0)414 448 166,
Email: nupac@infocom.co.ug

Mr. Kefa Wandera – Administrative Officer NUPAWU
P.O. Box 6902,
Kampala, Uganda,
Tel: +256 (0)414 448 276; Fax: +256 (0)414 448 166,
Email: nupac@infocom.co.ug

Mr. Francis Mukama – Assistant Branch Secretary/OSH expert
P.O. Box 6902,
Kampala, Uganda,
Tel: +256 (0)414 448 276; Fax: +256 (0)414 448 166,
Email: nupac@infocom.co.ug

Mr Taaka Wandera – Branch Secretary Lugazi SCOUl/OSH expert
P.O.Box 1, Lugazi, Uganda
Phone: 0312-555550

Mr. Julius Byentaka – Kiko Tea Estates Estate Manager
McLeod Russel Uganda Limited
PO Box 371, Fort Portal, Uganda
Tel: (+256) 3824 20000

Mr. Joseph Ayela – Kiko Tea Estate Field Manager
McLeod Russel Uganda Limited
PO Box 371 Fort Portal, Uganda
Tel: (+256) 3824 20000
Mr. Katende Francis
Federation of Uganda Employers
Ntinda Stretcher, P.O. Box 3820 Ntinda Rd
Kampala Uganda
fuemployers.org; ktnd_francis@yahoo.com
+256 41 4220201; 0712286390

Mr. Elmery Mbaha
Ministry of Health
P. O. Box 7272 Kampala, Uganda
Plot 6 Lourdel Rd, Nakasero
Tel: 256-414-340874/231563/9 and 0772650616
Email: info@health.go.ug

Dr Ampeire Immaculate
Ministry of Health
P. O. Box 7272 Kampala, Uganda
Plot 6 Lourdel Rd, Nakasero
Tel: 256-414-340874/231563/9
Email: info@health.go.ug

Mr. Yusuf Katula – Commissioner Occupational Safety and Health
Ministry of Gender Labour and Social Development
Plot 2, Simbamanyo House/P.O.Box 7136
George St, Kampala, Uganda
Tel: 256-41-4347854

Ms Mary Mayende
National Organisation of Trade Unions (NOTU)
P. O. Box 2150, Kampala Uganda.
Plot 64, Ntinda Rd
Tel: +256 414 256295/ 288 592 and 0712937301
Fax: +256 414 259833
Email: notu@ifocom.co.ug, info@notu.or.ug
Ms Christine Kavata
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Annex 6: QUESTIONNAIRES& Interview Questions

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR: CAPACITY ASSESSMENT FOR THE SOUND MANAGEMENT OF CHEMICALS WITH A FOCUS ON CHILDREN WORKING IN AGRICULTURE IN UGANDA

INTRODUCTION

The questionnaire is divided in two parts:

**Part A** is a qualitative assessment, the purpose is to get an initial opinion of capacity, and

**Part B** is to collect figures/data mainly for the purpose of assessing the impact of the project.

In providing an assessment the following scales can be used as guidance.

**High:** When the required infrastructure or mechanism/framework is operational by 75% to 100% as shown by the set indicators and milestones such as reports available

**Medium:** When the required infrastructure or mechanism/framework is operational by 45% to 74% as shown by the set indicators and milestones such as reports available.

**Low:** When the required infrastructure or mechanism/framework is operational below 45% as shown by the set indicators and milestones such as reports available.

ASSESSMENT OF THE NATIONAL GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK

**PART A**

PARTICIPATION OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR AND CIVIL SOCIETY IN SAFE CHEMICALS MANAGEMENT IN GENERAL

(Please fill and tick as appropriate)

1.0 What are the main functions of your institution?

2.0 How do you rank the level of participation of the private sector / civil society in government decision-making concerning safe management of chemicals and wastes?

2.1 Has your organization worked with other sectors in the Government and other stakeholders with a view of identifying priorities for safe chemicals management activities?

2.2 If yes, at what level?

3.0 What is the level of private sector /civil society participation in safe management of chemicals and wastes?

3.1 If 1 or 2, what are the barriers to their participation?

4.0 To which extent does the existing infrastructure/framework specify roles of private sector/civil society in the safe management of chemicals and wastes?

5.0 To what extent does your organization work closely with the rest of stakeholders in the country (NUPAWU; NOTU; MGLSD etc) to promote sound and safe management of chemicals and wastes?

6.0 Are there any successful initiatives taken by your organization in safe chemicals management over the past five years?

6.1 If yes please list:

6.2 If no, what type of improvements can be made?

7.0 To what extent are you aware of the potential roles of civil society in safe management of chemicals and wastes?

7.1 Are they being consulted by government and private sector on corporate matters?
PART B

A. SOUND INSTITUTIONAL AND PROGRAMMATIC NATIONAL FRAMEWORK:

1.0 Does your institution set aside resources for Chemicals management (annual budget, capacity building?)
   Yes   No
1.1 If yes, are the resources adequate?
   Yes   No
   1.2 If no, what are your suggestions?

2.0 To which extent do you involve workers in development of strategy/legislation to ensure equal participation in chemical safety and management?
   High3   Medium2   Low1

3.0 How best can you describe your institutional capacity for chemicals safety management in terms of;
   Category: Human resources;   Equipment; Financial resources; Data/Information
   High   Medium   Low
3.1 If the capacity is low, what are the existing gaps or problems?

3.2 What are your suggestions for possible actions? Please rank according to priorities

1
2
3
4
5
3.3 Please rank the possible actions according to priorities.

4.0 What kind of assistance do you require to enhance your capacity in chemicals safety management?

5.0 In which specific areas do you need assistance for training to enhance your participation in chemicals management?

6.0 Is there any data/information, reports regarding chemicals safety management available in your institution?
   Yes   No
6.1 What types of data/information/reports do you collect?
6.2 How do you collect and store data/information/reports?
6.3 Are the reports disseminated? To whom?
6.4 What other mechanisms for information sharing are applied by your institution?
6.5 Are you aware of any existing mechanisms for information sharing among stakeholders?
8.2 To what extent is information shared across the different stakeholders including government agencies, private sector and civil society involved in chemicals and waste management?

9.0 What can be done to improve information collection, review and analysis to support chemicals management?

10.0 What actions should be taken to improve accessibility to such information by concerned ministries and other government and non-government institutions?

PART C
INTEGRATING CHEMICALS MANAGEMENT INTO NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES AT THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT LEVELS

1. Is there any mutual supportiveness between Chemicals business, environment management and general policy development and planning at the centre and district level?
Yes No

1.1 If yes to what extent?
High3 Medium2 Low1

2. Are you aware of the need to promote mutual supportiveness between chemical business, environmental management policies and planning at all levels?
High3 Medium2 Low1

3. Do your organization's programmes and planning processes promote sound management of chemicals and waste?
Yes No

3.1 If yes, to what level?
High3 Medium2 Low1

4. Are the resources (human and financial) allocated for capacity building in chemicals management adequate?
Yes No

PART E
EFFECTIVE PROJECT PLANNING, IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING AND EVALUATION.

1. Has your institution, department, office or organization conducted any projects in chemicals safety management over the past five years?
Yes No

1.1 If yes please list

2. Please mention levels, offices or other organizations that participated in the following phases of the project:
Planning and design:  
Implementation:  
Monitoring and evaluation:  

3. What resources would you consider useful during the following activity/project phases?
Planning and design:  
Implementation:  
Monitoring and evaluation:  

2.1 How were the activities/project funded?

2.2 Were the resources to conduct the activities/project adequate?
Yes No

2.3 If No, what were the barriers?

2.4 If yes, to what extent were the activities/project objectives attained?
High3 Medium2 Low1

3.0 Did you conduct monitoring and evaluation of the activities/project?
Yes No

OTHERS

1.0 Are you aware of 2020 World Summit Sustainable Development (WSSD) goal on Chemicals management?
Yes No

1.1 If yes, are there existing/developing chemicals safety policies to achieve goals and milestones towards reaching the 2020 WSSD goal?
Yes No

1.2 Please comment.
1.3 Among these 10 (ten) priorities listed below, which one are not been adequately addressed with existing Laws/Policies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Capacity to manage chemicals,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordination of chemicals management efforts,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing a chemical emergency response,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public awareness raising on safe chemical use and handling,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National policy on chemicals management,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe handling practice of chemicals,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation, and both regulatory and non-regulatory instruments to manage chemicals,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement structure of legislations and regulations,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing a National information system for chemicals management,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proper disposal practices of waste/expired chemicals and drugs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 Which key areas have not been addressed at all?

---

LEGISLATION AND ENFORCEMENT

1. Are you aware of any existing legislation on chemicals management?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

1.1 If Yes, Please list

2. Do the legislation and their respective regulations cover important components of chemicals management (from production through disposal)?
   Mark as appropriate by:
   □ C – Comprehensive □ A – Adequate □ S – Satisfactory

   Legislation/Component
   Import
   Production
   Storage
   Transport
   Distribution
   Use/Handling
   Disposal
   Pesticide
   Fertilizer
   Industrial Chemicals
   Processing
   Facilities
   Petroleum Products
   Consumer Chemicals
   Chemical Wastes
   Others (Specify)

3. Is there an integrated legislative framework across all sectors that seek to address the entire life cycle of chemicals?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

3.1 If yes, name this legislation

---

4. Are there any gaps, difficulties, conflicts and overlaps in the legislative system for the management of chemicals?
   4.1 If yes, please comments;

5. To what extent is their existence of a comprehensive and well coordinated legal framework to avoid piecemeal, overlapping or conflict of regulations?
   High ☐ Medium ☐ Low ☐

6. Are you aware of any strategy/legislation in chemicals management which consider the interest of vulnerable groups such as children or particular sectors such as agriculture?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

6.1 If YES, please mention

---

7. Are you aware of any multilateral agreements (Conventions) related to chemicals management that ratified and implemented by Uganda?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

7.1 If yes, list and state the level of implementation at your institution.

   Conventions:

   Extent: High ☐ Medium ☐ Low ☐
8. Are there any laws, regulations or other instruments that are in place as a direct result of international conventions or agreements?
Yes No
8.1 If yes, specify the respective laws and the relevant international instrument.

9. What is the capacity of your organization/institution to enforce legislation on chemicals management?
High3 Medium2 Low1
9.1 If the answer is 1 or 2, what are the barriers?

10. How do you rank the adequacy of legislation for chemicals management in protecting health and the environment?
High3 Medium2 Low1
11. Does the legislation provide opportunity to the private sector/civil societies to provide ideas for reviews to enhance smooth implementation?
High3 Medium2 Low1
12. To what extent are all sectors related to chemicals management covered in the legislation?
High3 Medium2 Low1
13. To what extent does the legislation allow information exchange and sharing with stakeholders?
High3 Medium2 Low1
14. Are the obligations of the various stakeholders under the legislation stated clearly on issues related to chemicals management?
e.g. employers; employees; trade union representatives; workers; government agencies with a mandate etc.
Yes No
14.1 If yes, to what extent?
High3 Medium2 Low1
14.2 If no, please comment.

15. Is the enforcement of legislation effective?
Yes No
15.1 If no, what are underlying reasons?

16. At what levels are non-regulatory instruments effective in reducing chemical risks in the country (e.g., incentive systems, voluntary programmes and compliance by industry, etc.)?
16.1 Please comment on your response,
### Annex 7: Work-plan PROBICOU UGANDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>TARGET GROUP</th>
<th>OUTPUT</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE AGENCY</th>
<th>TIME FRAME IN QUARTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To train workers, workers' leaders, government in the safety measures in the use of chemicals through courses, seminars and workshops.</td>
<td>1. Conduct Training of trainers at National level</td>
<td>Trade union leaders, Government extension workers, Enterprise extension workers, Officers from ministry of gender Labor and social development</td>
<td>5,600 members of Trade Unions, Employers and Government officials on safety issues trained as follows:</td>
<td>• The number of training seminars held;</td>
<td>• Consultant</td>
<td>xxx 1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The number of persons trained</td>
<td>• PROBICOU</td>
<td>xxx 1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The type and number of institutions involved.</td>
<td>• NUPAWU</td>
<td>xxx 1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of government departments represented.</td>
<td>• PMU</td>
<td>xxx 1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consultant</td>
<td>• ILO/IPEC</td>
<td>xxx 1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• PROBICOU</td>
<td>• Steering committee</td>
<td>xxx 1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Steering committee</td>
<td>• PMU</td>
<td>xxx 1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Conduct Training Courses for Health Delivery service providers</td>
<td>• Doctors, Nurses, Medical officers</td>
<td>2 Training courses for health professionals</td>
<td>• Number of health professionals trained</td>
<td>• Consultant</td>
<td>xxx 1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• PROBICOU</td>
<td>• Steering committee</td>
<td>xxx 1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• PMU</td>
<td>xxx 1  2  3  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop a national inventory of dangerous chemicals,</td>
<td>1. Carry out a survey of enterprise/plantation at</td>
<td>• Government, Communities, Farmers, Workers</td>
<td>National survey carried out, Problem areas identified, Data collected, An inventory produced and</td>
<td>• List of enterprises surveyed, The inventory of dangerous processes</td>
<td>• Project team</td>
<td>Xxx 1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consultant</td>
<td>• PROBICOU</td>
<td>xxx 1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ILO/IPEC</td>
<td>xxx 1  2  3  4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Institutionalize chemical safety education, motivation and training programs of trade Unions, employers federation and government ministries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>1. Integrate chemical safety education into institutions/education departments through educators, and motivators trained under Objective 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Workers leaders (NOTU) leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Employers leaders (FUE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enterprise/plantation information availed to NOTU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chemical safety education incorporated into the training program of Federation of Uganda Employers and NOTU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chemical safety liaison units established in lead agencies through meetings above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing chemical safety education and occupational safety information expanded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Nature and number of new policies developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of bi-laws developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of programs put in place by institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of legislations revised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of training and IEC materials developed by the institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Line Ministries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PMU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PROBICOU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Line Ministries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NUPAWU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NOTU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1LO/IPEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PMU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RUDMEC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ILO/IPEC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PROBICOU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NUPAWU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Steering committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>4</strong> Raise awareness of workers, workers' leaders, employers, communities and government officers on the safety measures in use of chemicals through courses, seminars and workshops.</th>
<th>1. Conduct awareness raising Seminars and workshops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Community</td>
<td>• One national tripartite awareness workshop on pesticide safety for policy makers and government officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District officials</td>
<td>1 National awareness raising workshop for trade union officials and Federation of Uganda Employers (FUE);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extension workers</td>
<td>• The number of awareness workshops conducted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Workers</td>
<td>• The number of awareness raising seminars/workshops conducted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employers</td>
<td>• Number of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policy makers</td>
<td><strong>PMU</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>RUDMEC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ILO/IPEC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PROBICOU</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NUPAWU</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Steering committee</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Conducting information, education and communication (IEC), activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Conducting information, education and communication (IEC), activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extension workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Health professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Business men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Industrialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2 press releases produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 10 radio talk shows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5 TV talk shows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 10,000 posters produced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2,000 magazines produced quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 20,000 fliers produced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Regional awareness meetings for district officials and extension workers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 4 Regional awareness raising meetings for farmers’ representatives, through National Farmers federation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of IEC materials produced and distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Number of radio talk shows conducted,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of live callers on talk shows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line ministries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• PROBICOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• RUDMEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ILO/IPEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NUPAWUPMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Farmers federations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of radio talk shows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of live callers on talk shows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| XXX | XXX | XXX | XXX |