



United Nations Environment Programme

Terminal Evaluation of Project No. ROA 2792-1567 Implementation of a Regional Programme on Sustainable Production and Consumption in Latin America and the Caribbean

FINAL REPORT

Roberto A. Urquizo

Evaluation Office

November 2010

Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary.....	4
2	Background.....	8
3	Introduction to UNEP Regional Programme on SCP.....	10
3.1	Programme background.....	10
3.2	Programme objectives and expected accomplishments.....	10
3.3	Intervention areas and target groups.....	11
3.4	Programme milestones.....	11
3.5	Implementation arrangements and main partners	11
3.6	Financing.....	12
3.7	Main project activities and outputs	12
4	Evaluation Scope, Objectives and Methodology	13
5	Programme Performance and Impact	15
5.1	Attainment of objectives and planned results	15
5.1.1	Achievement of Outputs and Activities	15
5.1.2	Relevance	21
5.1.3	Effectiveness.....	22
5.1.4	Efficiency.....	26
5.1.5	Review of Outcomes towards Impacts	27
5.2	Sustainability and Catalytic Role	28
5.2.1	Sustainability	28
5.2.2	Catalytic Role and Replication	30
5.3	Processes affecting attainment of project results	31
5.3.1	Preparation and Readiness.....	31
5.3.2	Implementation Approach and Adaptive Management.....	31
5.3.3	Stakeholder Participation and Public Awareness	32
5.3.4	Country Ownership and Driven-ness.....	33
5.3.5	Financial Planning and Management	33
5.3.6	UNEP Supervision and backstopping.....	34
5.3.7	Monitoring and Evaluation.....	34
5.4	Complementarity with UNEP MTS and Programme of Work.....	36
6	Conclusions and Recommendations	36
6.1	Conclusions.....	36
6.2	Lessons Learnt.....	39
6.3	Recommendations	40
	Annex 1: TORs for the Evaluation	42
	Annex 2: Summary of main results of the Meetings of Government Experts on SCP in LAC	56
	Annex 3: Main results of the publication “Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) Progress Made in Latin America and the Caribbean”_CEGESTI - 200859	
	Annex 4: Bibliography	62
	Annex 5: List of Interviewees	66
	Annex 6: Actual costs and co-financing for the programme	71
	Annex 7: Expertise of the Evaluator	73

Abbreviations and Acronyms

10YFP	10 - Year Framework of Programmes on SCP
BPSB	UNEP Biennial Programme and Support Budget
CAN	Andean Community of Nations.
CARICOM	Caribbean Community
CCAD	Central American Commission of Environment and Development
CP&SC	Cleaner Production and Sustainable Consumption
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
DTIE	Division for Technology, Industry and Economy
ECLAC	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
GEO SSN	Global Environment Outlook (GEO) South-South Network (SSN) at UNEP
ILAC	Latin America and the Caribbean Initiative for Sustainable Development
ISWM	Integrated Solid Waste Management
JPOI	Johannesburg Plan of Implementation
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MERCOSUR	Southern Common Market
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding.
MSME	Micro, Small and Medium Sized Enterprises
MTS	UNEP Medium-term Strategy
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OVI	Objectively Verifiable Indicators
PRODOC	Project Document
ROLAC	Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
SCP	Sustainable Consumption and Production
SO	Specific Objective of the Programme.
SPP	Sustainable Public Procurement
SSFA	Small Scale Financial Agreement
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
WSSD	World Summit for Sustainable Development
WTO	World Trade Organization

1 Executive Summary

1. The Regional Programme on Sustainable Production and Consumption in Latin America and the Caribbean aimed at promoting sustainable production and consumption (SCP) in the Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) Region, with a view to contribute to employment generation, reduction of poverty and vulnerability, environment conservation, improved health and sustainable human development. The Programme sought to assist a number of LAC countries with developing new policies and strategies on SCP, to enhance participation of the private sector in the promotion and implementation of SCP and to increase awareness and participation of the general public and non-Governmental organizations in the promotion of SCP.

2. The Programme targeted all four sub-regions of the LAC Region and implemented enabling activities and demonstration projects in a number of countries in each of these sub-regions: Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay and Brazil for the Southern Cone; Saint Lucia and Trinidad and Tobago for the Caribbean; Costa Rica and El Salvador for Central America; and Colombia, Ecuador and Peru for the Andean Countries. The beneficiaries of the project were the Governments, NGOs, the private sector and the customers of the target countries

3. The Programme was designed in February 2006 approved mid-2006 by UNEP. It was supposed to end mid-2008 but was extended until mid-2009 for implementation and until the end of 2009 for final reporting. There are, at the time of evaluation, still some activities under development in Ecuador, Brazil and Argentina which should be concluded by the end of 2010.

Attainment of Programme Objectives and Results

4. The Programme was built upon and complemented ongoing SCP initiatives conducted by UNEP and others. Its SOs were fully in line with Expected Accomplishments of the Sub-programmes 4 and 5 of UNEP's BPSB 2006-2007. Outputs of the Programme contribute to the GEO SSN at UNEP. Outcomes should contribute to achieving MDG No. 7 (Environmental Sustainability).

5. Three countries supported by the Programme are already very far in the process of developing national policies and strategies on SCP. The Regional Council of SCP Government Experts has strengthened its work and its connections with partners and stakeholders in the region. Partnerships have also been strengthened at the sub-regional level. Integrated Solid Waste Management was successfully promoted in Peru and Ecuador, respectively through a demonstration project and support to drafting a regulation on plastic waste management. MSMEs' and Government officials' understanding of SCP issues has been improved through several workshops throughout the Region. However, improved understanding does not necessarily lead to changed behavior, as this requires resources and skills which are often absent. MSMEs, in particular, still take a rather passive stance waiting for Government or project support to introduce cleaner production methods, which indicates that there is still a wide-spread ignorance and misunderstanding on the costs and benefits of cleaner production among the smaller private producers.

6. Awareness raising initiatives were successfully supported and are likely to have contributed to raise awareness among the general public. Income poverty, however, often constraints people's ability to significantly change consumption patterns. The Programme was less successful in promoting SPP within MERCOSUR, mainly because the "Protocol on Government Procurement" of MERCOSUR had not been internalized in each member country. It deserves to be highlighted, however, that SPP activities of the programme built significant capacities and understanding among stakeholders in the sub-region, to facilitate their uptake of SPP national initiatives.

7. The Programme was found cost-effective, although it is difficult to estimate the real output over cost ratio, as the Programme often provided only part of the funding for its supported activities. Programme start-up was delayed and several activities also took off with considerable delay due to a minimalistic design, changes in intervention countries, Governments and Programme staff and delays in obtaining Government approval for certain initiatives.

Sustainability and catalytic role

8. Financial factors are the major risk for sustainability of Programme benefits and the main impediment for replication of Programme experiences. In the countries where the Programme helped develop policies and strategies on SCP, i.e. Colombia, Ecuador and Uruguay, it is likely that financial resources will be set aside for their implementation. In poorer countries, SCP is not yet a priority and public resources are more likely to go towards basic infrastructure, education and other areas considered of a higher priority. At the production (private sector) and consumption (general public) levels, lack of financial resources and incentives is likely to hamper generalization of more SCP patterns.

9. The catalytic role of public policy changes appears evident. In most other countries of the Region, the evaluation could not attribute fundamental institutional changes to the programme. It is doubtful that the number of entrepreneurs and consumers directly involved in Programme activities would have been sufficient for them to play a catalytic role at the scale of their country, sub-region or region. Some follow-on financing from Governments and donors has been secured through Programme activities. Many Programme activities can be replicated because capacities were strengthened and several events were capitalized in guidelines and manuals.

Processes affecting attainment of Programme Results

10. Programme design was rather minimalistic, expecting the country teams to design the activities under each output in more detail after Programme start-up, which took considerable time. The Programme's initial duration and budget were too limited to generate a significant impact on private sector, civil society and general public awareness and understanding of SCP issues, for the promotion of SCP in the Region. In addition, some delays in Programme start-up and implementation were incurred because the UNEP Programme Coordinator was not dedicated full time to the Programme as originally planned and changed twice in the course of the Programme. As a result, time available for Programme execution was even more restrained. Execution partners were well chosen, although private sector bodies were not sufficiently involved.

11. The Programme followed the implementation arrangements foreseen at design. Programme management appears to have been efficient, effective and flexible enough to adapt to changes in the context. Financial planning was done on a yearly basis, through the Annual Development Account Progress Reports. Programme Funds appear to have been managed with due diligence. The Programme disbursed about 76 per cent of its core funding. Co-financing was provided in funds or in-kind by several partners such as UNEP, Governments, and bilateral and multilateral donors. The consecutive Programme Coordinators did a satisfactory job in terms of Programme supervision and reporting. The UNEP Regional Director provided support when needed.

12. Stakeholder participation has been a strong feature throughout the diverse initiatives supported by the programme, at all levels of intervention. However, private sector bodies were not sufficiently involved to give capacity building and information dissemination efforts enough reach and continuity. Public awareness was not increased as expected because the coverage and instruments used for awareness campaigns were inadequate to reach significant numbers at the scale of the Region. Government ownership was strongest in countries where the Programme supported policy processes. Local Government was much involved in the demonstration project on ISWM in Peru. Involvement of Government in countries where only punctual activities were supported was very limited.

Evaluation Ratings

13. Table 1.1 below summarizes the evaluator's ratings for the different evaluation criteria used by the evaluation:

Table 1.1. Summary of Evaluator's rating for each criterion under evaluation.

Criterion	Evaluator's Rating¹
Attainment of project objectives and results	S
Effectiveness	S
Relevance	S
Efficiency	MS
Sustainability of Project outcomes	MU
Financial	MU
Socio Political	ML
Institutional framework and governance	ML
Environmental	L
Catalytic Role and Replication	MS
Stakeholder participation / public awareness	MS
Country ownership / driven-ness	S
Achievement of outputs and activities	S
Preparation and Readiness	MS
Monitoring and Evaluation	MS
Implementation approach	S
Financial planning and management	S
UNEP Supervision and backstopping	S

Key lessons learned

14. The Regional LAC Council of Experts in Sustainable Consumption and Production, under the Forum of Latin America and Caribbean Ministers for the Environment, is a valuable instrument to support Governments and to enhance capacity building, share knowledge and experience among members. Fostering information exchange and capacity building through a regional hub has been a very cohesive mechanism for all SCP experts in the region and has facilitated the establishment of connection with other regional initiatives. Sub-regional entities such as CARICOM, CCAD, CAN and MERCOSUR are also strategic partners for mainstreaming SCP into the economies of the Sub-regions of LAC. The facilitation role offered by the sub-regional institutions in fostering SCP dissemination and multiplying efforts has proved to be crucial.

15. UNEP plays an important role in supporting governments in the development of SCP policies and programmes at country level. The most valuable contribution can be made when the intervention is targeting strategic planning and policy development – supported by demonstration projects - more than in the development of a scattered number of different SCP punctual interventions.

16. SCP is not yet a priority in countries with high levels of poverty. In those countries, improvement of basic infrastructure, education and health services usually receive a much higher priority than tackling environmental sustainability concerns in production and consumption, even though it is recognized that SCP might create more jobs, improve health conditions and ultimately reduce poverty. SCP patterns are easier to promote when coupled to strong industrial development and considered as a way to increase productivity, rather than promoted as a way to combat poverty.

17. Several countries selected at Programme design to implement pilot projects had to be replaced by other countries for a variety of reasons, which led to important delays. Although it is advisable to identify countries for pilot activities well in advance, to ensure that the countries are committed and that the pilot projects are relevant and part of their development priorities, a closer-up feasibility check and firmer evidence of government commitment should be required.

¹ Ratings for Sustainability: L – Likely; ML – Moderately Likely; MU – Moderately Unlikely; U – Unlikely
Ratings for other criteria: HS – Highly Satisfactory; S – Satisfactory; MS – Moderately Satisfactory; MU - Moderately Unsatisfactory; U – Unsatisfactory

18. There where MSMEs have been directly involved in Programme initiatives, their buy-in in cleaner production concepts was generally very good. However, most other small producers in the Region still take a passive stance towards introducing cleaner production patterns in their enterprises, and still show poor understanding of the costs and benefits of introducing cleaner production methods. Demonstration projects without massive publicity around their successes have little effect on the attitudes and behavior of stakeholders that are not directly involved.

Key recommendations

19. UNEP should reinforce efforts to strengthen the Regional Council of Experts and its capacities to influence the SCP agenda, ensuring that other relevant stakeholders are also involved in the decision making process. Such stakeholders will include the private sector, academia, NGOs, among others. The 16th Forum of Ministers of the Environment of LAC approved in its Decision Number Five in April 2010, *inter alia*, to support the implementation of the priority areas of SCP and to promote the strengthening of institutions (Government and non-Government) responsible for SCP in each country and their active participation in the regional activities related with SCP.

20. UNEP should re-enforce its collaboration with Sub-regional entities such as CARICOM, CCAD, CAN and MERCOSUR which are strategic partners for mainstreaming SCP into the integration processes and the socio-economic development agenda of each LAC country. Some countries in the region have already acquired good experiences and expertise on Sustainable Production – particularly on Cleaner Production – that could benefit other countries in the region through a mechanism of south-south cooperation.

21. Information exchange and cooperation among countries still needs to be reinforced, not just among Governments but also among private enterprises and civil society.

22. Within countries, it is also essential to strengthen partnerships among key Government sectors areas in the Governments besides Ministries for the Environment such as Investment and Promotion Office, Planning, Energy, Transport, Economy and Finance, Education Ministries, Science and Technology Office, etc. and even Regional or Local Governments. Enhanced dialogue and cooperation among these institutions in each country will facilitate the development of concrete projects and effective policies.

23. It is necessary also to involve a wider group of stakeholders to ensure effective uptake of SCP. Civil society, industry associations, technology centers and universities among others need definitely to be more involved in the SCP process. They play an important role for the dissemination of good practices. Governments should be coordinating with the private sector and civil society in order to achieve more tangible results. The Marrakech Process in the region should continue the positive practice of opening the dialogue with other relevant stakeholders, including the private sector, academia, civil society, etc.

24. A large number of manuals, methodologies and guidelines have been developed which need to be shared and made available to all users, to limit duplication of efforts.

25. Technical assistance should be provided to new demonstration projects on sustainable production in the Region, that involve more the private sector, especially MSMEs. Demonstrations should always be accompanied by a massive publicity campaign, to raise the awareness of the enterprises that are not directly involved in the demo. Advice should be given to MSMEs how to include the “clean producer” aspect in their advertising, and the Government should mention the successful cleaner producers by name in public awareness raising campaigns, providing these MSMEs with free advertising. Another track that is worth exploring is the eco-labeling of the clean products of MSMEs.

26. The sustainable consumption side of the SCP represents perhaps the biggest challenge for the Region and should receive more attention. Additional research is needed to identify and understand current consumption patterns, and develop appropriated instruments and mechanisms to promote the change in consumption patterns in the Region.

2 Background

27. Changing production and consumption patterns was one of the major challenges identified at the **Rio Earth Summit** in **1992** and ratified during the **World Summit for Sustainable Development (WSSD)** held in **Johannesburg** in **2002**.

28. The Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, adopted in June 1992, commits the signatory states to *“cooperate in a spirit of global partnership to conserve, protect and restore the health and integrity of the Earth's ecosystem”*. Rio Declaration acknowledges different contributions of the states to global environmental degradation and identifies common but differentiated responsibilities for developing and developed countries.

29. Paragraph 15 of Chapter III of the WSSD implementation plan takes the matter further, as it aims to: *“Encourage and promote the development of a 10-year framework of programmes in support of regional and national initiatives; to accelerate the shift towards sustainable consumption and production; to promote social and economic development within the carrying capacity of ecosystems by addressing and, where appropriate, de-linking economic growth and environmental degradation through improving efficiency and sustainability in the use of resources and production processes and reducing resource degradation, pollution and waste. All countries should take action, with developed countries taking the lead, taking into account the development needs and capabilities of developing countries, through mobilization, from all sources, of financial and technical assistance and capacity-building for developing countries”*.

30. The process of shifting towards sustainable growth and development, initiated in Rio and Johannesburg was followed by a series of high-level international meetings and agreements, which further emphasized the priorities and challenges facing the world community.

31. To support Chapter III of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (JPOI), the **Marrakech Process** was launched in **2003**. It is a global informal multi-stakeholder expert process (the “International Expert Meetings”) which aims at accelerating the shift towards sustainable consumption and production (SCP) patterns and to support the elaboration of a 10-Year Framework of Programmes on SCP (10YFP). The Marrakech Process recognized the importance for Governments to specify their priorities in the area of sustainable consumption and production in order to ensure an effective and well targeted international cooperation. UNEP and UNDESA are serving as the Secretariat to coordinate this global process, with an active participation of national Governments, and major groups thus far represented by the business and industry, NGOs, workers and trade unions and other stakeholders.

32. The Marrakech Process has undertaken the following tasks:

- a) Organizing regional consultations to promote awareness and identify priorities and needs for SCP;
- b) Helping build regional programmes and implementation mechanisms with regional, sub-regional and national ownership, to be endorsed by the relevant regional institutions;
- c) Implementing concrete projects and programmes on the regional, national and local levels to develop and/or improve SCP tools and methodologies, with the seven Task Forces as the main mechanisms;
- d) Evaluating progress, exchanging information and encouraging international cooperation and coordination, through the international review meetings;
- e) Securing and incorporating multi-stakeholder inputs to the elaboration of the 10YFP to be submitted as an input to the Commission of Sustainable Development (CSD) Session 18/19.

33. After various regional and international consultations, the third draft of inputs to the CSD 18/19 has been prepared, with a highlight on the following most relevant issues at global level:

1. Political and institutional framework and integration of SCP in national development plans

2. Intersectoral opportunities (small and medium sized enterprises, Corporate Social Responsibility, Sustainable Procurement, Education)
3. Intersectoral approach: Mobility and transport; construction and building; food and agriculture; sustainable tourism
4. Efficient resource management: energy, water and waste.

34. LAC Region countries have initiated a number of actions aimed at strengthening the regional strategy towards sustainability. The Council of Government Experts in SCP was created within the framework of the Forum of Ministers of LAC, with the purpose of carrying out specific follow-up on the issues related to national environmental organizations and broadening the involvement towards organizations of the civil society.

35. Six meetings of regional relevance have been held in LAC region in the past seven years, addressing the challenges of unsustainable consumption and production with main results shown in Annex 2.

36. Through Council meetings and the consequent decisions taken by the Forum of Ministers for the Environment of LAC, the following main intervention areas, common to all the region's countries, have been established in a LAC Action Plan on SCP: (a) Dialogue tables and an open participation processes; (b) Development of policies and instruments; (c) SCP in micro, small and medium sized enterprises (MSMEs); (d) Sustainable public procurement; and (e) Information networks and training.

37. In accordance with the UNEP Medium-term Strategy (MTS) 2010–2013, UNEP will promote the decoupling of growth in production and consumption of goods and services from resource depletion and environmental degradation, and will strengthen the scientific base for doing so. The application of environmentally sound technologies and integrated waste management will lead to the more efficient use of resources. Reforms in Government policies, changes in private sector management practices and decisions, and increased consumer awareness are needed to achieve this decoupling. A mix of these approaches will be integrated to address inefficient and polluting production and consumption patterns, including through the 10YFP on SCP under the Marrakech process. Public-private partnerships that promote more sustainable product life-cycles and supply chains will be a major focus of the work of UNEP.

38. The objectives, indicators and expected accomplishments for UNEP Medium-term Strategy 2010–2013, are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Objectives, Expected Accomplishments, Indicators and Measurement, baseline, target for Resource efficiency, Sustainable Consumption and Production, UNEP Medium Term Strategy 2010-2013

	Objectives	Expected accomplishments (EAs)	Indicators for EA
Resource efficiency, Sustainable consumption and Production	<p>Natural resources are produced, processed and consumed in a more environmentally sustainable way</p> <p>Impact indicator: number of Governments introducing policy reforms; number of private sector initiatives leading to more efficient and less polluting use of natural resources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource efficiency is increased and pollution is reduced over product life cycles and along supply chains. • Investment in efficient, clean and safe industrial production methods is increased through public policies and private sector action. • Consumer choice favors more resource-efficient and environmentally friendly products. 	Indicators will be detailed as part of the strategic frameworks and programmes of work

Source: UNEP Medium-term Strategy 2010–2013, Environment for Development

3 Introduction to UNEP Regional Programme on SCP

3.1 Programme background

39. The Project “Implementation of a Regional Programme on SCP in LAC” aims at addressing the problem of unsustainable consumption and production in the LAC Region, which leads to environmental degradation, worsening of health, increased poverty and vulnerability, and impedes sustainable human development. The Project was designed taking into consideration the expected impact of SCP on employment generation and poverty reduction, environment conservation and sustainable human development. The Project Document (PRODOC – February 2006) provides a detailed analysis of the problems faced when attempting to integrate environmental concerns into sustainable development plans. This integration requires political commitment by Governments, technical expertise to identify environmental problems and solutions, broad participation of affected groups, and effective mobilization of financial resources.

40. The Programme was designed to utilize a participatory approach to development, engaging three major groups of stakeholders in project implementation: the Governments of countries in the Region (all countries could benefit from the regional meetings and trainings, and 11 countries were involved in pilot projects), the private sector and civil society. All these groups have intrinsic interests in changing unsustainable consumption and production patterns and shifting towards environmentally friendly, efficient and healthy ways of industrial and agricultural production. As such, all three groups were expected to be active agents and, at the same time, the end-users and beneficiaries of project accomplishments.

3.2 Programme objectives and expected accomplishments

41. The Programme aimed at supporting the development and implementation of concrete policies and projects to accelerate the shift towards SCP patterns, with the active participation of key stakeholders from Governments, private sector, civil society, mass media as well as the general public.

42. At the regional and national levels, the Programme built on the needs identified during the meetings of national experts and Government officials held in Argentina, Nicaragua and Panama in 2003 as well as the Expert Meetings held in Marrakech in 2003 and in Costa-Rica in 2005.

43. The Overall Objective of the Programme, as defined in the PRODOC (February 2006) was “Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns in Participating Countries of Latin America and the Caribbean”. Specific Objectives and Expected Accomplishments² of the Programme and their relationship are shown in table 2 below.

Table 2. Specific Objectives versus Expected Accomplishments of the Regional Programme on SCP in Latin American and the Caribbean

Specific Objectives of the Programme	Expected Accomplishments of the Programme	Objectively verifiable indicators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO1: Develop and adopt national strategies on sustainable consumption and production; • SO2: Support the implementation of sustainable public procurement programmes by Governments; • SO3: Strengthen the Regional Council of Government Experts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EA1. New policies and strategies on sustainable consumption and production adopted in the region. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two national policies and strategies on SCP designed and adopted by the Governments of Argentina and Nicaragua by March 2008

² Not to be confused with the UNEP Expected Accomplishments in the Medium Term Strategy 2010-2014.

Specific Objectives of the Programme	Expected Accomplishments of the Programme	Objectively verifiable indicators
on SCP.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO4: Support the design and implementation of integrated waste management systems and promote policies on waste prevention and minimization; • SO5: Improve the capacities and knowledge of MSMEs on environmentally friendly technologies, cleaner production and eco-design; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EA2. Enhanced participation of private sector in the promotion and implementation of sustainable production and consumption. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50 new SCP related initiatives (e.g. cleaner production, energy efficiency) adopted by the private sector by March 2008 • Capacities and skills of participating entrepreneurs on sustainable production and consumption increased by the end of the project
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO6: Increase the environmental awareness on sustainable consumption and production. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EA3. Increased awareness and participation of general public and non-Governmental organizations in the promotion of sustainable consumption and production. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of awareness campaigns on sustainable production and consumption conducted before March 2008 • Level of awareness on SCP of a random sample of people expose to the awareness campaigns • Number of visits to the web pages of the information centers and number of requests of information.

Source: Project Document, February 2006.

3.3 Intervention areas and target groups

44. The Programme targeted all 4 sub-regions of the LAC region and would implement key activities and demonstration projects in at least one country of each of these sub-regions. Were originally targeted: Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil for the Southern Cone; Saint Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago for the Caribbean; Costa Rica for Central America; and Colombia, Ecuador and Peru for the Andean Countries.

45. In the end, the Programme involved all countries above, in various degrees, as presented in Table 5 page 25 of this report.

46. The beneficiaries of the project were the Governments in the target countries, consumers, NGOs and the private sector.

3.4 Programme milestones

47. The expected duration of the project was two years from May 2006 to April 2008. After Programme approval, mid-2006, it took some time for activities to take off, and because of several delays in implementation, the Programme needed to be extended until mid-2009 for implementation and the end of 2009 for final reporting. At the time of evaluation, some activities were still under development in Ecuador, Brazil and Argentina. These should be concluded by October 2010.

3.5 Implementation arrangements and main partners

48. UNEP would implement the Programme through the Technology, Industry and Economics (TIE) Programme Coordinator in the Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (ROLAC) in close cooperation with UNEP Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE) and in

consultation with the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA) and the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).

49. The Programme was to be executed by each country through either the Ministries of Environment or similar public institutions, or through a local NGO.

3.6 Financing

50. Table 3 shows the Programme's budgetary allocation.

Table 3. Budget allocation to the Programme

The total project cost	US\$560,000.
UNEP Staff time equivalent (in-kind through full-time project coordinator, support staff, logistics and administrative support).	US\$100,000
Contributions of participating Governments' in staff time equivalent	US\$2,000 per month per country

Source: Project Document, February 2006.

51. According to the Status Allotment Report of December 2009 the Programme had disbursed a total of US\$328,400.92, and still had outstanding debts for US\$95,510.07. Thus, the total disbursements and outstanding debts together at that date amounted to \$423,911 or about 76 per cent of the budget estimated at design.

3.7 Main project activities and outputs

52. The PRODOC defined a list of activities to be conducted in a variety of countries in the Region. Some outputs were modified during Programme implementation. Table 4 presents planned outputs and the main adaptations made to Programme design during implementation.

Table 4. Planned versus delivered activities and outputs by the Regional Programme on SCP in Latin American and the Caribbean

	Planned outputs	Modifications to design
1	Two demonstration projects (in Argentina and Nicaragua) to guide the development of national SCP policies and strategies in participation with key stakeholders (Government agencies, private companies, consumer organizations, NGOs).	Change of location: SCP policies and programmes were supported in Ecuador, Uruguay and Colombia.
2	Two meetings of the regional Council of Government Experts on SCP, to share experiences and best practices on SCP policies and strategies (in Peru and Cuba).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No meetings were held in Peru or Cuba as intended. • 2 regional meetings and 2 sub-regional meetings were supported. • An initiative was conducted with the Andean Community
3	Demonstration project in Managua, Nicaragua on Integrated Municipal Solid Waste Management (ISWM).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change of location: The Norte Chico area (north of Lima, Peru) was supported. • In addition, in Ecuador, options were assessed for plastics management, and a proposal for a national regulation was made.
4	Demonstration Project in Brazil to increase the capacities of MSMEs to move towards SCP patterns.	The UNEP Office in Brazil is currently preparing the project with the Ministry of Environment. Terms of Reference for the required consulting services are ready, and selection criteria for the

	Planned outputs	Modifications to design
		consultant have been established. The demonstration project should be concluded by October 2010.
5	Four capacity-building workshops and exhibitions on environmentally friendly technologies, cleaner production and eco-design for MSMEs (in Colombia, Costa Rica, Trinidad and Tobago and El Salvador)	Number of training workshops was increased and some locations changed (El Salvador, Colombia, Costa Rica, Grenada, Suriname and Peru).
6	Two demonstration projects on sustainable public procurement (SPP) in Argentina and Mexico.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only the project in Argentina was implemented. The demonstration project in Mexico did not take place; • The MERCOSUR Pilot Sustainable Public Procurement project was completed; • A Sub-regional SPP training workshop for Central America was held in Costa Rica, and a pilot project is being initiated there
7	Four awareness campaigns for Governments, private companies and consumer groups conducted in each of the 4 sub-regions of the LAC region.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two campaigns and two youthXchange projects were carried out; • A survey was conducted on Sustainable Consumption in Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia.
8	Demonstration project aimed at the creation of a Sub-Regional SCP Information Center for the Caribbean (based in Saint Lucia)	The Caribbean Regional SCP Information Center was established.
9	Two sub-regional trade & technology fairs with participation of private sector and Government organizations in Mexico and El Salvador	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One fair organized in El Salvador; • Other training initiatives were carried out in Costa Rica.
10	Online information hub to disseminate information on SCP.	The SCP Information Network has been created and launched (see: www.redpycs.net).
11	Two publications on lessons learnt on the implementation of SCP in LAC region.	One assessment ³ on SCP progress made in LAC was published and presented to the 5 th Meeting of the Council of SCP Government Experts of LAC.

Source: Project Document and Information gathered during the evaluation period from different counterparts.

4 Evaluation Scope, Objectives and Methodology

53. In line with the UNEP Evaluation Policy⁴ and the UNEP Evaluation Manual⁵, the Terminal Evaluation of the Implementation of the Regional Programme on SCP in LAC was undertaken close to the end of the Programme to assess Programme performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), determine outcomes and impacts (actual and potential) stemming from the Programme, and appreciate the sustainability of Programme benefits. The evaluation had two primary purposes:

- (i) to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, by reviewing the status of Programme implementation in light of its original objectives, targets and expected end results and

³ Prepared by CEGESTI (Fundación Centro de Gestión Tecnológica e Informática Industrial), an international NGO with head quarters in Costa Rica.

⁴ <http://www.unep.org/eou/StandardsPolicyandPractices/UNEPevaluationPolicy/tabid/3050/language/en-US/Default.aspx>

⁵ <http://www.unep.org/eou/StandardsPolicyandPractices/UNEPevaluationManual/tabid/2314/language/en-US/Default.aspx>

- (ii) to promote learning, feedback, and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned by UNEP and its partners. The evaluation has identified lessons of operational relevance for future project and Programme formulation and implementation.

54. The Evaluation was conducted by an independent consultant between February 2010 and July 2010, a few months before the last Programme activities were supposed to be completed. It involved visits to three participating countries (Peru, Argentina and Uruguay) and was comprised of three major phases:

Phase 1: Preparation of the field mission:

- Desk review of project reports and other documents (See Annex 5);
- Preliminary contact by Email or phone with former UNEP Task Manager and national implementation agencies;
- Interviews by phone with representatives of Colombia and Ecuador.

Phase 2: Field missions to Peru, Argentina and Uruguay.

Lima, Peru, March 1, 2010

- Briefing meeting with NGO CooperAccion in Lima, Peru.
- Interviews with relevant beneficiaries and stakeholders from the Province and Municipal authorities in the Norte Chico part of the Region of Lima
- Site visits and technical inspections of an open dump in the Huasca Region.

Montevideo, Uruguay, March 3 and 4, 2010

- Interview with a representative and a consultant of the National Environment Directorate (DINAMA), Ministry of Housing, Land Use Planning and Environment of Uruguay;
- Interview with two project beneficiaries: dialogue table participants in Montevideo;
- Interview with UNEP representative;
- Interview with a representative and a consultant of DINAMA's Planning Unit and with DINAMA's public procurement representative from the Ministry of Economy of Uruguay.

Buenos Aires, Argentina, March 2 and 5, 2010

- Interview with Victoria Belaustegui, former Programme Manager of the Programme;
- Interview with representatives of the NGO Argentinean Institute for Sustainable Development.

Phase 3: Data analysis & Reporting

- Additional data collection by Email;
- Data analysis per country;
- Additional phone interviews with key stakeholders;
- Report drafting and submission to UNEP;
- Revisions to report as per UNEP Evaluation Office comments;
- Revisions of report as per stakeholders' comments.

55. The evaluation was conducted, within the limits of resources available, using a participatory approach. This was ensured by engaging key stakeholders in interviews (live or over the telephone) and Email interactions with the sub-projects sponsored by the Programme. The participatory evaluation approach gave beneficiaries and implementing agencies in the different countries the opportunity to contribute their views on project performance and usefulness of the interventions. Their recommendations and suggestions as to how the project could have been more responsive to their needs were given full consideration. A detailed list of people encountered is presented in Annex 5.

56. As always, there were limitations to the evaluation process. The timing of the evaluation was not ideal, as the country visits were conducted in the middle of the school vacation period, during which some key resource people were out on annual leave. There were no resources to visit the ROLAC office in Panama, where the evaluation consultant could have had face-to-face meetings with the current Programme Coordinator and easier/earlier access to the original project documentation. The evaluation was also affected by the fact that the former Programme Coordinator had left UNEP and that a meeting with the former Programme Coordinator could only be arranged late in the evaluation process. There was little time left to review thoroughly some key documentation obtained

through this person. Finally, funds available for the evaluation did not allow for much primary data collection, which forced the consultant to rely to a very large extent on secondary data and information provided by people directly involved in conducting or supervising the Programme initiatives.

5 Programme Performance and Impact

57. This chapter on Programme Performance and Impact presents the evaluator's findings with respect to the UNEP evaluation criteria, grouped in four categories: (1) **Attainment of objectives and planned results**, which comprises the assessment of outputs achieved, relevance, effectiveness and efficiency and the review of outcomes towards impacts; (2) **Sustainability and catalytic role**, which focuses on financial, socio-political, institutional and ecological factors conditioning sustainability of project outcomes, and also assesses efforts and achievements in terms of replication and up-scaling of project lessons and good practices; (3) **Processes affecting attainment of project results**, which covers project preparation and readiness, implementation approach and adaptive management, stakeholder participation and public awareness, country ownership and driven-ness, project finance, UNEP supervision and backstopping, and project monitoring and evaluation; and (4) **Complementarity with the UNEP Medium Term Strategy and Programme of Work**, which describes linkages to UNEP's Expected Accomplishments, project contributions in line with the Bali Strategic Plan, and South-South Cooperation.

5.1 Attainment of objectives and planned results

5.1.1 Achievement of Outputs and Activities

58. This section assesses, for each output, the project's success in producing it as programmed, both in terms of quantity and quality, as well as its usefulness and timeliness. Table 4 above has indicated the planned outputs and the main adaptations made to design during Programme implementation.

Output 1: Two demonstration projects (in Argentina and Nicaragua) to guide the Development of national SCP policies and strategies in participation with key stakeholders

59. The two countries originally planned were substituted by three other countries that demonstrated interest to work on the formulation of their SCP plans or strategies: Ecuador, Uruguay and Colombia.

60. **Ecuador** prepared a study regarding integration of SCP in the National Development Plan, with support from a Small Scale Financial Agreement (SSFA) signed between the Environment Ministry and UNEP/ROLAC, and in cooperation with the "SCP for Poverty Reduction" Project (UNEP/DTIE). A National SCP Policy was prepared with direct assistance from the Programme to facilitate the involvement of other private and public stakeholders in the process of formulation. The main goals of the National SCP Policy have been reflected in the UNDAF 2010-2011, with a view to foster the inclusion of SCP in the development plans, policies and strategies of the country.

61. SCP was incorporated in the National Development Plan, a process in which the Secretary of Planning played a crucial role. The priority areas of SCP that were incorporate are : (1) Conservation of strategic resources such as biodiversity, agricultural soils and water, (2) Implementation of cleaner production mechanisms, (3) Pollution prevention, (4) Waste Management, (5) Eco-efficiency and eco-labeling and (6) Education & Training on SCP. The choice of priority areas was based on the human development goals and the socio-environmental diagnosis of the country, progress in the SCP process, and the technological situation of national production.

62. A draft strategy was prepared for implementing the National SCP Policy, based on a study on the links between sustainable consumption and sustainable production in the country and its development potentials. It proposes revisions to policies, strategies and other relevant national instruments which may foster SCP. It is structured around a series of programs in line with the

National SCP Policy and priorities, for a five year period. The draft strategy for the SCP implementation will be made available for public consultation in 2010.

63. **Uruguay** has developed a National Action Plan on Environmentally Sustainable Production and Consumption with the support of a SSFA signed as part of the One-UN Pilot Project. The Action Plan aims at integrating the environmental dimension in production and domestic consumption.

64. The development of the Action Plan involved multiple stakeholders, coming from Government, industry, services, academia, NGOs and other institutions. In all, about 225 people contributed from 32 Government agencies and 56 NGOs and private businesses. The draft National Action Plan on Environmentally SCP defines objectives with indicators, activities, time limits and key actors. On the production side, the Plan considers the major productive groups and efficient resource use. On the consumption side, the Plan focuses *inter alia* on the demand of water, energy, sustainable public procurement. The draft Plan was made available for public consultation and released in March 2010. It is expected that SCP Action Plan of Uruguay will provide strong basis for the development of new future initiatives within the framework of the ONE UN Projects.

65. In **Colombia**, a consultant hired in the framework of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed between the Ministry of Environment, Urban Development and Housing, and UNEP/ROLAC, conducted an assessment of current consumption patterns and their relationship with progress made in the implementation the National Policy on Cleaner Production, and its integration with the National Strategic Plan for Green Markets and the Integrated Waste Management Policy. In addition, the consultant drafted a first National Policy for SCP integrating the above policies, that was discussed among different stakeholders. The Government of Colombia also commissioned a national survey (1,200 persons interviewed in 5 main cities of Colombia) during the first half of 2009, to assess the perception, knowledge, motivations and trends within the Colombian population on consumption patterns, as a second important input for National Policy on SCP.

66. The final draft National Policy for SCP of Colombia combines sustainable consumption with the already existing policies on Cleaner Production and Green Markets. It was announced on the occasion of the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Marrakech Process, in September 2009 and posted on the website of the Ministry of Environment, Urban Development and Housing for public comments since November 2009.

67. *Assessment of Output 1: Highly satisfactory. In every case, the Programme has collaborated with other partners and organizations which was conducive to achieving more than the expected results.*

Output 2: Two meetings of the Regional Council of Government Experts on SCP, to share experiences and best practices on SCP policies and strategies (in Peru and Cuba)

68. No meetings were held in Peru or Cuba as intended. However, two regional and two sub-regional meetings were supported, as well as an initiative with the Andean Community.

69. **At the sub-regional level**, a first Sub-regional SCP meeting was held for the Caribbean countries in Trinidad and Tobago, in August 2008, with 32 participants (47% women). A second Sub-regional SCP meeting was held for Mesoamerican countries in Costa Rica, in October 2008, with 13 participants (31% women). It was co-organized with the CCAD.

70. An information and capacity building initiative with the Andean Community, included: (i) a workshop for the development of national SCP plans with the participation of relevant representatives of each country of the sub-region, in Lima, in April 2008, with 17 participants of the region (53% women); (ii) an assessment of the existing legal framework for each country in the sub-region, aiming at the incorporation of SCP; (iii) a survey on domestic consumption in each of the countries to plan the incorporation of sustainable consumption patterns at policy level; and (iv) support in the development of national SCP policies in the member countries.

71. **At the regional level**, the Government Experts Meetings on SCP in LAC were carried out as originally planned. The Fourth Meeting of the Council of Government Experts was held in Sao Paulo, Brazil, in October 2007 with 86 participants (39 % women). The Fifth Meeting of the Council of

Government Experts was held in Cartagena, Colombia, in September 2009⁶ with 95 participants (45% women).

72. *Assessment of Output 2: Highly satisfactory. The Regional and Sub-regional Expert Meetings were successfully organized, exceeding what was originally planned.*

Output 3: Demonstration project in Managua, Nicaragua on Integrated Municipal Solid Waste Management (ISWM)

73. The activity originally proposed for Nicaragua, was implemented in **Lima, Peru**, following an institutional change in Nicaragua during the project internalization phase. The ISWM project in Peru was implemented with the assistance of an NGO called "CooperAccion", in three province (Barranca, Huaura and Huaral, encompassing 13 districts) in the "Norte Chico" region, north of Lima.

74. A database was developed for the provinces to record the characteristics of waste generated and management options for solid municipal waste. The database helped municipal officials to develop projects under the National Public Investment System mechanism, by which the Ministry of Economy authorizes public investment at all levels of the state. Local authorities highlighted the support provided by CooperAccion in taking forward the proposals for ISWM projects in each province based on waste disposal in sanitary landfills.

75. Trainings on ISWM were held for officials and authorities of the municipalities in the three provinces, and for municipal workers responsible for solid waste pickup and street sweeping in the 13 districts involved. The training for officials emphasized technical operational aspects, conceptual and economic issues related to solid waste. The training for municipal workers mainly dealt with safety and health issues, as well as with their perception of the population being served.

76. In Caleta de Carquin, a small fishing village, an Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan was developed, which included source segregation of solid waste.

77. Guidelines for Municipal Workers and Guidelines for Municipal Officials were prepared to disseminate the results of the project. Other dissemination material was developed such as three radio spots concerning sound waste management, newsletters and a documentary on DVD which has been distributed in schools, public transport and TV channels in the area.

78. In addition to the ISWM project in Peru, there was an initiative in **Ecuador**, where upon request by the Government, options were assessed for plastics management to reduce plastic pollution. A national regulation has been drafted which was submitted to the Ministry for the Environment for revision and approval.

79. *Assessment of Output 3: Satisfactory. The activities in Peru (demonstration project) and in Ecuador (study) were successfully achieved in light of what was initially planned.*

Output 4: Demonstration Project in Brazil to increase the capacities of MSMEs to move towards SCP patterns

80. The Brazil UNEP Office is currently preparing the project with the Ministry of Environment. Terms of Reference for the required consulting services are ready, and selection criteria for the consultant have been established. The demonstration project should be concluded by October 2010.

81. The project is in fact a detailed study of the particular situation, perspectives and the role of MSMEs in sustainable construction in Brazil; involving at least 30 MSMEs from the building and construction industry. The project will: (i) prepare an assessment of the resource management practices currently existing in the construction sector in Brazil; (ii) Analyze the environmental impacts of the value chain of civil construction; (iii) study innovative solutions to be applied throughout the value chain of civil construction; (iv) assess existing initiatives and programmes targeting sustainable building and construction in the country; and (v) research policy options to be used as a reference within the framework of the Brazilian National SCP plan.

⁶ See full report of the Conclusions of the Fifth Meeting of the Council of Government Experts of Latin America and the Caribbean for Sustainable Production and Consumption in Annex B

82. *Assessment of Output 4: The activity is still pending.*

Output 5: Four capacity-building workshops and exhibitions on environmentally friendly technologies, cleaner production and eco-design for MSMEs (in Colombia, Costa Rica, Trinidad and Tobago and El Salvador)

83. Under this output, the Programme supported many training workshops through the LAC Region, namely:

- i. A one-day training workshop on "Proposed guidelines for the implementation of voluntary agreements on Cleaner Production" was held in San Salvador in October 2007, in parallel with the ExpoAmbiente (see paragraph 95). There were 16 participants, among which representatives of the Ministries of Environment of Guatemala, Honduras, Costa Rica, Panama and the Dominican Republic, Directors of National Cleaner Production Centers of Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua and Costa Rica, and representatives of companies ICAFE of Costa Rica and PROLACSA of Panama.
- ii. An SCP training session was incorporated in two important national events in Colombia: the National Industry Congress and the BioExpo 2008, with over 500 participants.
- iii. Three training workshops were organized in Costa Rica. The Government coordinated an intervention to develop the capacities of MSMEs in the area of SCP through three training workshops, targeting 70 MSMEs representatives, 10 NGOs and 20 Government professionals and experts. This initiative was carried out in partnership with the industrial associations, to ensure wider replication. The training methodology was also summarized in a manual, allowing replication of these trainings.
- iv. SCP aspects were included in the Wider Caribbean Solid Waste and Recycling Alliance (RECARIBE) waste management training session, at the 4th Caribbean Environmental Forum hosted by the Caribbean Environment and Health Institute (CEHI) in Grenada in 200. The Caribbean Environmental Forum is one of the Region's most important environmental forums.
- v. SCP, including waste minimization aspects, was incorporated in a biomedical waste management training conducted by CEHI in Suriname, in October 2009. The country is also interested in developing a Biomedical Waste Management Strategy and CEHI will assist in this undertaking.
- vi. A Cleaner Production Manual for Pig Farming in Central-America was prepared and a three-day training workshop was organized on the theme for 20 MSMEs, in March 2008. The topics covered were: cleaner production, integrated management of pig farms, treatment and disposal of solid and wastewater generated in pig farms, establishment of environmental indicators and the experience of El Salvador in the first voluntary implementation of Cleaner Production for pig farms sector, among others. The training was conducted by the National Center for Cleaner Production in El Salvador, had a total of 29 participants representing the pork producers associations of Central American and Dominican Republic. In addition, there was participation of technicians from the Cleaner Production Centers in the region and representatives from Ministries of Environment and Agriculture.
- vii. Thirty local carpentries in Caleta de Carquin, District North of Lima were involved in the Demonstration Project and received training in this regard. A two-day workshop was organized with the Carquin Carpenters Organization in February 2009, aimed at strengthening the cleaner production capacity of the carpenters, to improve work efficiency taking into account the protection of the environment.

84. *Assessment of Output 5: The planned activities were overachieved by far in terms of building SCP aspects in training workshops and exhibitions targeted at MSMEs.*

Output 6: Two demonstration projects on sustainable public procurement (SPP) in Argentina and Mexico

85. Under this output, the Programme supported the MERCOSUR Pilot Sustainable Public Procurement project, a sub-regional SPP training workshop for Central America, the preparation of

SPP pilot projects under the Marrakech Task Force with Costa Rica and Mexico, and the development of a new project on SSP with UNEP and EU (Switzerland counterpart). The project in Argentina is ongoing and focuses on creating national awareness on the concept of SPP and fostering the coordination of key Government institutions. Mexico has not made an agreement with UNEP/ROLAC to conduct the programmed SPP activity defined in the PRODOC.

86. The **MERCOSUR SPP Pilot Project**'s main objective was to contribute to the dissemination and capacity building in SPP. This project was driven by the Sub-Working Group No. 6 Environment of MERCOSUR with support from UNEP/ROLAC. Activities under the project were:

- i. Two workshops in Buenos Aires: one workshop for the Environment and Procurement sub-regional working groups (23 participants from Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay) and one workshop for capacity building on SPP (25 participants from national procurement offices);
- ii. Preparation of guidelines⁷ for MERCOSUR identifying the different sections of the Request for Proposals in public procurements where sustainability criteria can be incorporated and defining general sustainability criteria for consideration at the time of acquisition, use, maintenance, operation and disposal of goods and services procured;
- iii. A proposal for an information campaign to sensitize officials involved in the procurement of goods and services on the importance of adopting sustainability criteria and practices in the process of public procurement.
- iv. Two sub-regional SPP training workshops: one workshop for Central America, held in Costa Rica in October 2008, with 27 high level representatives from 7 national procurement offices; and one workshop in coordination with the Andean Community carried out in Chile in May 2009 with 31 participants.

87. The Pilot Project did not succeed in putting in place and implementing a sub-regional system for SPP for several reasons: the "Protocol on Government Procurement" of MERCOSUR has not been internalized in each member country, important asymmetries exist among countries, information and skills are lacking on the subject, and the widespread misunderstanding that SPP could bring trade barriers. These factors limit the possibility of incorporating sustainability criteria at the regulatory level in MERCOSUR.

88. In **Argentina**, the demonstration project was approved by the Government at the end of 2009, is currently ongoing and expected to be concluded in 2010. Staff changes in the counterpart institutions delayed the launch of activities which could not start according to the schedule stipulated in the agreement. Capacity building initiatives are being carried out with stakeholders from the public sector regarding the implementation of sustainability criteria in public procurement.

89. *Assessment: The MERCOSUR Pilot Project faced a number of challenges and achieved limited results. The Argentina demonstration project has been launched after some delays and capacity building efforts regarding sustainable public procurement are under way.*

Output 7: Four awareness campaigns for Governments, private companies and consumer groups conducted in each of the 4 sub-regions of the LAC region

90. The Programme supported two campaigns and the adaptation of the youthXchange website to two LAC countries, to raise awareness of the general public on SCP issues. An awareness campaign on waste management was implemented in Peru, using flyers, DVD-video, newsletters etc. A detailed proposal for a MERCOSUR SPP campaign is currently under consideration of the Environmental Sub-Working Group of MERCOSUR (See paragraph 84). It is ready for implementation. Both for Argentina and Ecuador, the youthXchange website and guide were adapted to the country context. For Argentina, the results were presented in the GEO Sub-regional Meeting and for Ecuador, they should be presented in early June 2010. The guide for Argentina is available online though difficult to find and slow to download.

91. Other awareness activities supported by the Programme included the dissemination of a Cleaner Production Manual for Pig Farming in Central America; the preparation and distribution of

⁷ In the form of a report with the title "Proposal for the Incorporation of Sustainability Criteria in Public Procurement in MERCOSUR" prepared by the Argentinean Sustainable Development Institute (IADS).

2.000 CDs with SCP publications during the BioExpo in Colombia; the publication of 1000 newsletter on ISWM for the Peru Project (see Output 3); the distribution of 1000 flyers on waste minimization and management; the preparation of a 10 minute video on ISWM with 1000 copies distributed.

92. With the Andean Community (CAN), the Programme conducted a survey about Sustainable Consumption in Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia. A sample of around 1,200 inhabitants older than 15 years in the principal cities of each country were interviewed. The Programme further designed and implemented a SCP information campaign in the sub-region.

93. *Assessment: These activities were carried out satisfactorily.*

Output 8: Demonstration project aimed at the creation of a Sub-Regional SCP Information Center for the Caribbean (based in Saint Lucia)

94. In 2007, CEHI entered into an MOU with UNEP/ROLAC for the development of a Cleaner Production and Sustainable Production Information Centre for the Caribbean (CP&SCICC). The Information Center is currently housed and incorporated within CEHI's Documentation Center at CEHI headquarters in Castries, St. Lucia. The Information Center disseminates information through its library and, upon request, through Email, and organizes information and training events.

95. The Information Center stores and showcases SCP information materials such as brochures and handouts, reference texts, workshop, training and seminar reports, newsletters, and reports from past CEHI work related to SCP. Documents relevant to SCP which were part of the CEHI's collection (prior to this project) are also included as part of the Information Centre. The Information Center is utilized mostly by St. Lucian clientele, especially students from the neighboring Sir Arthur Lewis Community College. Documents from the center are also (E)mailed to interested parties from other islands upon request.

96. *Assessment: This demonstration project was carried out satisfactorily.*

Output 9: Two sub-regional trade & technology fairs with participation of private sector and Government organizations in Mexico and El Salvador

97. The Programme supported the organization of the **ExpoAmbiente**, held from 11 to 13 October 2007 in San Salvador, El Salvador by the Central American Commission for the Environment and Development (CCAD). The Cooperation Agreement between CCAD, USAID, UNEP/ROLAC and UNIDO supported the organizing committee of the ExpoAmbiente in assembling a discussion panel on "Competitiveness and Environment", by providing regional and international speakers on the following three topics: (i) Business Competitiveness and Environmental Management under the framework of the Dominican Republic – Central America Free Trade Agreement; (ii) Experience of Mexico in increasing the competitiveness of companies under the North America Free Trade Agreement; and (iii) Colombia's experience in the Competitiveness and the Environmental Agenda.

98. UNEP also supported the activity by funding the participation of 13 MSMEs from Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic and Panamá, and nine Government representatives from those countries. In parallel with ExpoAmbiente, a training workshop for entrepreneurs, public sector representatives and Directors of Cleaner Production Centers in the Central American region was organized on "Proposed Guidelines for the implementation of Voluntary Agreements on Cleaner Production" (see paragraph 81).

99. *Assessment: Although the Programme supported only one trade and technology fare instead of two, the ExpoAmbiente 2007 in El Salvador was a success.*

Output 10: Online information hub to disseminate information on SCP

100. The Information Network on SCP for LAC has been created and launched Mid-April 2009 (see: www.redpycs.net). It is a Web-based information platform in a three languages (Spanish, Portuguese and English). The network has several features:

- i. It includes an E-learning platform for on-line training courses, seminars or special lectures. A first E-learning course on how to use the platform was given to 13 countries and several thematic nodes (e.g. youthXchange);
- ii. 192 general publications are available in the Information Network
- iii. 212 documents have been uploaded to the Virtual Library
- iv. documents related to 36 events were published in the Information Network

101. *Assessment: The Information Network was successfully launched and is operational.*

Output 11: Two publications on lessons learnt on the implementation of SCP in LAC region

102. On the opportunity of the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Council of SCP Government Experts, an assessment of the progress achieved in LAC with reference to SCP implementation was presented. This assessment, prepared by CEGESTI,⁸ was published in September 2009 under the title "SCP: Progress Made in Latin America and the Caribbean". The report was not printed for distribution but is made publicly available on the Information Network in 2 languages. The assessment concludes, *inter alia*, that:

- i. The countries have initiated the definition and formalization of the political mechanisms to speed up SCP in the region, involving different sectors of society and institutions of the public sector, both in the process of preparation as in implementation;
- ii. Some countries have been implementing successful technical assistance programs in Cleaner Production, targeting specific sectors;
- iii. On the other hand, with reference to Sustainable Consumption, the efforts are still incipient;
- iv. A very active movement of Corporate Social Responsibility can be noticed in the region;
- v. The legal framework and the enforcement capacity still show weaknesses in a number of countries;
- vi. The instruments aimed at the promotion or creation of SCP markets have hardly been used in the region;
- vii. Despite their enormous weight in the region, MSMEs generally lack resources and skills concerning environmental management, including those needed to comply with environmental regulations and occupational health and safety;
- viii. Social exclusion and poverty put at risk the successful implementation of sustainable consumption programmes.
- ix. There is a need for further strengthening the dissemination efforts, especially targeting general public with reference to SCP.

103. *Assessment: The CEGESTI assessment provides a good overview of SCP perception and implementation in the region. The second publication planned has not been produced.*

Overall assessment of Achievements of Outputs and Activities

104. Overall, the Programme was successful in terms of delivering on outputs, given the fact that almost all planned activities were executed and that they have, with a few exceptions, been useful and timely for each country. It should, however, be noted that there are still ongoing activities, going beyond the extension period approved by UNEP.

105. The overall rating for the achievements of outputs and activities is Satisfactory.

5.1.2 Relevance

106. This section assesses, in retrospect, whether the project's objectives and implementation strategies were consistent with those of the programme frameworks and thematic sub programmes at UNEP. It also appreciates how project interventions linked to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goal (MDGs).

⁸ Prepared by CEGESTI (Fundación Centro de Gestión Tecnológica e Informática Industrial), an international NGO with head quarters in Costa Rica.

107. This Regional Programme was designed to complement and was built on prior ongoing activities of other UNEP capacity building programmes and initiatives. In particular, it was linked to Sub-programme 4, "Technology, Industry and Economics", of the UNEP Biennial Programme and Support Budget (BPSB) for 2006-2007, and, in particular, to its expected accomplishment: *"Increased understanding and implementation by public and private sector decision makers and organizations of environmentally sound management practices and tools, including cleaner production, sustainable consumption and prevention and responses to environmental threats and emergencies"*. This expected accomplishment had two indicators: (i) *Increased number of local, national and regional authorities having introduced sustainable production and consumption policies and programmes, and* (ii) *Increased number of industry and professional associations having introduced sustainable production and consumption policies and programmes*. As such, the Specific Objectives of the Programme (see Table 3.1 above) were fully in line with and contributed to the accomplishment of the UNEP BPSB 2006-2007.

108. The Programme was also linked to Sub-programme 5, "Regional Cooperation and Representation" of the BPSB 2006-2007 and its expected accomplishment, *"increased capacities of countries and regional bodies in the legal, policy and institutional areas to address environmental priority issues"*. This expected accomplishment had an indicator: (i) *Increased number of regional and subregional environmental action plans and strategies adopted and under implementation, with support from UNEP*. This was the case through the Regional SCP Government Expert Meetings, which led to the development of a Regional Action Plan, strategies and priorities that were adopted by the LAC Forum of Ministers for the Environment.

109. Outcomes of the Programme have contributed with environmental assessments and reporting regarding Sustainable Consumption and Production in the LAC Region which can be integrated into the Global Environment Outlook (GEO) South-South Network (SSN) at UNEP, which supports policy formulation and informed decision-making processes at national, regional and global levels.

110. Outcomes of the Programme have also contributed to reach the MDG No. 7 of "Ensuring Environmental Sustainability", by integrating the principles of SCP and sustainable development into country policies to help reverse the loss of environmental resources.

111. Programme objectives and implementation strategies of the Regional SCP Programme were consistent with the LAC Action Plan on SCP discussed by the Council of Government Experts in Sao Paulo in October 2007 and the consequent decisions taken by the Forum of Ministers for the Environment of LAC (see paragraph 34). The Programme was also consistent with the 10-Year Framework Programme on SCP.

112. Overall, the assessment of relevance is Satisfactory.

5.1.3 Effectiveness

113. The Programme effectiveness is the extent to which the Programme has achieved its specific objectives. The LOGFRAME in Annex 1 of the PRODOC proposes objectively verifiable indicators (OVIs) to measure this extent, but not for all SOs, and these OVIs were used as part of the effectiveness assessment. The following paragraphs present the assessment of effectiveness for each of the six specific objectives of the programme.

SO1: Develop and adopt national strategies on sustainable consumption and production

114. The Programme attempted to achieve this SO through Output 1, which was successfully implemented, but not in the two countries originally planned (see paragraphs). Indeed, the OVI for this SO in the LOGFRAME was: "Two national policies and strategies on SCP designed and adopted by the Governments of Argentina and Nicaragua by March 2008." However, three other countries were supported to either develop new policies or mainstream SCP into existing policies and strategies, namely:

- **Ecuador** disposes of a National SCP Policy, with its main goals reflected in the UNDAF 2010-2011. SCP is also incorporated in the National Development Plan. Furthermore, the country disposes of a draft strategy for implementing the National SCP Policy, which proposes revisions to policies, strategies and other relevant national instruments which may foster SCP, and will be made available for public consultation in 2010.
- **Uruguay** disposes of a draft National Action Plan on Environmentally SCP, which was developed with the involvement of multiple stakeholders and made available for public consultation in March 2010. It is expected that the SCP Action Plan of Uruguay will provide a strong basis for the development of new future initiatives within the framework of the One-UN Projects.
- **Colombia** disposes of a draft National Policy for SCP, which combines sustainable consumption with the already existing policies on Cleaner Production and Green Markets, posted on the website of the Ministry of Environment, Urban Development and Housing for public comments since November 2009.

115. *Assessment: Three countries supported by the Programme are already very far in the process of developing national policies and strategies on SCP. SO1 can therefore be considered as fully achieved.*

SO2: Support the implementation of sustainable public procurement programmes by Governments

116. The Programme sought to achieve this SO mainly through Output 6. There were no OVIs linked to this SO in the LOGFRAME.

117. The Programme supported the MERCOSUR Pilot Sustainable Public Procurement project, which was a first opportunity to support SPP implementation at the sub-regional level, in application of the Protocol for Public Procurement at MERCOSUR. The Pilot project contributed to the dissemination of capacity building in SPP in the sub-region, but did not succeed in implementing a sub-regional system for SPP (see paragraph 85). The Pilot has, however, facilitated the involvement of a number of countries of the region in the activities carried out by the Marrakech Task Force on SPP. As a result of the important awareness-raising effort, currently five countries of the region have been selected as pilot countries for the implementation of the SPP methodology, which include Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Uruguay and Argentina.

118. In Argentina, the methodologies, actions and tools developed within the framework of the SPP project will contribute to the work of the Marrakech Task Force on Sustainable Public Procurement.

119. Overall, the initiatives carried out in the region in the area of SPP generated an important basis of knowledge and awareness among Government institutions. This helped prepare the Region to take the opportunity for joining SPP pilot projects in a global programme funded by EU and Switzerland. Indeed out of the 6 pilot countries, 4 are from the LAC Region. The activities carried out by the SCP in LAC Programme prepared and facilitated the compliance of those countries with the conditions to be eligible as pilot projects.

120. *Assessment: Despite Programme support, the MERCOSUR Pilot did not fully achieve its objectives, and the Argentina initiative has yet to show its first results. Overall, however, the initiatives carried out in the region in the area of SPP generated an important basis of knowledge and awareness among Government institutions as witnessed by the participation of 4 LAC countries in a new global programme on SPP funded by the EU and Switzerland.*

SO3: Strengthen the Regional Council of Government Experts on SCP.

121. There were no OVIs linked to this SO in the LOGFRAME. The Programme successfully supported two regional and two sub-regional meetings, as mentioned under Output 2.

122. **At the regional level**, the Fourth Meeting of the Council of Government Experts was instrumental in building consensus among the political focal points on the Regional SCP Action Plan,

based on sub-regional priorities and 5 common main areas of intervention for the entire region⁹. Specific recommendations were also approved to be presented during the Forum of Ministers of the Environment of the Latin America and Caribbean region. The Fifth Meeting of the Council of Government Experts discussed further streamlining of regional priorities as a basis for the further elaboration of sub-regional priorities. Recommendations to the Ministers were formulated for their discussion during the 2010 Forum of Ministers. In addition, the meeting facilitated the involvement of stakeholders from the private sector and NGOs, recognizing their role in achieving the regional priorities.

123. **At the sub-regional level**, a first SCP meeting for the Caribbean sub-region prepared a first draft sub-regional action plan for the implementation of SCP. A second sub-regional SCP meeting for Mesoamerican countries discussed the incorporation of the concept of SCP in the sub-regional strategies. An initiative with the Andean Community succeeded at disseminating information and developing local capacities for the modification of consumption and production patterns towards sustainability.

124. *Assessment: With support from the programme, the Regional Council of SCP Government Expert has strengthened its work and communication with members, in addition to its connections to other relevant SCP stakeholders in the region. At the sub-regional level, strengthened partnerships have facilitated the development of joint initiatives.*

SO4: Support the design and implementation of integrated waste management systems and promote policies on waste prevention and minimization;

125. The Programme attempted to achieve this SO through Output 3. There were no OVIs linked to this SO in the LOGFRAME. As mentioned above, the activity originally proposed for Nicaragua, was implemented in three provinces in the “Norte Chico” region, north of Lima, Peru. The database developed for the provinces to record the characteristics of waste generated and management options for solid municipal waste, is an important tool to understand and generate public attention for the domestic solid waste management issue. By providing quantitative and qualitative information on waste generation, it also helps municipal officials to develop projects under the National Public Investment System mechanism, by which the Ministry of Economy authorizes public investment at all levels of the state. Trainings, and guidance material on ISWM for officials contributed to their understanding of technical operational aspects, and conceptual and economic issues related to ISWM. Trainings and guidelines for municipal workers made them better aware of their role towards the population they serve, and also of safety and health issues.

126. Another initiative in Ecuador on the management of plastics in waste, led to a draft national regulation on plastic waste management, which was submitted to the Ministry for the Environment for revision and approval.

127. *Assessment: This SO was satisfactorily achieved.*

SO5: Improve the capacities and knowledge of MSMEs on environmentally friendly technologies, cleaner production and eco-design

128. The Programme attempted to achieve this SO through Outputs 4, 5, 8 and 9. The OVIs linked to this SO in the LOGFRAME were: “50 new SCP related initiatives (e.g. cleaner production, energy efficiency) adopted by the private sector by March 2008” and “Capacities and skills of participating entrepreneurs on SCP increased by the end of the project”.

129. The many training workshops supported by the Programme throughout the LAC Region for private entrepreneurs, but also public sector representatives, have contributed to improving their understanding of SCP and, in particular, of Cleaner Production concepts. The ExpoAmbiente in El Salvador contributed to SCP dissemination on the basis of particular experiences in MSMEs from the

⁹ The Forum of Ministries of Environment for Latin America and the Caribbean ratified the SCP Regional Action Plan developed by the Regional Council of Government Experts and decided to focus the activities for the coming years on the 5 main common priorities for the region related to SCP: policies and national programmes, roundtables and participatory process, focus on Small and Medium Enterprises, Sustainable Public Procurement and the information network (Decision 12/2008).

sub-region, and strengthened public-private dialogue thanks to the participation of Governmental representatives. The Cleaner Production and Sustainable Production Information Centre for the Caribbean, housed in CEHI's Documentation Center in St. Lucia, aims at promoting Cleaner Production and Sustainable Consumption, environmental quality and pollution reduction, a change in consumption patterns and Sustainable Industrial Development. It improves availability and access to SCP information, tools and methodologies as well as contributes to awareness among industry, Government, academia, NGOs and civil society in the Caribbean. The Information Center is currently utilized mostly by St. Lucian clientele. The recently launched Demonstration Project in Brazil to increase the capacities of MSMEs to move towards SCP patterns should also involve at least 30 MSMEs.

130. It should be noted, however, that improved awareness and knowledge for a relatively small number of private enterprises is not sufficient to change MSME behavior patterns on a large-scale. A lack of resources, but also mostly knowledge and skills concerning cleaner production methods and environmental management in general, including the compliance with environmental regulations and occupational health and safety, remain often major impediments for the adoption of more sustainable and cleaner production practices. In addition, the vast majority of MSMEs in the Region remain unaware of the costs and benefits of introducing cleaner production methods and processes in their businesses, which is evidenced by their largely passive stance towards cleaner production, expecting Government or project assistance to help them make the change.

131. *Assessment: Certainly more than 50 representatives from the private sector have participated in events and trainings supported by the programme. There is, however, no evidence that this has led to 50 new SCP initiatives among MSMEs. There is little indication that capacities and knowledge of MSMEs on environmentally friendly technologies, cleaner production and eco-design have been improved on a large scale in the Region.*

SO6: Increase the environmental awareness on sustainable consumption and production.

132. Outputs 7, 10 and 11 were expected to contribute to achieving this SO. The OVIs linked to it were: "Number of awareness campaigns on sustainable production and consumption conducted before March 2008"; "Level of awareness on SCP of a random sample of people exposed to the awareness campaigns"; and "Number of visits to the web pages of the information centers and number of requests of information".

133. The SCP Information Network is a valuable tool that can support other SCP related projects in the region generating synergies and cost-efficiency opportunities. It offers a platform to create work spaces within the network, upload documents and have access to the SCP related institutions, Governments and end-users. It is considered an effective mechanism to share information and experiences, develop SCP capacities through an e-learning platform and facilitate the coordination among SCP experts. As such, it has and will continue to facilitate greater awareness and understanding among more specialized persons, bringing together a wide variety of regional stakeholders. Between the launch of the Information Network and the end of 2009, i.e. in less than 9 months, it had received 56,886 visits and has 527 registered users.

134. The two awareness campaigns (Peru and MERCOSUR-wide) supported by the Programme were aimed at raising awareness of the general public on SCP issues, respectively on waste management and SPP. Another SCP information campaign was conducted in the Andean Community sub-region. The adaptations of the youthXchange website and guide for Argentina and Ecuador are also promising initiatives. Thus, awareness initiatives on SCP were effectively conducted.

135. However, no assessment has been done of how effective the initiatives above were in raising people's awareness on SCP. The study published by CEGESTI in September 2009, concludes that there is a need for further strengthening the dissemination efforts, especially targeting general public with reference to SCP. The study also indicates that social exclusion and poverty put at risk the successful implementation of sustainable consumption programmes. In countries with high poverty, Government and the population alike are more concerned by other issues than SCP.

136. *Assessment: The Programme successfully supported awareness raising initiatives, likely to have contributed to increase environmental awareness of the general population in LAC countries*

concerned. There is, however, no hard evidence to indicate any changes in awareness and behavior towards SCP.

Overall assessment of effectiveness

137. The Programme successfully supported three countries in developing and adopting national strategies on sustainable consumption and production (SO1). It also provided an important contribution in strengthening the Regional Council of Government Experts on SCP (SO3), even going beyond this objective by supporting two sub-regional meetings. Furthermore, the Programme successfully supported the design and implementation of an ISWM pilot in Peru and promoted a regulation on plastic waste prevention and minimization in Ecuador (SO4). In all likelihood, although no hard evidence exists, the Programme contributed to an increase in the environmental awareness on sustainable consumption and production of the general public in LAC (SO6).

138. However, the Programme was less successful in supporting the implementation of sustainable public procurement programmes by Governments (SO2) even though the initiatives carried out by the programme increased knowledge and awareness among Government institutions. Capacities and knowledge of MSMEs on environmentally friendly technologies, cleaner production and eco-design were promoted, but, it is unlikely that these will have significantly changed the production patterns of MSMEs on the scale of the LAC Region (SO5).

139. In sum, effectiveness of the Programme is rated Satisfactory.

5.1.4 Efficiency

140. Efficiency is defined as a measure of how economically resources (funds, expertise, time, etc.) were converted to results.

141. In general terms, when comparing the numerous and diverse outputs of the Programme to its limited financial resources (less than US\$0.5 million for the whole Region), the Programme can be considered cost-effective. However, it should be noted that the Programme usually provided only part of the financial support to initiatives that also received significant financing from elsewhere. As the real cost of many outputs is unknown, it is not possible to assess the real output/input ratio and therefore make a definitive statement about cost-effectiveness.

142. There might have been efficiency losses because of the important dispersion of activities across the LAC Region. But this dispersion was necessary considering the regional scope of the project. To obtain buy-in from a given country, it was essential to hold some visible project activities there. A question might be raised, however, on the extent to which these dispersed activities have been used to attract public and private sector interest at a national and regional level. In most cases insufficient publicity was made around events and pilot projects, and these were therefore little noticed at a national or regional level.

143. Programme start-up and implementation of activities were delayed due to: (i) the need for country teams to design the initiatives in more detail, establish agreements, procure goods and services etc.; (ii) changes of the Programme Coordinator at UNEP/ROLAC¹⁰; (iii) political and institutional changes in some of the countries previously selected as pilots for demonstration projects, which made it necessary to identify new partners to implement the planned activities; and (iv) delays in getting approvals from the Governments. The Programme required extension until the end of 2009. Although most activities were concluded by that date, there are still some activities in Argentina, Ecuador and Brazil pending their conclusion by the end of 2010.

144. Overall, efficiency is rated Moderately Satisfactory.

¹⁰ The Industry Officer in charge of the programme was appointed to another UN post as of June, 2006. Another ROLAC Programme Officer took over the management of the programme on a part-time basis (i.e. 50% of the time) between September 2006 and August 2007. From September 2007 onwards, a consultant was hired to manage the programme.

5.1.5 Review of Outcomes towards Impacts

145. Improved sustainability of consumption and production patterns in participating countries of LAC is expected to have environmental and socio-economic impacts, by reducing environmental and health hazards, loss of cultural identity and poverty associated with unsustainable production and consumption. To achieve more sustainable consumption and production in the LAC Region, the Programme worked on three fronts: development of national and regional policies, legislations and regulatory frameworks, capacity building for the private sector and awareness raising of the general public.

146. The contribution of the Programme to policies and measures aimed at promoting SCP patterns by Governments is very likely, considering the direct causal link between the achieved Programme outputs and specific objectives in terms of: (i) support to SCP policies in three countries of the LAC Region; (ii) support to regional and sub-regional expert meetings contributing to the inclusion of SCP in the LAC Ministerial Forum and the recognition of SCP as a high regional and sub-regional priority; and (iii) SPP activities carried out in MERCOSUR, which were only partly successful, but a good starting point to review how to deal with barriers for sub-regional integration in Latin American countries.

147. The contribution of the Programme to capacity building for the private sector is likely, although the number of MSMEs directly involved in Programme activities, due to budget constraints, was not enough to create the required momentum and achieve a more efficient and less polluting use of natural resources at the scale of the LAC Region. Success-stories of MSMEs that have adopted cleaner production methods did not receive enough nation-wide publicity nor did the MSMEs themselves make much use of their cleaner production model to advertise themselves.

148. The ISWM activity carried out in three provinces North of Lima contributed to the achievement of the programme's main objective through introducing a more sustainable management of solid waste involving reuse or recycling. However, this demonstration initiative remains on a very small scale to have a significant impact on the scale of the LAC Region, considering the enormous challenges of waste management region-wide. Along similar lines, the contribution of the different expos and training workshops on Cleaner Production and other SCP related topics for entrepreneurs, were most probably not enough to achieve significant advances in the Region for the involvement and participation of the private sector in implementing SCP patterns.

149. It should, finally, be noted that increased resources and a better awareness and understanding of the economic benefits of adopting cleaner production practices are needed for MSMEs to adopt cleaner production methods, and these issues were not dealt with in the Programme even though these were mentioned in the PRODOC as important factors for success. These factors can therefore be considered as fatal assumptions.

150. As regards increasing public and non-Government organization awareness for understanding the importance and promotion of SCP, it appears that the efforts undertaken by the Programme did not achieve significant impact. First, those efforts were not enough nor always appropriate to reach the largest number of people possible. For example, the expected impact of the Information Network on SCP is based on the assumption that the Internet is widely used by the general public throughout the Region, which is not (yet) the case. Second, the Programme expected to change existing attitudes and behavior of consumers by information dissemination and awareness raising efforts only, while consumption patterns are to a large extent determined by the consumers' income level, in particular for the poorer portions of the population. Given poor peoples' limited disposable income and restricted access to credit, they are often not able to expand their consumption choices and opt for healthier products and habits.

151. Derived from the above, in all likelihood, improved sustainability of consumption and production patterns has, so far, only been achieved on a relatively small scale in the immediate vicinity of Programme supported activities on the ground. Because no significant changes were achieved in private sector and consumer awareness and behavior towards more sustainable production and consumption at the scale of the Region, the environmental and socio-economic impacts of the Programme will mostly remain very localized.

152. In sum, although the Programme had positive effects on its three intervention fronts and achieved environmental and socio-economic impacts at the local level, it is moderately unlikely that the outcomes will lead to the expected impacts at the scale of the LAC Region, mainly because several assumptions made at design were not realistic.

5.2 Sustainability and Catalytic Role

5.2.1 Sustainability

153. Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts after the Programme funding ends. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors (financial, socio-political, institutional and environmental) that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits after the Programme was closed.

Financial Factors

154. In those countries where the Programme provided policy support (i.e. Ecuador, Uruguay and Colombia) and in a few countries where SCP policies and regulations are already well embedded in national policies (e.g. Brazil and Costa Rica), financial resources are likely to be set aside to implement those policies and strategies. For example, in Uruguay, the Ministry for the Environment has foreseen a budget to carry out the activities of the Action Plan for SCP, during the next five-years. In countries where the above conditions are absent, however, there is a high risk that the lack of financial resources will jeopardize the achieved outcomes and the desirable progress towards impacts.

155. One of the key factors that is likely to undermine the persistence of benefits after the Programme ends is the economic situation of some of the poorer countries of the region where activities were carried out, like Peru and most Central American countries. In these countries, public funding typically goes to infrastructure, education, health and other priorities, and not (yet) to cleaner, resource efficient production and more sustainable consumption. Ecuador, however, will most likely escape the financial risk to sustainability because the concept of SCP has been incorporated there within the National Development Plans and UNDAF, which are expected to give long-term financial sustainability to the initiatives which the Government has foreseen in its National SCP Policy.

156. As mentioned above (paragraphs 132-133) there is also a financial risk at the production and consumption level. MSMEs in the LAC Region more often than not lack the financial resources to allow for restructuring of existing business modalities, upgrading of equipment and introduction of clean technologies and production processes. On the consumption side, the low purchasing power of a large portion of the population keeps very often the more sustainable consumer goods and services out of their reach.

157. External financial resources are definitely needed to cover some medium and long-term activities for which very little internal resources are available within the private sector or the Governments of most countries in the Region. It is Moderately Unlikely that Programme results are financially sustainable without continued external support.

158. It should be noted that, since SCP is one of the Expected Accomplishments of the UNEP MTS 2010–2013, external funding will likely remain available from UNEP in the future to further promote the use of more efficient, clean and safe industrial production methods through increased public policies and private sector action. On the consumer awareness raising side, financial resources are also likely to remain available from UNEP, EU and other sources to increase the awareness of citizens on the importance of choosing for more resource-efficient and environmentally friendly products.

Socio-Political Factors

159. Along similar lines as the financial sustainability at the political level mentioned above (paragraphs 148-149), sustainability of Government commitment to promote SCP in the national and regional economies is very likely in those countries and sub-regions where there are strong institutional frameworks, and in particular there where SCP has been internalized in public policies (e.g. Brazil, Costa Rica, Uruguay and Colombia) or the National Development Plan (e.g. Ecuador). In

other countries where the Programme supported SCP-related initiatives, there is still a risk that Government change will stop or even reverse the process of introducing SCP in the national or sub-regional economies. In Peru, for instance, there is a moderate risk that the significant progress in Barranca, Huaura and Huaral Provinces will stagnate after the Programme ends, if there is no continuity in Government. The difficulty to initiate Programme initiatives in some countries due to the continuous changes of Government officials and the evident lack of political commitment (e.g. Argentina and Nicaragua) might be a forewarning of the risk for sustainability of Programme outcomes in those countries.

160. Where MSMEs were directly involved by Programme supported activities (training workshops, expos etc.), the private sector has bought-in very well in the cleaner production concepts. However, the knowledge and understanding that in many cases the investments in cleaner production processes are low and can be recovered swiftly due to improved efficiencies in the production process, are not yet as wide-spread in the Region as one would have hoped and most small-sized private businesses are still taking a passive stance, expecting Government or project support before making efforts towards cleaner production.

161. The Programme did not succeed to significantly change general public awareness of SCP issues, which consists another moderate risk to sustainability. Information and awareness raising efforts were not sufficient to change consumer attitudes and behavior, which are, in particular for the poorer portions of the population, determined by the consumer's level of income.

162. The assessment of sustainability due to Socio-Political Factors is Moderately Likely.

Institutional Framework and Governance Factors

163. The participation of sub-regional institutions, in support of the organization of a number of workshops, high-level meetings and the preparation of tools, is likely to contribute to the continuity of efforts to keep SCP on the political agendas of member countries. At the country level, however, there is a high dependency between sustenance of Programme outcomes and progress towards impact, on the one hand, and the institutional frameworks and environmental governance, on the other.

164. In Ecuador, the concept of SCP is incorporated in the National Development Plans and UNDAF, which is expected to help coordination among institutions involved in planning and implementation, and to guarantee long-term sustainability of SCP promotion efforts. In the case of Brazil, the Programme has worked with Sao Paulo state since it has one of the strongest institutional frameworks and level of governance in the country and LAC region. Dependency of level of Governance structure and institutional framework has been noticeable in this case. Similarly, Costa Rica has a strong institutional framework and high level of governance structure.

165. Technical know-how differs among countries in the LAC region. On the one hand, there are countries where Cleaner Production Policies have been implemented for several years and which have taken steps towards integrating sustainable consumption, as in the case of Brazil, Colombia, Uruguay and Ecuador. On the other hand, there are still many countries where technical know-how needs to be improved. Training workshops organized by the programme often involved a limited number of high-level public servants, but there is no evidence that these have passed on their new knowledge to others in their respective home-countries.

166. The private sector and the smaller producers in particular, still feel that it is the Governments' responsibility to provide the adequate policy and regulatory framework, and create incentives to attract investment in sustainable production. This perception was evidenced by the evaluator in Uruguay, Costa Rica and Ecuador and underlies the passive stance that most small businesses still maintain towards introducing cleaner production methods in their enterprises.

167. Based on the information gathered during this evaluation, the consultant believes that it is moderately likely that institutional and technical achievements, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures in the region in general will allow for the outcomes/benefits to be sustained. Therefore, the rating for sustainability due to the Institutional Framework and Governance Factors is Moderately Likely.

Environmental Factors

168. The SCP Programme in LAC aimed at contributing positively to the environment. It is likely that, where improvements to the environment are already visible, producers and consumers will be motivated to continue on the track towards cleaner production and more sustainable consumption. Visible improvements in the environment, however, remain limited to those areas, scattered around the Region, where the Programme supported concrete activities on the ground and are not likely to go much beyond in the near future.

169. On the other hand, the Programme did not support activities that pose a threat to the environment, nor do external environmental threats appear to exist that could undermine the future flow of Programme benefits.

170. Therefore, the assessment of sustainability due to environmental factors is Likely.

Overall Assessment of Sustainability

171. No environmental threats to Programme benefits exist, and several socio-political, institutional and governance factors are moderately likely to contribute to sustainability of Programme results. The main risk to sustainability resides in the lack of sustained financial resources, be it at the Governmental, the production (private sector) or the consumption (general public) level to adopt and maintain more sustainable production and consumption patterns. Overall, sustainability is therefore rated moderately unlikely.

5.2.2 Catalytic Role and Replication

Catalytic Role

172. The SCP Policy proposal for Colombia, the Strategy for implementation of SCP in Ecuador and the Action Plan for SCP in Uruguay have generated regulations, plans, specific activities and incentives to spread more sustainable consumption and production. For example, elements of Cleaner Production have been integrated in the Investment Laws of Uruguay. The catalytic role of the public policy changes supported by the Programme is evident.

173. Information dissemination, trainings and awareness raising events supported by the programme, such as the ExpoAmbiente 2007 in El Salvador, played a certain role in enhancing the catalytic role of the programme. However, these events were relatively isolated activities, without much follow-up.

174. Some follow-on financing from Governments and other donors has been secured through Programme activities. Examples are the Programme support to the preparation of the strategy for SCP policy implementation in Ecuador with contributions from UNDAF and the Government of Norway; the SCP Policy in Colombia with the contribution of the Government of Colombia etc..

Replication

175. Assessments or surveys on SCP for policy proposals, Expos, training activities, youthXchange websites and guides etc. can all be replicated elsewhere in the LAC Region by the institutions that have acquired experience in these matters through support from the programme.

176. Some outputs were accompanied by the development of guidelines (e.g. on Cleaner Production in pig farming in Central America, incorporation of sustainability criteria in public procurement in MERCOSUR, implementation of voluntary agreements on Cleaner Production in Central America, etc.), which will facilitate replication of processes, technologies etc.

177. The ISWM Demonstration Project in Peru brought satisfactory outcomes and can be replicated in other regions of Peru, Ecuador and Bolivia, where there is a high demand for a solution to the solid waste issue. The main barrier to replication is adequate funding for new initiatives. Three regional

Governments in Peru now have a ISWM Project and are looking for national Government financial support to implement it.

178. The Regional Information Center for Cleaner Production and Sustainable Consumption and Production in Saint Lucia supported by the Program can be replicated by any other representative public or private institution in each of the Latin American Sub-regions. The regional information network can also be replicated in other regions of the world. In both cases, funding will be the main challenge.

179. Considering the important catalytic role of the Programme at the policy level, but less so at the level of the producers and consumers, and the potential for replication of many programme-supported activities and pilot projects, even though financing new activities will often be a major challenge, the rating for catalytic role and replication is Moderately Satisfactory.

5.3 Processes affecting attainment of project results

5.3.1 Preparation and Readiness

180. The Programme's initial duration and budget were too limited to generate a significant impact on private sector, civil society and general public awareness and understanding of SCP issues, for the promotion of Sustainable Consumption and Production in the Region.

181. Programme design was rather minimalistic, with little detail for each output, expecting the country teams to design the activities under each output in more detail, to negotiate partnerships and financing etc.: this took considerable time after Programme approval.

182. The interests and capacities of executing agencies, Governments and other partners were taken into consideration when countries and partners were selected during Programme design. However, in some of the originally selected countries, unforeseeable institutional and political changes occurred that forced the Programme to look for different partner countries in the region for certain planned activities. The arrangements with partners were adequately spelled out in MOUs or SSFA agreements with UNEP.

183. For activities at the policy level, Programme partners were by default the sub-regional bodies (e.g. MERCOSUR, CCAD) and national Governments, often represented by the Ministries of Environment. There was a lack of direct participation from private sector bodies like chambers or entrepreneur associations.

184. The assessment of Preparation and Readiness of the Programme is Moderately Satisfactory.

5.3.2 Implementation Approach and Adaptive Management

185. In line with the PRODOC, the Programme was executed by the Technology, Industry and Economics (TIE) Programme within UNEP's Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (UNEP/ROLAC). UNEP/ROLAC housed the Project Coordinator, an Officer of UNEP's Division for Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE) and later a DTIE consultant, and provided support staff, logistics and administrative support. The DTIE Project Coordinator managed the Programme on a day-to-day basis and was directly in charge of the regional activities of the programme. National coordinators were appointed in countries where demonstration projects were conducted, who worked under direct supervision of UNEP/ROLAC's DTIE Project Coordinator.

186. According to the ProDoc both UNDESA and ECLAC were supposed to provide substantive contributions to the programme. UNDESA financed and attended the Fourth Regional Meeting of the Council of Government Experts held in Sao Paulo, Brazil in October 2007. ECLAC co-financed and attended the training workshop on Sustainable Public Procurement for South American Countries held in Santiago de Chile in May 2009, as part of the Sustainable Public Procurement project under the

Marrakesh Task Force. ECLAC also attended the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Council of LAC Government Experts in Cartagena, Colombia.

187. The Regional Council of SCP Government Experts was supposed to function as the Programme's Steering Committee, but this was not the case. As such, the Programme missed the opportunity to discuss high-level bottlenecks and obtain expert guidance and advice on its activities. However, the meetings did bring the opportunity for each country to meet the Programme Coordinator and discuss the status of Programme activities.

188. Overall, program management appears to have been efficient, effective and flexible enough to adjust project activities to the particular context of each country. As mentioned earlier, the consecutive Project Coordinators had to face several challenges that influenced Programme execution, namely: (i) Political and institutional changes in some of the countries previously selected for demonstration projects made it necessary to identify new partners to implement the planned activities; and (ii) There were sometimes important delays in getting approvals from the Governments selected to implement the activities designed by the programme. The Project Coordinators were able to adapt to changes during the life of the project, to enable the implementation of the Programme and its activities.

189. The overall rating for Implementation Approach and Adaptive Management of the Programme is Satisfactory.

5.3.3 Stakeholder Participation and Public Awareness

190. Stakeholder participation has been a strong feature throughout the diverse initiatives supported by the programme.

191. At the Regional Level, the main partners of the Programme were the Regional Council of Government Experts and the national SCP Focal Points. The SCP Focal Points belong to national environmental agencies (such as the Ministry for the Environment). Their influence in their respective home agency is often rather weak and their participation and contribution to processes at the regional level could still be increased. This is particularly the case for the Caribbean countries.

192. In the Sustainable Public Procurement Project, stakeholder involvement took place through an Environment Working Group that is institutionalized in MERCOSUR.

193. Involvement of the general public in SCP policy development processes was ensured through surveys and studies at the outset and posting of draft proposals on the Internet for public consultation. The Programme provided direct assistance to facilitate the involvement of private and public stakeholders in the formulation processes.

194. In the demonstration projects, stakeholder participation was ensured in most cases. For example, the Peruvian NGO CooperAccion in charge of the ISWM demonstration project, undertook all activities in coordination with the municipal authorities and beneficiary groups.

195. The private sector, including MSMEs, were directly involved by Programme in some activities (training workshops, expos, the ISWM Project in Peru etc.), but their representative bodies (Chambers of commerce, industry associations, unions etc.) were not involved sufficiently, even though they could have played a major role in "broadening the audience" of the Programme.

196. The effectiveness of public awareness activities were assessed under the effectiveness of SO6. In short, it appears that the awareness of the general public on SCP issues has not significantly improved, except when people were directly part of specific events such as the ExpoAmbiente in San Salvador and the National Industry Congress in Colombia which were partly financed by the Programme. As mentioned before, the Internet is currently not (yet?) the most effective medium for raising public awareness and promoting public involvement on SCP matters in LAC. Indeed, the portion of the general public that is likely to pay for Internet access to inform itself about sustainable consumption issues is very small. Also, the Internet is still used mostly in a passive manner (reading information on the web) and much less in an active manner (providing inputs to web content e.g. on web fora).

197. Considering the important efforts of the Programme to involve stakeholders in its supported activities, but its limited effectiveness in increasing public awareness on SCP issues, the assessment for this criterion is Moderately Satisfactory.

5.3.4 Country Ownership and Driven-ness

198. Government ownership and driven-ness are strongly related to the type of activities supported in the different countries. The table below summarizes the activities for each country and allows us to understand where ownership was stronger and where it was practically absent.

Table 5. Programme-supported initiatives per country

Country	Programme-supported activities
Colombia	Draft National Policy for SCP; Regional Council of Government Experts Meeting 2009; Training events on SCP in National Industry Congress and BioExpo 2008; Future Pilot for SPP in MERCOSUR initiative
Uruguay	Draft National Action Plan on Environmentally SCP
Ecuador	Draft National Policy on SCP; Draft regulation on plastic waste prevention and minimization; Adaptation of youthXchange
Costa Rica	Sub-regional SCP meeting for Mesoamerican countries 2008; 3 training workshops on SCP for MSMEs; Sub-regional training for Central America on SPP 2008; Future Pilot for an global SPP project.
Peru	ISWM demo project; SCP awareness campaign
Brazil	Regional Council of Government Experts Meeting 2007; Ongoing demo on increasing capacities of MSMEs to adopt SCP
Argentina	Ongoing capacity building initiative on SPP; Adaptation of youthXchange
El Salvador	ExpoAmbiente 2007 w/ training on Cleaner Production
Chile	Training workshop for South American Countries on SPP, May 2009
Suriname	SCP incorporated in biomedical waste management training 2009
St. Lucia	Caribbean SCP Information Center

Source: Terminal Report, March 2010

199. The Governments of Colombia, Uruguay, Ecuador and Costa Rica appear to be in control of the ongoing policy processes regarding SCP in their countries and are an important driving force behind the intended changes in production and consumption attitudes and behaviors in their industry and general population.

200. Most Governments of participating countries provided co-financing to project activities, be it through funding or in-kind, which is an indication of Government interest if not ownership of project outputs and achievements.

201. In those countries where punctual activities were implemented by non-Governmental partners, such as training events, expos etc. interaction with the national Government was often very limited, and in those countries Government ownership was, as can be expected, usually weak.

202. The demonstration project on ISWM in Peru benefited from a very strong involvement of local Government at the provincial and municipal level.

203. Overall, the assessment of Government ownership and driven-ness is Satisfactory.

5.3.5 Financial Planning and Management

204. Every year, the Programme Coordinator has prepared an “Annual Development Account Progress Report” that summarized *inter alia* the expenditures of the Programme to date and the work plan and budget for the coming yea. A review of these reports indicates that these probably allowed the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for a proper and timely flow of funds towards the supported initiatives. In all appearance, Programme funds were managed with due diligence.

205. The breakdown of final actual costs and co-financing for the project is presented in Annex 8. The main source of funding for the Programme originated from the UN Development Account (US\$560,000). Of this, US\$430,336.73 were effectively spent, i.e. 76.31 per cent of the planned amount.

206. Programme co-financing has been provided by several partners:

- UNEP has provided an in-kind contribution covering the cost of a full-time Project Coordinator, support staff, logistics and administrative support.
- The Government of Colombia made a contribution of US\$30,000 to activities in the country.
- The NFL project contributed US\$30,000 to activities carried out in Ecuador, US\$20,000 to the Fifth Expert meeting in Cartagena, Colombia, and US\$70,000 to the ISWM demonstration project north of Lima, Peru.
- The Andean Community contributed US\$30,000 for the assessment of SCP in the region.
- The Fifth Expert meeting in Cartagena received also co-financing from the UNEP/DTIE Marrakesh project (US\$40,000) and the Andean Community (US\$20,000).

207. In-kind contributions from countries where activities of the Programme were conducted were significant but difficult to estimate. Government officials from Costa Rica, Ecuador, Colombia, Uruguay, Brazil etc. were involved in activities such as preparing agreements with UNEP, giving information and feedback to the Project Coordinator, preparing Terms of Reference for contractual processes, reviewing contracts and products for services hire etc.

208. The Programme has leveraged resources for further promotion of SCP, inter alia:

- The UNDAF 2010–2013 for Ecuador through UNDP allocated a contribution of US\$100,000 to SCP initiatives in Ecuador.
- The European Union allocated US\$100,000 for a SPP project for Uruguay, Chile, Costa Rica

209. The overall evaluation of Financial Planning and Management is Satisfactory.

5.3.6 UNEP Supervision and backstopping

210. As mentioned above (paragraph 130), the Programme Coordinator changed twice, which caused delays in Programme start-up and implementation. UNEP did not provide a full-time coordinator for the whole duration of the Programme as originally planned.

211. However, in all appearances, the successive Programme Coordinators supervised the Programme in a satisfactory way, in continuous dialogue with the program counterparts in each country. They provided adequate reporting through the Annual Development Account Progress Reports, which candidly presented the status of Programme activities, mentioning successes and shortcomings. The reports, however, focus much more on outputs than on the achievement of Programme objectives (see paragraph 198).

212. In addition to participating in numerous training workshops, the two Regional Council of Government Experts meetings and the Sub-regional SCP meeting for Mesoamerica, the Programme Coordinator also carried out advisory missions to Quito, Ecuador, Sao Paulo, Brazil and Lima, Peru.

213. The Programme Coordinators received full support from UNEP Regional Director in Panama every time it was necessary, in order to solve a problem or to make a decision.

214. Overall, UNEP supervision and backstopping is rated Satisfactory.

5.3.7 Monitoring and Evaluation

M&E Design

215. The LOGFRAME of the Programme annexed to the PRODOC presented a clear logic between outputs and expected accomplishments of the programme. However, the specific objectives of the

Programme presented in the main text were absent from the LOGFRAME. The objectively verifiable indicators defined in the LOGFRAME were generally well chosen and measurable.

216. The M&E strategy presented in the PRODOC was not very detailed. It proposed quarterly M&E information collection and analysis by the Programme Coordinator, in particular on progress achieved in the planned activities, reaching of targets, problems encountered and expenditures incurred. Furthermore, twice a year a meeting should have been held for Programme planning and budget review. On these occasions all data collected on project progress and expenditures should have been analyzed in detail by key project participants. Team members in different countries should have participated via videoconference. Based on the result of this analysis a plan of work for the next year should have been agreed, indicating who will be responsible for the activities to be developed and what specific targets should be achieved.

217. It was planned that after 12 months of implementation, a mid-term review (MTR) of the Programme would be prepared. The MTR would be based on the information collected quarterly and, if necessary, on special surveys and interviews. In a similar way, a final review (Completion Report) would be prepared by the Programme Coordinator at the end of project execution. Finally, a final review and impact evaluation by an independent expert would be commissioned; US\$12,000 was allocated in the budget to conduct this task. There was no other budget foreseen for M&E, which was, in the evaluation's opinion, an important oversight.¹¹

M&E Implementation

218. M&E was carried out directly by the Programme Coordinators as part of their duties, without following an strict M&E plan. UNEP/ROLAC was not able to provide any evidence that quarterly monitoring and evaluation was effectively conducted or that the twice a year meetings for Programme planning and budget review were effectively held. The MTR was never prepared.

219. However, at the end of each year (2006 through 2008), the Programme Coordinator has submitted an "Annual Development Account Progress Report", that summarizes the status of every output of the Programme and makes a qualitative review of the expected accomplishments in line with the LOGFRAME. The reports explain the problems encountered, present the measures taken to ensure sustainability, and also revisions made to the activities and the budget of the Programme in order to remain relevant. The reports also present budget expenditures up to the date of the report and propose the work plan and budget for the next project year.

220. Two outcome indicators in the LOGFRAME were not reported on because they required additional data collection efforts that were never made: the improvement of skills of participating entrepreneurs in SCP trainings was supposed to be assessed through questionnaires at the beginning and after each training course attended and six months after the completion of the project; the raise in awareness on SCP of the general public was supposed to be measured by surveying a random sample of people exposed to the awareness campaigns, before and immediately after their exposure. The absence of measurement of these indicators made it very difficult for but the Programme implementers and the evaluators to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of capacity building efforts for MSMEs and awareness campaigns for the general public.

221. A Terminal Report was prepared in March 2010. It is very much focused on outputs of the project rather than outcomes and impacts, but indicates a number of interesting lessons learned, which have inspired the lessons learned and recommendations section of this Terminal Evaluation Report.

222. Considering the above, the overall assessment of M&E is Moderately Satisfactory.

¹¹ At current prices, a reasonable budget for an external evaluation, employing one consultant and including two country visits is about US\$30,000. If the team includes two consultants and more field visits are involved, then a budget of US\$50,000 should be adequate. This is more or less independent of the size of the project. This cost could seem high in comparison with the overall cost of the project, but the evaluation should not be seen as some external obligatory addition to the project: it is an opportunity for all stakeholders involved to reflect upon and learn from the experiences of the project, which is an integral part of the project cycle.

5.4 Complementarity with UNEP Medium Term Strategy and Programme of Work

Linkage to UNEP's Expected Accomplishments of Medium Term Strategy (MTS) 2010 – 2013.

223. In the UNEP Medium Term Strategy (MTS) 2010-2013 the Programme on SCP in LAC fits under Sub-programme 6 "Resource Efficiency and Sustainable Consumption and Production". This Sub-programme has three Expected Accomplishments and the Programme on SCP in LAC has contributed to all three:

- *Resource efficiency is increased and pollution is reduced over product life cycles and along supply chains.* The Programme has contributed by increasing the number of Governments adopting policies and businesses adopting management practices for resource-efficient and sustainable production.
- Investment in efficient, clean and safe industrial production methods through public policies and private sector action is increased. The Programme has contributed to increase the number of Governments to select environmentally sound technologies through the sustainable public procurement and integrated solid waste management initiatives. It has also probably increased the number of businesses selecting more resource-efficient management practices and production methods through the training workshop on SCP.
- *Consumer choice favors more resource efficient and environmentally friendly products.* The awareness campaigns supported by the Programme should have contributed to directing consumer choices to more sustainable products, although this is probably limited to consumers with a relatively high purchasing power.

Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building

224. The most effective contributions of the SCP Regional Programme in changing SCP patterns in LAC were the national SCP policies and strategies supported by the Programme and the sub-regional cooperation. However, at the end of the programme, there is no a significant contribution for the Promotion of Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns, as the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building addressed.

South-South Cooperation

225. The Regional and Sub-regional meetings of Government Experts on SCP as well as other collaborative efforts for several Programme outputs (SPP initiative at the level of MERCOSUR, Andean Community initiative to incorporate SCP in National policies, sub-regional training workshops and networks etc.) have significantly contributed to South-South Cooperation.

6 Conclusions and Recommendations

6.1 Conclusions

226. Probably the two most effective contributions of the Programme in changing SCP patterns in LAC, regarded national SCP policy and strategy development and (sub-)regional cooperation. SCP has gained more relevance, attention and commitment from Governments in the region. It is now included in the regional political agenda as one of the main priorities, formally ratified by the Forum of Ministers of Environment of LAC. Expanding on the former focus on cleaner production, the sustainable consumption aspect is now also taken into account for policy development and implementation programmes: projects for SCP policy development are ongoing in Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Mexico and Uruguay and new initiatives are taking place for SCP policy implementation in Brazil.

227. Contributions from the Programme to build capacities of MSMEs on cleaner production and to create awareness of the general public on sustainable consumption were less effective. Their intended coverage and duration was not enough, and collaboration with private sector bodies and civil society too limited, to reach a significant number of producers and consumers in the Region.

228. The relatively limited number of MSMEs and consumers effectively reached by the training workshops, awareness campaigns and other initiatives may have increased their understanding of SCP issues, but these stakeholders often miss the financial resources to change their production and consumption patterns.

229. The initial under-design of Programme outputs by UNEP, changes in Programme management and changes in partner countries, created delays in the launching of demonstration projects. A number are still ongoing, after Programme closing. Demonstration projects, such as the ISWM project in Peru, had considerable local impact and are on their way for replication elsewhere in the country.

230. Even though the limited success of the outcome of SPP activity at a sub-regional group, south-south cooperation has been enhanced through the development of a MERCOSUR sub-regional initiative.

231. The initiatives carried out in the region in the area of SPP generated an important basis of knowledge and awareness among Government institutions. This contributed to the fact that the region was very well prepared to take the opportunity for joining SPP pilot projects, through a global project funded by EU and Switzerland. The activities carried out by the Programme prepared and facilitated the compliance of the countries with the conditions to become pilot projects.

232. The Regional web based Network on SCP has played a limited role to public awareness but is an important tool to disseminate information to the network members.

233. Table 6 below summarizes the assessment and ratings for all evaluation criteria reviewed by this evaluation.

Table 6. Summary ratings table

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary	Rating¹²
Attainment of project objectives and results		S
Effectiveness	Three countries supported by the Programme are already very far in the process of developing national policies and strategies on SCP. The Regional Council of SCP Government Experts has strengthened its work and its connections with partners and stakeholders in the region. Partnerships have also been strengthened at the sub-regional level. ISWM was successfully promoted in Peru and Ecuador, respectively through a demonstration project and support to drafting of a regulation on plastic waste management. MSMEs' and Government officials' understanding of SCP issues has been improved through several work shops throughout the Region. However, improved understanding does not necessarily lead to changed behavior, as this requires resources and skills which are often absent. Awareness raising initiatives were successfully supported and are likely to have contributed to raise awareness among the general public. Income poverty, however, often constraints people's ability to significantly change consumption patterns. The Programme was less successful in promoting SPP within MERCOSUR.	S
Relevance	The Programme was built upon and complemented ongoing SCP initiatives conducted by UNEP and others. Its SOs were fully in line with Expected Accomplishments of the Sub-programmes 4 and 5 of UNEP's BPSB 2006-2007. Outputs of the Programme contribute to the GEO SSN at UNEP. Outcomes should	S

¹² Ratings for Sustainability: L – Likely; ML – Moderately Likely; MU – Moderately Unlikely; U – Unlikely
Ratings for other criteria: HS – Highly Satisfactory; S – Satisfactory; MS – Moderately Satisfactory; MU - Moderately Unsatisfactory; U – Unsatisfactory

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary	Rating¹²
	contribute to achieving MDG No. 7 (Environmental Sustainability).	
Efficiency	The Programme was found cost-effective, although it is difficult to estimate the real output over cost ratio, as the Programme often provided only part of the funding for its supported activities. Programme start-up was delayed and several activities also took off with considerable delay due to a minimalistic design, changes in intervention countries, Governments and Programme staff and delays in obtaining Government approval for certain initiatives.	MS
Sustainability		MU
Financial Factors	In the countries where the Programme helped develop policies and strategies on SCP, it is likely that financial resources will be set aside for their implementation. In poorer countries, SCP is not yet a priority and public resources are more likely to go towards basic infrastructure, education and other areas considered of a higher priority. At the production (private sector) and consumption (general public) levels, lack of financial resources and incentives is likely to hamper generalization of more SCP patterns.	MU
Socio-Political Factors	Continued Government commitment to promote SCP is very likely in those countries where the Programme supported the development of policies and strategies. Elsewhere, there is still a risk that changes in Government will reduce attention to promoting SCP patterns in the national economies. Progress by MSMEs towards cleaner production and further consumer awareness raising depends to a large extent on continuing Government commitment.	ML
Institutional Framework and Governance Factors	Sub-regional and national institutions involved in Programme activities were strengthened in varying degrees. Regulatory frameworks and technical know-how is also quite unequal throughout the Region, depending much on for how long countries' Governments have been concerned by and integrating SCP issues.	ML
Environmental Factors	Programme results do not seem to be causing or subject to any environmental threats. They should, on the contrary, contribute to an improved environment, which, in turn, should further stimulate the public and private sectors to pursue their efforts in adopting more SCP patterns.	L
Catalytic Role and Replication	The catalytic role of public policy changes in Colombia, Ecuador and Uruguay appears evident. In most other countries of the Region, the evaluation could not attribute fundamental institutional changes to the programme. It is doubtful that the number of entrepreneurs and consumers directly involved in Programme activities would have been sufficient for them to play a catalytic role at the scale of their country, sub-region or region. Some follow-on financing from Governments and donors has been secured through Programme activities. Many Programme activities can be replicated because capacities were strengthened and several events were capitalized in guidelines and manuals. Funding is the main challenge.	MS
Stakeholder participation/public awareness	Stakeholder participation has been a strong feature throughout the diverse initiatives supported by the programme, at all levels of intervention. However, public awareness was probably not increased as expected because the coverage and instruments used for awareness campaigns were inadequate to reach significant numbers at the scale of the Region.	MS
Country ownership / driven-ness	Government ownership was strongest in countries where the Programme supported policy processes. Local Government was much involved in the demonstration project on ISWM in Peru.	S

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary	Rating¹²
	Involvement of Government in countries where only punctual activities were supported was very limited.	
Achievement of outputs and activities	<p>The Programme achieved most of its intended outputs. Both Ecuador and Colombia have now draft National Policies and Uruguay has a National Action Plan on SCP. Government SCP Expert Meetings were supported both at the Regional and sub-regional levels. A demonstration project on ISWM in Peru was successfully conducted. Various capacity building workshops were supported on SCP related subjects for MSMEs. Awareness raising efforts for the general public were also delivered as planned.</p> <p>On some outputs, however, the Programme was seriously delayed or performed below target: a study on MSMEs' capacity to move towards SCP patterns is still to be launched in Brazil; another demonstration project in Argentina on SPP is still ongoing; only one sub-regional trade & technology expo was supported instead of two; and only one publication instead of two was prepared on lessons learned and progress made in LAC on SCP.</p>	S
Preparation and Readiness	Programme design was minimalistic, expecting the country teams to design the activities under each output in more detail which took considerable time. The Programme's initial duration and budget were too limited to generate a significant impact on private sector, civil society and general public awareness and understanding of SCP issues, for the promotion of SCP in the Region. Execution partners were well chosen, although private sector bodies were not sufficiently involved.	MS
Monitoring and Evaluation		MS
M&E Design	The LOGFRAME is simple and logic, though it does not mention the SOs of the Programme but expected accomplishments instead. The M&E strategy was not very detailed at design, but simple and straightforward. It was, however, under-budgeted, so difficult to implement.	MS
M&E Implementation	M&E was not conducted as planned, but more on a continuous basis through regular communicating between the Programme Coordinator and country teams. Annual reporting was of an acceptable standard, though very output-oriented. So was the Terminal Report of the programme.	MS
Implementation Approach and Adaptive Management	The Programme followed the implementation arrangements foreseen at design. Programme management appears to have been efficient, effective and flexible enough to adapt to changes in the context.	S
Financial Planning and Management	Financial Planning was done on a yearly basis, through the Annual Development Account Progress Reports. Programme Funds appear to have been managed with due diligence. The Programme disbursed about 76 per cent of its core funding. Co-financing was provided in funds or in-kind by several partners such as UNEP, Governments, the NFL Project, the EU etc.	S
UNEP Supervision and backstopping	Although the Programme Coordinator changed twice, it seems they did a good job in terms of Programme supervision and reporting. The UNEP Regional Director provided support when needed.	S

6.2 Lessons Learnt

234. The Regional LAC Council of Experts in Sustainable Consumption and Production, under the Forum of Latin America and Caribbean Ministers for the Environment, is a valuable instrument to

support Governments and to enhance capacity building, share knowledge and experience among members. Fostering information exchange and capacity building through a regional hub has been a very cohesive mechanism for all SCP experts in the region and has facilitated the establishment of connection with other regional initiatives. Sub-regional entities such as CARICOM, CCAD, CAN and MERCOSUR are also strategic partners for mainstreaming SCP into the economies of the Sub-regions of LAC. The facilitation role offered by the sub-regional institutions in fostering SCP dissemination and multiplying efforts has proved to be crucial.

235. UNEP plays an important role in supporting governments in the development of SCP policies and programmes at country level. The most valuable contribution can be made when the intervention is targeting strategic planning and policy development – supported by demonstration projects - more than in the development of a scattered number of different SCP punctual interventions.

236. SCP is not yet a priority in countries with high levels of poverty. In those countries, improvement of basic infrastructure, education and health services usually receive a much higher priority than tackling environmental sustainability concerns in production and consumption, even though it is recognized that SCP might create more jobs, improve health conditions and ultimately reduce poverty. SCP patterns are easier to promote when coupled to strong industrial development and considered as a way to increase productivity, rather than promoted as a way to combat poverty.

237. Several countries selected at Programme design to implement pilot projects had to be replaced by other countries for a variety of reasons, which led to important delays. Although it is advisable to identify countries for pilot activities well in advance, to ensure that the countries are committed and that the pilot projects are relevant and part of their development priorities, a closer-up feasibility check and firmer evidence of government commitment should be required.

238. There were MSMEs have been directly involved in Programme initiatives, their buy-in in cleaner production concepts was generally very good. However, most small producers in the Region still take a passive stance towards introducing cleaner production patterns in their enterprises, expecting Government or project support to do so. This seems to be to a large extent a matter of poor understanding of the costs and benefits of introducing cleaner production methods. Demonstration projects without massive publicity around their successes have little effect on the attitudes and behavior of stakeholders that are not directly involved.

6.3 Recommendations

239. UNEP should reinforce efforts to strengthen the Regional Council of Experts and its capacities to influence the SCP agenda, ensuring that other relevant stakeholders are also involved in the decision making process, with the objective of facilitating the achievement of results in all priority areas. Such stakeholders will include the private sector, academia, NGOs, among others. The 16th Forum of Ministers of the Environment of LAC approved in its Decision Number Five in April 2010, *inter alia*, to support the implementation of the priority areas of SCP, taking into consideration the themes identified in the Final Report of the Fifth Meeting of Government Experts on SCP of LAC, and to promote the strengthening of institutions (Government and non-Government) responsible for SCP in each country and their active participation in the regional activities related with SCP.

240. UNEP should re-enforce its collaboration with Sub-regional entities such as CARICOM, CCAD, CAN and MERCOSUR which are strategic partners for mainstreaming SCP into the integration processes and the socio-economic development agenda of each LAC country. Some countries in the region have already acquired good experiences and expertise on Sustainable Production – particularly on Cleaner Production – that could benefit other countries in the region through a mechanism of south-south cooperation.

241. Information exchange and cooperation among countries still needs to be reinforced, not just among Governments but also among private enterprises and civil society.

242. Within countries, it is also essential to strengthen partnerships among key Government sectors areas in the Governments besides Ministries for the Environment such as Investment and Promotion Office, Planning, Energy, Transport, Economy and Finance, Education Ministries, Science and

Technology Office, etc. and even Regional or Local Governments. Enhanced dialogue and cooperation among these institutions in each country will facilitate the development of concrete projects and effective policies.

243. It is necessary also to involve a wider group of stakeholders to ensure effective uptake of SCP. Civil society, industry associations, technology centers and universities among others need definitely to be more involved in the SCP process. They play an important role for the dissemination of good practices. Governments should be coordinating with the private sector and civil society in order to achieve more tangible results. The Marrakech Process in the region should continue the positive practice of opening the dialogue with other relevant stakeholders, including the private sector, academia, civil society, etc.

244. A large number of manuals, methodologies and guidelines have been developed which need to be shared and made available to all users, to limit duplication of efforts.

245. Technical assistance should be provided to new demonstration projects on sustainable production in the Region, that involve more the private sector, especially MSMEs. Demonstrations should always be accompanied by a massive publicity campaign, to raise the awareness of the enterprises that are not directly involved in the demo. Advice should be given to MSMEs how to include the "clean producer" aspect in their advertising, and the Government should mention the successful cleaner producers by name in public awareness raising campaigns, providing these MSMEs with free advertising. Another track that is worth exploring is the eco-labeling of the clean products of MSMEs.

246. The sustainable consumption side of the SCP represents perhaps the biggest challenge for the Region and should receive more attention by UNEP and Governments alike. Additional research is needed to identify and understand current consumption patterns, and develop appropriated instruments and mechanisms to promote the change in consumption patterns in the Region.

Annex 1: TORs for the Evaluation

Implementation of a Regional Programme on Sustainable Production and Consumption in Latin America and the Caribbean

1. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

Project rationale

The project Implementation of a Regional Programme on Sustainable Production And Consumption In Latin America And The Caribbean aimed at supporting the development and implementation of concrete policies and projects to accelerate the shift towards sustainable consumption and production (SCP) patterns, with the active participation of key stakeholders from Governments, private sector, civil society (NGOS), mass media as well as the general public. Changing production and consumption patterns was one of the major challenges identified at the Rio Earth Summit in 1992 and ratified during the World Summit for Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg.

The Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, adopted in June 1992 commits the signatory states to “cooperate in a spirit of global partnership to conserve, protect and restore the health and integrity of the Earth's ecosystem”.

- At the regional and national levels the project builds on the needs identified during the meetings of national experts and Government officials held in Argentina, Nicaragua and Panama in 2003 as well as the expert meeting in Marrakech in 2003 and in Costa-Rica in 2005.
- The Overall Objective of the Project:

The Overall Objective Was: Sustainable Consumption And Production Patterns In Participating Countries Of Latin America And The Caribbean.

- Specific objectives of the project were to:
 -
 - 1. Develop and adopt **national strategies on sustainable consumption and production**;
 - 2. Support the design and implementation of **integrated waste management systems** and promote policies on waste prevention and minimization;
 - 3. Improve the **capacities and knowledge of MSMEs** on environmentally friendly technologies, cleaner production and eco-design;
 - 4. Support the implementation of **sustainable public procurement programmes** by Governments;
 - 5. Increase the **environmental awareness on sustainable consumption and production**; and
 - 6. Strengthen the **Regional Council of Government Experts on SCP**.

Relevance to UNEP Programmes

This project was supposed to complement and build on prior or ongoing activities of other UNEP capacity building programmes and initiatives, in particular, it was linked to UNEP's Sub-programme 4, Technology, Industry and Economics and to its expected accomplishment *increased understanding and implementation by public and private sector decision makers and organizations of environmentally sound management practices and tools, including cleaner production, sustainable consumption and prevention and responses to environmental threats and emergencies through:*

- General Assembly Resolution 58/197 “International trade and development”;
- UNEP Governing Council Decisions:
 - o 21/14 “Trade and environment”;
 - o 22/6 “Promotion of sustainable consumption and production patterns”;
 - o 22/7 “Engaging business and industry”;

It was also linked to UNEP's Sub-programme 5, "Regional Cooperation and Representation" and its expected accomplishment, "increased capacities of countries and regional bodies in the legal, policy and institutional areas to address environmental priority issues" through:

- UNEP Governing Council decisions:
 - o 20/39 Functioning of the regional offices and proposed measures for the strengthening of regionalization and decentralization;
 - o 22/21 Regional implementation of the programme of work of the United Nations Environment Programme.

The project was designed taking into consideration the impact of SCP on employment generation and poverty reduction, environment conservation and sustainable human development. Through the adoption of sustainable patterns of consumption and production in the Latin American and the Caribbean Region, the project was supposed to contribute towards assisting countries in achieving the Millennium Development Goals 1, 7, and 8 of reducing extreme poverty, promoting environmental stability and building global partnerships for development.

Executing Arrangements

UNEP implemented the project through its Technology, Industry and Economics (TIE) programme within the Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (ROLAC) in close cooperation with UNEP Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE) and in consultation with the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA) and the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).

- The project targeted all 4 sub-regions of the LAC region by implementing 7 demonstration projects and key activities in the following countries: Argentina and Brazil for the Southern Cone, Saint Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago and Cuba for the Caribbean, Nicaragua, EL Salvador, Costa Rica, Panama and Mexico for Central America and Colombia, and Peru for the Andean Countries. The beneficiaries of the project were the Governments in the target countries, consumers, NGOs and the private sector.

The project involved 11 countries of the LAC region through The Regional Council of Experts, as well as through subregional organizations such as MERCOSUR, CARICOM, CAN, CCAD, and enhancing partnerships between the private sector, civil society and the Governments. These partnerships would further expanded through dissemination of the project experience and lessons learnt through global networks within the framework of Marrakech Process.

Project Activities:

Component 1:

Establishing of two demonstration projects (in Argentina and Nicaragua) to guide the Development of national SCP policies and strategies in participation with key stakeholders (Government agencies, private companies, consumer organizations, NGOs)

The national strategies were supposed to build on the existing national policies (e.g. National Strategies on Sustainable Development, Poverty Reduction Strategies) and find the synergies and new opportunities to contribute to poverty reduction by promoting SCP. A methodology designed by UNDESA and used to develop the cleaner production strategies of both countries could have been used as a methodological starting point.

Component 2:

Implementing two meetings of the regional Council of Government Experts on SCP to share experiences and best practices on SCP policies and strategies (in Peru and Cuba)

These meetings of the regional Council of Government Experts on SCP aimed at capacity building and sharing good practices- streamlined national policies, legal and normative frameworks, creating favorable conditions for introduction and promotion of SCP patterns and practice as well as improved institutional capacities of stakeholders to design, implement and monitor SCP policies and processes.

Component 3:

Establishing a demonstration Project in Nicaragua on Integrated Municipal Solid Waste management in Managua

This activity was supposed to build on UNEP-ROLAC on-going work with the Nicaraguan Ministry of Environment and Municipalities that facilitated south-south cooperation on good practices in Municipal Solid Waste Management. It was supposed to involve private companies and consumer groups and contribute to policy recommendations for Central America. This activity was linked to the Marrakech process task force on "Integrated Waste Management System".

Component 4:

Establishing a demonstration Project in Brazil on to increase the capacities of Micro and Small Enterprises (MSMEs) to move towards Sustainable Consumption and Production patterns

This activity aimed at improving the capacities and knowledge of MSMEs on cleaner technologies to reduce their environmental impacts and become more competitive and profitable.

Component 5:

Implementing four capacity-building workshops and exhibitions on environmentally friendly technologies, cleaner production and eco-design for MSMEs (in Colombia, Costa Rica, Trinidad and Tobago and El Salvador)

This activity was linked to the Marrakech Process Task Force on SCP for Micro, Small and Medium Size Enterprises.

Component 6:

Establishing two demonstration projects on sustainable public procurement (in Argentina and Mexico)

Two demonstration projects on sustainable public procurement were supposed to be implemented in a coordinated manner in Argentina and Mexico facilitating the exchange of information, identifying common obstacles, challenges and opportunities. This activity was linked to the Marrakech Process Task Force on Sustainable Public Procurement. The activities of this component were supposed to lead to the adoption of sustainable public procurement practices and procedures by these two Governments in the region.

Component 7:

Implementing four awareness campaigns for Governments, private companies and consumer groups conducted in each of the 4 sub-regions of the LAC region

These campaigns would increase the environmental awareness on sustainable consumption and production of Governments, private sector and civil society. They would be based on education and communication strategies developed at sub-regional levels. The contents of the campaigns would be based on the results of the demonstration projects. This activity was supposed to contribute to the UN Decade on Education for Sustainable Development and build upon other existing UNEP programmes (e.g. Youth Exchange) and forums (e.g. Advertising and Communication Forum).

Component 8:

Establishing a demonstration project aimed at the creation of a Sub-Regional SCP Information Center for the Caribbean (based in Saint Lucia)

This centre would improved exchange of information on SCP policies, new technologies, best practices, ongoing projects, funding opportunities in the Caribbean and would also contribute to increasing awareness of producers and consumers on the benefits of SCP.

Component 9:

Organizing two subregional trade and technology fairs for and with participation of representatives of private sector and Government organizations in Mexico and El Salvador

One of these was the 3rd Expo-Ambiente MesoAmericana "Soluciones Ambientales para la Produccion y Consumo Sostenibles" held in San Salvador in June 2007.

These fairs were meant to introduce, promote and disseminate new cleaner and efficient technologies, and facilitate the establishment of trade and industrial networks.

Component 10:

Creating an online information hub to disseminate information on SCP through the existing 5 national information centers established by UNEP in Argentina, Venezuela, Panama, and 2 in Cuba

This information hub would strengthen the Regional Council of Government Experts on SCP by facilitating the exchange of information among the regional programmes, ensuring the adequate dissemination of best practices, relevant information and motivating active policy dialogue. It was supposed to generate a wealth of systematized information and make it available 24/7 for all interested parties (Governments, producers, consumers). It was supposed to promote better local intellectual and institutional capacities through increased South-South cooperation; business solutions, legislative acts and make scientific information available at low cost for all users.

This activity included the establishment of knowledge groups utilizing local expertise in participating countries through Government agencies, media, research and educational intuitions, civil society, consumer groups through online networks.

Component 11:

Printing two publications on lessons learnt on the implementation of SCP in LAC region for distribution among stakeholders.

Budget

The project had the following budgetary allocation:

The total project cost USD 560,000.

UNEP Staff time equivalent = USD 100,000 (in-kind through full-time project coordinator, support staff, logistics and administrative support)

Contributions of participating Governments' in staff time equivalent USD 2,000 per month per country

Total contribution per country USD 240,000

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION

1. Objective and Scope of the Evaluation

The objective of this terminal evaluation is to examine the extent and magnitude of any project impacts to date and determine the likelihood of future impacts. The evaluation will also assess project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results. The evaluation will focus on the following main questions:

- Did the project through its activities encourage and support sustainable consumption and production patterns in participating countries of Latin America and the Caribbean regions?
- Did the project develop and adopt national strategies on sustainable consumption and production;
- Did the project support the design and implementation of integrated waste management systems and promote policies on waste prevention and minimization;
- To what extent did the project improve the capacities and knowledge of MSMEs on environmentally friendly technologies, cleaner production and eco-design;
- To what extent did the project support the implementation of sustainable public procurement programmes by Governments;
- To what extent did the project increase the environmental awareness on sustainable consumption and production; and strengthen the regional council of Government experts on SCP

2. Methods

This terminal evaluation will be conducted as an in-depth evaluation using a participatory mixed-methods approach, during which the UNEP Project Task Manager, key representatives of the executing agencies and other relevant staff are kept informed and consulted throughout the evaluation. The consultant will liaise with the UNEP Evaluation Office and the UNEP Project Task Manager on any logistic and/or methodological issues to properly conduct the review in as independent way as possible, given the circumstances and resources offered. The draft report will be delivered to the Evaluation Office and circulated to UNEP Project Task Manager and key representatives of the executing agencies. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to the UNEP Evaluation Office for collation and the consultant will be advised of any necessary or suggested revisions.

The findings of the evaluation will be based on multiple approaches:

1. A desk review of project documents including, but not limited to:
 - (a) The PRODOC, outputs, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNEP and UNEP annual Project Implementation Review reports) and relevant correspondence.
 - (b) Notes from the Project Task Manager's office.
 - (c) Other project-related material produced by the project staff or partners.
 - (d) Relevant material published on the project web-site.
2. Interviews with project management and technical support staff.
3. Interviews and telephone interviews with intended users for the project outputs and other stakeholders involved with this project, including in the participating countries and international bodies. The Consultant shall determine whether to seek additional information and opinions from representatives of donor agencies and other organisations. As appropriate, these interviews could be combined with an email questionnaire, online survey, or other electronic communication.
4. Interviews with the UNEP Project Task Manager and Fund Management Officer, and other relevant staff in UNEP dealing with ROA Capacity Building Project. The Consultant shall also gain broader perspectives from discussions with relevant UNEP Programme staff.

5. Field visits¹³ to project staff and target audiences. The evaluator will make field visits to the Latin America and the Caribbean Region and to meet key beneficiaries of the project to get their opinions on the project performance.

Key Evaluation principles

In attempting to evaluate any outcomes and impacts that the project may have achieved, evaluators should remember that the project's performance should be assessed by considering the difference between the answers to two simple questions "**what happened?**" and "**what would have happened anyway?**". These questions imply that there should be consideration of the baseline conditions and trends in relation to the intended project outcomes and impacts. In addition it implies that there should be plausible evidence to **attribute** such outcomes and impacts **to the actions of the project**.

Sometimes, adequate information on baseline conditions and trends is lacking. In such cases this should be clearly highlighted by the evaluator, along with any simplifying assumptions that were taken to enable the evaluator to make informed judgements about project performance.

3. Project Evaluation Parameters and Ratings

The success of project implementation will be rated on a scale from 'highly unsatisfactory' to 'highly satisfactory'. In particular the evaluation shall **assess and rate** the project with respect to the eleven categories defined below¹⁴.

It should be noted that many of the evaluation parameters are interrelated. For example, the 'achievement of objectives and planned results' is closely linked to the issue of 'sustainability'. Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts and is, in turn, linked to the issues of 'catalytic effects / replication' and, often, 'country ownership' and 'stakeholder participation'.

4. Project Evaluation Parameters and Ratings

The success of project implementation will be rated on a scale from 'highly unsatisfactory' to 'highly satisfactory'. In particular the evaluation shall **assess and rate** the project with respect to the eleven categories defined below¹⁵.

It should be noted that many of the evaluation parameters are interrelated. For example, the 'achievement of objectives and planned results' is closely linked to the issue of 'sustainability'. Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts and is, in turn, linked to the issues of 'catalytic effects / replication' and, often, 'country ownership' and 'stakeholder participation'.

1. Attainment of objectives and planned results:

The evaluation should assess the extent to which the project's major relevant objectives were effectively and efficiently achieved or are expected to be achieved and their relevance. Any project contributions to the achievement of UNEP Expected Accomplishments¹⁶ should be clearly highlighted.

- **Effectiveness:** Evaluate the overall likelihood of impact achievement, taking into account the "achievement indicators", the achievement of outcomes and the progress made towards impacts. UNEP's Evaluation Office advocates the use of the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method (described in Annex 5) to establish this rating. The analysis should specify whether the project has plausible causal pathways that link project activities to the achievement of Expected Accomplishments. It should also specify whether the intervention is likely to have any lasting differential impacts in relation to gender.
- **Relevance:** In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with those of the programme frameworks and thematic sub programmes? Ascertain the nature and significance of the contribution of the project outcomes to GEO SSN and

¹³ Evaluators should make a brief courtesy call to UNEP Focal points during field visits if at all possible.

¹⁴ However, the views and comments expressed by the evaluator need not be restricted to these items.

¹⁵ However, the views and comments expressed by the evaluator need not be restricted to these items.

¹⁶ UNEP Expected accomplishments are specified in the 2010- 2011 Programme of Work and the 2010-2013 Medium Term Strategy. <http://www.unep.org/PDF/FinalMTSGCSS-X-8.pdf>

other UNEP thematic sub programmes. To what extent does the project intervention link to the achievement of the MDGs (in particular Goal 7)?

- *Efficiency:* Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was, then did that affect cost-effectiveness? Assess the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing, and any additional resources leveraged by the project, to the project's achievements. Did the project build on earlier initiatives; did it make effective use of available scientific and / or technical information? Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.

2. Sustainability:

Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts after the project funding ends. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits after the project ends. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, e.g. stronger institutional capacities or better informed decision-making. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes. The evaluation should ascertain to what extent follow-up work has been initiated and how project outcomes will be sustained and enhanced over time.

Application of the ROTl method described in Annex 7 will also assist in the evaluation of sustainability.

Five aspects of sustainability should be addressed: financial, socio-political, institutional frameworks and governance, environmental (if applicable). The following questions provide guidance on the assessment of these aspects:

- *Financial resources.* Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes and onward progress towards impact? What is the likelihood that financial and economic resources will not be available once the project funding ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)? To what extent are the outcomes and eventual impact of the project dependent on continued financial support?
- *Socio-political:* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes and onward progress towards impacts? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- *Institutional framework and governance.* To what extent is the sustenance of the outcomes and onward progress towards impacts dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance? What is the likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for, the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? While responding to these questions consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency and the required technical know-how are in place.
- *Environmental.* Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits? The TE should assess whether certain activities in the project area will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes. For example; construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralize the biodiversity-related gains made by the project; or, a newly established pulp mill might jeopardise the viability of nearby protected forest areas by increasing logging pressures; or a vector control intervention may be made less effective by changes in climate and consequent alterations to the incidence and distribution of malarial mosquitoes. Would these risks apply in other contexts where the project may be replicated?

3. Catalytic Role and Replication

The catalytic role of UNEP is embodied in its approach of supporting the creation an enabling environment, investing in activities which are innovative and show how new approaches and market changes can work, and supporting activities that can help upscale new approaches to a national (or regional) level to sustainably achieve global environmental benefits.

In general this catalytic approach can be separated into are three broad categories of activities: (1) “**foundational**” and enabling activities, focusing on policy, regulatory frameworks, and national priority setting and relevant capacity (2) **demonstration** activities, which focus on demonstration, capacity development, innovation, and market barrier removal; and (3) **investment** activities (rarely if ever undertaken exclusively by UNEP) with high rates of cofunding, catalyzing investments or implementing a new strategic approach at the national level.

The three categories approach combines all the elements that have been shown to catalyze results in international cooperation. Evaluations in the bilateral and multilateral aid community have shown time and again that activities at the micro level of skills transfer—piloting new technologies and demonstrating new approaches—will fail if these activities are not supported at the institutional or market level as well. Evaluations have also consistently shown that institutional capacity development or market interventions on a larger scale will fail if Governmental laws, regulatory frameworks, and policies are not in place to support and sustain these improvements. And they show that demonstration, innovation and market barrier removal do not work if there is no follow up through investment or scaling up of financial means. (From UNEP OPS4)

In this context the evaluation should assess the catalytic role played by this project by consideration of the following questions:

- INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provided incentives (socio-economic / market based) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholder behaviours?
- INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviors?
- POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?
- CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project contribute to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different from co-financing)
- PROJECT CHAMPIONS: To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)?

(Note: the ROtl analysis should contribute useful information to address these questions)

Replication approach, in the context of UNEP projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources).

Is the project suitable for replication? If so, has the project approach been replicated? If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the strategy / approach adopted by the projected to promote replication effects.

4. Stakeholder participation / public awareness:

This consists of three related and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the UNEP project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project. The evaluation will specifically:

- Assess the mechanisms put in place by the project for identification and engagement of stakeholders in each participating country and establish, in consultation with the stakeholders, whether this mechanism was successful, and identify its strengths and weaknesses.
- Assess the degree and effectiveness of collaboration/interactions between the various project partners and institutions during the course of implementation of the project.
- Assess the degree and effectiveness of any various public awareness activities that were undertaken during the course of implementation of the project.

5. Country ownership / driven-ness:

This is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements. The evaluation will:

- Assess the level of country ownership. Specifically, the evaluator should assess whether the project was effective in providing and communicating information on South-South Networking and collaboration for integrated environmental Assessments and reporting to support policy formulation and informed decision making processes at national and regional levels in the selected regions.
- Assess the level of country commitment to the generation and use of ICTS to influence policy formulation and informed decision making

6. Achievement of outputs and activities:

- Delivered outputs: Assessment of the project's success in producing each of the programmed outputs, both in quantity and quality as well as usefulness and timeliness.
- Assess the soundness and effectiveness of the methodologies used for developing the technical documents and related management options in the participating countries
- Assess the extent to which the project outputs have the credibility, necessary to influence policy and decision-makers at the national and regional levels.

7. Preparation and Readiness

Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project implementation? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place?

8. Assessment monitoring and evaluation systems.

The evaluation shall include an assessment of the quality, application and effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation plans and tools, including an assessment of risk management based on the assumptions and risks identified in the project document. The Terminal Evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for 'project design of M&E' and 'the application of the Project M&E plan' (see minimum requirements 1&2 in Annex 4). UNEP projects must budget adequately for execution of the M&E plan, and provide adequate resources during implementation of the M&E plan. Project task managers are also expected to use the information generated by the M&E system during project implementation to adapt and improve the project.

9. Implementation approach:

This includes an analysis of the project's management framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management. The evaluation will:

- Ascertain to what extent the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document have been closely followed. In particular, assess the

role of the various committees established and whether the project document was clear and realistic to enable effective and efficient implementation, whether the project was executed according to the plan and how well the management was able to adapt to changes during the life of the project to enable the implementation of the project.

- Assess the extent to which the project responded the mid term review / evaluation (if any).
- Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency and adaptability of project management and the supervision of project activities / project execution arrangements at all levels (1) policy decisions: Steering Group; (2) day to day project management in each of the country executing agencies.
- Identify administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project.

M&E during project implementation

- *M&E design.* Projects should have sound M&E plans to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives. An M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART indicators (see Annex 4) and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should have been specified.

The evaluator should use the following questions to help assess the M&E design aspects:

SMART-ness of Indicators

- Are there specific indicators in the log frame for each of the project objectives and outcomes?
- Are the indicators relevant to the objectives and outcomes?
- Are the indicators for the objectives and outcomes sufficient?
- Are the indicators quantifiable?

Adequacy of Baseline Information

- Is there baseline information?
- Has the methodology for the baseline data collection been explained?
- Is desired level of achievement for indicators based on a reasoned estimate of baseline?

Arrangements for Monitoring of Implementation

- Has a budget been allocated for M&E activities?
- Have the responsibility centers for M&E activities been clearly defined?
- Has the time frame for M&E activities been specified?

Arrangements for Evaluation

- Have specific targets been specified for project outputs?
- Has the desired level of achievement been specified for all Indicators of Objectives and Outcomes?
- *M&E plan implementation.* A Terminal Evaluation should verify that:
 - an M&E system was in place and facilitated timely tracking of results and progress towards projects objectives throughout the project implementation period (perhaps through use of a logframe or similar);
 - annual project reports and Progress Implementation Review (PIR) reports were complete, accurate and with well justified ratings;
 - that the information provided by the M&E system was used during the project to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs;
 - and that projects had an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities.

- *Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities.* The terminal evaluation should determine whether support for M&E was budgeted adequately and was funded in a timely fashion during implementation.

10. Financial Planning

Evaluation of financial planning requires assessment of the quality and effectiveness of financial planning and control of financial resources throughout the project's lifetime. Evaluation includes actual project costs by activities compared to budget (variances), financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. The evaluation should:

- Assess the strength and utility of financial controls, including reporting, and planning to allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for a proper and timely flow of funds for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables.
- Present the major findings from the financial audit if one has been conducted.
- Identify and verify the sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing (in co-operation with the IA and EA).
- Assess whether the project has applied appropriate standards of due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.
- The evaluation should also include a breakdown of final actual costs and co-financing for the project prepared in consultation with the relevant UNEP Fund Management Officer of the project (table attached in Annex 1 Co-financing and leveraged resources).

11. UNEP Supervision and Backstopping

The purpose of supervision is to work with the executing agency in identifying and dealing with problems which arise during implementation of the project itself. Such problems may be related to project management but may also involve technical/substantive issues in which UNEP has a major contribution to make. The evaluator should assess the effectiveness of supervision and administrative and financial support provided by UNEP including:

- (i) the adequacy of project supervision plans, inputs and processes;
- (ii) the emphasis given to outcome monitoring (results-based project management);
- (iii) the realism / candor of project reporting and rating (i.e. are PIR ratings an accurate reflection of the project realities and risks);
- (iv) the quality of documentation of project supervision activities; and
- (v) financial, administrative and other fiduciary aspects of project implementation supervision.

In summary, accountability and implementation support through technical assistance and problem solving are the main elements of project supervision (Annex 6).

12. Complementarity with UNEP Medium Term Strategy and Programme of Work

Linkage to UNEP's Expected Accomplishments. The UNEP Medium Term Strategy specifies desired results in six thematic focal areas. The desired results are termed Expected Accomplishments. Using the completed ROtI analysis, the evaluation should comment on whether the project makes a tangible contribution to any of the Expected Accomplishments specified in the UNEP MTS. The magnitude and extent any contributions and the causal linkages should be fully described.

*Project contributions that are in-line with the Bali Strategic Plan (BSP).*¹⁷ The outcomes and achievements of the project should be briefly discussed in relation to the objectives of the UNEP BSP.

South-South Cooperation is regarded as the exchange of resources, technology, and knowledge between developing countries. Briefly describe any aspects of the project that could be considered as examples of South-South Cooperation.

¹⁷ <http://www.unep.org/GC/GC23/documents/GC23-6-add-1.pdf>

The **ratings for the parameters A - K will be presented in the form of a table**. Each of the eleven categories should be rated separately with **brief justifications** based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given. The following rating system is to be applied:

HS	= Highly Satisfactory
S	= Satisfactory
MS	= Moderately Satisfactory
MU	= Moderately Unsatisfactory
U	= Unsatisfactory
HU	= Highly Unsatisfactory

5. Evaluation Report Format and Review Procedures

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

The evaluation will rate the overall implementation success of the project and provide individual ratings of the eleven implementation aspects as described in Section 1 of this TOR. ***The ratings will be presented in the format of a table with brief justifications based on the findings of the main analysis.***

Evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete and balanced manner. Any dissident views in response to evaluation findings will be appended in an annex. The evaluation report shall be written in English, be of no more than 50 pages (excluding annexes), use numbered paragraphs and include:

- i) An **executive summary** (no more than 3 pages) providing a brief overview of the main conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation;
- ii) **Introduction and background** giving a brief overview of the evaluated project, for example, the objective and status of activities The report should provide summary information on when the evaluation took place; places visited; who was involved; the key questions; and, the methodology.
- iii) **Scope, objective and methods** presenting the evaluation's purpose, the evaluation criteria used and questions to be addressed;
- iv) **Project Performance and Impact** providing *factual evidence* relevant to the questions asked by the evaluator and interpretations of such evidence. This is the main substantive section of the report. The evaluator should provide a commentary and analysis on all eleven evaluation aspects (A – K above).
- v) **Conclusions and rating** of project implementation success giving the evaluator's concluding assessments and ratings of the project against given evaluation criteria and standards of performance. The conclusions should provide answers to questions about whether the project is considered good or bad, and whether the results are considered positive or negative. The ratings should be provided with a brief narrative comment in a table (see Annex 1);
- vi) **Lessons (to be) learned** presenting general conclusions from the standpoint of the design and implementation of the project, based on good practices and successes or problems and mistakes. Lessons should have the potential for wider application and use. All lessons should 'stand alone' and should:
 - Briefly describe the context from which they are derived
 - State or imply some prescriptive action;
 - Specify the contexts in which they may be applied (if possible, who when and where)
- vii) **Recommendations** suggesting *actionable* proposals for improvement of the current project. In general, Terminal Evaluations are likely to have very few (perhaps two or three) actionable recommendations.

Prior to each recommendation, the issue(s) or problem(s) to be addressed by the recommendation should be clearly stated.

A high quality recommendation is an actionable proposal that is:

1. Feasible to implement within the timeframe and resources available
2. Commensurate with the available capacities of project team and partners
3. Specific in terms of who would do what and when
4. Contains results-based language (i.e. a measurable performance target)
5. Includes a trade-off analysis, when its implementation may require utilizing significant resources that would otherwise be used for other project purposes.

viii) **Annexes** may include additional material deemed relevant by the evaluator but must include:

1. The Evaluation Terms of Reference,
2. A list of interviewees, and evaluation timeline
3. A list of documents reviewed / consulted
4. Summary co-finance information and a statement of project expenditure by activity
5. Details of the project's 'impact pathways' and the 'ROtI' analysis
6. The expertise of the evaluation team. (Brief CV).

TE reports will also include any formal response / comments from the project management team and/or the country focal point regarding the evaluation findings or conclusions as an annex to the report, however, such will be appended to the report by UNEP Evaluation Office.

Examples of UNEP Terminal Evaluation Reports are available at www.unep.org/eou

Review of the Draft Evaluation Report

Draft reports submitted to UNEP Evaluation Office are shared with the corresponding Programme or Project Task Manager and his or her supervisor for initial review and consultation. The UNEP staff and the Executing Agency staff are allowed to comment on the draft evaluation report. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. Where, possible, a consultation is held between the evaluator, Evaluation Office Staff, the Task Manager and key members of the project execution team. The consultation seeks feedback on the proposed recommendations and lessons. UNEP Evaluation Office collates all review comments and provides them to the evaluator(s) for their consideration in preparing the final version of the report.

6. Submission of Final Terminal Evaluation Reports.

The final report shall be written in English and submitted electronic form in MS Word format and should be sent directly to

Segbedzi Norgbey, Chief,
UNEP Evaluation Office
P.O. Box 30552-00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel.: (254-20) 7623387
Fax: (254-20) 7623158
Email: segbedzi.norgbey@unep.org

The Chief of Evaluation office shall share the report with the following individual:

Elisa Tonda, Oficial de Programa
UNEP Project Task Manager
Eficiencia de Recursos - Producción y Consumo Sostenible
Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente
Oficina Regional para América Latina y el Caribe
Clayton, Ciudad del Saber - Avenida Morse, Edificio 103
Corregimiento de Ancón - Ciudad de Panamá, PANAMÁ
Tel.: (507) 305-3160 Conmutador: Tel.: (507) 305-3100
Fax: (507) 305-3105 Apto. Postal: 0843-03590
C.E.: elisa.tonda@unep.org / Sitio: www.pnuma.org

The Final evaluation will also be copied to the UNEP Programme Operational Focal Points.

The final evaluation report will be published on the Evaluation Office's web-site www.unep.org/eou and may be printed in hard copy. Subsequently, the report will be sent to the UNEP/GEO Programme office for their review, appraisal and inclusion on their website.

7. Resources and Schedule of the Evaluation

This final evaluation will be undertaken by an international evaluator contracted by the Evaluation Office, UNEP. The contract for the evaluator will begin on January 11 2010 and April 5 2010 (26 days) spread over 12 weeks (8 days of Field Mission in Latin America and the Caribbean) and 6 days of desk study). The evaluator will submit a draft report on 5 March 2010 to UNEP/Evaluation office. The Chief of Evaluation Office will share the draft report with the UNEP Project Task Manager, and key representatives of the executing agencies. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to UNEP / EO for collation and the consultant will be advised of any necessary revisions. Comments to the final draft report will be sent to the consultant by 20 March 2010 after which, the consultant will submit the final report no later than 5 April 2010.

The evaluator will after an initial telephone briefing with Evaluation Office and the UNEP Project Task Manager, conduct initial desk review work and later travel to selected project sites in Latin America and the Caribbean and meet with project staff at the beginning of the evaluation.

In accordance with UNEP Evaluation Policy, all UNEP projects are evaluated by independent evaluators contracted as consultants by the Evaluation Office. The evaluator should have the following qualifications:

The evaluator should not have been associated with the design and implementation of the project in a paid capacity. The evaluator will work under the overall supervision of the Chief, Evaluation Office. The evaluator should be an international expert in experience in designing, managing and implementing large scale national and regional evaluations; He/She should have the following minimum qualifications: (i) Knowledge and experience in sustainable consumption and production. (ii) Experience with environmentally friendly technologies and integrated waste management. (iii) Knowledge of UNEP programmes is desirable. Knowledge of Spanish is an advantage. Fluency in oral and written English is a must.

8. Schedule Of Payment

The consultant shall select one of the following two contract options:

Lump-Sum Option

The evaluator will receive an initial payment of 30% of the total amount due upon signature of the contract. A further 30% will be paid upon submission of the draft report. A final payment of 40% will be made upon satisfactory completion of work. The fee is payable under the individual Special Service Agreement (SSA) of the evaluator and **is inclusive** of all expenses such as travel, accommodation and incidental expenses.

Fee-only Option

The evaluator will receive an initial payment of 40% of the total amount due upon signature of the contract. Final payment of 60% will be made upon satisfactory completion of work. The fee is payable under the individual SSAs of the evaluator and is **NOT** inclusive of all expenses such as travel, accommodation and incidental expenses. Ticket and DSA will be paid separately.

In case, the evaluator cannot provide the products in accordance with the TORs, the timeframe agreed, or his products are substandard, the payment to the evaluator could be withheld, until such a time the products are modified to meet UNEP's standard. In case the evaluator fails to submit a satisfactory final product to UNEP, the product prepared by the evaluator may not constitute the evaluation report.

Annex 2: Summary of main results of the Meetings of Government Experts on SCP in LAC

- **First Meeting of Government Experts on Sustainable Consumption and Production in Latin America and the Caribbean, Argentina in April 2003.** The meeting addressed the challenges of poverty and inequality in the region and established the Regional Council of Government Experts on SCP.
- **Second Latin American and the Caribbean Government Experts Meeting on Sustainable Consumption and Production, Managua, Nicaragua in 15-16 October, 2003.** The Governmental experts from the region developed a regional strategy that focuses on the regional priorities and concrete actions to promote sustainable consumption and production patterns.
- **Second International Expert Meeting on the 10-year Framework of Programmes for SCP, San José, Costa Rica, September 2005,** emphasized the importance of linking work on sustainable consumption and production to poverty reduction and the attainment of the MDGs as well as incorporation of SCP principles in national and regional strategies.
- **Third Meeting of Government's Experts on Sustainable Production and Consumption in Latin America and the Caribbean in Managua, Nicaragua, August 2005.** The participants agreed to create National Consultative Councils on SCP with representatives from the private sector, the Government, universities, consumers associations and civil society; and to reinforce the collaboration with sub-regional organizations and to support and facilitate the adoption of sustainable consumption and production among their members.
- **Fourth Meeting of Government's Experts on Sustainable Production and Consumption in Latin America and the Caribbean in Sao Paulo, Brazil, October 2007.** The participants approve the Plan of Action on SCP, prepared according to the needs and priorities and plans of each subregion and the input and contributions made by the NGOs and the private sector; promote the strengthening of the Institutions in each country responsible for SCP and maintain an active participation of these agencies in regional activities on the issue; and ratify SCP priority areas common to the subregions as follow:
 - a) Dialogue Round tables open to all sectors of the society;
 - b) Small and Medium Enterprises;
 - c) Sustainable public procurement;
 - d) National Policies and Strategies on SCP
 - e) Regional Information Network on SCP
- **Fifth Meeting of Council of Government Experts of Latin America and the Caribbean for Sustainable Production and Consumption in Cartagena, Colombia, September 2009.** Conclusions and main remarks of the Fifth meeting of Government Experts of LAC with the presence of representatives from 23 countries of LAC, Experts on SCP, are as follow¹⁸:

"The region has made considerable progress in terms of policy, plan and programme generation for the promotion of SCP. Besides, 70% of the countries has some kind of initiative in force, though half of them have not legalized these initiatives within the national legal framework yet. In addition, a large percentage (40%) of these initiatives is mainstreamed into national development plans.

However, there is a long way to go in terms of implementation. The majority of the countries state that no significant results have been achieved and that they do not have sound indicator, follow-up and assessment systems.

In all the cases in which public initiatives on SCP are applied, there have been open and participatory processes with nonGovernmental organizations and associations of the productive sector, though still weak as regards the participation of consumers' organizations.

The priority sectors in which SCP policies are focused are basically concentrated in the agriculture, food, tourism, construction, textile, manufacturing industry sectors in general, and in cross-cutting

¹⁸ Final Report of the Fifth Meeting of Council of Government Experts of Latin America and the Caribbean for Sustainable Production and Consumption

areas as water, energy and waste, being SMEs the productive group more highly regarded in these initiatives.

The region is underway towards the adoption of sustainable public procurement systems. Even though there are some cases that have covered a longer pathway, most initiatives –involving at least 40% of the countries of the region– have been recently created so it will take time before the results and real impacts may be assessed.

In spite of the relevant progress made in terms of framework and programme generation, the greatest challenge continues to be the implementation and assessment, apart from the more emphatic inclusion of the consumption dimension.

In this sense, the recommendation approved by the Council ([Annex A](#)), including the contributions made by the civil society and the private sector present in this document, reaffirms the importance for the region of the 4 priority areas aimed at concentrating efforts towards SCP in Latin America and the Caribbean and including them in the 10 Year Framework Programme: 1) national policies and programmes; 2) small and medium-sized enterprises; 3) sustainable public procurement; and 4) sustainable lifestyles.

1. **As regards national policies and strategies**, the challenge should be centred in mainstreaming and coordinating SCP in development policies, programmes and strategies, at the national, sub-regional, regional and international level. To strengthen the processes related to the information, education and training of the population, to quantify SCP costs and benefits in the region and to create financial instruments are three key aspects to support the implementation of policies, plans and programmes. Also, it is recommended to prioritize SCP management in sectors that while producing mass consumption goods, by the end of their lifespan generate a greater environmental and social impact and, therefore, to incorporate concepts such as life-cycle assessment and extended producer responsibility.
2. **As regards Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises**, the experts recommend to prioritize sectors related to environmental or ecosystemic services, at the sub-regional level, which play a vital role in the region's economy; to coordinate and create economic mechanisms and instruments to support industrial reconversion, including the creation of SCP specific indicators.
3. **As regards sustainable public procurement**, a high level of political leadership should be promoted, involving and mainstreaming the leading organization for national public procurement, and a strategy of gradual application should be adopted in order to incorporate environmental and social criteria in the contracting processes of priority goods and services. Besides, to develop specific measures and instruments for small and medium-sized enterprises, which may allow them to adapt to the market's new requirements, and establish a multisectoral mechanism that may facilitate the participation of the actors involved.
4. **As regards sustainable lifestyles**, it is necessary to adjust and apply policies that may promote the offer of sustainable goods and services at affordable prices for the entire community, adapt the language and communication, and foster the firm inclusion of education for sustainable consumption in educational programmes. To do so, it is urgently needed to carry out studies and apply measurement systematic mechanisms in order to identify and understand the region's consumption motivators. Finally, it is necessary to make an appeal to transnational corporations so that they may apply in the region the quality and environmental management standards they apply in their home countries or in countries with more stringent standards.

In addition, two common axes have been mentioned in the 4 areas by all the groups and deserve special attention:

- One has to do with the review and adaptation of the language used for the transmission of the concept, which should be adequate for the region according to its contexts and socio-cultural guiding principles.
- The other refers to the deepening of participation spaces from and to the community, considering more varied groups of society, which may truly reflect their composition, actors and interests at stake.

Besides, the fruitful discussions and information exchanges, as well as the presentations made and participants degree of representativeness allow to deepen the contribution to the 10 Year Framework

Programme, identifying some additional elements for the mapping proposed in the 3rd Draft which may allow to further identify and develop national, regional, and global key SCP programmes and activities, and be one building block for the inputs to the CSD19 decision on SCP.

Finally, particular attention deserves the appeal of the experts on the region's cultural and historical values, included in the statement section of the Recommendation to the Ministers of Environment, where it is acknowledged:

“... the need to recover the ancient Latin American and Caribbean philosophy related to sustainable life styles and understanding the quality of life as one of the key factors in the process of modifying Sustainable Consumption and Production patterns and, therefore, as an opportunity to widen the population's acceptance and work towards a regional vision on the sustainability of consumption and production considering poverty reduction and the harmonization between humankind and nature”

This need to take possession of a common concept and understanding on the sustainability of consumption and production for the region, knowing its environmental, economic and social impacts, costs and benefits, is probably the main challenge faced in order to achieve the true mainstreaming of this issue related to the notion of genuine, enduring and equitable development”.

**Annex 3: Main results of the publication “Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP)
Progress Made in Latin America and the Caribbean”**

CEGESTI - 2008

Main results of the study “Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) Progress Made in Latin America and the Caribbean”, of September 2008, prepared by CEGESTI on behalf of UNEP ROLAC, are as follow:

Private consumption of Latin America and the Caribbean represents 6.7% of the world’s private consumption, with 8.5% of the world’s population versus, for example, 31.5% of private consumption by the United States and Canada, with 5.2% of the world’s population or 21.4% of private consumption by East Asia and the Pacific, with 32.9% of the world’s population (Bentley, 2008). Despite the fact that this consumption is low if compared at the worldwide level, what is certain is that it is showing a strong upward trend.

In a number of cases both in developed and in developing countries, the use rate of natural resources exceeds the ecosystem’s adaptation capacity, Although at the global level there is a considerable improvement of the efficiency with which natural resources are used, it is not enough to compensate the increase in absolute terms of the consumption of water, energy, raw materials, waste generation, among others that will therefore continue deteriorating the planet.

The region of Latin America and the Caribbean still presents a severe poverty and social inequality situation. The world and this region in particular need to grow and increase the levels of consumption in order to decrease the high levels of poverty, although to date the growth in consumption rates experienced by the region in recent years has not entailed a substantive reduction of poverty levels.

The challenge is to improve the quality of life dissociating economic growth from environmental degradation, using new ways of production and consumption. This is the challenge of sustainable consumption and production, to modify the trend of growth of the economies, integrating environmental and social dimensions.

Integrated solid waste management represents one of the big challenges faced by the region, central and local Governments, health and environment authorities, as well as the society in general. This is an issue directly connected with the population’s style of consumption, as well as with the production methods used by industries as they both show an increase in the volume and types of waste, requiring solutions for its collection, transport, treatment and final disposal. To quote a fact, from a sanitary perspective, only 23% of municipal waste generated in the region is adequately disposed (PAHO, 2005)

Policy instrument used to promote the adoption of clean production and/or sustainable consumption measures are the specialized technical assistance. 80% of the countries in LAC that answered the questionnaire carried out from CEGESTI pointed out that they provide technical assistance for the implementation of Cleaner Production (CP). The efforts concerning this issue are focused on different sectors, mainly on Tourism, Food and Agriculture. “Others” include the following: Energy Efficiency, Citrus Agro-industry, Biotechnology, Sugar Industry, Textile Industry, Livestock Dressing Plants (slaughter-houses), Peddler’s Wares (informal sales), Construction, Livestock (stockbreeding) sector, Graphics sector, Plastics sector, Metallurgical sector, Naval sector, Paper sector, and Jewellery trade. The years reported for these programmes range from the year 2000 and after, except in the case of Colombia that indicated 1997 as the starting year.

Half of countries have not put in place laws that regulate water use, waste generation and recycling and pollution control levels. 55% of the countries have a law in place to make companies pay for damages they can cause. Most of these laws seem to date from the mid 1990s. Only three countries use market mechanisms such as deposit fee, pollution trading schemes, and certified products.

Half the countries are putting in place sustainable public procurement policies but only Mexico (1999) and Brazil (2006) have well defined policies.

40% of the responding countries indicated having a special focus on SMEs. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is present and growing in the region and shows sign on similarity (ethical behavior, labor right, community development, environmental impacts). In Brazil, 500 companies submit CSR report and an index of sustainable companies have been started. Banks don't tend to have environmental policies or for green environmental financial products. 70 local Governments receive technical assistance from ICLEI to improve their sustainable development as well as exchanging experience.

Environmental awareness of the consumers is still limited in the region; citizens still feel the Government has the major role in changing things, not them. In Mexico, organic products represent less than 1% of food purchase. However, in Argentina a study found that 33% of 9 consumers reported taking environmental impacts into account in their purchase and 31% reported be willing to pay a premium for environmentally friendly products (of 25 - 35%). The most common program are recent (2004) and in the form of campaigns to incite recycling and general SCP and directed at water, energy and plastic bag use.

Given a relatively young population, campaigns directed at youth are important. Also, lessons can be learned from the innovative electronic waste and industrial byproduct market (Costa Rica, Ecuador, y Columbia) through recuperation, recycling, and reuse of these products.

Conclusions made by the study "Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) Progress Made in Latin America and the Caribbean", of September 2009, are as follow:

- *The countries have initiated the definition and formalization of the political mechanisms to speed up SCP in the region. The implementation of these mechanisms is embryonic, as many of the cases are still under approval process.*
- *As regards to Cleaner Production, the countries in general have technical assistance programs, aimed at specific sectors, where successful experiences have been generated. On the other hand, regarding Sustainable Consumption, the efforts are still incipient; for example, only two countries reported experience on Sustainable Public Procurement.*
- *A very active movement of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) can be noticed in the region. This movement includes issues related to sustainability and the countries should take advantage as part of their SCP strategies (none of the countries mentioned any link with any CSR organization as part of its SCP strategy).*
- *Courses, guides and other dissemination/training tools on issues related to SCP have been developed in the different countries of the region, which could be reply. Universities have also organized themselves in networks in order to work on these issues.*
- *The legal framework and its enforcement capacity on issues related to SCP, as solid waste, water and maximum levels of contamination, responsibility for environmental damages, among others, still show weaknesses in a number of countries. Additionally, the instruments aimed at the promotion or creation of SCP markets has hardly been used in the region.*
- *The sub-regions show different production specializations, which is something to be considered when defining sectoral priorities. The experiences in Cleaner Production generated by the subregions, particularly considering their proactive sectors, is an important factor to bear in mind for potential intra-regional cooperation programmes.*
- *Something well-known is the lack of resources and skills of the micro, small and medium sized enterprises concerning environmental management in general, including the compliance with regulations on environment, and occupational health and safety. The enormous weight this kind of companies have on the region should be considered when implementing SCP programmes, as without an adequate assistance and support programmes it will not be feasible that these companies may implement any measure on their own, even if they were related to regulations or sanctions. The existing prize systems, training and assistance programmes are good sign but hey should come together with some kind of incentive or additional financing that may allow the company to make the necessary improvements in their production process.*

• *Social exclusion and poverty put at risk the successful implementation of sustainable consumption programmes. Combined with programmes for poverty reduction, it is important to work on the issue related to the supply of sustainable products at favorable prices, particularly in the case of food (that brings about 70% of consumption of most of the population).*

Annex 4: Bibliography

Argentina

- ✓ Convenio de Financiamiento a Pequeña Escala No. SSFA/IND-003-2009 entre el PNUMA y la Secretaria de Gabinete y Gestión Pública de la Jefatura de Gabinete de Ministros de la Nación Argentina.

Brasil

- ✓ Memorando de Entendimiento entre el PNUMA y el CETESB que establece una cooperación general entre las dos Instituciones.
- ✓ Términos de Referencia para la Contratación de servicios de consultoría para la elaboración de un estudio relativo al estado del arte de la construcción sustentable enfocado a las pequeñas y medianas empresas. Junio de 2009. Documento preparado por la Secretaria Ejecutiva del Departamento de Economía y Medio Ambiente del Ministerio del Ambiente del Brasil.

Colombia

- ✓ Memorando de Entendimiento MOU-IND-001/2008 suscrito entre el PNUMA y el Ministerio de Ambiente, Vivienda y Desarrollo Territorial de Colombia.
- ✓ Contrato de Manuel Felipe Olivera, consultor contratado por el PNUMA para el desarrollo de ciertas actividades.
- ✓ Documento de Política Nacional de Producción Mas Limpia y Consumo Sustentable. Autor: Ministerio de Ambiente, Vivienda y Desarrollo Territorial de Colombia, con la asistencia técnica del PNUMA.
- ✓ Documento Preliminar de Política Nacional de Producción Más Limpia y Consumo Sustentable. Autor: Ministerio de Ambiente, Vivienda y Desarrollo Territorial de Colombia, con la asistencia técnica del PNUMA.
- ✓ Informe Final de la encuesta sobre percepción, conocimiento, motivaciones y tendencias de la población Colombiana frente al consumo sostenible, como insumo para orientar la definición de la Política Nacional de Producción y Consumo Sustentable.
- ✓ Informe Final de la V Reunión del Consejo de Expertos de Gobierno en Consumo y Producción Sustentable para América Latina y el Caribe, que se llevo a cabo en Cartagena entre el 16 y 18 de septiembre de 2009. Autor: Ministerio MADTMA Colombia.
- ✓ Política Nacional de Producción y Consumo Sostenible. "Hacia una cultura de consumo sostenible y transformación productiva" Propuesta documento oficial Noviembre de 2009. Publicada en el internet.

Costa Rica

- ✓ Memorando de Entendimiento MOU-IND-004/2007 suscrito entre el PNUMA y el Ministerio de Ambiente y Energía de Costa Rica.
- ✓ Documento de Consultoría: Informe Final de Capacitación en P+L y elaboración de material de apoyo. Proyecto PNUMA/ORLPAC – MINAET/DiGeCA, de Octubre de 2009.
- ✓ Documento: Conceptos básicos de Producción más Limpia y su aplicación en la cría subasta y matanza de ganado de carne bovino en Costa Rica. 2009.

Ecuador

- ✓ Convenio de Financiamiento a Pequeña Escala No. SSFA/IND-006-2008 entre el PNUMA y el Ministerio de Ambiente de Ecuador para Contribuir al Desarrollo y adopción de una política Integrada de Consumo y Producción Sostenible en Ecuador, que incluye la realización de un Estudio sobre los vínculos entre medio ambiente y desarrollo para Ecuador, entre otras actividades.

- ✓ Enmienda 1 al Convenio de Financiamiento a Pequeña Escala No. SSFA/IND-006-2008 entre el PNUMA y el Ministerio de Ambiente de Ecuador.
- ✓ Informe Final de consultoría: "Integración de Producción y Consumo Sustentable en Planes de Desarrollo Nacional Proyecto Demostrativo para Ecuador Componente A - B", presentado por Aldir Cia. Ltda.
- ✓ Matriz de Resultados UNDAF 2010-2014, Ambiente y Gestión de Riegos, relacionados con los Objetivos del Plan Nacional de Desarrollo del Ecuador 2007 -2010, con los Objetivos de Desarrollo del Milenio, donde se integra el tema de consumo y producción sostenible en los planes, políticas y estrategias de desarrollo del Ecuador, y como meta hasta el 2010 se plantea tener elaborada una Política de Consumo y Producción Sostenible.

Trinidad and Tobago

- ✓ Letter from the Ministry of Legal Affairs (MLA) of Trinidad and Tobago with the approval to proceed with the hosting of the 1st Sub-regional Meeting on Marrakech Process on Sustainable Consumption and Production on the 12th and 13th August, 2008 in collaboration with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). The letter confirmed MLA responsibilities with regard to the organization of the meeting and also detailed the responsibilities of UNEP.
- ✓ Report on First Sub-Regional meeting on sustainable consumption and production for the Caribbean. August 13 and 14, 2008.
- ✓ Mission Report regarding attendant to the First Sub-regional Meeting on SCP for the Caribbean.

Uruguay

- ✓ Documento: Formulario de presentación del componente PML de proyectos de inversión.
- ✓ Informe de Avance, Desarrollo de una política de consumo y producción sustentables en Uruguay, 23/06/09.
- ✓ Documento: Notas de fin de Consultoría de Plan de Acción para el desarrollo de una Política de Consumo y Producción Sustentable en Uruguay.
- ✓ Documento: Criterios para la aplicación de la ley de inversiones en la Línea de Producción Más Limpia.
- ✓ Convenio de Financiamiento a Pequeña Escala No. SSFA/IND-004-2008 entre el PNUMA y el Ministerio de Vivienda, Ordenamiento Territorial y Medio Ambiente de Uruguay (MVOTMA).
- ✓ Plan de Acción Nacional en Producción y Consumo Ambientalmente Sustentable, Informe Preliminar. MVOTMA de Uruguay

LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEW BY PARTNER INSTITUTION

Caribbean Environmental Health Institute (CEHI)

- ✓ Memorandum of Understanding MOU-IND-002/2007 signed by PNUMA and the Caribbean Environmental Health Institute (CEHI) or Castries, Santa Lucia. Signed by September 2007.
- ✓ Final Report on UNEP/ROLAC Project no. MOU-IND-002/2007: Establishment of a Cleaner Production and Sustainable Consumption Information Center for the Caribbean, January 2010 and Appendixes 1 to 5.
- ✓ Power Point Presentation: The Marrakech Process in Latin America and the Caribbean, at the 1st Meeting on Sustainable Consumption and Production for the Caribbean, Trinidad and Tobago, 12 and 13 August 2008.

Comisión Centroamericana de Ambiente y Desarrollo (CCAD)

- ✓ Memorando de Entendimiento MOU-IND-003/2007 suscrito entre el PNUMA y la Comisión Centroamericana de Ambiente y Desarrollo –CCAD-.
- ✓ Informe Final, Apoyo a actores del sector público y privado de la región Centroamericana para la celebración de la III Expoambiente Mesoamericana 2007 en San Salvador (realizada del 11 al 13 de octubre de 2007), El Salvador. Informe comprende el período: Octubre 2007 – Abril 2008.
- ✓ Borrador de Convenio de Financiamiento a Pequeña Escala s/n entre el PNUMA y la CCAD, por US\$ 9,000, para la Elaboración de un Manual Regional de Producción Mas Limpia en Granjas Porcinas y su difusión en dos países de la región Centroamericana.
- ✓ Manual Regional de Producción Mas Limpia en Granjas Porcinas, 2009 para su distribución en Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panamá y Republica Dominicana.
- ✓ Informe del 1° Seminario Taller en Compras Públicas Sustentables para Centro América, 29 y 30 de octubre de 2008, Santo Domingo de Heredia, Costa Rica

Comunidad Andina de Naciones

- ✓ Convenio de Financiamiento a Pequeña Escala No. SSFA/IND-005-2008 entre el PNUMA y la Secretaria General de la Comunidad Andina de Naciones, suscrito en Abril de 2008.
- ✓ Informe Final de Actividades del Convenio de financiamiento a pequeña escala entre la Secretaría General de la Comunidad Andina y la Oficina Regional para América Latina y el Caribe del Programa de Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente, de Enero de 2010.
- ✓ Enmienda 2 al Convenio de Financiamiento a Pequeña Escala No. SSFA/IND-005-2008 entre el PNUMA y la Secretaria General de la Comunidad Andina de Naciones.
- ✓ Ayuda Memoria sobre Producción y Consumo Sostenible en la Comunidad Andina. Autor: Secretaria General de la CAN.
- ✓ Presentación Power Point Informe Final Consumo Sostenible. Encuesta realizada en muestras de hogares en las principales ciudades de Perú, Ecuador y Bolivia. Informe Preparado por IPSOS Apoyo para la CAN.

CooperAccion (Perú)

- ✓ Convenio de Financiamiento a Pequeña Escala No. SSFA/IND-007-2008 entre el PNUMA y la ONG CooperAccion.
- ✓ Informe Final (Mayo de 2009) Consumo y Producción Sostenible “Manejo Integral de Residuos Sólidos en el Norte Chico” y Anexos, Mayo del 2009. Autor: CooperAccion.
- ✓ Informe de la Ampliación del Proyecto. Consumo y Producción Sostenible “Manejo Integral de Residuos Sólidos en el Norte Chico” y Anexos, Octubre del 2009. Autor: CooperAccion.
- ✓ Plan de Gestión de Residuos Sólidos de Caleta de Carquín, Octubre - 2009. Autor: CooperAccion.
- ✓ Documento: Análisis de la Legislación Peruana en materia de Residuos Sólidos. Carlos Chirinos y Luis Miguel Guillen A, contratados por CooperAccion y el PNUMA.
- ✓ Documento: Aspectos Técnicos Operativos de la Gestion de Residuos Solidos en el Perú. Una realidad urbana con nuevos actores y que demanda respuestas urgentes. Cesar Zela F., Autor: CooperAccion y el PNUMA.
- ✓ Documento Guía Ambiental sobre Residuos Sólidos, Medio Ambiente y Salud, dirigida a trabajadores. Autor: CooperAccion y PNUMA.
- ✓ Documento Cartilla Informativa para las Municipalidades sobre Gestión Adecuada de los Residuos Sólidos. Consumo y Producción Sustentable, Ciclo de Vida, Consumo Sustentable,

Producción Sostenible, Minimización de los Residuos Sólidos, Aspectos de la gestión de los Residuos Sólidos municipales.

- ✓ Documento Tríptico dirigido a la población en general. Manejo Integral de residuos.

Mercosur

- ✓ Documento: Proyecto Piloto Compras Públicas Sustentables en el MERCOSUR. Las Compras Públicas en el MERCOSUR. Propuesta para la incorporación de criterios de sustentabilidad.
- ✓ Informe del Taller: Compras Publicas Sustentables en Mercosur. Buenos Aires, 10 y 11 de junio de 2007. Autor: Ing. Ernesto Feilbogen.
- ✓ Diseño de campaña de Comunicación e información compras públicas sustentables para el Mercosur. Septiembre de 2008. Autor: Instituto Argentino para el Desarrollo Sustentable, bajo convenio con el PNUMA.

Red de Información en Consumo y Producción Sustentable (CPS) para América Latina y el Caribe Trinidad

- ✓ Informe Final de Consultoría de Apoyo al Start up de la Red. Autor: Verónica Rodríguez.
- ✓ Documento Presupuesto Servidor HP.
- ✓ Contrato Consultora Verónica Rodríguez.
- ✓ Contrato con DAXTEL, para el desarrollo de herramientas para la Red y el mantenimiento del servidor de la Red.
- ✓ Contrato con DAXTEL para el desarrollo de una curso de entrenamiento de cómo usar la Plataforma de la Red en tres idiomas: Español., Ingles y Portugués.

Annex 5: List of Interviewees

	Name of person interviewed	Activity carried out within the framework of the project	Contact's details	Country of residence	Contacted.	Reply to email and questionnaire
1	Elisa Tonda,	Program Officer, Resources' Efficiency, Sustainable Consumption and Production. United Nations Environment Program, Regional Office for Latin American and the Caribbean.	Email: elisa.tonda@unep.org Address: Clayton, Ciudad del Saber - Avenida Morse, Edificio 103 Corregimiento de Ancón - Ciudad de Panamá, PANAMÁ Telephone: +(507) 305-3160 , 305-3100 Fax: + (507) 305-3105	Panama	Contacted by email and skype.	Yes, She replied to emails.
2	Victoria Belaustegui	UNEP regional consultant, Former UNEP SCP Programme Task Manager. Responsible for the activities undertaken within the framework of this project, in coordination with UNEP DTIE	Email: vickybe@linksat.com.ar , belausteguivicky@gmail.com Telephone: +(54)01158091495	Argentina	Contacted by email, skype and interviewed in person in Buenos Aires.	Yes, She replied to emails.
3	Diego Martino	UNEP National Officer in Uruguay	Email: diego.martino@unep.org Telephone: +(598)2 4123357 Ext: 266	Uruguay	Contacted by email and skype and interviewed in person in Montevideo.	Yes, He replied to emails
4	Cristina Montenegro	UNEP Representative in Brazil	Email: cristina.montenegro@unep.org Telephone: +(55) 61 3038 9236	Brazil	Contacted by email.	Yes, she replied to general questions about the project in Brazil.
5	Juan Carlos Sueiro	Technical counterpart from the NGO CooperAccion in Peru, involved in the activities of Integral solid waste management in the Norte Chico in Lima Region	Email: jcsueiro@cooperaccion.org.pe Telephone: + (511) 4440316	Peru	Interviewed in person during the field trip.	Yes, He replied to emails.

	Name of person interviewed	Activity carried out within the framework of the project	Contact's details	Country of residence	Contacted.	Reply to email and questionnaire
6	Margarita Suarez	Technical counterpart from the NGO CooperAccion in Peru	Email: msuarez@cooperaccion.org.pe Telephone: + (511) 4440316	Peru	Interviewed in person during the field trip.	Yes, She replied to emails and submitted the questionnaire filled out.
7	Wilder Ramirez León	Beneficiary. Technician of the Provincial Municipality of Barranca.	Telephone: +(511) 991555745	Peru.	Contacted through CooperAccion	He filled out the questionnaire.
8	Mario Luis Alva Chacpi	Beneficiary. Provincial Municipality of Huaura	Telephone: +(511) 2324272	Peru.	Contacted through CooperAccion	He filled out the questionnaire.
9	Dr. Rommel Ulillen	Beneficiary. Mayor of the Municipality of Barranca.	Not Available.	Peru	Interviewed in person during the field trip.	NA
10	Clarissa Salas	Beneficiary, Head of Health and Public Sanitation, Municipality of Huaral.	Not Available	Peru	Interviewed in person during the field trip.	NA.
11	Arturo Moreno	Beneficiary, Deputy Mayor, Municipality of Huaura.	Not Available.	Peru	Interviewed in person during the field trip.	NA
12	Javier Unzueta.	Beneficiary, Technician in charge of Municipal Budget, Municipality of Huaura.	Not Available.	Peru	Interviewed in person during the field trip.	NA
13	Matias Arzalluz	Director of the Argentinean Institute for Sustainable Development (IADS), Counterpart of Mercosur's Pilot Project on Sustainable Public.	Email: matias@iadsargentina.org Address: Venezuela 634 Dpto 24. Telephone: +(54) 11 5368 1389	Argentina	Contacted by email and interviewed in person in Buenos Aires	Yes, he replied to first emails. He didn't submit the questionnaire filled out.

	Name of person interviewed	Activity carried out within the framework of the project	Contact's details	Country of residence	Contacted.	Reply to email and questionnaire
14	Ezequiel Gaspes.	Counterpart of the Mercosur's Pilot Project on Sustainable Public Procurement, Part of IADS team during the execution of the project.	Email: ezequiel@egyasociados.com.ar	Argentina	Interviewed in person in Buenos Aires	Yes, he replied to first emails. He didn't submit the questionnaire filled out.
15	Giselle Beja,	SGT6/ Mercosur National Counterpart, Officer International Affairs DINAMA. Counterpart of Mercosur's Pilot Project on Sustainable Public Procurement.	Email: giselle.beja@dinama.gub.uy Address: Galicia 1133 esquina Roldeau. Telephone: +(598) 29170710 Ext: 4300	Uruguay	Interviewed in person in Montevideo	Yes, She replied to an email explaining that an official questionnaire should be submitted by Argentina.
16	Graciela Rossi,	Counterpart of Mercosur's Pilot Project on Sustainable Public Procurement. Advisor International Affairs. DINAMA.	Email: graciela.rossi@dinama.gub.uy Address: Galicia 1133 esquina Roldeau. Telephone: +(598) 29170710 Ext: 4608	Uruguay	Interviewed in person in Montevideo	Yes, She replied to an email explaining that an official questionnaire should be submitted by Argentina.
17	Maria Isabel Masoller	Counterpart of the Mercosur's SPP Project. Advisor, Ministry of Economy and Finance. Commercial Policy Advisory Group. Stakeholder of Mercosur's Pilot Project on Sustainable Public Procurement.	Email: imasoller@mef.gub.uy Address: Colonia 1206 – 2do Piso. Telephone: +(598) 2 9020354	Uruguay	Interviewed in person in Montevideo	Yes, She replied to an email explaining that an official questionnaire should be submitted by Argentina.
18	Mirta Elizabeth Laciari	Counterpart of Mercosur's SPP Pilot project. National Coordinator for SGT No. 6 Environment - Mercosur	Email: mlaciari@ambiente.gob.ar Address: San Martin 320 Telephone: +(54)11 4328 3890	Argentina	Contacted by email	Yes, She replied to an email sent but she didn't want to answer on behalf of Mercosur.
19	Violeta Gustale Gill	Counterpart of the Mercosur's workshop on SPP. Legal Department – Sustainable Public Procurement, National Direction for	Email: asesoria6@dncp.gov.py Address: Estados Unidos 961 casi Tte Fariña. Asunción.	Paraguay	Contacted by email	Yes, She replied to an email. She explained why she couldn't submit the

	Name of person interviewed	Activity carried out within the framework of the project	Contact's details	Country of residence	Contacted.	Reply to email and questionnaire
		Public Procurement	Telephone: +(595 21) 415 4000. Ext: 1210.			questionnaire filled out.
20	Gabriela Cordova	CCAD, Counterpart of the Project: III Expoambiente Mesoamericana 2007 in San Salvador, El Salvador and the development of the "Manual Regional de Produccion Mas Limpias para Granjas Porcinas".	Email: gcordova@sica.int	Costa Rica	Contacted by email	Yes, She submitted the questionnaire filled out.
21	Flavio Riveiro	Expert from a national technical counterpart - CETESB, involved in the first activities of the Internet based information system.	Email: flavior@cetesbnet.sp.gov.br Telephone: + (55) 11 3133-3501 ext 3583.	Brazil	Contacted by email.	Yes, He replied to emails.
22	Marisol Mallo	Counterpart of the Ministry of Housing, Land Planning and Environment involved in the development of the Action Plan for the development of a National Policy for Sustainable Consumption and Production.	Email: marisol.mallo@adinet.com.uy , marisol.mallo@dinama.gub.uy Address: Galicia 1133 esquina Roldeau. Telephone: + 598 (2) 9170710 Ext: 4505.	Uruguay	Contacted by email, telephone and interviewed in person in Montevideo.	No, She didn't reply to several emails asking for the questionnaire filled out.
23	Beatriz Olivet	Consultant hired by DINAMA at the Ministry for Housing, Land Planning and Environment in Uruguay	Email: Cellular Phone number: +(598)99132092	Uruguay	Interviewed in person in Montevideo	NA
24	Milton Vasquez	Stakeholder of the Action Plan on SCP Policy in Uruguay. Coordinator, Responsible Care of the Environment Program. Association of Chemical Industries of Uruguay (ASIQUR).	Email: asiqucr@ciu.com.uy Address: Av. Italia 6101 Telephone: +(598) 26040464 Fax: +(598) 2 6040495	Uruguay	Interviewed in person in Montevideo	Yes, he replied to an email and submitted the questionnaire filled out.
25	Laura Queiruga	Counterpart in the elaboration of the Action Plan on SCP Policy in Uruguay. Advisor, Ministry of Industries, Energy and Mines of Uruguay, National Direction of Industries.	Email: laura.queiruga@dni.miem.gub.uy Address: Sarandi 690 D – 2do Entrepiso. Telephone: +(598) 2 9162411 ext 352	Uruguay	Interviewed in person in Montevideo	Yes, she replied to an email and submitted the questionnaire filled out.

	Name of person interviewed	Activity carried out within the framework of the project	Contact's details	Country of residence	Contacted.	Reply to email and questionnaire
			Fax: +(598) 2 9163651			
26	Irma Suarez	Counterpart at the Ministry of Environment in Ecuador.	Email: isuarez@ambiente.gov.ec Address: Alemania y Avenida Eloy Alfaro, Telephone: +(593)22563543	Ecuador	Interviewed by phone.	Yes, she replied to emails but didn't submit the questionnaire filled out.
27	Mariela Canepa	Technical counterpart for a project on Sustainable Consumption in the Andean region. Secretariat General of the Andean Community.	Email: mcanepa@comunidadandina.com	Peru	Contacted by email.	Yes, she replied to emails but she didn't submitted the questionnaire filled out.
28	Elmer Cardozo Guzman.	Counterpart, Ministry of Housing, Land Planning and Environment of the project for the development of a national Sustainable Consumption and Production Policy	Email: ecardozo@minambiente.gov.co	Colombia	Contacted by email and interviewed by skype.	Yes, he replied to emails and he explained why he couldn't submit the questionnaire.
29	María Guzmán Ortiz	Counterpart of the project. Director, Direction for Environmental Quality Management. Ministry for the Environment, Energy and Telecommunications.	Email: mguzman@mnaet.go.cr Telephones: +(506) 2257-1839, 2233-0270 Fax: +(506) 2258-2820	Costa Rica	Contacted by email.	Yes, she replied to emails and she submitted the questionnaire.
30	Patricia Aquings	Counterpart. Executive Director Caribbean Environmental Health Institute	Email: paquing@cehi.org.lc	Saint Lucia.	Contacted by email and interviewed by skype.	Yes, she replied to emails.
31	Veronica Rodriguez Feldmann	Consultant responsible for the development and start up of the Internet based Information system	Email: verovrf@gmail.com	Argentina	Contacted by email.	Yes, She replied to the first email. She didn't reply to further emails.

Annex 6: Actual costs and co-financing for the programme

Table Total budget expenditures as December 2009

Object class	Description	Budget in PRODOC February 2006	Current Budget / Allotment	Total Expenditure as December 31/2009	Balance remaining as December 31/2009
602	General Temporary Assistance	101,000.00	80,900.00	73,400.00	7,500.00
604	Consultants fees & travel	132,000.00	122,000.00	104,917.45	21,649.95
608	Travel of staff	38,000.00	37,343.00	35,312.78	2,018.12
612	Contractual Services	74,000.00	57,000.00	44,451.89	11,837.50
		43,000.00	33,200.00	28,591.77	4,580.82
616	Operating Expenses				
617	Communications	34,000.00	26,919.99	16,097.67	10,762.50
618	Supplies, material, furniture & equipment	31,000.00	28,102.14	13,103.95	9,850.00
621	Fellowship, grants and Contributions	107,000.00	44,871.22	12,525.41	27,311.18
	<i>Total US Dollars</i>	560,000.00	430,336.73	328,400.92	95,510.07
Implementation rate at December 2009			76.31%		

Table Distribution of the Budget expended by every activity performed for the Programme **(need to be checked by UNEP financial Department)**.

Activity	Ongoing actions	Financing by LAC SCP Programme	Co-financing
Activity 1: Development of national policy on SCP	Colombia Demo Project on SCP Policy	USD 25,000	USD 30,000 (from Government of Colombia)
	Argentina Demo Project en SPP Policy	USD 15,000	On going.
	Ecuador Demo Project on SCP Policy	USD 20,000	USD 30,000 (NFLA Project)
	Uruguay Demo Project on SCP Policy	USD 15,000	
Activity 2: Meetings of the Regional Council: 3 meetings	Regional meeting held in October 2007 in Sao Pablo, Brazil:	USD 47,000	UNDESA, UNIDO, CETESB not quantified
	Sub-regional meeting for Caribbean , 2008	USD 13,000	Government of Trinidad & Tobago not quantified
	Regional meeting in Cartagena, 2009	USD 40,000	Others contributors: CAN USD 40,000, Government of Colombia: USD 15,000, UNEP NFL: USD 20,000, UNEP DTIE Marrakesh Project: USD 40,000, UNIDO: not quantified

Activity 3: Integrated Solid Waste Management	ISWM Project in Peru	USD 40,000	UDD 70,000 from NL project.
Activity 4: Increase capacities of MSMEs on SCP: demo project in Brazil	Brazil SMEs	USD 30,000	On going.
Activity 5: Workshops and exhibitions: 4 demo projects	Training and exhibitions with CCAD (see Activity 9)	USD 11.000	
	Costa Rica MOU signed	USD 14.000	
	Trinidad & Tobago: training to be included in the sub-regional meeting Act. 2	USD 10.000	
	Sustainable Public Procurement Mercosur training in Argentina	USD 15.000	
Activity 6: Sustainable Public Procurement	Support for training in Argentina	USD 2.000	
	Mercosur Pilot Project	USD 50.000	
Activity 7: 4 sub-regional Awareness Campaigns	CAN	USD 30,000	USD 30,000
	Mercosur Pilot Project	USD 9.000	
	Campaign for Mesoamerica CCAD	USD 9.000	
Activity 8: Creation of Sub regional info Center	MOU Signed with CEHI	USD 25.000	
Activity 9: Trade and Technology Fairs	MOU signed with CCAD for the fair, included on Activity 5	USD 14.000	
	Sao Pablo Report Translation	USD 750	
Activity 10: on line info hub	Preparing the project with the help of CETESB (Sao Paulo, Brazil), contract with DAXTEL	USD 26,300	USD 11,600
	Purchase of the server	USD 4,200	
	Contract with consultant	USD 20,000	
	Ecuador Demo Project on SCP (info)	USD 5,000	
Activity 11	Publications	USD 8.000	
Final evaluation		USD 12.000	On going.
Total		USD 510,250	

Annex 7: Expertise of the Evaluator

ROBERTO A. URQUIZO
Master of Science in Engineering (Environmental Engineering)
Environmental Auditor ISO 14001

Address: Altagracia Mz. 1 Solar 31, Km 2.5 Av. Carlos Julio Arosemena

Guayaquil – Ecuador
 Phone: + (593) 4 2202583
 Cellular Phone: + (593) 9 7464919
 Email: rurquizoec@hotmail.com, carbononeutral@gmail.com

Nationality: Ecuadorian

Education:

Institution	Degree(s) or Diploma(s) obtained:
Escuela Superior Politécnica del Litoral, Guayaquil– Ecuador (May 1987 – August 1992)	Mechanical Engineer
University of New Orleans, New Orleans, Louisiana- U.S.A. (September 1993 – May 1995)	Master of Science in Engineering

Detailed Professional experience:

Date: from/to	January 2008 – up to date
Location	Guayaquil, Ecuador
Company	Carbono Neutral Cia. Ltda
Position	Partner, Environmental Specialist.
Description	<p>Main focus on: Environmental consulting, environmental advising, environmental due diligence, Environmental Impact Assessments, Environmental audits, Environmental Site assessments, working for public and private sector.</p> <p>Some of the clients are: Intervisatrade (Power Generation Company), Plasticos Industriales, Reybanpac, Reysahiwal, SGS of Ecuador, Owens Illinois del Ecuador, Exportadora de Alimentos EXPALSA, Industrial Pesquera Santa Priscila (in association with Equilibratum, an Agribusiness management consultant company), Grupo Agroindustrial Quirola, Empresa Pesquera Polar, Pesquera Herco, CMC Consultores, CATEG Power Generation Company, Novacero, PORTA (part of America Movil Group), Univisa, Energy Palma (Palm Oil Plantations), among others in the following sectors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Agribusiness. ✓ Electricity Generation. ✓ Public Works. ✓ Manufacturing industries (various types) <p>Start focusing on new business national and internationally with the companies Ameresco and Carbon Trade Limited in the areas of Renewable Energies, Landfill Gas recovery and use, CDM project and development, Gas flaring reduction and Methane recovery and use in agriculture waste.</p>

Date: from/to	February 2010 – March 2010 (8 weeks)
Location	Latin America and the Caribbean.
Company	United Nation Environmental Program, UNEP Evaluation Office in Nairobi.

Position	Consultant.
Description	Evaluation of the Implementation of a Regional Programme on Sustainable Production and Consumption in Latin America and the Caribbean The objective of this terminal evaluation is to examine the extent and magnitude of any project impacts to date and determine the likelihood of future impacts. The evaluation will also assess project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results.

Date: from/to	July 2005 – December 2007
Location	Quito, Ecuador
Company	Ministry for the Environment
Position	Vice Minister for Environmental Quality
Description	National Authority for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDM National Authority approval. • Environmental Licensing. • Environmental Quality Policy • Environmental legislation on pollution prevention and control. • Hazardous Waste Management. • Climate Change. • President of the Ecuadorian National CDM Promotional Office. • President of the Ecuadorian National Committee for Climate Change. • Director of the Netherlands technical assistant project for environmental quality in Ecuador. • President of other several National Advisory boards in Environmental Quality issues. • Ecuador's Representative to the Steering Committee for Methane to Markets Partnership of USEPA and Global Gas Flaring Reduction Partnership of the World Bank.

Date: from/to	March – April 2005
Location	Ecuador
Company	ECONERGY INTERNATIONAL, WASHINGTON, USA.
Position	Consultant.
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collect general data of capacity and investment on the electric sectors of Ecuador and Peru. 2. Collect representative data renewable energy - RE-and energy efficiency –EE- sectors in Ecuador and Peru, including the following: - Data on investment in renewable energy for 2000 through 2004, including details on the technology used in each instance; - Data on investment in energy efficiency for 2000 through 2004, including breakdown of project type (cogeneration, lighting, controls, other). 3. Collect information on the financial sector in Ecuador, including representative data on the following: - Interest rates for lending for energy-sector projects (non-recourse); - Relevant reference interest rates (LIBOR, etc.); - Lending conditions (guarantees, term, grace periods, etc.); - Major financial institutions with demonstrated interest in RE and EE; - Names of major programs for financing RE and EE, with information on size of the program, characteristics, and experience to date.

Date: from/to	November 2001 – up to Date
Location	Ecuador
Company	SGS Ecuador
Position	EMS Auditor
Description	Participation first as a Trainee and later as an Auditor in ISO 14001 Environmental Management System Audits.

Date: from/to	February – April 2005
Location	Ecuador
Company	AGRICOLA GANADERA REYSAHIWAL
Position	Environmental Consultant
Description	One Environmental Impact Assessment for a new project in Guayaquil and two Environmental Audits of two industrial facilities for the production of Milk

Date: from/to	March – April 2005
Location	Ecuador
Company	NOVACERO – ACEROPAXI.
Position	Environmental Consultant
Description	Environmental Compliance Audit: covered compliance of the Environmental Managing Plan presented and approved by the Division of Environment at the Municipality of Guayaquil and compliance of the environmental standards limits for wastewater discharge, gas emissions, noise, safety and industrial hygienist and handling of hazardous chemical products and solid waste.

Date: from/to	September 2003 – October 2004.
Location	Ecuador
Company	ANDEAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION (CORPORACION ANDINA DE FOMENTO CAF) – DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENT –
Position	Consultant
Description	Environmental and Social Evaluation of projects presented to CAF for financing, public and private sector, and detailed environmental and social supervision and Environmental a Social supervision of approved projects. During thirteen month for CAF, ten different proposed projects (civil and electrical mayor infrastructure, new industries) were evaluated and six approved projects were supervised. Major projects evaluated were: Intercantonal Bus Terminal in Guayaquil, Irrigation Project in Chone, Manabí province, Major Bridge in Ambato, Tunnel in Guayaquil, Hydroelectric power plant, Milk Plant. Supervision of six projects, principally roads projects.

Date: from/to	November 2004 – December 2004
Location	Guayaquil
Company	BRISTOL MYERS SQUIBB
Position	Environmental Consultant
Description	Environmental Compliance Audit: covered Compliance of the Environmental Managing Plan presented and approved by the Division of Environment at the Municipality of Guayaquil and compliance of the environmental standards limits for wastewater discharge, gas emissions, noise, safety and industrial hygienist and handling of hazardous chemical products and solid waste.

Date: from/to	November 2004 – November 2004
Location	Guayaquil
Company	CONSORCIO SANTOS CMI
Position	Environmental Consultant.
Description	Environmental Consultant for the formulation of a technical and economical proposal to execute the Environmental Managing Plan for the construction of a hydraulic retention of branch “B” and a pedestrian bridge over the Estero Salado Estuary, part of the Integral Plan for the Recovery of Water Quality at the Estero Salado

Date: from/to	October 2004 – November 2004
Location	Guayaquil

Company	BATERIAS LUX
Position	Environmental Consultant
Description	Two projects: Monitoring acid gas concentrations in the battery charge room and at the factory boundaries. Monitoring water polluting concentration in receiving water body of the industrial wastewater effluent.

Date: from/to	August 2004 – November 2004
Location	Guayaquil
Company	SUMA CONSULTORIA / CLIENT: CRISTALERIA DEL ECUADOR, OWENS ILLINIOS
Position	Environmental Consultant
Description	Environmental Compliance Audit, that covered: Compliance of the Environmental Managing Plan presented and approved by the Division of Environment at the Municipality of Guayaquil and compliance of the environmental standards for wastewater discharge, gas emissions, noise, safety and industrial hygienist and handling of hazardous chemical products and solid waste.
Date: from/to	November 2003 – January 2004
Location	Guayaquil,
Company	SUMA CONSULTORIA / CLIENT: INTERVISA TRADE CO.
Position	Lead Environmental Consultant.
Description	Environmental Audit of a 105 MW Thermoelectric Power Plant, that covered: Verification of compliance of the environmental standards for wastewater discharge, gas emissions, noise, safety and industrial hygienist and handling of hazardous chemical products and solid waste, identification and evaluation of the environmental impacts and the execution of an Air Quality Modeling considering the gas emissions from the power plant.

Date: from/to	December 2003 – February 2004
Location	Quito, Azoguez and Quevedo
Company	SGS OF ECUADOR / CLIENT: SHELL DEL ECUADOR
Position	Lead Environmental Consultant.
Description	Determination of Hydrogeology and environmental underground pollution conditions of three (3) Shell gas stations. Underground pollution model and pre-design of the engineering solution.

Date: from/to	June 2004 – September 2004
Location	Guayaquil, Duran
Company	SGS OF ECUADOR / CLIENT: SHELL DEL ECUADOR
Position	Lead Environmental Consultant
Description	Environmental Impact Assessment of the project: Picking up and transportation of used oil generated in Shell service stations and Lubrication Centers in the Guayaquil city and communities nearby

Date: from/to	June 2004 – July 2004.
Location	Guayaquil
Company	KIMBERLEY CLARK ECUADOR, PLANTA MAPASINGUE
Position	Environmental Consultant
Description	Determination of Particulate Matter PM10 and PM4.5 concentrations in internal and boundary areas of the industrial plant.

Date: from/to	April 2003 – December 2003
Location	Guayaquil, Nobol
Company	SUMA CONSULTORIA / CLIENT: TRANSELECTRIC S.A.
Position	Lead Environmental Consultant
Description	Environmental Impact Assessment of the Project: Environmental Managing (from the picking up, transportation and disposal off) of special and hazardous solid waste. The projects included the construction of hazardous waste incineration equipment in Nobol, Guayas province.

Date: from/to	August 2003 – January 2004
Location	Guayas and El Oro Provinces
Company	SUMA CONSULTORIA / CLIENT: TRANSELECTRIC S.A.
Position	Lead Environmental Consultant
Description	Definitive Environmental Impact Assessment of Project: Construction of a Transmission Power Line from Machala to the Peruvian Border, 190 Km of longitude, and electric Substation Machala.

Date: from/to	September 2002 – January 2003
Location	Napo and Orellana Provinces / Ecuador
Company	SUMA CONSULTORIA / CLIENT: TRANSELECTRIC S.A.
Position	Lead Environmental Consultant
Description	Definitive Environmental Impact Assessment of Project: Construction of a Transmission Power Line Tena-Coca, 140 Km of longitude, and electric Substation Coca.

Date: from/to	January 1998 – August 2003
Location	Guayaquil, Ecuador
Company	MUNICIPALITY OF GUAYAQUIL, DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENT,
Position	Head of the Environmental Pollution Control Department
Description	Manager of the Prevention and Control Plan for Industrial and other sources of Pollution in Guayaquil (includes 320 industries and 180 other principal sources of pollution); Manager of 15 technical auditors in charge of the evaluation and approval of Environmental Audits submitted by industries and other sources of pollution; Elaboration of Terms of Reference for environmental projects related to urban environmental impacts and the coordination and supervision of the contracts related with this projects.

Date: from/to	March 1996 – December 1997
Location	Guayaquil
Company	MUNICIPALITY OF GUAYAQUIL, COORDINATION AND SUPERVISION MUNICIPAL UNIT OF THE INTER AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK LOAN NUMBER: 919
Position	Technical Supervisor
Description	Member of the Municipal Technical Commission for the supervision of the Projects: a. Prevention and Control Plan for Industrial and other sources of pollution in Guayaquil, and b. Integral Plan for the Recovery of water quality at the Estero Salado Estuary Responsible for the daily supervision and technical local coordination of consultant contracts with the Municipality.

Date: from/to	August 1993 – May 1995
Location	New Orleans, Louisiana
Company	URBAN WASTE MANAGEMENT AND RESEARCH FOUNDATION

Position	Research Assistant.
Description	Evaluation of sanitary sewer system network and waste water treatment plants Development of Geographical Information Systems applied to Sanitary Sewer system.

Training:

- International Program on Environment and Public Transport Management, sponsored by the Swedish National Road and Research Institute and the Swedish International Development Agency, held in Linköping, Malmö, Gothenburg, Stockholm, April 15 – May 23 2001.
- ISO 14001 Lead Assessor, Bureau Veritas, Guayaquil, Ecuador, July 2001.

Language Competence: scale of 1 to 5 (1 – excellent to 5 – basic)

Language	Reading	Speaking	Writing
English	1	1	2

Publications:

- Evaluation, Prevention and Control Plan of Industrial and Other sources of pollution in Guayaquil city. "Energy" Magazine of the Mechanical Engineers Association, Volume 4, Number 4. June 1999.
- Environment Chapter of the Strategic Urban Development Plan for Salinas, Guayas Province February 2001.
- User's Manual Ecuador Landfill Gas Model, Version 1.0, Prepared for Ministry for the Environment, Ministry for Urban Development and Housing, Government of Ecuador, February 2009.

University teacher:

- Various environmental science and engineering courses taught at different Universities in Guayaquil, since 2002:
 - Escuela Superior Politécnica del Litoral,
 - Universidad del Pacífico,
 - Universidad de Especialidades Espíritu Santo,
 - Universidad Católica Santiago de Guayaquil

Membership of professional bodies:

- Mechanical Engineers Association, Guayas Province, Registry number 04-G-478
- Ecuadorian Consultant Companies Association, ACCE. Individual Consultant from 1995
- Ecuadorian Association of Sanitary and Environmental Engineering. AEISA. Member from 2000.
- Environmental Consultant, Ecuadorian Ministry of Energy and Mines, Registry Number 51, from February 2002.
- Methane to Markets, Vice Chair of the Landfill Subcommittee, October 2007 –December 2008.
- Member of Methane to Markets Association, delegate of the Regional Government of Guayas to the subcommittee of Landfill Gas and Agricultural Waste.

Other skills:

- Very good knowledge of Microsoft Office software: Word, Excel, Microsoft project, Internet Explorer and
- EMS Auditor, SGS of Ecuador.
- Very good knowledge of Computer Aided Design software: AutoCAD and MicroStation.
- Sports: Tennis and Swimming.