

785 DC



INSTITUTIONALIZING THE AFRICAN ROUNDTABLE ON CLEANER PRODUCTION AND SUSTAINABLE CONSUMPTION PROJECT

FINAL EVALUATION

JULY 2006



UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

Man
Tools
(6) 5

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

**Final Evaluation of the
Institutionalising The African Roundtable On Cleaner
Production And Sustainable Consumption Project**

by

Dr. Yokobo Moyini

Evaluation and Oversight Unit

July 2006

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	IV
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1.0 INTRODUCTION	5
1.1 BACKGROUND.....	5
1.2 THE PROJECT	6
1.3 FROM CLEANER PRODUCTION TO SCP.....	8
1.4 EVOLUTION OF THE AFRICAN ROUNDTABLE ON SUSTAINABLE CONSUMPTION AND PRODUCTION (ARSCP)	8
2.0 SCOPE, OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY.....	9
2.1 SCOPE	9
2.2 EVALUATION OBJECTIVE	10
2.3 METHODOLOGY	10
2.4 LOGICAL FRAMEWORK.....	11
2.5 ASSESSMENT CONSTRAINTS	11
3.0 PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND IMPACT	12
3.1 ATTAINMENT OF OBJECTIVES AND PLANNED RESULTS	12
3.2 ACHIEVEMENTS OF OUTPUTS AND ACTIVITIES.....	13
3.3 IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH	14
3.4 STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION	15
3.5 FINANCIAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT.....	17
3.6 COST-EFFECTIVENESS	18
3.7 REGIONAL/ COUNTRY OWNERSHIP	19
3.8 REPLICABILITY	19
3.9 MONITORING AND EVALUATION	20
3.10 IMPACTS.....	20
3.11 SUSTAINABILITY	21
4.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RATING OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION SUCCESS 23	
4.1 CONCLUSIONS.....	23
4.2 PERFORMANCE RATINGS.....	24
5.0 LESSONS LEARNED	26
6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	27
7.0 LITERATURE CITED AND PROJECT DOCUMENTS REVIEWED.....	29
ANNEX 1: THE CHARTER OF THE ARSCP	31
ANNEX 2: TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	36
ANNEX 3: LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED.....	44
ANNEX 4: ARSCP PROJECT EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE	45

ANNEX 5: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX OF THE PROJECT	51
ANNEX 6: PROGRAMME OF THE ARSCP-4.....	54
ANNEX 7: STATUS OF COMPLETION OF MOUS.....	57
ANNEX 8: INTERNATIONAL PARTICIPANTS AT THE ARSCP-4	58
ANNEX 8: INTERNATIONAL PARTICIPANTS AT THE ARSCP-4	58
ANNEX 9. RESPONSE TO THE UNEP EOU COMMENT ON RATING	61

Acronyms and Abbreviations

10YFP	Ten Year Framework Programme
ALCANET	African Lifecycle Assessment Network
AMCEN	African Ministerial Conference on the Environment
ARSCP	African Roundtable for Sustainable Consumption and Production
BFMS	Budget and Financial Management Service of UNEP
CDG	Carl Duisberg Gesellschaft
CITET	The International Centre for Environmental Technologies
COMESA	Common Market for East and Southern Africa
CPCT	Cleaner Production Centre of Tanzania
DPLC	Design and Product Lifecycle
DTIE	Division of Trade, Industry and Economics
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
ECPC	Ethiopian Cleaner Production Centre
ESTC	Ethiopian Science and Technology Council
GoN	Government of Norway
IGAD	Inter-Governmental Authority on Development
LCA	Life Cycle Analysis
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreement
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NCPC	National Cleaner Production Centre
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for International Development
NRSCP	National Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production
OVI	Objectively Verifiable Indicator
ROA	Regional Office for Africa
RSC	Regional Steering Committee
SADC	Southern African Development Cooperation
SCP	Sustainable Consumption and Production
SREAP	Sub-Regional Environment Action Plan
ToR	Terms of Reference
UCPC	Uganda Cleaner Production Centre
UN	United Nations
UNDESA	UN Division for Economic and Social Affairs
UNECA	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organisation

Executive Summary

Introduction

The dangers of unsustainable consumption and production were highlighted in 1987 in the publication, *Our Common Future*. In 1990, the concept of cleaner production came into the arena of international cooperation. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) joined with the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO) in 1994 to support the establishment of National Cleaner Production Centres as the principal institutional mechanism to promote cleaner production in developing countries, including Africa, among others. The strong need to institutionalise the African Regional Roundtable was expressed by participants of the First and Second African Roundtables. This provided, the basis for developing the project on 'Institutionalising the African Roundtable on Cleaner Production and Sustainable Consumption'.

The project provided support to UNEP's Regional Office for Africa (UNEP-ROA) to take the initial responsibility of providing the required assistance to the African Roundtable. The project was to facilitate the development of an institutional mechanism that would enable the establishment of the African Roundtable as a self-supporting institution in due course. Principal activities of the project included: organising regional and national Roundtables, the design and launch of an African Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production (ARSCP) Webpage, and the preparation of national and regional status reports among others.

Evaluation results

The overall objective of the final evaluation of the ARSCP project was to assess whether the objectives and goals had been achieved in an effective and efficient manner and to provide recommendations and lessons from project implementation in order to assist in determining whether to continue, replicate or expand the project. The Evaluator reviewed various project documents, held interviews with key stakeholders and solicited responses from some respondents using a structured questionnaire. This report presents the results from the final evaluation of the project. The evaluation exercise produced the following key findings.

- From the evidence gathered, the objectives and all activities of the project were implemented timely and effectively with all outputs and results realised and the activities implemented cost-effectively generated significant leveraged funds. In this respect, therefore, the project must be judged an overwhelming success.
- With virtually no institutional blueprint to follow and no relevant lessons learned from past projects to draw on, the project facilitated the successful institutionalisation of the ARSCP as a non-governmental, not-for-profit organisation.
- As key implementors of the ARSCP project activities at the national level, the National Cleaner Production Centres (NCPCs) played an effective role in encouraging African countries, institutions and individuals to embrace the SCP concept and become members of the ARSCP.
- National governments, directly and through AMCEN, gave a strong endorsement to the popularisation of the SCP concept in line with the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and the NEPAD Environment Initiative. African governments also recognised the ARSCP as the sustainable consumption and production (SCP) institution in the region.
- Development partners endorsed and supported the institutionalisation of the ARSCP and remained on board during the entire life of the project. They provided technical and financial support for organising the regional, sub-regional and national Roundtables, among other forms of support.

- The 2 sub-regional Roundtables which were organised by the project proved useful and facilitated the sharing of knowledge and experiences on sub-regional issues. The ARSCP may wish to further study the feasibility of institutionalising the sub-regional Roundtables as a follow-on project.

Lessons learned

Just as the ARSCP project was very successful in its implementation, it also generated important lessons learned – grouped around project design, stakeholder participation and consultation, project partners, project duration, and performance indicators, monitoring and reporting.

Project design

1. The starting point for any project intervention should be an in-depth situational analysis – some kind of baseline study – to facilitate the proper focusing of interventions beginning with a clear hierarchical set of objectives, and both performance and impact indicators which can be objectively verified. The design must also incorporate elements of flexibility to accommodate adaptations to future changing circumstances. While there was less than adequate attention to design issues, the flexibility built into the ARSCP project allowed for efficient execution of activities. Furthermore, for many environmental projects whose impacts take longer time to manifest themselves, provision should be made for ex post evaluation right from the beginning.
2. Proper financial planning is crucial in ensuring that enough resources are made available to realise planned results. Less than adequate financing can lead to project implementation failure unless project managers and the Steering Committee are in a position to come up with innovative solutions of doing more with less as was the case for the ARSCP project.

Stakeholder identification, participation and the consultative process

3. Ultimately, every individual human being is a stakeholder in the environmental management business. For projects dealing with the environment, therefore, narrowing the list of stakeholders down to a manageable number requires stakeholder analysis, which should be done before a project starts and should form part of the situational analysis. For example, the private sector should have been given a more prominent role than it received during the ARSCP project.
4. It is important to have active and meaningful participation of all stakeholders to ensure success of a project – during both planning and implementation. The ARSCP was successful in part because it tried as much as possible within the resources available to have many participants from representatives of all key stakeholder groups during the national, sub-regional and regional Roundtables.

Project partners

5. Working with willing development partners and established political processes can enhance the acceptability and success of a project. This was the case for the ARSCP project. The political support which AMCEN and AU provided combined with technical support from UNEP, UNIDO, UNECA and UN-DESA and financial support from the Governments of Norway and Germany were crucial in ensuring the successful implementation of the ARSCP project.

Project duration

6. Institutional capacity building is a lengthy process. While the institutionalisation of an organisation such as the ARSCP – making it formal – may require less time and resources, achieving long-term institutional sustainability is a much lengthier process and more expensive.

Performance indicators, monitoring and reporting

7. Oftentimes, however good the management of a project may be, external factors can frustrate efforts and result in missed timetables. Ideally, the promoter of the SCP concept should also at the same time have the mandate to help countries establish NCPCs so that there is a smooth transition from promotion to implementation.
8. Sustainable consumption and sustainable production are different sides of the same coin. They need to be addressed together and focusing on both hard science and social aspects. The Roundtables should address this balance for a better promotion of the SCP concept.

Project Assessment

Overall, the implementation of the ARSCP project was satisfactory, somewhere between 'highly satisfactory' and 'satisfactory'. Except for the financial planning and stakeholder participation parameters which were ranked as 'satisfactory' and sustainability rated 'moderately satisfactory', all the remaining nine parameters were rated 'highly satisfactory'. Another way of looking at this is that the implementation of the project was very good, somehow below excellent, with two parameters out of the eleven considered 'good' and one rated 'fair'. The revised rankings include considerations of the comments of the reviewers on the first draft.

Parameter	Score*
1. Attainment of objectives and planned results	1
2. Achievement of outputs and activities	1
3. Implementation Approach	1
4. Stakeholder Participation	2
5. Financial Planning	2
6. Cost-Effectiveness	1
7. Regional/country ownership	1
8. Replicability	1
9. Monitoring and Evaluation	1
10. Results and Impacts	1
11. Sustainability	3
OVERALL	2

* 1-highly satisfactory; 2-satisfactory; 3-moderately satisfactory; 4-moderately unsatisfactory; 5-unsatisfactory; 6-highly unsatisfactory.

Recommendations

The ARSCP has been very successfully institutionalised. However, during the process, a number of key issues emerged. Presented below are key strategic recommendations required to address some of the critical ones.

Recommendation 1

Africa's development partners need to continue providing their support to the further strengthening of the ARSCP as it will be a vital regional instrument in the further development and implementation of the African 10 Year Framework Programme on Sustainable Consumption and Production.

Recommendation 2

UNEP should expand the role of UNEP-ROA in popularising the SCP concept in Africa to include awareness creation and assistance with the actual establishment of the NCPCs. This approach will speed up the process of adoption of the concept in the whole region.

Recommendation 3

UNEP-ROA, in close co-operation with sub-regional organisations such as ECOWAS, IGAD and COMESA, should assist the Executive Board of the ARSCP to institutionalise sub-regional SCP centres.

Recommendation 4

UNEP-ROA should assist the Executive Board of the ARSCP to access operational funds for at least a 2-year period to allow the organisation more time for planning and addressing urgent institutional capacity building requirements.

Recommendation 5

The Executive Board of the ARSCP should seek technical support from UNEP-ROA and UNEP-DTIE including other development partners to build the institutional capacity of the ARSCP including staff recruitment and training, development of management systems, and acquisition of organisational skills and hardware.

Recommendation 6

The Secretariat, together with the Executive Board of the ARSCP, should as a matter of urgency, develop a 10-year strategic plan modeled in line with the African 10YFP to guide its annual workplans.

Recommendation 7

The ARSCP should conduct an ex post evaluation, say 3 years after the project has ended, to measure the impacts which it helped to create.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background

In 1987, the Brundtland Commission, through its publication 'Our Common Future', awakened the world to the dangers of unsustainable production and consumption (Brundtland Commission, 1987). However, it wasn't until 1990 that the concept of cleaner production came into the arena of international cooperation through the high level seminar organised by the Division of Trade, Industry and Economics (DTIE) of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

In 1992, the Earth Summit held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil further elaborated on the issue of sustainable consumption and production. Principle 8 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development states as follows: 'To achieve sustainable development and a higher quality of life for all people, States (countries) should reduce and eliminate unsustainable patterns of production and consumption and promote appropriate demographic policies' (UN 1993).

Chapter 4 of Agenda 21 on Changing Consumption Patterns has two broad programme areas, namely:

- focusing on unsustainable patterns of production and consumption; and
- developing national policies and strategies to encourage changes in unsustainable consumption patterns.

In turn, two objectives were specified to address the broad programme areas. They are:

- to promote patterns of consumption and production that reduce environmental stress and meet the basic needs of humanity; and
- to develop a better understanding of the role of consumption and how to bring about more sustainable consumption patterns (UN 1993).

Since UNEP-DTIE's high level seminar in 1990, thousands of industries, government agencies and academic institutions have been engaged in the development and promotion of the concept of cleaner production. However, the adoption of the cleaner production concept was slower in developing as opposed to industrialised countries. In the case of Africa, it can be surmised that concerns for conservation of natural resources – the 'green issues' – received more attention than cleaner production initially. As a result, the few cleaner production activities in Africa were largely ad hoc. This situation is slowly changing. Over the years two initiatives have made a major contribution to the application of cleaner production concepts in Africa. They are:

- *National Cleaner Production Centres (NCPCs):*
UNEP joined with the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO) in 1994 to support the establishment of National Cleaner Production Centres as the principal institutional mechanism to promote cleaner production in developing countries and economies in transition. So far, there are twenty-four NCPCs established all over the world out of which nine are in Africa.
- *The African Roundtable:*
The First Africa Roundtable was initiated by UNEP and the first conference was organised in August 2000 with support from the Government of Norway (GoN) and the Carl Duisberg Gesellschaft (CDG) of Germany. The conference provided the first ever opportunity to the African Cleaner Production community to come together and discuss issues of regional importance.

While the national cleaner production centres in Africa recognised the important contribution of regional roundtables, many of them were not strong enough to take full responsibility of organising the regional roundtable on a rotating basis. In view of this limitation, participants of both the first and second African Roundtables expressed the strong need to institutionalise the African Roundtable at the regional level and requested UNEP to provide the required support. This regional need provided the basis for developing the project on 'Institutionalising the African Roundtable on Cleaner Production and Sustainable Consumption'.

The 22nd Session of the Governing Council of UNEP (February 2003) recalled paragraph 14 of the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, which states that fundamental changes in the way societies produce and consume are indispensable for achieving global sustainable development. It also recalled the work undertaken by the United Nations Environment Programme since 1992 to promote cleaner production, pollution prevention and sustainable consumption, in cooperation with other United Nations organisations and other stakeholders. It further recognised the results in the field of cleaner production, pollution prevention and eco-efficiency already achieved and documented in regular progress reports published on the occasion of the biennial high-level conferences on cleaner production.

In view of addressing the remaining and emerging challenges with respect to sustainable consumption and production, The Governing Council requested the Executive Director, inter alia, to:

- strengthen sustainable consumption and production activities of the United Nations Environment Programme within its existing mandate and subject to available resources, and consistent with the recommendations adopted at the World Summit on Sustainable Development; and
- strengthen existing eco-efficiency, cleaner production and sustainable consumption programmes, such as the United Nations Environment Programme's regional cleaner production roundtables and its partnership with the Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, including facilitating the transfer of environmentally sound technologies, especially to developing countries and countries with economies in transition, and activities to stimulate the design of sustainable products and services.

Article 18 C of the 'Proposed Work Programme on Promoting Sustainable Consumption and Production Pattern' prepared by UNEP-DTIE (August 2002) underlines that the application of life-cycle based production and consumption instruments requires behavioural change, new skills and insights. It further notes the need to raise awareness and develop better understanding of consumption and production issues, in particular for small and medium-sized businesses and to develop case-studies and share best practices and information. In this regard, the work programme states that the activities of existing national centres and roundtables on cleaner production will be expanded to address sustainable consumption issues and – where necessary- the establishment of new sustainable consumption and production centres will be promoted and full capacity building will be carried out.

1.2 The Project

The Institutionalising the African Roundtable on Cleaner Production and Sustainable Consumption project provided support to UNEP's Regional Office for Africa (UNEP-ROA) to take the initial responsibility of providing the required support to the African Roundtable. As planned, the project was to facilitate the development of an institutional mechanism that would enable the establishment of the African Roundtable as a self-supporting institution in due course. This was to be achieved by supporting the National Cleaner Production Centres (NCPCs) to organise national and regional roundtables and co-ordinating the efforts of the NCPCs through the Regional Steering Committee (RSC) of the African Roundtable. The RSC was expected to take over the leadership responsibility from UNEP- ROA.

The project was co-ordinated by UNEP and financially supported by the Government of Norway. It was carried out in partnership with the NCPCs and other institutions engaged in the promotion of cleaner production in African countries as the principal implementing institutions at the national level. The United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO) was the collaborating UN agency of the project, under the umbrella of the UNIDO/UNEP Cleaner Production Programme.

More specifically, the overall project co-ordination, both administrative and technical, was undertaken by UNEP-ROA with the advice of the Regional Steering Committee (RSC) which was established by the African Roundtable. The national institutions were principally responsible for organising the national and regional roundtables, while UNEP provided financial and technical support within the limits of available resources.

The principal activities of the Institutionalising the African Roundtable on Cleaner Production and Sustainable Consumption project were the following.

- Proposals shall be solicited from National Cleaner Production Centres to organise National and Regional Roundtables.
- Memorandum of Understandings (MoUs) shall be signed with those Centres that are selected to organise the national and/or Regional Roundtables.
- National Roundtables shall be convened on thematic issues that are of immediate importance to the countries.
- Regional Roundtables shall be held in different parts of the region. Each Roundtable is expected to be attended by about 30 participants to be invited from all over Africa and about 30-40 participants from the host country.
- A professional web-designer shall be recruited to develop the Webpage of the African Roundtable on Cleaner Production.
- The required consultants for the preparation of the national and regional status reports shall be recruited.
- UNEP Officers shall provide the required technical support for the project implementation.

A summary of project particulars is presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Project Identification

UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME		
PROJECT IDENTIFICATION		
1.1 Title of Subprogram:	Sustainable Consumption and Production	
1.2 Title of Subprogram Element:	Programme of Work 2004-2005	
1.3 Title of Project:	Institutionalising the African Roundtable on Cleaner Production & Sustainable Consumption.	
Implementation:	Internal: DTIE/ROA	
1.4 Project Number:	CP/4020-04-	
1.5 Geographical Scope:	Covers the whole Africa Region with initial basis in Countries where there are National Cleaner Production Centres.	
1.6 Cooperating Agency or Supporting Organisation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National Cleaner Production Centres (NCPCs) ▪ United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO) 	
1.7 Duration of the Project:	28 months Commencing: March 2004 Completion: June 2006	
1.8 Cost of Project: (Expressed in US \$)		
	US\$	%
Cost to Counterpart contribution from Norway:	490,275.00	87
Programme administration cost:	63,794.00	13
Total Cost of the Project:	554,519.00	100

1.3 From Cleaner Production to SCP

“There is no sustainable consumption without sustainable production and vice versa” (UCPC 2004).

In 1994, the Norwegian Government hosted the first international symposium on sustainable consumption as an initial step in the follow-up to the relevant recommendations of Agenda 21. An important outcome of that meeting was a call for the establishment of ‘national and multidisciplinary centres ...to support more sustainable consumption and production’ (UCPC 2004).

Recognising the inter-connectedness of sustainable production and consumption, UNIDO and UNEP called upon NCPCs to expand their scope of activity to include sustainable consumption (UCPC 2004). In its Cleaner Production Status Report 2002, UNEP (2002a) urged NCPCs to ‘focus now on the expanded vision of cleaner production that links explicitly with sustainable consumption’ (UCPC 2004). Furthermore, according to UNEP (2002b) ‘the activities of existing national centres and roundtables on cleaner production were to be expanded to address sustainable consumption issues and - where necessary - the establishment of new Sustainable Consumption and Production Centres promoted. In this respect a full-fledged capacity building programme would have been carried out”.

1.4 Evolution of the African Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production (ARSCP)

The First African Roundtable on Cleaner Production and Sustainable Consumption (ARSCP-1) was organised jointly by UNEP and the Carl Duisberg Gasellschaft e.V. of Germany in Nairobi, Kenya, August 9-11, 2000. It was funded by the Government of Norway, the Government of the Netherlands, and UNIDO. The first two days of the event were dedicated to cleaner production issues and the third day emphasised the linkages and synergies between sustainable consumption and cleaner production.

The Second African Roundtable on Cleaner Production and Sustainable Consumption (ARSCP-2) was held in Arusha, Tanzania over 13-14 March 2002. It was organised by the Cleaner Production Centre of Tanzania (CPCT). The Roundtable demonstrated that the region had taken ownership of the process and would continue to exist as an on-going institution. A steering group consisting of representatives from Morocco, Nigeria, Cameroon, Kenya and South Africa was formed to work towards the establishment of a secretariat. The ARSCP-2 consisted of country presentations, thematic inputs, working groups and plenary. There was also a signing ceremony of the International Declaration on Cleaner Production which saw 17 new signatories from African industry, government and facilitating organisations.

The Third African Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production (ARSCP-3), held on 17-18 May, 2004 in Casablanca, Morocco, resulted in the institutionalisation of the African Roundtable which established a Charter and an Executive Board of 5 members. They were:

- *Dr. Patrick Mwesigye* – *Director of the Uganda Cleaner Production Centre as President of the Executive Board of ARSCP*
- *Prof Cleo Migiro* – *Director of the Cleaner Production Centre of Tanzania as Secretary of the Executive Board of ARSCP*
- *Mr. Smail Hilal* – *Director of the Morocco Cleaner Production Centre as Treasurer of the Executive Board of ARSCP*
- *Mr. Philil Acquah* – *Deputy Director of the Ghana Environment Protection Agency as Member of the Executive Board of ARSCP*
- *Dr. Evans Kituyi* – *Lecturer, University of Nairobi as Member of the Executive Board of the ARSCP*

The Cleaner Production Centre of Tanzania (CPCT) was made the Interim Secretariat of the ARSCP, located in Dar es Salaam. The Charter of the African Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production (ARSCP) is presented in Annex 1.

The ARSCP-3 was attended by 60 participants from 25 countries and included representatives of national governments, national cleaner production centres, business, research institutes, members of the African Lifecycle Assessment Network (ALCANET) and NGOs, as well as 4 international organisations (UNEP, UN-DESA, UNIDO and NORAD). The meeting was organised by UNEP and the Moroccan National Cleaner Production Centre, in consultation with UN-DESA and financial support from the German Federal Ministry of Environment and the Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The Fourth African Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production (ARSCP-4) was held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, from 29th to 31st May, 2006 during which the High –Level Launch of the African 10 Year Framework Programme (10YFP) on Sustainable Consumption and Production took place. The launch was jointly organised by the African Union (AU), UNEP and the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA). The ARSCP-4 was organised by UNEP and the Secretariat of the ARSCP in collaboration with UNIDO and hosted by the Ethiopian Cleaner Production Centre (ECPC/ESTC) and the Federal Environmental Protection Authority.

The overall objectives of the ARSCP-4 was to provide an input into the further development and implementation of the Africa 10 YFP on Sustainable Consumption and Production at the sub-regional and national level. The specific objectives were to:

- review the current status of activities on cleaner production and sustainable consumption in the region and facilitate experience sharing on best practices and strategies implemented in the region;
- undertake discussion on the possible modalities for the implementation of selected thematic programmes of the African 10YFP; and
- review the report from the Secretariat of the ARSCP and propose ways on further strengthening the activities of the ARSCP.

2.0 Scope, Objectives and Methodology

2.1 Scope

The evaluation concerns and is specific to the institutionalisation of the African Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production (ARSCP). The project recognised the important role the NCPCs and other programmes and initiatives have in promoting sustainable consumption and production at the national level. However, this evaluation is not aimed at evaluating the performance of individual NCPCs in particular. Instead the evaluation recognises the fact that seven NCPCs were already in existence before the project started. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the promotion of the establishment of NCPCs was seen as a means of contributing to the expansion of the adoption of the cleaner production concept in African countries. Hence the increased number of proposals for the establishment of new centres was identified as one of the objectively verifiable indicators (OVIs) of the project. This and other OVIs related to the NCPCs is what the evaluation focused on.

Second, while the evaluation focused on the project activities in the African region, it also addressed the important linkages of the ARSCP to the global network of NCPCs, other regional roundtables and the global forum as specified in the project document.

2.2 Evaluation Objective

Overall objective

As stated in the Terms of Reference (ToR) presented in Annex 2, the overall objective of the final evaluation of the ARSCP Project is to assess whether the objectives and goals had been achieved in an effective and efficient manner and to provide recommendations and lessons from project implementation in order to assist in determining whether to continue, replicate or expand the project.

Specific objectives

Similarly as shown in Annex 2, the evaluation was required to focus on three key issues. These issues have in turn been translated into specific objectives as follows:

- to assess the effectiveness of the project in expanding the adoption of the sustainable consumption and production concept in participating countries;
- to ascertain whether the processes for information collection and exchange between national cleaner production centres were appropriately designed and effective in fulfilling the needs of the Project; and
- to determine the extent to which the Project was successful in establishing an institutional mechanism for the ARSCP.

2.3 Methodology

As elaborated in the ToR, the end of term evaluation was tasked to conduct analysis pertaining to the following eleven parameters:

- attainment of objectives and planned results;
- achievement of outputs and activities;
- implementation approach;
- stakeholder participation;
- cost effectiveness;
- regional/country ownership;
- replicability;
- monitoring and evaluation;
- impact; and
- sustainability.

In addition, the Evaluator was required to make strategic recommendations which would contribute to the future direction of the project based on lessons learned during project implementation. Finally, the Evaluator was also required to rate the overall implementation success of the project and provide individual ratings of the implementation aspects (the 11 parameters) aforementioned.

The analysis and findings of the evaluation were based on the following.

1. A desk review of various project documents including:
 - project documents, meeting and workshop reports, progress reports, and relevant correspondence;
 - review of specific products including technical reviews, guidance manual, and project content based articles published in journals, and other documents produced by the project;
 - notes from the Steering Committee; and

- other materials provided by the project team in both hard and soft forms.
2. In-person or telephone interviews with Project Management Staff at the NCPCs, UNIDO cleaner production staff, UNEP Project Manager and Fund Management Officer and other relevant staff in UNEP as deemed appropriate. The evaluation exercise coincided with the meeting of the ARSCP-4 and the launch of the 10-year African Framework Programme, held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The meeting provided an opportunity for the Evaluator to witness an ARSCP Roundtable in person and to interact with a number of participants. A list of persons contacted is presented in Annex 3.
 3. A questionnaire (Annex 4) was administered to selected respondents to solicit their views regarding the eleven parameters on which the success of project implementation was to be judged.

2.4 Logical framework

The logical framework (logframe) of a project is the starting point for any evaluation exercise, especially the attainment of objectives and planned results. A typical logframe has objectives/results, activities, objectively verifiable indicators, means of verification, and assumptions and risks. The project's logframe as presented in Annex 5 had all the necessary elements. However, the hierarchical ordering of objectives of the project was not clear from an examination of the logframe. It can be discerned from the project document that:

- at the apex, the overall goal was to achieve greater adoption of the sustainable consumption and production (SCP) concept in the Africa region; and
- the second level, or principal objective was to facilitate the development of an institutional mechanism that would enable the establishment of the ARSCP as a self-supporting institution.
- Other project objectives would then follow the above two levels of objectives.

As presented in the Logframe, the OVIs were mainly output/performance indicators. Impact indicators were largely missing. Institutional development takes a long time and impacts may be realised much later than the 28 months of the project period. Since the project was for a short time, it was perhaps logical to focus more on the obvious, easily measurable output and performance indicators and less on the impacts generated by an institutionalised ARSCP.

2.5 Assessment constraints

Two main constraints were encountered during the evaluation. The first was methodological and the other related to the evaluation process itself.

- To the extent that NCPCs and other programmes and initiatives on sustainable consumption and production were already in existence before the project started, it was somewhat difficult to say with certainty that some of the impacts observed or realised were the direct result of project interventions. On the other hand, for a short duration project dealing with institutional capacity building, the issue of impacts may be relatively minor as opposed to output indicators.
- While a questionnaire was distributed to NCPCs and other sustainable consumption and production institutions and experts, few responded. This may be partly explained by the short time given to the respondents. In hindsight, perhaps the questionnaire would have had better response either before or during the Fourth African Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production (ARSCP-4). Nevertheless and on the other hand, the few responses received showed no major discrepancies in the scores of individual items in the questionnaire. Their average scores were subsequently used in the evaluation.

3.0 Project Performance and Impact

3.1 Attainment of objectives and planned results

The principal objective of the project was to facilitate the development of an institutional mechanism that would enable the establishment of the African Roundtable on Cleaner Production and Sustainable Consumption as a self-supporting initiative. From the questionnaire administered, respondents ranked the attainment of objectives as having been 'very adequately met', a score of 4 out of a maximum score of 5 (above expectations).

The ARSCP was established as a loose networking mechanism during ARSCP-1. The project facilitated its institutionalisation in 2004 and thereafter went on to strengthen it. The activities of the project resulted in:

- the formal establishment and legal registration of the Roundtable as a regional networking institution during ARSCP-3 in Casablanca, Morocco. The institutional structure of the ARSCP was also strengthened somewhat. During ARSCP-4, the old Executive Board Members were returned unopposed. Two new members were added to the Board to address considerations of regional balance and to account for gender. The ARSCP Executive Board now, therefore, has 7 members. During the same session, individual members volunteered to serve on the 5 Technical Committees of the ARSCP. While having the ARSCP as a self-supporting institution was a stated goal, the project acknowledged right from the start that this would not be achieved easily, at least not during the 28 months period.
- strong ownership by SCP promoting institutions and individuals as witnessed during the business session of the ARSCP that was held at ARSCP-4. Right there, a total of 35 individuals registered as new members and paid the required fee of \$50 per person;
- recognition of the ARSCP as the regional focal institution for the African Ministerial Conference on Environment (AMCEN) on matters related to sustainable consumption and production; and
- recognition of the ARSCP as the regional lead institution for the Marrakech Process on the 10 Year Framework Programme as confirmed by its election as the Vice Chair of the Regional Steering Committee for the African 10YFP and the Vice Chair of the Marrakech Task Force on Cooperation with Africa.

The project document had three specific objectives and three related results. Expanding the adoption of cleaner production in African countries was the first specific objective of the ARSCP project. The ARSCP project facilitated the establishment of NCPCs through the creation of awareness and appreciation about the concept of SCP and the benefit of establishing a centre. During the life of the ARSCP project, one additional NCPC was established; another set of 5 countries have initiated the process for establishing their centres; while a number of other African countries have expressed interest. Unfortunately, even after the creation of awareness and appreciation for the concept of the SCP in addition to strong national government commitment, delays in actually establishing the NCPC undermined enthusiasm and the momentum for creating new centres. Here, Rwanda is a case in point. Furthermore, while UNEP can help create awareness and appreciation in countries, the actual establishment of NCPCs is not part of its mandate. The facilitation of the establishment of NCPCs is the responsibility of UNIDO and other development partners. There is need, therefore, for better synchronisation of the activities of UNEP with those of the other partners in the promotion of the SCP concept in the region if interventions such as the ARSCP project are to be effective.

The second objective of the ARSCP project was the facilitation of information and experience exchanges among NCPCs. The respondents scored the attainment of this objective as 'very good', just below 'excellent'. The project facilitated improved information exchange amongst the NCPCs through the organisation of the Regional and Sub-regional Roundtables and the establishment of a mailing list that facilitated communication amongst the NCPCs.

The third specific objective was to strengthen the linkages, mainly electronic of the regional cleaner production effort with the global cleaner production network. The respondents rated the attainment of this objective as 'very successful', giving a score of 4 out of a maximum of 5. Linkages were strengthened through the Marrakech Process on the African 10 Year Framework Programme and the support provided for ARSCP participation in UNEP's High-Level International Advisory Seminar on SCP. The linkages were further strengthened by the design, development and launch of the ARSCP Webpage. An invitation of representatives of other regions to the biennial ARSCP regional Roundtable would also have been useful in adding value to the linkages through sharing of information and exchange of experiences with other regions.

The first planned result was the establishment of new NCPCs and programmes. One new NCPC was established and several are now at different stages of development. Apart from promoting the establishment of new NCPCs by holding national RoundTables some countries had cleaner production programmes in form of demonstration projects. The ARSCP was able to generate interest in NCPCs and pilot projects in part as a result of strong support from national governments and development partners. With respect to national government support, for example, the Rwandan National Roundtable was attended by at least four Cabinet Ministers.

The second planned result was the establishment of an institutional mechanism for the ARSCP. The ARSCP was formally established. Two regional, 2 sub-regional and several national Roundtables were organised during the life of the project. The organisation of sub-regional Roundtables was originally not specified but became necessary in the course of project implementation. A system for future Roundtables although not specifically stated is actually provided for, embedded in the 10YFP of AMCEN. The able leadership of the Regional Steering Committee also contributed to the strengthening of the ARSCP. As evidence, all the 5 RSC members were requested to remain on the new Executive Board of the ARSCP thereby assuring continuity and the retention of institutional memory. Another contributing factor was the active participation by governments both national and local. For example, the ARSCP-4 Roundtable and the launch of the African 10YFP were attended by none other than the President of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia.

The third planned result was knowledge and information sharing on SCP, mainly through launching and maintaining of an interactive webpage. A significant amount of knowledge sharing took place. During the regional, sub-regional and national Roundtables technical papers covering different aspects of the SCP concept were presented (for ARSCP-4 see Annex 6). One of the outcomes of the knowledge sharing was the establishment of the African Life Cycle Analysis Network (ALCANET) as a technical unit of ARSCP. Additional knowledge sharing occurred through the launching and maintaining of an interactive webpage. It is now entirely up to the ARSCP Secretariat to ensure the website is fully functional and useful beyond the project period. This consideration is important because the continued existence of the webpage is likely to be a very powerful tool for sharing knowledge and experiences since all African countries have capable web users.

3.2 Achievements of outputs and activities

During the evaluation, planned activities and associated outputs were assessed taking into account timelines of completion, quality of outputs and contribution to the overall objective of the project. The project carried out its planned activities well and was able to realise the three outputs that had been planned. The outputs were commensurate with the initial targets set. Respondents rated the quality of the outcomes of activities organised as 'very good', a score of 4 out of a maximum 5. This was because the national, sub-regional and regional Roundtables were well organised with very positive outcomes – during ARSCP-3 the ARSCP was institutionalised while during ARSCP-4 the African 10YFP was launched. The outputs were useful in the sense that they laid the foundation for the future activities of ARSCP such as: awareness created in the Francophone Sub-Saharan Africa for the need to have NCPCs; and the institutionalisation of Ghana's NCPC that characterised the provision of a seed-fund which led to official acceptance of Ghana's

application to UNIDO for financial support for its NCPC. The ARSCP achieved the following three planned outputs.

- Proposals were solicited from NCPCs and institutions to organise national Roundtables. Then MoUs were signed to organise the national Roundtables which were subsequently convened. Five national Roundtables were organised and convened as planned. National status reports were also produced and submitted. These reports were then synthesised into regional status reports.
- Offers were received from NCPCs to host the regional Roundtable and MoUs were subsequently signed with the selected NCPCs. Two regional Roundtables were organised one at the beginning of the ARSCP project in 2004 and the second towards the end of May 2006. Regional status reports were also produced. A list and status of MoUs signed for various project activities is presented in Annex 7.
- A professional web designer was identified and contracted. A skeleton web structure was developed initially and suitable materials gathered. The webpage development was finalised, a domain secured and the website launched.
- The following pilot projects were supported:
 - a. mainstreaming SCP in the Management of Lake Victoria Basin Development Programmes;
 - b. sustainable use and production of plastics in Africa;
 - c. regional capacity building on Life Cycle Analysis (LCA); and
 - d. pilot projects in Ghana and Senegal on integrating the concepts of SCP into national poverty reduction strategies.

Respondents felt the national and regional Roundtables were very effectively organised, scoring 4 out of a maximum 5. This was because the Roundtables succeeded in creating awareness of the SCP concept based on lifecycle thinking and supply chain management instead of the traditional production processes in cleaner production methodology. As such the national and regional Roundtables were reported to have achieved their objectives. For instance, the Ghana¹ Roundtable has led to the institutionalisation of the NCPC and subsequent construction of a permanent office building for the centre. Some element of a national SCP policy has been developed in Ghana. Also in the same country, a project was developed to integrate SCP into the National Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy (GPRS-II). On the other hand, the ARSCP website has had low patronage, scoring 2 (fairly effective) out of a maximum 5. The low patronage can probably be attributed to the lack of effective dissemination of its existence. Finally, respondents felt the project outputs have had noticeable influence on policymakers at both national and regional levels, giving a score of 3 out of a maximum 5. Taking the Ghana example, the project was able to create awareness which led to the patronage of relevant stakeholders in the subsequent forum on the country's NCPC. The project also catalysed the Government of Ghana's investment in the construction of the NCPC building and the establishment of the institution as an autonomous not-for-profit organisation.

3.3 Implementation approach

A good implementation approach reflects the capability of project management, first to adjust and adapt to changing conditions; second, to incorporate lessons learned during the implementation of the project; and, third, effectively to manage and maintain partnerships with relevant institutions and stakeholders (EOU, 2005).

Overall, the supervision, administrative and financial support by UNEP was rated 'very good', a score of 4 out of a maximum 5. One interviewee had this to say:

¹ The Ghana NCPC was the one established during the life of the ARSCP project, hence the added focus here.

"The UNEP support has been greatly facilitated by the UNEP-DTIE Officer, who dedicated himself to see the ARSCP achieving the initial set targets and outcomes. His role has been exceptional not withstanding the lack of internally generated funds to support the UNEP efforts, most of the programmes were implemented".

The initial plan was to have a longer-term project with a significantly bigger budget than was actually realised. The project was able to adapt to this change and developed an appropriate strategy to achieve key outputs with less resources, by mainly back-to-back meetings. For example the ARSCP-3 was held in Morocco at the same time as the First African Experts Meeting on the African 10YFP. The ARSCP-4 in Ethiopia was held together with the launching of the African 10YFP. Finally, the combined approach of working both at the political and technical level simultaneously on a subject that has largely been left for the technicians; the active engagement of development partners in the process which led to the self-motivated decision of launching the Marrakech Taskforce on Cooperation with Africa by the German Government; and the utilisation of a sub-contracting arrangement that is based on provision of technical services in order to overcome the absence of budget allocation for the Secretariat in the project, made the project implementation approach unique.

Whereas the initial focus of the NCPCs which were established before the ARSCP project was on cleaner production during the life of the project all NCPCs and other practitioners were able to adapt and subscribe to the sustainable consumption and production concept.

The project logframe document called for the organisation of national and regional Roundtables. During the project period, it became clear that there existed some important sub-regional challenges and priorities. Subsequently, two sub-regional Roundtables were organised – mainstreaming SCP into the activities of the Lake Victoria Basin Development Programmes; and a roundtable for Francophone West and Central African countries.

At the ARSCP-4, it was realised that the 5 Executive Board members were not sufficient to represent all stakeholder interests. Gender and regional differences were recognised as constituting important areas which required an expanded Executive Board. The members of the ARSCP unanimously agreed to increase the number of Executive Board positions from 5 to 7.

The project was able to keep all original partners on board and new partners – who often provided leveraged funds – were added on as the need arose. For example the Dutch Partnership Programme on Urban Environment provided support to Rwanda aimed ultimately at establishing a NCPC for that country.

3.4 Stakeholder participation

The project was specifically designed as support to the institutionalisation of the ARSCP. The key stakeholders of the project were:

- the Regional Steering Committee (RSC) and the Secretariat of the ARSCP;
- UNEP-ROA
- UNEP-DTIE
- UNIDO
- NCPCs and other SCP institutions and individual experts;
- Civil society (including NGOs);
- Other development partners (e.g. the governments of Norway and Germany);
- AMCEN;
- African Union (AU); and
- national and subnational governments

The evaluation assessed stakeholder involvement in the form of participation, consultation and information dissemination.

Participation in the project took various forms, ranging from attendance of Roundtables and meetings to the effective engagement of stakeholders at all levels. The following are the roles played by some of the key stakeholders:

- The Secretariat of AMCEN has worked very closely with the project management in promoting the institutionalization of the ARSCP through the development and approval of the African 10 Year Framework Programme on Sustainable Consumption and Production. The development of the African 10YFP on SCP was facilitated by UNEP and UN-DESA in close consultation with the Secretariat of AMCEN and the Secretariat of ARSCP. At the 2nd African Expert Meeting held in February 2005 in Nairobi, during the last plenary participants recommended that the ARSCP be recognised by AMCEN as a *Centre of Excellence on Sustainable Consumption and Production* in the context of the NEPAD Environmental Action Plan. During the same meeting the Technical Segment of AMCEN convened where the 2nd Experts Meeting recommendation was presented and endorsed for submission to AMCEN's Ministerial Session for approval. The Regional Framework Programme developed through the above technical forums was approved by AMCEN in March 2005 in Dakar, Senegal. The Dakar Declaration for Enhanced Partnership in the Implementation of the African Plan for the Environment Initiative of NEPAD Declaration 17 reads 'Further call upon our development partners to provide concrete support to the activities and programmes based on the outcome of the Second African Expert Meeting on the 10-Year Framework Programme on Sustainable Consumption and Production'. Declaration 20 further urged 'African countries to honour their offer to provide in-kind and in-cash contribution for the implementation of the action plan for the environment initiative of NEPAD, particularly its programme on capacity building and the priority projects selected by AMCEN.
- UNEP-DTIE and UNEP-DRC, which are the internal project implementing partners provided an effective support for the successful implementation of the project through the Industry Office at the Regional Office for Africa;
- the RSC which was later transformed into the Board of ARSCP made significant contribution in facilitating and providing the required technical inputs for the Roundtables at the regional, sub-regional and national levels. The project right from the beginning recognised the RSC as having an advisory role. The RSC is the policy organ of the ARSCP and as such provided strategic advice on the activities of the Secretariat. In particular, the RSC participated actively in promoting the establishment of additional NCPCs. As a result 1 NCPC was established 5 countries have initiated the process and others have expressed interest. The President of the RSC attended both the Ghana and Rwanda national Roundtables. The Secretary attended the one of Ghana.
- As a collaborating institution, UNIDO provided support during the organisation of the two Regional Roundtables and supported the various NCPCs who were seen as the implementing institutions at the national level. UNIDO provided programmatic funding during the establishment of NCPCs. UNIDO also provided funding for pilot or demonstration projects whose findings were later shared at the regional, sub-regional and national Roundtables. The Second Regional Status Report (May 2006) reiterated the need to support the development and implementation of concrete demonstration projects with support from donors and replicate them elsewhere. Furthermore, that the results of such projects need to be presented in manuals and guidelines which everybody can use.
- the NCPCs and other SCP institutions operating at the national level were the principal players in organising and implementing all the activities undertaken under the project. The NCPCs are expected to be leading promoters of SCP in the continent under ARSCP (Mebratu 2005). Their work is however supplemented by research institutions and other establishments involved in CP promotion. Unfortunately, weak national legislation and enforcement procedures, lack of institutional capacity, institutional sustainability concerns and lack of financing mechanisms for SCP investments are the foremost constraints affecting the effectiveness of NCPCs (Mebratu 2005).

In general, the key stakeholders of the project had ample opportunities for participation. They were able to participate in regional, sub-regional and national Roundtables. A list of international participants

(excluding Ethiopian national participants) is presented as Annex 8 of this Evaluation Report. The private sector represented about 16% of the international participants at the ARSCP-4.

Project consultation was in the form of meetings and interactions at different levels both prior to and during implementation. The ARSCP project was conceived during ARSCP-1 and ARSCP-2 when NCPCs recognised they did not have adequate capacity to take full responsibility of organising the regional Roundtable on a rotating basis. Subsequently, participants at the first two Roundtables expressed the strong need to institutionalise the African Roundtable at the regional level and requested UNEP to provide the required support. The Regional Steering Committee consulted regularly with UNEP on the implementation of the project.

With respect to information dissemination, stakeholders of the project had access to the ARSCP website although its existence could perhaps have been made known better by the ARSCP Secretariat. The NCPCs also devoted considerable effort to awareness creation through among others, demonstration projects. Unfortunately, stakeholders such as NGOs, trade unions and consumer associations – who constitute civil society – could have played stronger advocacy roles but featured less prominently. At the regional level, the diminished role of the civil society organisations and the private sector can best be explained by the paucity of continent-wide institutions. The private sector and civil society organisations on the other hand are otherwise regarded as key stakeholders. However, even at the national level, they are not considered among the top three most important stakeholders. In a survey carried out during the preparation of the ARSCP Second Regional Status Report (2006), respondents across Africa rated national governments, cleaner production centres/programmes and local governments as the top three most important stakeholders followed by industry associations, universities and then business organisations among the top six key stakeholders. The ranking was so because SCP is seen to a large extent as a government responsibility, with CP centres, industry associations and business organisations as important partners. Government efforts are still linked to their traditional means of control – policymaking, legislation, enforcement, education and coordination. CP centres play an important role in capacity building while industry associations and business organisations are seen as important stakeholders since the behavioural practices of business must change in order to achieve SCP. Possible low ranking of consumer, health authorities and investors is that even if they have a potential influence, they are perceived as being difficult to activate to support more sustainable behaviour. Mwesigye (2005) observed that a viable CPC depends largely on industry's involvement, acceptability, contribution and participation of its programmes and their willingness to pay for services rendered by the Centre. Unfortunately, he suggested, industry feels that NCPC programmes should be at no cost to industry. This calls for more awareness creation and the introduction of economic incentives measures in the promotion of SCP. As national implementers, the NCPCs through their institutional relationships with government ministries and organisations were able to keep national and subnational governments engaged in the popularisation of the SCP concept. As national implementors of the project, the NCPCs could also have encouraged a larger group including Parliamentarians to appreciate the SCP concept.

3.5 Financial planning and management

The evaluation assessed financial planning and management in terms of the quality of planning, and financial discipline, including transparency and accountability to the stakeholders.

The quality of planning was assessed in terms of adequacy, accuracy and realistic expectations. Originally, the project was estimated to cost \$2,350,000 and take three years to complete. The project which was finally approved was to last 28 months and cost \$554,519 (Table 2). Whichever way one views it the project was under-funded. The cost of running the Secretariat was originally budgeted at \$300,000 with an additional \$150,000 for the Network /Listserve/Website, giving a total of \$450,000, almost the amount which was finally approved for the entire project. The regional, sub-regional and the national Roundtables were together budgeted for \$800,000, an amount that far exceeded the total approved budget of the project. There was also an amount of \$450,000 originally budgeted for the extension of the coverage of NCPCs to other parts of Africa. These funds were not available in the approved budget which in part contributed to UNEP's inability to actually have NCPCs established and operational, hence the reliance on UNIDO. The drastic reduction of the project budget, realising slightly less than a quarter of what was originally planned

meant that some of the originally planned activities of the project could not be adequately met. Perhaps the reduction in funds availability was the result of an initial less than enthusiastic response from development partners. Whatever the reason, an opportunity exists now to scale up the project at least to the level originally proposed less activities already implemented. It is important that the scaling up is based on a well articulated strategic plan, most suitably within the African 10YFP context.

UNEP-ROA made finances available to beneficiaries guided by Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs). The MoUs spelt out clearly the responsibilities for accountability and to a large extent eliminated possibilities for non-transparency. Consequently, project funds were well spent and on activities specified in the MoUs. Project funds were properly spent and this assertion was supported by the view of the Fund Programme Office, Budget and Financial Management Service (BFMS) of UNEP.

Table 2. Budget proposal and approval

Item	Cost (\$)
A. ORIGINAL BUDGET PROPOSED	
• Secretariat	300,000
• Network/ListServe/Website	450,000
• Annual African Roundtable Conference	350,000
• National Roundtable Conference	150,000
• Travel, Expert Services, Meetings	450,000
• Extension to other African Countries	<u>150,000</u>
Donors	1,850,000
UNEP	<u>500,000</u>
Total	<u>2,350,000</u>
B. APPROVED BUDGET	
• Project Personnel	
• Sub-Contract	161,000
• Training	139,750
• Equipment & Premises	141,500
• Miscellaneous	3,000
• Total cost to project	<u>45,475</u>
• Programme support cost	490,725
• Grand total project cost	<u>43,794</u>
	<u>554,519</u>
Cost to Earmarked Contribution from Norway	
Programme Administration Cost (UNEP)	490,725
Total	<u>63,794</u>
	<u>554,519</u>

3.6 Cost-effectiveness

Cost-effectiveness assessments reflect the efficiency and effectiveness of resource use in project design and implementation in ensuring achievements of expected outputs. As such, cost-effectiveness governs the timely implementation and completion of projects using the financial and human resources provided.

Although the budget was reduced from the original submission, the amount made available was well spent. There were no records of financial impropriety. Frugality was observed, and generosity demonstrated by, for example, the Regional Steering Committee members donating their allowances worth \$6,000 to the ARSCP Secretariat.

Out of total project funds of \$554,519, the direct financial assistance given to ARSCP Secretariat was only \$20,000 which was made through a sub-contracting arrangement for the provision of technical inputs to

Regional and sub-regional Roundtables. An additional \$64,000 (made up of \$51,000 for the Secretary, \$10,000 for Web Design and \$3,000 for a Laptop) could also be considered as an indirect contribution to the Secretariat. While this amount was much smaller than originally planned, the support provided above was significantly augmented by the in-kind contributions by the Cleaner Production Centre of Tanzania (CPCT) and the time value of the Regional Steering Committee members.

Apart from in-kind contributions, the project was able to leverage an additional \$160,000 in cash, equivalent to about 30% of total project cost, as shown below.

- the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany worth 50,000 Euros (ca. \$65,000) to organise the First African Expert Meeting on the 10YFP back-to-back with ARSCP-3; and another \$ 45,000 towards the organisation of the Second African Expert Meeting on the 10YFP; and
- the Dutch Partnership Programme on Urban Environment provided \$ 50,000 to the Government of Rwanda which support was expected to lead to the establishment of the Rwandan National Cleaner Production Centre.

3.7 Regional/ Country ownership

Regional/country ownership measures the extent to which the project succeeded in becoming part of development plans, programmes and environmental agenda and how the region/country is committed to ensuring that the results of the project are sustained, for example, by setting aside resources in national or regional budgets to undertake relevant activities. The ARSCP is a regional initiative, and as such the evaluation focused on regional aspects of ownership.

The ARSCP has strong support from AMCEN and the AU. The project positioned the ARSCP to take the lead in sustainable consumption and production in the Africa region. The ARSCP itself was legally registered and is owned by members who come from the region. The project also facilitated the development of the ALCANET as a unit of ARSCP.

The institutionalisation of the ARSCP working in close collaboration with the NCPCs means that a framework now exists for mainstreaming the SCP concept into sub-regional, national and sub-national development agendas. The Government of Ghana demonstrated its support for the SCP concept by availing incremental resources for the establishment of a permanent home for the country's NCPC. In Senegal and Ghana projects were carried out aimed at mainstreaming SCP into national poverty reduction strategies.

As a key implementer of the African 10YFP and a Vice Chair of the Marrakech Task Force on Cooperation with Africa, the ARSCP has been institutionalised to address key regional issues of unsustainable consumption and production.

3.8 Replicability

Replicability refers to the extent to which project lessons and experiences could be applied and scaled up in the design and implementation of other similar projects.

The Regional Roundtable structures in the other regions of the world are largely based on ad-hoc structures in which the secretariat of the Roundtable revolves with the hosting of the subsequent regional roundtables. The ARSCP is the first formally constituted institution whose exclusive mandate is the promotion of the SCP concept and with a clear linkage to Regional Programmes on SCP. Hence the project generated important lessons learned for other developing regions wishing to establish similar institutions for promoting the SCP concept.

Two sub-regional Roundtables were successfully organised and dealt with issues specific to the areas. This approach of using sub-regional fora offers opportunities to replicate the ARSCP at the sub-regional level. The model under which the ARSCP cooperates with the existing NCPCs means it should be relatively easy

to extend the SCP concept to the non-NCPC countries. Also, through the experiences of the regional, sub-regional and national Roundtables, the ARSCP offers scope for recruiting more institutional and individual members.

The ARSCP approach can also be adapted to handle other environmental issues facing the region. Sub-regional and regional collaboration is already in place for economic development and political union initiatives. The ARSCP structure can thus be adapted to tackle issues of implementation of multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) at national and regional level with particular reference to MEAs related to chemical management.

3.9 Monitoring and evaluation

Monitoring is a continuous process undertaken by project management that allows the actual status of project activities to be compared against the workplan and budget, thereby providing a sound basis for *taking corrective measures, if required*. Evaluation is a *time-bound exercise aimed to assess systematically and objectively the relevance, performance and success of projects underway and already completed*. The project provided for one, an end-of-term, evaluation due to the short period in which it was implemented.

The project had an elaborate monitoring plan consisting of, among others, the following.

- Half-yearly progress reports. These reports were prepared.
- Final report. To be prepared at the end of the project.
- Financial reports detailing budget codes. These reports were submitted to UNEP. The reports were guided by the MoUs which recipients signed with UNEP and signed by the respective NCPC authorities. The reports had provisions for return of unspent funds.
- As part of monitoring, there was provision to keep records of non-expendable equipment and submit an inventory report.
- Publications were also part of monitoring – there was a requirement for 2 regional status reports, themselves syntheses of national status reports from NCPCs. The national and regional status reports were produced.

The results of monitoring were used for better management of the project. From the half-yearly reports it was clear that the project was on track. The reports also identified the need to address some specific sub-regional challenges that emerged. Two sub-regional Roundtables were organised, one to address SCP issues in the Lake Victoria Basin, a transboundary resource. The second sub-regional Roundtable was organised to better focus on the requirements of Francophone countries of Central and West Africa. These two sub-regional Roundtables were not included in the original project plan. Hence some resources initially meant for national Roundtables were later used to cover a larger area in a sub-regional setting.

3.10 Impacts

The evaluation sought to assess any available immediate impacts of the project on the adoption of the SCP concept in the participating African countries. Furthermore, under impacts the evaluation sought to find out if any appropriate mechanisms engaged by the project were established.

The implementation period for the ARSCP was too short to determine *long-term environmental impacts*. This fact was partly acknowledged right from the start by the absence of impact indicators. Hence results were largely measured by performance or achievement indicators. Another complicating factor was the fact that several NCPCs were already promoting the SCP concept at the national level before the ARSCP project started. Hence, it was difficult to credit, say, adoption of the various SCP practices exclusively to the project. Impacts and results could also have been under-reported especially for non-NCPCs whose

representatives were exposed to the SCP concept at the various sub-regional and regional Roundtables. The non-NCPCs were under no obligation to prepare and present national status reports.

Notwithstanding the above observations, the following may be considered to constitute some of the project impacts:

- industries adopting cleaner production practices and hence generating significant savings (for example through eco-labelling) explained further below;
- through information and exchange of experiences, awareness has been created regarding different ways of doing things in support of SCP (e.g. Ghana and Nigeria);
- the project made policymakers both at regional and national levels more aware of the SCP concept. AMCEN's endorsement of the ARSCP should be seen as an indicator of impact;
- at the regional and sub-regional Roundtables which the project facilitated, there was a lot of exchange of information on the SCP concept. This body of knowledge has the potential to be spread within and outside participating countries; and
- the creation of ALCANET as a unit of ARSCP though unintended, was nevertheless a significant impact of the project.

The sectors where most of the demonstration projects were performed had been mainly in textiles, metal finishing, tanneries and foods and beverages processing. In the case study of local brewers in northern Uganda, the UCPC trained 400 members of the industrial cluster to become themselves trainers in cleaner production in their respective communities (Mwesigye, 2006). With respect to textile eco-labels, 'Fibre Citoyenne' a north and West African initiative provides guidelines and tools to textile companies and their customers on quality, environment and social responsibility. The initiative started with 8 enterprises as members in June 2005 and one year later it supported 100 enterprises (Al-Hilal 2006). In Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal, the 'Bio Cotton' initiative aimed at the promotion of bio cotton and the development of fair trade market of bio cotton products in Europe (Al-Hilali 2006). In Ghana, increased awareness was helpful to Biogas Technologies West Africa Ltd. According to Idan & Acquah (2006), the company has been able to construct a total of 71 biogas plants – 7 in residential estates, 3 in schools, 2 on farms, 2 at orphanages, 6 in hospitals, 17 at industrial establishments, 24 in domestic/private homes and 13 at public biolatrines. Ghana has also mainstreamed SCP into its growth and poverty reduction strategy-II (Acquah 2005). Furthermore, since Ghana is the first NCPC in the West African sub-region it has the added responsibility to promote the establishment of NCPCs in the other countries in West Africa.

3.11 Sustainability

Sustainability of project interventions was assessed against three parameters – enabling environment, institutional sustainability, and financial sustainability.

Enabling environment

The project enjoyed strong support from national governments especially where NCPCs were established. The support given by the Republic of Tanzania to host the ARSCP Secretariat and to grant the institution legal registration status was an illustration of government commitment at the national level. Even in countries where NCPCs were not yet established the respective governments contributed to the collective decisions of AMCEN, and hence approved the SCP concept; and this enabled the launching of the African 10YFP during ARSCP-4 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Development partners also showed strong support for the SCP concept, especially the UN system and the Governments of Norway and the Federal Republic of Germany. Industry also showed support for the ARSCP, this mainly through the promotional activities of the NCPCs. Academic institutions embraced the

SCP concept. At several universities, the concept is being incorporated into the curricula of formal education thus assuring that the practice will be continued well into the future. Addis Ababa University has included the concept of sustainability in its graduate programmes in three faculties (Assefa 2006). Within the Natural Science Faculty there is the Environmental Science Programme. In the Social Science Faculty, the University has the Environment and Development Stream of the Development Studies. Finally, the Engineering Faculty has an Environmental Engineering Programme. The International Centre for Environmental Technologies (CITET) in Tunisia offers short training courses, distance training courses and diploma awarding courses linked to environmental management, protection, environment quality management, as well as prevention and treatment of all forms of pollution, water sanitation, environmental management systems (ISO 14001, PEM, EMAS), waste management, combating atmospheric pollution, energy saving and noise nuisance control (Hanchi 2006). The Zimbabwe Institution of Engineers started some courses in cleaner production systems with the support of IVAM Environmental Research of the Netherlands. The Department of Mechanical Engineering is a partner and student projects are conducted in volunteering companies (Mbohwa 2006). The MASOM Cleaner Production Technology course was designed to prepare local commerce and industry to meet the requirements of ISO certification and eco-labelling. The course consists of: pollution and waste prevention in the Design and Product Lifecycle (DPLC), Cycle Analysis and others (Mbohwa 2006). 'These efforts were stimulated by the formation of the Cleaner Production Centre and the cleaner production programmes arranged by the Zimbabwe Institution of Engineers' (Mbohwa 2006). All these developments which the project generated augur well for sustainability, since they facilitate the creation of an enabling environment in which to apply the SCP concept.

Institutional sustainability

The establishment of the ARSCP as a formal, registered regional charter is the first feature of institutional sustainability. Furthermore, the recognition of the ARSCP as the focal point on sustainable consumption and production in Africa; its appointment as Vice Chair of the Africa 10YFP and Vice Chair of the Marrakech Task Force on Cooperation with Africa; and its role as principal implementer of the African 10YFP all point to enhanced institutional sustainability if the opportunities availed are taken advantage of. The responsibility now belongs to the ARSCP Executive Board and the Secretariat.

The realisation of the aforementioned opportunities will to a large extent depend on the ability of the ARSCP Secretariat. At its present level of development, the ARSCP Secretariat is not sustainable. More support is required to further develop the institution from the sound beginnings of the project. The ARSCP Secretariat is currently weak with respect to equipment, personnel and administrative systems. This requires institutional strengthening, intended to contribute to what might be called the self development phase of an established organisation (Brown & McGann, 1996).

Institutional sustainability at regional level is also of concern because of differences in coverage. Francophone Central and West African countries had much less institutional capacity in SCP due largely to the absence of NCPCs. The ARSCP needs to make a special effort to bring these countries into the SCP family. An attempt is already underway in this regard through the sub-regional Roundtable which was organised specifically for Francophone African countries in Central and West Africa. The ARSCP may require assistance to follow up on the initiative.

The state of the NCPCs though by themselves are not a subject of this evaluation is nonetheless relevant to the institutional sustainability of the ARSCP. Weak or inactive NCPCs would impact negatively on the efforts of the ARSCP to deal with SCP issues regionally and sub-regionally. While a few NCPCs got together and through their collective efforts the ARSCP was started and then institutionalised, the reverse may now pertain. The ARSCP will consequently have to take a bigger role – perhaps the lead – in ensuring that existing and future NCPCs remain strong because they will constitute the 'stilts' on which the ARSCP walks.

Financial sustainability

Through its central position in the Marrakech Process and pivotal role in the implementation of the African 10YFP, one obvious conclusion would be that the project laid sufficient grounds for the ARSCP to be financially sustainable well into the future. In addition, as the project comes to an end, the ARSCP has some \$26,000 in its accounts which the organisation can utilise to strengthen the Secretariat's management capacity, among others. This money came from two sources: contribution by members of the Executive Board; and unused balance from the project on Water Utilisation in African Breweries which is currently under implementation.

As things stand now and before the ARSCP can realise the opportunities contained in the African 10YFP, the Secretariat is not financially sustainable for the following reasons:

- the Secretariat of the ARSCP is totally under-funded. While the Secretariat has begun to fundraise through membership fees, the amount realised is unlikely to sustain the organisation. Additional funding sources – the African 10YFP and the Marrakech Process and others – are required if the ARSCP is to achieve financial sustainability and remain a strong force in the promotion of the SCP concept in the Africa region. However, these opportunities can be realised only if the administrative capacity of the ARSCP Secretariat can be strengthened as a matter of urgency.
- slightly less than a quarter of the originally proposed budget was realised. This meant some of the activities that would have led to a better institutionalised ARSCP were left out and may need to be implemented in a follow-on project.

4.0 Conclusions and Rating of Project Implementation Success

4.1 Conclusions

The ARSCP project was very successful. It fulfilled all its objectives and realised all the planned outputs and results as highlighted below.

1. With virtually no institutional blueprint to follow and no relevant lessons learned from past projects to draw from, the project facilitated the successful institutionalisation of the ARSCP as a not-for-profit regional charter organisation as evidenced by the following:
 - the project had to innovate and achieve major critical milestones with less funds;
 - while the ARSCP was under-funded, those funds made available were utilised cost-effectively, attracting close to 30% of project value in form of cash leveraged from other sources. In-kind contributions were additional;
 - the ARSCP is now positioned to become much more sustainable institutionally and financially if it can take advantage of opportunities offered by the African 10YFP and the Marrakech Process; and
 - the ARSCP is recognised by AMCEN as the focal point institution for SCP initiatives in the African region. The ARSCP is also the Vice Chair of the Marrakech Task Force on Cooperation with Africa; and
 - two regional, two sub-regional and 5 national Roundtables were organised, demonstration projects supported, and an interactive Webpage designed and launched, amongst the project's other achievements.

2. As key implementers of the ARSCP project activities at the national level, the NCPCs played an effective role in encouraging African countries, institutions and individuals to embrace the SCP concept and become members of the ARSCP.
3. National governments, directly and through AMCEN, gave strong endorsement to the popularisation of the SCP concept in line with the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and the NEPAD Environment Initiative. The Governments also recognised the ARSCP as the lead SCP institution in the region.
4. Development partners endorsed and supported the institutionalisation of the ARSCP. They provided technical and financial support for organising the regional, sub-regional and national Roundtables during the project period. All indications were that barring any unforeseen adverse changes, development partner support to the ARSCP would continue. Despite this support, sustainable financing for the promotion of SCP in the Africa region generally remains a challenge. The project was not tasked to address financial sustainability as one of its activities. However, future projects will need to assess options and opportunities for sustainable financing of SCP activities, particularly at the national and subnational levels.
5. The two sub-regional Roundtables proved useful avenues for facilitating the sharing of information and experiences on sub-regional issues. The ARSCP may wish to examine the feasibility of regularising sub-regional Roundtables. Unfortunately, during the duration of the project there was minimum interface with sub-regional organisations (such as ECOWAS, COMESA, IGAD and SADC). The opportunity of mainstreaming SCP into sub-regional environmental action plans (SREAPs) was therefore missed. However, it is worth noting that the project did make efforts to have participation from the sub-regional organisations, but without success.

4.2 Performance Ratings

As shown below in Table 3 it is clear that overall, the implementation of the ARSCP project was between 'highly satisfactory' and 'satisfactory'. Except for the stakeholder participation and financial planning which were ranked as 'satisfactory' and sustainability rated as 'moderately satisfactory', all the remaining nine parameters were rated 'highly satisfactory'. Put another way, the implementation of the project was very good, slightly below excellent, with two parameters out of the eleven considered 'good' and one as 'fair'. The revised rankings include considerations of the comments of the reviewers on the first draft as elaborated in Annex 9.

Table 3. Performance Rating Score Sheet

Parameter	Score*	Rationale
1. Attainment of objectives and planned results	1	The project achieved its objectives and planned results well, the ultimate being the institutionalisation of the ARSCP – registration as a not-for-profit organisation, election of Executive Board members and a permanent Secretariat.
2. Achievement of outputs and activities	1	All activities planned were successfully executed and the three desired outputs realised. Activities were completed in time while outputs were commensurate with initial targets set.
3. Implementation Approach	1	An appropriate implementation approach was adopted. The project was able to adapt to 'doing with less' once the original budget was drastically reduced. The project was also able to add sub-regional Roundtables to the regional and national ones originally planned. The project seems to have adapted well to the changing conditions and hence unique. One unique

Parameter	Score*	Rationale
		feature of the adaptation was to hold meetings back-to-back with other events (e.g. ARSCP-4 and the High Level launch of the African 10YFP). Also, the combined approach of working both at the political and technical level simultaneously on a subject, the active engagement of development partners in the process, and the utilisation of a sub-contracting arrangement all contributed to the uniqueness of project approach.
4. Stakeholder Participation	2	Key stakeholders participated effectively in the activities of the project except for civil society organisations and to some extent the private sector. There were extensive consultations and information dissemination especially during the Roundtables but also as a result of access to the ARSCP website and demonstration projects.
5. Financial Planning	2	The project's budget had to be adjusted several times and only a quarter of what was originally considered to be adequate was approved. This meant some key activities could not be carried out.
6. Cost-Effectiveness	1	On the other hand, the approved project funds were used cost-effectively and the project was able to leverage in-kind contributions from NCPCs plus additional cash resources from other development partners amounting to approximately 30% of approved total project cost.
7. Regional/country ownership	1	The ARSCP has strong support from AMCEN and the AU. The project positioned the ARSCP into leadership with respect to SCP in Africa. The institutionalisation of the ARSCP working closely with NCPCs means now a framework exists for mainstreaming the SCP concept into sub-regional, national and subnational development plans.
8. Replicability	1	The ARSCP is the first permanent institution for SCP established in any region of the world. It is a suitable model for developing countries and can be replicated to the other regions. The ARSCP model can also be adapted to deal with other environmental problems of transboundary nature (desertification, migratory species, biodiversity, climate change, etc.) the framework of the ARSCP means that replication at the sub-regional level would also be easy.
9. Monitoring and Evaluation	1	The monitoring and evaluation of the project was well executed – progress reports, financial accountability reports, and national and regional status reports as part of the monitoring effort. Due to the short duration of the project, a mid-term evaluation would not have been useful. Hence an end-of-term evaluation was eventually adopted and carried out.
10. Results and Impacts	1	The logframe of the project was short on impact indicators. However, from national reports such as Uganda's eco-labelling, cost-savings were realised by adopters and should be seen as an impact of the project. In other cases, it is difficult to separate the impacts generated from the activities of the NCPCs many of which began promoting SCP before the project with those actually generated by the ARSCP activities. An ex post evaluation, say two years from the end of the project, may better highlight the impacts which the project helped to generate.
11. Sustainability	3	An enabling environment by way of political commitments (AMCEN, AU, national governments) was created for the continued popularisation of the SCP concept in Africa thus ensuring sustainability. On the other hand, the ARSCP as an institution is not yet sustainable. The project has created

Parameter	Score*	Rationale
		conditions for it to be so, but much will now depend on the ability of the Secretariat to build the institutional capacity. Financial sustainability of the ARSCP is also of concern. The project has positioned the ARSCP to subcontract some activities of the African 10YFP. Whether these opportunities will be realised will again depend on the effectiveness of the Secretariat.
OVERALL	2	

* 1-highly satisfactory; 2-satisfactory; 3-moderately satisfactory; 4-moderately unsatisfactory; 5-unsatisfactory; 6-highly unsatisfactory.

5.0 Lessons Learned

Just as the ARSCP project was very successful in its implementation, it also generated important lessons learned – grouped around project design, stakeholder consultation process, selection of project partners, project duration, and performance indicators, monitoring and reporting.

Project design

1. It is well and good to have a general feeling that something is not quite right and ought to be addressed, as was the need to institutionalise the ARSCP. However, the starting point for such an intervention should be an in-depth situational analysis – some kind of baseline study – which would facilitate the proper focusing of interventions beginning with a clear hierarchical set of objectives, and both performance and impact indicators which can be objectively verified.
2. For any kind of project, proper financial planning is crucial in ensuring that enough resources are made available to realise planned results. Less than adequate financing can lead to project implementation failure unless project managers and the steering committee are able to come up with innovative solutions of doing more with less. The project was able to hold Roundtables organised into different sessions addressing technical issues and administrative matters at a single meeting. The Second African Panel of Experts Meeting was held at the same time as the ARSCP-3; while the African 10YFP was launched during the ARSCP-4. Otherwise with more financial resources available, the foregoing events could have been held on different occasions or separately.

Stakeholder identification and consultative process

3. Ultimately, every individual human being is a stakeholder in the environmental management business. Narrowing the list of stakeholders down to a manageable number requires stakeholder analysis which should be done before a project starts. For example, while the ARSCP project was able to identify most of its key stakeholders, the role of the private sector – one of the key agents in the popularisation of the sustainable consumption and production concept – was somewhat less prominent considering the potential size of both negative and positive impacts they can generate.
4. It is important to have the active participation of all stakeholders to ensure success in project implementation. The ARSCP project was successful in part because it tried as much as possible within the resources available to have many participants from the various stakeholder groups represented at the national, sub-regional and regional Roundtables.

Selection of project partners

5. Working with willing development partners and established political processes can enhance the acceptability and success of a project. The political support which AMCEN and AU provided combined with technical support from UNEP, UNIDO, UNECA and UNDESA and financial support from the Governments of Norway and Germany were crucial in ensuring the successful implementation of the ARSCP project.
6. There is a significant amount of goodwill from development partners to support efforts needed to address Africa's many environmental challenges, so long as these are well articulated with a clear sense of purpose and ownership and strongly linked to the region's overarching development objective of poverty reduction, and having the necessary political support.

Project duration

7. Institutional capacity building is a lengthy process. While the institutionalisation of an organisation – making it formal – may require less time and resources, achieving sustainability is a much lengthier process and more expensive. Building the capacity of the ARSCP to operate efficiently will require more time. An institutionalisation project should, therefore, include activities devoted to building capacity in addition to merely formalising the establishment of the institution so as to enhance its prospects for sustainability.

Performance indicators, monitoring and reporting

8. It is relatively more challenging to present an orderly, hierarchical logframe for a policy, institutionalisation or legal reform project especially the identification or the need for impact indicators. Notwithstanding the foregoing, a baseline study helps to identify whether impact indicators are needed for the project or not.
9. Oftentimes, however good the management of a project may be, external factors can frustrate efforts and result in missed timetables. For example, while the promotion of the adoption of the SCP concept and the need for establishing NCPCs was the responsibility of UNEP, the actual institutionalisation of the NCPCs was outside UNEP's mandate. Thus, in the absence of harmonised approaches, the efforts expended on awareness creation can be severely undermined. Ideally, the promoter of the SCP concept should also have the mandate to help countries establish NCPCs so that there is smooth transition from promotion to implementation.
10. Sustainable consumption and sustainable production are different sides of the same coin. They need to be addressed together and focusing on both hard science and social aspects. For example, presentations at the Roundtables were predominantly covering scientific research findings and virtually none dealing with such areas as innovative approaches to increased awareness creation or the promotion of SCP through appropriate incentives measures.

6.0 Recommendations

The ARSCP has been successfully institutionalised. During the process, a number of issues have emerged. Presented below are some key strategic recommendations required to address the issues.

Recommendation 1

Africa's development partners need to continue providing their support to the further strengthening of the ARSCP as it will be a vital regional instrument in the further development and implementation of the African 10 Year Framework Programme on Sustainable Consumption and Production.

Recommendation 2

UNEP should expand the role of UNEP-ROA in popularising the SCP concept in Africa to include awareness creation and assistance with the actual establishment of the NCPCs. This approach will speed up the process of adoption of the concept in the whole region.

Recommendation 3

UNEP-ROA, in close co-operation with sub-regional organisations such as ECOWAS, IGAD and COMESA, should assist the Executive Board of the ARSCP to institutionalise sub-regional SCP centres.

Recommendation 4

UNEP-ROA should assist the Executive Board of the ARSCP to access operational funds for at least a 2-year period to allow the organisation time for planning and addressing urgent institutional capacity building requirements.

Recommendation 5

The Executive Board of the ARSCP should seek technical support from UNEP-ROA and UNEP-DTIE including other development partners to build the institutional capacity of the ARSCP including staff recruitment and training, development of management systems, and acquisition of organisational skills and hardware.

Recommendation 6

The Secretariat, together with the Executive Board of the ARSCP, should as a matter of urgency, develop a 10-year strategic plan for the organisation modeled in line with the African 10YFP to guide its annual workplans in popularising the SCP concept in the region.

Recommendation 7

The ARSCP should conduct an ex post evaluation, say 3 years after the project has ended, to measure the impacts which it helped to create.

7.0 Literature Cited and Project Documents Reviewed

Acquah, P. 2005. Approaches to SCP and Breaking of Poverty Cycles for Sustainable Development. Paper presented at the First National Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production (NRSCP). Labadi Beach Hotel, Accra, Ghana, 3-4 February 2005. Draft Final Report.

Al-Hilali, S. 2006. Textile Eco Labels: Basic EU Regulations and Standards and African Initiatives. Paper Presented at the Fourth African Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production (ARSCP-4). Held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, May 29-31, 2006.

Assefa, G. 2006. Some reflections on six graduate programs from the perspective of education for sustainability. Paper presented at the Fourth African Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production (ARSCP-4). Held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, May 29-31, 2006.

Brown, M. and J. Mc Gann. 1996. A Guide to Strengthening Non-Governmental Organisation Effectiveness in Natural Resources Management. The PVO-NGO/NRMs Project: Funded by the US Agency for International Development. World Learning Inc./CARE/World Wildlife Fund. Washington, D.C.

EOU (Evaluation and Oversight Unit). 2005. The 2004 Annual Evaluation Report. UNEP, Nairobi, Kenya.

EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) Ghana. 2005. First National Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production (NRSCP). Labadi Beach Hotel, Accra, Ghana, 3-4 February 2005. Draft Final Report, February 2005.

Hanchi, B. 2006. Capacity building and training activities at CITET: a permanent challenge. Paper presented at the Fourth African Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production (ARSCP-4). Held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 29-31 May, 2006.

Idan, J.A. and Acquah, P. 2006. Best practice waste-to-energy for sustainable management of sewage and health care waste. Paper presented at the Fourth African Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production (ARSCP-4). Held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, May 29-31, 2006.

KCPC (Kenya Cleaner Production Centre). 2004. Mainstreaming Cleaner Production and Sustainable Consumption in Lake Victoria Basin Development Programs. Proceedings of the 1st East African Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production, held on 6-7 December 2004, Imperial Hotel – Kisumu, Kenya.

Mbohwa, C. 2006. Experiences in education and training for sustainability in Zimbabwe. Paper presented at the Fourth African Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production (ARSCP-4). Held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, May 29-31, 2006.

Mebratu, D. 2005. Africa takes steps to promote sustainable consumption and production. ROA News No. 8 June 2005. Nairobi, Kenya.

Mebratu, D. 2005. Regional Status Report on Sustainable Consumption and Production. Paper presented at the First National Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production (NRSCP). Labadi Beach Hotel, Accra, Ghana, 3-4 February 2005. Draft Final Report.

Mwesigye, P. 2005. The Eco-Benefits Programme and Sustainable Financing of Uganda CPC. Paper presented at the First National Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production (NRSCP). Labadi Beach Hotel, Accra, Ghana, 3-4 February, 2005.

Mwesigye, P. K. 2006. Applications of Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) to Industrial Clusters: Case Study of Local Brewers in Lira Municipality, Northern Uganda. Paper presented at the Fourth African Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production (ARSCP-4). Held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, May 29-31, 2006.

REMA (Rwanda Environmental Management Authority). 2005. Report of the National Seminar on Sustainable Consumption and Production. Organised by the Rwanda Environmental Management Authority in Collaboration with United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) under the Inter-Agency (UNDP/UNEP/UN-HABITAT) Support on Kigali Industrial Zone.

The Brundtland Commission. 1987. Our Common Future.

UCPC (Uganda Cleaner Production Centre). 2004. Cleaner Production in Uganda: The Eco-Benefits Programme. Volume 3. Kampala, Uganda.

UN (United Nations). 1993. Agenda 21: The United Nations Programme of Action from Rio. New York, New York.

UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). 2002a. Cleaner Production Status Report 2002. Nairobi, Kenya.

UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). 2002a. Global Cleaner Production Status Report 2002. Nairobi, Kenya.

UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). 2002b. Proposal for a Work Programme on Promoting Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns. Nairobi, Kenya.

UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). 2004. The Third African Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production. Work Programme & Compendium of Abstracts. Nairobi, Kenya.

UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). 2005. The 2004 Annual Evaluation Report. The Evaluation and Oversight Unit. Nairobi, Kenya.

UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). 2006a. Sustainable Consumption and Production Activities in Africa. Second Regional Status Report (2004-2006).

UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). 2006b. The Fourth African Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production (ARSCP-4). Compendium of Abstracts. Nairobi, Kenya.

UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). The African 10 Year Framework Programme (10YFP) on Sustainable Consumption and Production. Developed by The African Experts Meeting on the 10YFP. Co-facilitated by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Supported by the Federal Ministry of Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety of Germany.

UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme).n.d. Sustainable Consumption and Production in Africa.

Annex 1: The Charter of the ARSCP

Preamble

Recognizing the important contribution that the development of the industrial sector makes to the fulfilment of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and NEPAD's objectives on poverty reduction and sustainable development;

Underlining the WSSD statement that fundamental changes in the way societies produce and consume are indispensable for achieving global sustainable development and that all countries should promote Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) patterns;

Appreciating the support provided through the UNEP/UNIDO International Programme on Cleaner Production for the establishment of National Cleaner Production Centers (NCPCs) in African countries;

Saluting the encouraging results that have been registered by NCPCs and other SCP promoting institutions and individuals in promoting the adoption of cleaner production principles by industries, government agencies and academic institutions in the region;

Taking note of the need to create a regional institution that would provide support to activities at the national level and facilitate regional cooperation on sustainable consumption and production activities in the Region;

We, representatives of NCPCs, SCP promoting institutions and individual SCP experts have resolved to establish a regional coordination mechanism on sustainable consumption and production.

I. Establishment

The 'African Roundtable for Sustainable Consumption and Production' (herein after ARSCP) is hereby established by this Charter as a Regional non-governmental and not-for-profit organization.

II. The vision

The vision of ARSCP is to achieve sustainable development of African countries with an effective contribution to the reduction of poverty, improvement of well being as well as the protection and conservation of the environment.

III. The Mission

The mission of ARSCP is to promote the development of national and regional capacities for the effective promotion and implementation of sustainable consumption and production principles and serve as the regional clearinghouse for sustainable consumption and production activities in the region.

IV. The objectives

The overall objective of the ARSCP is to facilitate the development of national and regional capacities for sustainable consumption and production and promote the effective implementations of the concepts and tools of sustainable consumption and production in African countries. The following are the specific objectives of ARSCP under the overall objective.

- 4.1 To promote the establishment of national cleaner production centres in countries where there are no NCPCs or SCP promoting institutions and facilitate support to strengthen existing NCPCs and SCP promoting institutions in African countries.
- 4.2 To facilitate the further integration of the concepts and principles of sustainable consumption and production in national policy frameworks in the region.
- 4.3 To provide the necessary support for the development, effective transfer and assimilation of Environmentally Sound Technologies (ESTs) that are of particular relevance to African economies.
- 4.4 To encourage specialization, facilitate information exchange and experience sharing between SCP promoting institutions and individual experts working within the region and at the international level.
- 4.5 To strengthen cooperation between NCPCs and SCP promoting institutions in African countries with UNEP/UNIDO and other international organizations and NCPCs in other regions.
- 4.6 To promote the development and integration of Sustainable Cleaner Production curriculum in educational institutions in the region.

V. Activities

The following are the major activities that are going to be conducted by ARSCP to fulfil its objectives:

- 5.1 Organize the African Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production with a minimum of once every two years.
- 5.2 Support the organization of national and sub-regional roundtables with special emphasis given to countries where there are no formally organized NCPCs.
- 5.3 Facilitate information exchange through the appropriate combination of communication means, such as: newsletters, internet-based communications and/or special publications.
- 5.4 Develop and maintain a directory of African professionals with expertise in the area of sustainable consumption and production and make it available to interested parties.
- 5.5 Compile best cases of strategies and application of sustainable consumption and production and publish and disseminate through the appropriate means.
- 5.6 Provide technical and policy input to regional initiatives such as NEPAD and forums associated with sustainable consumption and production.
- 5.7 Develop sub-regional and regional projects that will be implemented in collaboration with a group of NCPCs and SCP promoting institutions.
- 5.8 Organize training workshops and seminars on selected topics that are of particular importance to develop the capacities of SCP promoters in the region.
- 5.9 Establish collaborative linkages with other regional roundtable on cleaner production and international programs on sustainable consumption and production.
- 5.10 Promote research partnerships in the area of sustainable consumption and production.
- 5.11 Carry out other activities that are found necessary for the fulfilment of its missions and objectives.
- 5.12 Organize the African Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production with a minimum of once every two years.
- 5.13 Support the organization of national and sub-regional roundtables with special emphasis given to countries where there are no formally organized NCPCs.
- 5.14 Facilitate information exchange through the appropriate combination of communication means, such as: newsletters, internet-based communications and/or special publications.
- 5.15 Develop and maintain a directory of African professionals with expertise in the area of sustainable consumption and production and make it available to interested parties.
- 5.16 Compile best cases of strategies and application of sustainable consumption and production and publish and disseminate through the appropriate means.
- 5.17 Provide technical and policy input to regional initiatives such as NEPAD and forums associated with sustainable consumption and production.
- 5.18 Develop sub-regional and regional projects that will be implemented in collaboration with a group of NCPCs and SCP promoting institutions.
- 5.19 Organize training workshops and seminars on selected topics that are of particular importance to develop the capacities of SCP promoters in the region.
- 5.20 Establish collaborative linkages with other regional roundtable on cleaner production and international programs on sustainable consumption and production.
- 5.21 Promote research partnerships in the area of sustainable consumption and production.
- 5.22 Carry out other activities that are found necessary for the fulfilment of its missions and objectives.

VI. Membership

ARSCP shall have the following three categories of membership:

- Patron institutions
- Institutional members
- Individual members

6.1. Patron institutions

Patron institutions are non-voting members of ARSCP that are going to be appointed by the General Assembly in recognition of their outstanding contribution to the promotion of sustainable consumption and production in the region.

6.2. Institutional members

Institutions that are directly engaged in the promotion of cleaner production and sustainable consumption in their respective countries within the region and that accept the charter can be institutional members of ARSCP.

6.3. Individual members

Individuals that are directly engaged in the promotion of cleaner production and sustainable consumption in the region and that accept the charter can be members of ARSCP.

VII Membership rights and obligations

7.1 Membership rights

Individual and institutional members have the following rights as members of ARSCP:

- 7.1.1 They have the right to vote and be elected as per the provisions given under this charter.
- 7.1.2 Each member of ARSCP has the right to have equal benefits from the services to be provided to the respective groups of membership.
- 7.1.3 Each member has the right to withdraw its membership of ARSCP without giving any explanation.

7.2 Members obligation

Members are obliged to fulfil the following obligation as members of ARSCP:

- 7.2.1 Members shall be willing to share information pertaining to sustainable consumption and production through ARSCP.
- 7.2.2 Members shall be willing to pay their membership fee as per the decision to be made by the General Assembly of ARSCP.
- 7.2.3 Members shall conduct themselves in the spirit of international cooperation and shall foster regional cooperation as embodied in ARSCP's vision and mission.

VIII Organization

The organizational structure of ARSCP shall be consisted of the following three bodies:

- The General Assembly
- The Executive Board
- The Secretariat

8.1 The General Assembly

- 8.1.1 The General Assembly is the highest policy making body that consists of the institutional and individual members of ARSCP.
- 8.1.2. The General Assembly of ARSCP shall be convened in conjunction with the regional roundtable on sustainable consumption and production and shall have the following duties and responsibilities.
 - a) Decide on the policies and strategies that would guide the activities and programmes of ARSCP.
 - b) Approve the bi-annual work plan of ARSCP, the activity report and the audit report of the Executive Board.
 - c) Elect the president of ARSCP and members of the Executive Board.
 - d) Approve and revoke the appointment of the Patron Institutions of ARSCP.
 - e) Revoke membership to ARSCP upon the recommendation by the Executive Board.
 - f) Appoint the external auditor for ARSCP.

8.1.3. The members that attend the Regional Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production shall constitute the quorum of the General Assembly.

8.2 The Executive Board

- 8.2.1 The Executive Board shall be consisted of four institutional members and one individual members to be elected by the General Assembly.

8.2.2 The term of office for the executive Board members is two years; but members can be elected for another two-year term.

8.2.3 The Executive Board shall consist of the following members:

- President
- Secretary
- Treasurer
- 2 Committee Members

8.2.4 The outgoing president and Secretary shall serve as ex-officio members of the Incoming Executive Board for one additional term to ensure continuity.

8.2.5 The Executive Board shall provide general guidance to the Secretariat of ARSCP through the President of ARSCP. This will include:

- a) Provision of guidance on the implementation of the workplan approved by the General Assembly;
- b) Recruitment and employment of the necessary staff for the secretariat of ARSCP;
- c) Preparation of the activity and audit report of ARSCP to be presented to the General Assembly;

8.2.6 The President of ARSCP, who will be directly elected by the General Assembly, shall provide the leadership to the Executive Board, including:

- a) Provision of general guidance to the Secretariat of ARSCP on behalf of the Executive Board;
- b) Official representation of ARSCP in public forums and communications;
- c) Supervision of the Officer(s) of the Secretariat of ARSCP;
- d) Chairing the meetings of the Executive Board and the General Assembly of ARSCP;

8.2.7. The Executive Board shall select the Secretary of ARSCP from its members. The Secretary of ARSCP shall:

- perform the duties of the President, in the absence of the President;
- preparing the agenda and minuting of the meetings of the EB of the Roundtable;
- keeping the records of the records of the Executive Board.

8.2.8. The Executive Board shall appoint a Treasurer from its members. The Treasurer shall be responsible to ensure that the financial management of ARSCP including developing financial policy and procedure are in place, and supervises the preparation of annual budget, and arrangement for audit.

8.3 The ARSCP shall have a Secretariat that will conduct the day to day activities of the Roundtable under the leadership of the Executive Board of ARSCP. In the interim period, the NCPC that will host the ARSCP shall serve as the interim secretariat.

8.4 The Executive Board shall have the right to co-opt additional members to the Board as and when it finds it necessary between the convening of the General Assembly.

IX. Source of financing

9.1 The following are the major sources of financing for the activities of ARSCP:

- Membership fee
- Donations, grants and special contributions
- Project financing
- Revenues from workshops, conferences, seminars, etc.
- Sales of publications
- Any other appropriate sources

9.2. The Executive Board shall prepare a guideline on rules, procedures and ethical consideration on accepting donations, grants and special contributions to ARSCP.

9.3 Accounts shall be regularly audited, as per the fiscal year to be adopted by the Board, and audit reports shall be submitted to the subsequent General Assembly meeting.

X. General provisions

10.1 Amendments

10.1.1 This charter can be amended by a simple majority vote of the membership attending a given General Assembly of ARSCP with due prior notice and circulation of the proposed changes to all members.

10.1.2 Amendments shall enter into force based on a timetable established by the Executive Board but no later than 90 days.

10.2 Dissolution and Liquidation

10.2.1 The ARSCP shall be dissolved by the decision of the two third vote of the members attending a given General Assembly or if the number of its members go below the legal requirement of the country of registration.

10.2.2 Upon dissolution of ARSCP, any net assets shall be transferred to an organization of similar nature that will be determined by the General Assembly or the Executive Board.

XI. Legal enforcement

11.1. This charter shall enter into force upon the signing of five institutional members on the charter.

11.2. ARSCP becomes a legally constituted entity upon its registration in one of the countries of the founding members as a regional non-governmental and not-for-profit organization.

Annex 2: Terms of Reference

Final Evaluation of the UNEP project “Institutionalising the African Roundtable on Cleaner Production and Sustainable Consumption” CP/4020-04-03

1. BACKGROUND

Project Rationale

The concept of cleaner production came into the arena of international cooperation through the high level seminar organised by UNEP-DTIE in 1990. Since then, thousands of industries, government agencies and academic institutions were engaged in the development and promotion of the concept of cleaner production. National and regional roundtables on cleaner production emerged as effective forums to exchange information and experience. Coming to the specific case of Africa, besides the few initiatives that were aimed at the application of the concept in some African countries, the following two initiatives have made a major contribution.

- **National Cleaner Production Centres:** UNEP joined with UNIDO in 1994 to support the establishment of National Cleaner Production Centres as the principal institutional mechanism to promote cleaner production in developing countries and economies in transition. So far, there are twenty-four NCPCs established all over the world out of which nine are in Africa.
- **The African Roundtable:** The First Africa Round Table was initiated by UNEP in 2000 and the first conference was organised in August 2000 with support from Govt. of Norway and Carl Duisberg Gesellschaft (CDG) of Germany. The conference provided the first ever opportunity to the African Cleaner Production community to come together and discuss issues of regional importance. The second African Roundtable was organised by Cleaner Production Centre of Tanzania in Arusha Tanzania in 2002, with support from the Government of Norway.

While the national cleaner production centres in Africa recognise the important contribution of regional roundtables, many of them are not strong enough to take full responsibility of organising the regional roundtable on a rotating basis. In view of this limitation, participants of both the first and second African Roundtable expressed the strong need to institutionalise the African roundtable at the regional level and requested UNEP to provide the required support. This regional need has provided the basis for developing the project on ‘Institutionalising the African Roundtable on Cleaner Production and Sustainable Consumption’.

The project provides support to the UNEP’s Regional Office for Africa to take the initial responsibility of providing the required support to the African Roundtable. The project will facilitate the development of an institutional mechanism that would enable establishment of the Round Table as a self-supporting institution in due course. This will be promoted by supporting the NCPCs to organise national and regional roundtables and coordinating the effort of the NCPCs through the Regional Steering Committee of the African Roundtable. The Regional Steering Committee is expected to take-over the leadership responsibility from UNEP-ROA. The project will provide support to organise national roundtables to promote the establishment of NCPCs. The project would also lead to the development of a website to strengthen the linkage of the regional cleaner production effort with the global Cleaner production network. The Division of Technology, Industry and Economics will provide the substantive support. The project shall provide support for three years by which time the regional roundtable is expected to have its own institutional basis, which would allow it to function on a self-sustaining basis. The process will put emphasis on the use of the experiences and the expertise of the NCPCs already established.

Legislative Authority and Relevance to UNEP Programmes

The 22nd Session of the Governing Council of UNEP (February 2003) recalled paragraph 14 of the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, which states that fundamental changes in the way societies produce and consume are indispensable for achieving global sustainable development. It also recalled the work undertaken by the United Nations Environment Programme since 1992 to promote cleaner production, pollution prevention and sustainable consumption, in cooperation with other United

Nations organisations and other stakeholders. It further recognised the results in the field of cleaner production, pollution prevention and eco-efficiency already achieved and documented in regular progress reports published on the occasion of the biennial high-level conferences on cleaner production.

In view of addressing the remaining and emerging challenges with respect to sustainable consumption and production, The Governing Council requested the Executive Director, inter alia, to:

- Strengthen sustainable consumption and production activities of the United Nations Environment Programme within its existing mandate and subject to available resources, and consistent with the recommendations adopted at the World Summit on Sustainable Development;
- Strengthen existing eco-efficiency, cleaner production and sustainable consumption programmes, such as the United Nations Environment Programme's regional cleaner production roundtables and its partnership with the Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, including facilitating the transfer of environmentally sound technologies, especially to developing countries and countries with economies in transition, and activities to stimulate the design of sustainable products and services.

Article 18 C of the 'Proposed Work Programme on Promoting Sustainable Consumption and Production Pattern' prepared by UNEP-DTIE (August 2002) underlines that the application of life-cycle based production and consumption instruments requires behavioural change, new skills and insights. It further notes the need to raise awareness and develop better understanding of consumption and production issues, in particular for small and medium-sized businesses and to develop case-studies and share best practices and information. In this regard, the work programme states that the activities of existing national centres and roundtables on cleaner production will be expanded to address sustainable consumption issues and – where necessary- the establishment of new sustainable consumption and production centres will be promoted and full capacity building will be carried out.

Executing Arrangements

The project "Institutionalising the African Roundtable on Cleaner Production and Sustainable Consumption", hereinafter referred to as "ARSCP" is coordinated by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and financially supported by Government of Norway. The project is carried out in partnership with the National Cleaner Production Centres (NCPCs), and other institutions that are engaged in the promotion of cleaner production in African countries as principal implementing institutions at the national level. The United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO) is the collaborating UN agency under the umbrella of UNIDO/UNEP Cleaner Production Programme.

The overall project coordination (administrative and operational) is undertaken by UNEP ROA with the advice of a Regional Steering Committee which was established by the African Roundtable. The national institutions are principally responsible for organising the national and regional roundtables while UNEP will provides financial and technical support within the limits of available resources.

Project Activities

The core element of the project activities is the organisation of National and Regional Roundtables on Cleaner Production. The Cleaner Production Roundtables are important training forums through which CP promoters share their experiences and learn about new cleaner production approaches and practices. UNEP, mainly through its DTIE Officers, will provide the required technical input for the organisation of the National and Regional Roundtables. The following are the principal activities to be conducted:

- Proposals shall be solicited from National Cleaner Production Centres to organise National and Regional Roundtables.
- Memorandum of Understandings shall be signed with those Centres that are selected to organise the national and/or Regional Roundtables.
- National Roundtables shall be convened on thematic issues that are of immediate importance to the Countries.

- Regional Round Tables shall be held in different parts of the region. Each Roundtable is expected to be attended by about 30 participants to be invited from all over Africa and about 30-40 participants from the host country.
- A professional web-designer shall be recruited to develop the Webpage of the African Roundtable on Cleaner Production.
- The required consultants for the preparation of the national and regional status reports shall be recruited.
- UNEP Officers shall provide the required technical support for the project implementation.

Budget

The project had a budget of US\$ 554,519 which was provided through Earmarked Contribution from Government of Norway. UNEP in-kind contribution was estimated at about US\$75,000. The project cost as estimated at the commencement of the project is presented in the table below.

Cost of Project: (Expressed in US \$)

	US\$	%
Cost to Earmarked Contribution from Norway:	490,725.00	87
Programme administration cost:	63,794.00	13
Total Cost of the Project:	554,519.00	100

2. OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

Objectives

The objective of this terminal evaluation is to assess whether the objectives and goals have been achieved in an effective and efficient manner and provide recommendations and lessons from project implementation in order to assist in determining whether to continue, replicate or expand the project. It will cover the entire project period March 2004 – June 2006. The evaluation will focus on three key issues:

1. How effective was the project in expanding the adoption of the sustainable consumption and production concept in the participating countries.
2. Were the processes for information collection and exchange between national clean production centres appropriately designed and effective in fulfilling the needs of the project?
3. To what extent was the project successful in establishing an institutional mechanism for the African Roundtable on Sustainable Production and Consumptions?

Terms

In particular but not restricted to, the evaluator shall conduct analysis on the following parameters defined:

1. Attainment of objectives and planned results:
 - Evaluate how, and to what extent, the stated project objectives have been met, taking into account the “achievement indicators”. In particular, evaluate whether and to what extent the information collection, synthesis and dissemination have been properly carried out to achieve the objective of the project.
 - Ascertain the extent to which the project facilitate the establishment of new national production centres and programmes
 - Determine the extent to which the project was effective in facilitating information and experience exchange between national cleaner production centres (NCPCs).
 - Assess how the project was successful in strengthening the linkage, of the regional cleaner production effort with the global cleaner production network.

2. Achievement of outputs and activities:
 - Assess the scope, quality and usefulness of the project outputs in relation to its expected results.
 - Assess the effectiveness and efficiency with which the National and Regional Roundtables on Sustainable Production and Consumption were organised and determine if these roundtables accomplished their objectives.
 - Assess the effectiveness of the websites for the regional Roundtables in facilitating information sharing and strengthening the linkage between the regional cleaner production effort with the global cleaner production network.
 - Assess the extent to which project outputs have influenced policy makers at the national and regional levels.

3. Implementation approach:
 - Ascertain to what extent the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document have been closely followed.
 - Evaluate how appropriately implementation mechanisms have been adapted to the changing needs of the project.
 - Evaluate the effectiveness of project execution arrangements at all levels including (i) policy decisions; project steering committee; (ii) day to day project management; and (iii) the core team formed by project partners.
 - Assess the effectiveness of supervision and administrative and financial support provided by UNEP.
 - Identify administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project.

4. Stakeholder participation:
 - Assess efforts made by the project to identify and engage relevant stakeholders and establish whether the efforts were successful. Particular attention should be paid to the level of participation by national government institutions/organisations, consumer groups and other civil society.
 - Assess the degree and effectiveness of collaboration and coordination between the various project partners and institutions during the course of implementation of the project.

5. Cost-effectiveness:
 - Assess the cost-effectiveness of the project activities and whether the funds have been efficiently used by the project secretariat.
 - Assess the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing to project implementation and to what extent the project leveraged additional resources and identifies factors which contributed to leveraging additional resources, if any.

6. Regional/Country ownership:
 - Assess the level of regional/country ownership. Specifically, the evaluator should assess whether the project was relevant for regional/national development and environmental agendas and to regional and international agreements.

7. Replicability:
 - Assess whether the project has potential to be replicated, either in terms of expansion, extension or replication in other sub-regions and/or regions and whether any steps have been taken by the project to do so and the relevance and feasibility of these steps.
 - Assess the extent to which the project has contributed to any spill-over benefits to other countries in addition to the participating countries.

8. Monitoring and Evaluation:

- Determine the effectiveness of the reporting, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms employed throughout the project's lifetime; and how effective the project responded to the challenges identified through these mechanisms. The evaluator shall include an assessment of the quality and application of project monitoring and evaluation plans and tools including an assessment of risk based on the assumptions and risks identified in the project document.

9. Impact:

- Evaluate the immediate impact of the project if feasible on the adoption of cleaner production concept in the participating African countries. Were appropriate institutional mechanisms engaged by the project established?

10. Sustainability:

- Ascertain to what extent the project outcomes will be sustained and enhanced over time. The sustainability assessment should include the enabling environment, institutional and financial sustainability.

The evaluator shall make strategic recommendations which would contribute to the future direction of the project based on lessons learned during project implementation. These recommendations should be clearly stated in terms of who would do what and by when.

The evaluator will rate the overall implementation success of the project and provide individual ratings of implementation aspects as described in Section 3 of this TOR. The ratings will be presented in the format of a table with adequate justifications based on the findings of the main analysis.

Furthermore, the evaluation should highlight lessons learned, both the positive as well as the negative, from the standpoint of the design and implementation of the project.

3. METHODOLOGY

This terminal evaluation will be conducted as an in-depth evaluation using a participatory approach whereby the UNEP Project Officer and other relevant staff are kept informed and regularly consulted throughout the evaluation. The evaluator will consult with the UNEP/EOU and UNEP Project Officer on any logistic and/or methodological issues to properly conduct the review in an independent way.

The findings of the evaluation will be based on the following:

1. A desk review of project documents including, but not limited to:
 - (a) The project documents, meeting and workshop reports, progress reports, and relevant correspondence.
 - (b) Review of specific products including technical reviews, guidance manual, and project content based articles published in journals, and other documents produced by the project
 - (c) Notes from the Steering Committee.
 - (d) Other material provided by the project team in both hard and soft forms.
2. In-person or telephone interviews with project management staff at National Cleaner Production Centres (NCPCs), UNIDO cleaner production staff, UNEP project manager and fund management officer and other relevant staff in UNEP as deemed appropriate.

The success of project implementation will be rated on a six-point scale:

1=highly satisfactory, 2=satisfactory, 3=moderately satisfactory, 4=moderately unsatisfactory, 5=unsatisfactory and 6= highly unsatisfactory.

The following items should be considered for rating purposes and adequate justification must be provided for each rating:

- Attainment of objectives and planned results
- Achievement of outputs and activities
- Implementation approach
- Stakeholders participation
- Financial planning
- Cost-effectiveness
- Regional/Country ownership
- Replicability
- Monitoring and Evaluation
- Results and Impact
- Sustainability

4. EVALUATION REPORT FORMAT AND PROCEDURES

The evaluation report shall be a detailed report, written in English, of no more than 25 pages (excluding annexes) and include:

- i) An executive summary (no more than 3 pages)
- ii) Introduction and background
- iii) Scope, objective and methodology
- iv) Project Performance and Impact as per above listed 11 parameters
- v) Conclusions and rating of project implementation success
- vi) Lessons learned
- vii) Recommendations
- viii) Annexes

Quality Assessment of the Evaluation Report

The quality of the draft evaluation report will be assessed and rated against the following criteria:

Report Quality Criteria	UNEP EOU Assessment notes	Rating
A. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives in the context of the focal area program indicators if applicable?		
B. Was the report consistent and the evidence complete and convincing and were the ratings substantiated when used?		
C. Did the report present a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes?		
D. Were the lessons and recommendations supported by the evidence presented?		
E. Did the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?		
F. Did the report include an assessment of the quality of the project M&E system and its use for project management?		

Rating system for quality of terminal evaluation reports

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

A score for the quality of the terminal evaluation report is calculated by applying the as following formula:

$$\text{Quality of the TE report} = 0.3*(A + B) + 0.1*(C+D+E+F)$$

The total is rounded and converted to the scale of HS to HU

The final report shall be submitted in electronic form in MS Word format and should be sent to the following persons:

Segbedzi Norgbey
Chief, Evaluation and Oversight Unit
UNEP, P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel.: (254-20) 623387
Fax: (254-20) 623158
Email: segbedzi.norgbey@unep.org

With a copy to:
Monique Barbut, Director
UNEP/DTIE
39-43 Quai Andre Citroen
75739, Paris, Cedex 15, France
Tel: + 33 1 4437 1450
Fax: + 33 1 4437 1474
Email: monique.barbut@unep.fr

Sekou Toure, Director
UNEP/ROA
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi 00100, Kenya
Tel : +254 20 762 4284
Fax : +254 20 762 3928
Email : sekou.toure@unep.org

Destia Mebratu
Industry Affairs Officer
UNEP/ROA
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi 00100, Kenya
Tel : +254 20 762 4044
Fax : +254 20 762 3928
Email : destia.mebratu@unep.org

The evaluation report will be printed in hard copy and published on the Evaluation and Oversight Unit's web-site www.unep.org/eou.

6. RESOURCES AND SCHEDULE OF THE EVALUATION

The contract for this evaluation will be for a period of 20 days (spread over 8 weeks) and begins on or about 15 May 2006 and end on 7 July 2006. The consultant will submit a draft report to EOU on or before 14 June 2006, with a copy to the UNEP Programme Officer for initial comments. Comments to the final draft report will be sent to the consultant by 28 June 2006, after which the consultant will submit the final report no later than 14 July 2006. The Consultant will attend the Fourth African Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production (ARSCP-4), 29-31 May 2006, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia where s/he will conduct interviews and discussions with relevant stakeholders and UNEP staff. The consultant will also travel to UNEP Nairobi to meet with the relevant programme staff (AMCEN Secretariat, Fund Management Officer etc.)

In accordance with UNEP policy, all projects are evaluated by an independent evaluator contracted by the EOU. The evaluator should not have been associated with the design and implementation of the project. The evaluator will work under the overall supervision of the Chief, Evaluation and Oversight Unit, UNEP.

The evaluator should have the following minimum qualifications: (i) experience with project management and implementation and in particular with targeted research projects that generate policies/strategies, knowledge and information; (ii) scientific expertise in the subject matter; (iii) experience with environmental information networking projects in developing countries, and (iv) project evaluation. Knowledge of UNEP programmes and activities is highly desirable.

7. SCHEDULE OF PAYMENT

The evaluator will receive a lump sum payable in three parts. Upon signing of contract, the evaluator will receive 30% of the SSA fee for initial travel expenses and 30% upon submission of draft. Final payment of 40% will be paid upon satisfactory completion of work. The fee is inclusive of all expenses, including travel and per diem.

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.

21 April 2006

Annex 3: List of Persons Contacted

1. Dr. Segbedzi Norgbey, Chief, Evaluation and Oversight Unit, UNEP
2. Ms. Mercy Mwangi, Administrative Assistant, Evaluation and Oversight Unit, UNEP
3. Dr. Desta Mebratu, Industry Affairs Officer, Regional Office for Africa, UNEP
4. Nehemia Rotich, Senior Programme Officer (Biodiversity), Regional Office for Africa, UNEP
5. Mr. Pontus Molin, Fund Programme Management Officer, Budget and Financial Management Service (BFMS), UNEP.
6. Ms. Angele Luh Sy, Information Officer, Regional Office for Africa, UNEP
7. Mr. Rwothumio Thomiko, Regional Network Co-ordinator, UNEP Regional Office for Africa
8. Dr. Patrick Mwesigye, President Executive Board ARSCP and Executive Director Uganda Cleaner Production Centre
9. Dr. Evans Kituyi, Executive Board Member, ARSCP and Lecturer University of Nairobi
10. Mr. Philip Acquah, Executive Board Member ARSCP and Director, National Cleaner Production Centre of Ghana/Deputy Director, Environmental Protection Agency, Accra, Ghana
11. Ms Adrianna Zacariaha Farah, Programme Officer, Production and Consumption Branch, UNEP-DTIE, Paris
12. Ms Rose Chekenya, Executive Board Member, ARSCP & Service Consultant and Trainer, ROSCAM Strategic Development Consultancy, Zimbabwe
13. Mr. Charles Akol, Sustainable Development Unit, United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA)
14. Prof Cleo Migiros, Secretary Executive Board ARSCP and Director, National Cleaner Production Centre of Tanzania
15. Prof Oladele Osibanjo, Director, Basel Convention Regional Office for Africa
16. Mr. Lelissa Daba, Director, Ethiopian National Cleaner Production Centre, Addis Ababa
17. Mr Clive Mafukho, Director, Ivory Consult Ltd, Nairobi, Kenya
18. Prof Mohammed Tawfic Ahmed, Faculty of Agriculture, Suez Canal University, Egypt
19. Dr. John Afari Idan, Chief Executive Officer, Biogas Technologies West Africa Limited (BTWAL), Accra, Ghana
20. Ms Jane Nyakang'o, Director, Kenya National Cleaner Production Centre, Nairobi, Kenya
21. Mr. Smail Al Hilal, Executive Board Member, ARSCP and Director, Moroccan Cleaner Production Centre
22. Mr. Edgar Mugisha, Technical Officer, Uganda Cleaner Production Centre
23. Ms. Susan Nsangi, Environmentalist/Technical Officer, Uganda Cleaner Production Centre
24. Dr. Arab Hoballah, Chief, Production and Consumption Branch, UNEP-DTIE, Paris, France

Annex 4: ARSCP Project Evaluation Questionnaire

Dear Colleagues,

I have been contracted to carry out an end of term evaluation of the African Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and Production (ARSCP) Project. Coming fresh from the ARSCP-4 and having a wealth of institutional memory and experience, your views would very much enrich the evaluation process.

There are a total of 31 items for which your input is required. You are not obligated to respond to each and everyone of them.

- Section A of the Questionnaire is primarily for NCPCs.
- Section B of the Questionnaire is for those who have more involvement in project implementation (e.g. Board of ARSCP and UNEP's staff).
- Section C of the Questionnaire is left open for all to contribute.

Thank you.

Yakobo Moyini, PhD

ARSCP Project Evaluation Questionnaire

Section A: Project activities and support

1. To what extent, in your view, were the ARSCP Project objectives met? _____ (Please rank as 1- not met at all; 2-poorly met; 3-adequately met; 4-very adequately met; 5-above expectations). Briefly explain your score

2. How did the ARSCP Project facilitate the establishment of new national production centres and programmes? (State number) _____ new NCPCs established; _____ the process of establishing new NCPCs initiated; _____ programmes initiated.
3. How would you rate the manner in which the ARSCP Project facilitated the exchange of information and experience among the NCPCs? _____ (Score as follows: 1-Poor; 2-Fair; 3-Good; 4-Very Good; 5-Excellent). Briefly explain your score

4. How successful was the project in strengthening the linkage of the regional sustainable consumption and production effort with the global sustainable consumption and production network? _____ (Score as follows: 1-not successful; 2-Fairly Successful; 3-Successful; 4-Very Successful; 5-above expectations). Briefly explain your score

5. How do you rate the ARSCP outputs in relation to expected results with respect to: scope _____ quality _____ and usefulness _____ (Score as follows 1-Poor; 2-Fair; 3-Good; 4- Very Good and 5-Excellent). Briefly explain your score

6. In your opinion, how effective was the organisation of the National and Regional Roundtables on Sustainable Production and Consumption? _____ (Score as follows: 1-Not effective; 2-somewhat effective; 3-effective; 4-very effective; 5-above expectations). Briefly explain your score

7. Did the regional and national roundtables achieve their objectives? Yes _____ No _____
Explain.

8. How effective was the Website of the Regional Roundtable in facilitating information sharing and strengthening the linkage between the regional sustainable consumption and production effort with the global sustainable consumption and production network? _____ (Score as follows: 1- not effective; 2-fairly effective; 3-effective; 4-very effective; 5-above expectations). Explain your score

9. Have project outputs had any influence on policymakers at the national

yes Yes No Regional Yes No levels? If yes, to

what extent have the outputs had an influence? _____ (Score as follows: 1- limited influence; 2- some influence; 3- noticeable influence; 4- great influence; 5- outstanding influence). Briefly explain your score

Section B: Project Administration and management

10. How would you rate the effectiveness of the supervision, administrative and financial support provided by UNEP? _____ (Score as follows: 1-not effective; 2-fairly effective; 3-effective; 4-very effective; 5-outstanding). Briefly explain your score

11. Were the efforts made by the project to engage relevant stakeholders successful?

Yes No. Specify _____

12. How would you rate the level of participation by the following stakeholder groups? (Score as follows: 1- not at all; 2-somewhat active; 3-active; 4-very active; 5-outstanding).

- (i) National government institutions/organisations _____
- (ii) Consumer groups _____
- (iii) Other civil society _____

Explain your score

13. List 3 major impacts of the project (if any) on the adoption of sustainable consumption and production concept in your participating country (only those where NCPCs established).

(i) _____

(ii) _____

(iii) _____

To what extent have the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document been followed? _____ (Score as follows: 1-not at all; 2-somewhat; 3- followed; 4- very well followed; 5- excellently followed). Briefly explain your score

14. How appropriately have implementation mechanisms been adapted to the changing needs of the project? _____ (Score as follows: 1-no adaptation; 2- fair adaptation; 3-adapted well; 4- adapted very well; 5-excellent adaptation). Briefly explain your score

15. How effective was the project steering committee? _____ (Score as follows: 1-not effective; 2 –fairly effective; 3 – effective; 4-very effective; 5-outstanding). Briefly explain your

score

16. How effective was day to day project management? _____ (Score as follows: 1-not effective; 2-fairly effective; 3-effective; 4-very effective; 5-outstanding). Briefly explain your score

17. How effective was the core team formed by project managers? _____ (Score as follows: 1-not effective; 2-fairly effective; 3-effective; 4-very effective; 5-outstanding). Briefly explain your score

18. List the 5 most significant administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project (if any).

(i) _____

(ii) _____

(iii) _____

(iv) _____

(v) _____

- (a) Was there any meaningful degree of collaboration and co-ordination between the various project partners and institutions during the course of implementation of the project?

Yes No. Specify _____

- (b) If yes, was the degree of collaboration and co-ordination effective? _____ (Score as follows: 1-not effective; 2-somewhat effective; 3-effective; 4-very effective; 5-outstanding). Briefly explain your score

19. Do you feel the budget of the project was adequate to generate the outputs specified?

Yes No. Specify _____

20. Were the funds released for the project effectively used by the Project Secretariat?

Yes No. Explain _____

21. How much in-kind and cash co-financing was contributed to the project? In-kind (monetary value) \$ _____. Cash contribution \$ _____.
22. To what extent did the Project leverage additional resources? _____ (Score as follows: 1- none; 2-minimal amount; 3-significant amount; 4- very significant amount; 5-exceptional leveraging equal to or exceeding project funds). Briefly explain your score

23. (a) To what extent do you feel the Project was nationally/regionally owned? _____ (Score as follows: 1-no ownership; 2-limited ownership; 3-significant ownership; 4- very significant ownership; 5-totally owned). Briefly explain your score

- (b) Do you feel the project addressed national/regional development and environmental agendas
 Yes _____ No. Explain _____

- (c) and regional and international agreements? Yes No.
 Explain _____

24. Does the project have any potential to be replicated (expanded, extended or replicated to other sub-regions and /or regions? Yes No.
 Explain _____

25. (a) Have any steps been taken by the project to actually replicate (as defined in item 27)?
 Yes No. Explain _____

- (b) If yes, how do you rate the relevance and feasibility of these steps? _____ (Score as follows: 1-minimal relevance/feasibility; 2-some relevance/feasible; 3-relevant/feasible; 4-very relevant/feasible; 5-extremely relevant/feasible). Briefly explain your score

26. Has the project had any spill-over benefits to other countries in addition to the participating countries? Yes No. Explain _____

27. (a) How effective were the reporting monitoring and evaluation mechanisms employed throughout the project's lifetime? _____ (Score as follows: 1-not effective; 2-fairly effective; 3-effective; 4-very effective; 5-outstanding). Briefly explain your score

- (b) How effectively did the project respond to the challenges identified by the reporting, monitoring and evaluation systems in place? _____ (Score as follows: 1-not effective; 2-fairly effective; 3-effective; 4-very effective; 5-outstanding). Briefly explain your score

28. Do you feel the project outcomes will be sustained and enhanced overtime?

Yes No. Explain with reference to the following:

(i) enabling environment _____

(ii) institutional sustainability _____

(iii) financial sustainability _____

Section C: Miscellaneous

29. Any other comments you feel would be useful in informing the evaluation process?

Annex 5: Logical Framework Matrix of the Project

Narrative Summary (NS)	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI)	Means of Verification (MOV)	Important Assumptions
Needs			
1. Expand the adoption of cleaner production concept in African countries	1.1 Increased number of proposals for establishment of new centres. 1.2 Increased number of CP experts and industries practising CP.	1.1 National status reports; 1.2 National roundtable reports	1.1 The presence of national institutions, which will take the lead. 1.2 Support from governments, industries and other institutions.
2. Facilitate information and experience exchange between national cleaner production centres (NCPCs).	2.1 Holding of the three African Roundtables. 2.2 Setting-up of a self-sustaining institutional mechanism for Regional Roundtable.	2.1 Regional status reports 2.2 Reports of the Regional Steering Committee	2.1 Strong leadership from the regional steering committee. 2.2 Active participation of the governments, NCPCs and other institutions.
3. Strengthen the linkage, mainly electronic, of the regional cleaner production effort with the global cleaner production network.	3.1 The number of useful case-studies to be posted; 3.2 Increasing number of users of the webpage.	3.1 The homepage of the regional roundtable	3.1 NCPC's ability to utilise the system. 3.2 Availability of IT facilities in African countries.
Results			
1. Establishment of new national cleaner production centres and programmes.	1.1 Number of new CP programmes initiated. 1.2 Number of new NCPCs established.	1.1 National status reports. 1.2 National roundtable reports	1.1 The presence of national institutions, that take the lead. 1.2 Support from donors & national governments.
2. Establishment of an institutional mechanism for the African Roundtable on sustainable production and consumption.	2.1 Two roundtables held during the project. 2.2 A system for subsequent roundtables established.	2.1 Regional status reports. 2.2 Reports of the Steering Committee of the Roundtable	2.1 Strong leadership from the regional steering committee. 2.3 Active participation of the governments, NCPCs and other institutions.
3. Knowledge and information sharing on sustainable consumption and production, mainly	3.1 Number and growth of visits and interactions on the webpage	3.1 Homepage of the Roundtable.	3.1 The capability of web-users in Africa.

through launching and maintaining of an interactive webpage.			
<p>Outputs</p> <p>1. National Roundtables on cleaner production organised.</p> <p>2. Regional roundtables on sustainable production and consumption shall be organised.</p> <p>3. The website for the Regional Roundtable shall be developed and launched.</p>	<p>1.1 5 national roundtables organised.</p> <p>2.1 Two regional roundtables organised.</p> <p>3.1 Website developed and launched.</p>	<p>1.1 Report of the National Roundtables</p> <p>2.1 Regional status reports.</p> <p>3.1 Website users report.</p>	<p>1.1 National institutions, which will take the lead.</p> <p>1.2 Support from national governments.</p> <p>2.1 Active participation of governments, NCPCs and other institutions.</p> <p>3.1 Allocation of domain for the website by UNEP-ROA.</p>
<p>Activities</p> <p>1.1 Solicitation of proposals from national centres and institutions to organise national roundtables.</p> <p>1.2 Signing of the MOUs to organise the NRT for the selected countries.</p> <p>1.3 Convening of the national roundtables.</p> <p>1.4 Submission of the national status reports.</p> <p>2.1 Solicitation of proposals to host the regional roundtable (s).</p> <p>2.2 Signing of the MOU with the selected NCPC.</p>	<p>1.1 Number of country submission.</p> <p>1.2 Agreement on MOUs.</p> <p>1.3 Number of national round tables.</p> <p>1.4 Number of submission</p> <p>2.1 Number of submissions of proposals.</p> <p>2.2 Agreement on the MOU.</p>	<p>1.1 National proposals.</p> <p>1.2 Signed MOUs.</p> <p>1.3 Reports of national roundtables</p> <p>1.4 National status reports.</p> <p>2.1 Proposals for regional roundtables</p> <p>2.2 Signed MOUs</p>	<p>1.1 Commitment of national institutions.</p> <p>1.2 Local Commitment.</p> <p>1.3 Level of national participation.</p> <p>1.4 Availability of local expertise.</p> <p>2.1 In-house capability of the selected host institution.</p> <p>2.3 Reasonable external support requirement.</p>

2.3 Convening of the regional roundtable (s).	2.4 Holding the Regional roundtable.	2.3 Regional status reports.	2.4 Financial limitation
2.4 Preparation of the Regional status report	2.3 Publication of the Regional status report.	2.4 Regional status reports.	2.5 Timely submission of national status reports.
3.1 Identification of a professional web-designer and signing of a contract.	3.1 Commissioning of a web-designer.	3.1 The signed contract agreement.	3.1 Ease of locating the expert.
3.2 Development of the skeleton structure of the webpage and gathering the material.	3.2 Web-structure developed.	3.2 Website of the Regional Roundtable.	3.2 In-time provision of information from national centres.
3.3 Finalising the webpage, securing the domain and launching it.	3.2 Effective use of the web-design.	3.3 Number of Visitors.	3.3 Availability of domain in time.

Annex 6: Programme of the ARSCP-4



Monday, 29 May 2006

12:00 – 12:10

Programme introduction and facilitation
Mr. Lelissa Daba, Director, ECPC

Plenary session one:

12:10 – 12:30

Regional Status on sustainable consumption and production
Chair: Dr Patrick Mwesigye, President, ARSCP

12:30 – 13:00

Presentation of the Second Regional Status Report
Dr. T. Ramjeawon
Discussion on the Regional Status Report

13:00 – 14:00

Lunch break

Plenary session two: Topical presentations on SCP

Chair: Professor Cleo Migiro, Secretary, ARSCP

14:00 – 14:20

Integrating sustainable consumption and production in poverty reduction strategies, UNEP-DTIE

14:20 – 14:40

Programme des modes de consommation et production durable du Senegal, Ms. Ramatoulaye Dieng

14:40 -15:00

National Cleaner Production Strategy and action plan: Phases and progress, Mr. Sylvester Mokoena

15:00 – 15:30

Discussion

15:30 – 16:00

Coffee break

Plenary session three: Presentation of selected thematic papers

Chair: Mr. Smail al Hiliali, ARSCP

16:00 – 16 :20

Application of sustainable consumption and production to Industrial Clusters, Dr. Patrick Mwesigye

16:20 – 16:40

Waste to energy for sustainable management of sewage and health care waste, Dr. John Afrari Idan

16:40 – 17:00

Project de Mobilisation Sociale Pour Une Consommation Durable, Mr. Samba Nor Ndiaye

End of day one

Tuesday, 30 May 2006

9:00 – 10:30 Parallel sessions on Water services and environmental education and training

Water Services and Utilization Chair: Professor Cleo Migiro		Environmental education and training Chair: Dr. Evans Kituyi	
9:00 - 9:15	Community water supply service through collaboration, Ms. Anja J.M.O. Buwalda	9:00 9:15	Reflection on six graduate programmes from the perspective of education for sustainability, Dr. Getachew Assefa
9:15 – 9:30	Developing electro-coagulation and non-chemical treatment technologies for water and waste waters, Dr. Ife K. Adewumi	9:15 – 9:30	Experience in education and training for sustainability at the University of Zimbabwe, Dr. Charles Mbohwa
9:30 - 9:45	Closing the water cycle in a soap industry, Mr. Dande Sreenivasu	9:30 – 9:45	Capacity building and training activities at CITET, Mr Hanchi Belgacem
9:45 – 10:00	Solution to the Fluoride problem in the Rift Valley of Ethiopia, Dr. Feleke Zewge	9:45 – 10:05	Mainstreaming Environment into University Education Dr. Mohammed Tawfic
10:00 – 10:15	Evaluation of the sustainability of wastewater treatment systems in Africa using LCA tool, Dr. T. Ramjeawon	10:05 – 10:30	Discussion
10:15 – 10:30	Discussion		

10:30 – 11:00

Coffee break

11:00 – 12:30 Parallel sessions on Waste management and Eco-labelling

Waste Management Chair: Prof. Oladele Osibanjo		Eco-labelling Chair: Ms. Jane Nyakango	
11:00 – 11:15	Aerobic composting: An engineering solution to municipal solid wastes problems in local government areas of Nigeria Mr. Tunde Tairu	11:00 – 11:15	Eco-labelling Tunisian products: The road to global market Ms. Souad Benromdhane
11:15 – 11:30	Recycling billet scales as fine aggregate in construction, Engr. A. Akindahunsi	11:15 – 11:30	Eco-labelling of textile products: Morocco's experience Mr. Smail Al Hilali
11:30 – 11:45	Solid waste management in Nigeria: Efforts towards a paradigm shift of waste-to-wealth stratagems Dr. Ife K. Adewumi	11:30 – 11:45	Use of Technology Needs Assessment (TNAs) as a tool for promoting technology transfer Mr. Kelvin Kisha
11:45 – 12:00	Systems analysis of waste management: The Swedish experience Dr. Getachew Assefa	11:45 – 12:30	Discussion
12:00 – 12:30	Discussion		

12:30 – 14:00

Lunch Break

- 14:00 – 17:30 Regional working group session on the 10 Year Framework programme
- North Africa; facilitated by Mr. Smail Al Hilali
 - East Africa; facilitated by Dr. Patrick Mwesigye & Dr. Evans Kituyi
 - South Africa; facilitated by Professor Cleo Migiro
 - West and Central Africa; Facilitated by Mr. Philip Acquah & Mr. Cheikh fofana

Wednesday, 31 May 2006

9:00 – 10:30 Business session of ARSCP, Facilitated by the ARSCP Board

10:30 – 11:00 Coffee break

11:00 – 12:30 Plenary session three: Plenary presentations on selected topics

Chair: Mr. Philip Acquah, ARSCP

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| 11:00 – 11:20 | UNIDO's Experience on Solid Waste Management, Mrs. Mayra Sanchez Osuna, UNIDO |
| 11:20 – 11:40 | APELL - UNEP's Programme on local emergency preparedness; UNEP-DTIE |
| 11:40 – 12:00 | Ultraviolet (UV) disinfection for drinking water, Mr. Marvin |
| 12:00 – 12:20 | The potential to utilize ESTIS in Africa, UNEP-DTIE |
| 12:20 – 12:40 | Key Issues on Hazardous waste Management in Africa, Prof. Oladele Osibanjo, Regional Center for Basel Convention |
| 12:40 – 13:00 | Discussion |
| 13:00 – 14:00 | Lunch Break |
| 14:00 – 15:30 | Reports from the working groups
Chair: Dr. Desta Mebratu |

15:30 – 16:00 Coffee Break

16:00 – 17:00 Closing discussion on the way forward, co-facilitated by Dr. Patrick Mwesigye & Dr. Desta Mebratu.

Annex 7: Status of Completion of MOUs

	Purpose of the MOU	Signed on	Cost of MOU (USD)	Task undertaken by	Current status
1.	Organization of the Third African Roundtable on SCP	14/04/04	21,500	Morocco NCPC	Task completed and MOU closed on 20 July 2004
2.	Organization of sub-Regional Roundtable for Lake Victoria Region	15/09/04	17,600	Kenya NCPC	Task completed and MOU closed on 08/02/05
3.	Design of the Website of ARSCP	20/09/04	9,708	Tanzania NCPC	Task completed and report submitted and MOU closed on 15/11/05
4.	Organizing exhibition on Cleaner Production at the University of Nairobi	10/11/2004	800	Kenya NCPC	Task completed and MOU closed on 10 March 2005
5.	Organizing a national roundtable on SCP in Ghana	29/12/04	5,500	EPA-Ghana	Task completed, reports submitted and MOU closed on 15 March 2005.
6.	Technical inputs to national and regional roundtables	28/01/05	20,000	ARSCP Secretariat	Task completed but waiting for the report to close the MOU
7.	National Roundtable on Sustainable Consumption and production in Akaki River Basin	24/03/05	6,693.75	Ethiopian NCPC	Task completed, report submitted and MOU closed on 12/09/05
8.	Organizing a Regional Roundtable for French-speaking African Countries	21/09/05	21,962	Interim NEPAD Secretariat on Environment (SINEPAD/Senegal)	Task completed, report submitted waiting for the financial report.
9.	Organization of the Fourth African Roundtable on SCP (ARSCP-4)	11/04/06	7,500	Ethiopian Cleaner Production Center (ECPC)	Task Completed, waiting for the report to close it.
Sub-total			104,570		
Recruitment of Consultants					
1.	Preparation of the first regional status report on SCP (Dr. Evans Kituyi, Kenya)	May-July 2004	6,250	Recruitment of a Consultant	Task completed and report published in October 2004
2.	Preparation of the Second Regional Status Report on SCP (Dr. T Ramjeawon, Mauritius)	March-April 2006	10,000	Recruitment of a Consultant	Task completed and the report published
Sub-total			16,250		
Total			120,820		

Annex 8: International Participants at the ARSCP-4

NAME	COUNTRY	SPECIFIC CONTRIBUTION/ CHOICE OF SESSION
1. Mrs. Maryna Osuna Sanchez	Austria	Paper contribution Solid Waste Management
2. Mr. Ronald Braun	Canada	Paper contribution Water Utilization and services
3. Mr. Marvin Devries	Canada	Paper contribution Water Utilization and services
4. Dr. Ernest K Yanful	Canada	
5. Mr. Gilbert Nzobadilla	Congo	
6. Mr. Pedia Patrick Leon	Cote d'Ivoire	Paper Contribution Eco-labelling
7. Mme Monique Ouli Ndongo	Cameroon	
8. Dr. Mohamed Tawfic Ahmed	Egypt	Water utilization and services
9. Mrs. Hanan Mahmoud El Hadary	Egypt	Paper Contribution Water utilization & services Eco-labelling Application of LCA
10. Ms. Adriana Zacarias Farah	UNEP/France	Solid waste management
11. Dr. Arab Hoballah	UNEP/France	
12. Mr. Obiang Pierre Martian	Gabon	
13. Dr. Ulf Jaeckel	Germany	
14. Christian Loewe	Germany	
15. Dr. John Afrari Idan	Ghana	Paper contribution Application of LCA
16. Mr. Philip Acquah	Ghana	Solid waste management/ ARSCP Board
17. Ms. Jane Nyakang'o	Kenya	Solid waste management
18. Dr. Evans Kituyi	Kenya	Application of LCA/ ARSCP Board
19. Ms. Anja J.M. Oussoren Buwalda	Kenya	Paper contribution Water utilization and services
20. Mr. Clive Wafukho	Kenya	Paper Contribution Session Facilitation Water Utilization and services Solid waste management
21. Mr. Kelvin Khisa	Kenya	Paper contribution Session facilitation Environmental education and training Solid waste management
22. Maurice Okello Odera	Kenya	Paper Contribution Solid Waste Environmental education and training
23. Dr. Sekou Toure	UNEP/Kenya	

24. Dr. Desta Mebratu	UNEP/Kenya	
25. Dr. Ali Yacoub	Lebanon	Eco-labelling
26. Dr. Mohamed S Hamouda	Libya	Plenary session facilitation
27. Prof. T. Ramjeawon	Mauritius	Plenary presentation
28. Ms. Hanzaz Hanan	Morocco	Water utilization and services
29. Mr. Smail Al Hilali	Morocco	Application of LCA? ARSCP Board
30. Ms. Cristina Battaglino	Mozambique	Environmental Education and Training
31. Mr. Leonardo Guiruta	Mozambique	Environmental Education and Training
32. Mr. Hamissou Garba	Niger	
33. Dr. Ife Kenny Adewumi	Nigeria	Water utilization and services Solid waste management
34. Eng. Akindehinde Akindahunsi	Nigeria	Paper contribution Session facilitation Solid waste management
35. Prof. Oladele Osibanjo	Nigeria	
36. Mr. Tairu Tunde Tajudeen	Nigeria	Paper contribution Solid Waste Management
37. Abdoul Byujusenge	Rwanda	Session facilitation Environmental education and training
38. Dande Sreenivasu	Rwanda	Paper Presentation Water utilization and services
39. Mr. Cheikh FOFANA	Senegal	Paper Contribution Environmental education and Training
40. Mr. Samba Nor Ndiaye	Senegal	Paper contribution Environmental education and training
41. Ms. Ramatoulaye Dieng	Senegal	Plenary presentation
42. Mr Mamadou Syll KEBE	Sénégal	
43. Mr. Mano Ram Reddi	South Africa	Paper contribution Water Utilization and services Environmental education and training
44. Mr. Amigun Bamikole	South Africa	Poster display
45. Ms Tebatso Matlala	South Africa	Paper contribution Water utilization and services

		Eco-labelling Environmental education and training Solid waste management Application of LCA
46. Mr. Sylvester Mokoena	South Africa	Paper contribution Water utilization and services Eco-labelling Environmental education and training Solid waste management Application of LCA
47. Dr. Abdalmohsin Rizgalla Khairalseed	Sudan	Paper Contribution Session facilitation Environmental education and training
48. Dr. Getachew Assefa	Sweden	Paper contribution Session facilitation Environmental education and training Solid waste management Application of LCA
49. Prof Cleo L.C. Migiro	Tanzania	Plenary facilitation
50. Ms. Anne Magashi	Tanzania	ARSCP facilitation
51. Dr. Tom O. Okurut	Tanzania	
52. Mr. Belgacem Hanchi	Tunisia	
53. Mrs. Ben Romdhane Souad	Tunisia	Eco-label, paper presentation
54. Mr. Edgar Mugisha	Uganda	Solid waste management
55. Dr. Patrick Mwesigye	Uganda	Paper contribution Environmental education and training
56. Ms. Susan Nsangi	Uganda	Paper Contribution Poster display Environmental education and training
57. Dr. Yakobo Moyini	Uganda	
58. Mr. Danny Mwango	Zambia	Paper Contribution Solid waste Management
59. Ms. Rosie M. Chekenya	Zimbabwe	Environmental Education and Training
60. Dr. Charles Mbohwa	Zimbabwe	Environmental Education and Training Solid waste management Application of LCA
61. Mr. Morris Chidavaenzi	Zimbabwe	Session facilitation

Annex 9. Response to the UNEP EOU Comment on rating

Criterion	Evaluator's Project Rating	UNEP EOU Project Rating	UNEP EOU Comment on rating	Evaluator's Response to UNEP EOU Rating
Attainment of objectives and planned results	Highly satisfactory	Highly satisfactory	EOU concur with much of the assessment of objectives and results achieved.	None
Achievement of outputs and activities	Highly satisfactory	Satisfactory	The reports states "all activities planned were successfully executed and that the three desired outputs realized". However for the rating to be highly satisfactory we would need more information about the quality of the outputs (e.g. the pilot projects, the web-page etc.). As well as the analysis based on the questionnaires it would be useful to have the evaluators view on these outputs.	The draft has been improved and the Evaluator feels the original score should stand.
Cost-effectiveness	Highly Satisfactory	Highly satisfactory	Cost-estimates of 'in kind' contributions seem to be the main basis for the rating. Additional resources were leveraged as well. EOU concurs with the evaluator's assessment.	None
Impact	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	The examples given will need to be further elaborated in order to justify the current rating.	The section on impact has been strengthened with additional examples hence the original score stands
Sustainability (EOU rating incorporates consideration of the sub-criteria)	Satisfactory	Moderately satisfactory	Given the statement that "the ARSCP Secretariat is not sustainable at the present level (p. 33)" and that "the secretariat is not financially sustainable (p. 34)" the rating should be lowered. EOU has used an average score.	The non-sustainability of the ARSCP remains a key issues and the Evaluator is persuaded to agree with the UNEP EOU rating

Criterion	Evaluator's Project Rating	UNEP EOU Project Rating	UNEP EOU Comment on rating	Evaluator's Response to UNEP EOU Rating
Financial	None given	Unsatisfactory	"The secretariat of the ARSCP is totally under funded"	Agree
Socio Political	None given	Not directly applicable		The project worked closely with the political processes in the region
Institutional framework and governance	None given	satisfactory	"The establishment of the ARSCP as a formal registered regional charter is the first feature of institutional sustainability. However the implementing the 10YFP will to a large degree depend on the ability of the ARSCP Secretariat."	Agree with the UNEP EOU comment
Ecological	None given	Not directly applicable	Ecological impacts may (eventually) result from further application of SCP methods or products.	--
Examples of replication and catalytic outcomes	None given	Satisfactory	ARSCP methods have been used for sub-regional meetings	Examples of replication and catalytic outcomes have been included in the revised version.
Stakeholders participation	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	The recommendation to conduct a stakeholder analysis and the statement on page 8 that the private sector should have been given a more prominent role as well as the statement on p.27 that NGOs, trade unions etc. featured less prominently seems to indicate that this rating is on the high side.	The evaluator concedes in light of the fact that the private sector appears unwilling to commit resources to the SCP concept. Appropriate incentives are needed. Hence the Evaluator has lowered the rating to 'satisfactory'.
Country ownership	Highly Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory	There was evidence to show that the project was relevant and utilized in the formulation of national development and environmental agendas (Ghana). The ARSCP also has strong support from the AMCEN and AU.	--

Criterion	Evaluator's Project Rating	UNEP EOU Project Rating	UNEP EOU Comment on rating	Evaluator's Response to UNEP EOU Rating
Implementation approach	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	The project seems to have adopted well to the changing conditions but there is no evidence of this being out of the usual.	Evidence has been provided in the final version to justify the initial rating.
Financial planning	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Financial planning appears to have been OK.	--
Replicability	Highly Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory	The ARSCP approach have been used for sub-regional meetings. Potential for continued use and application of ARSCP methods is high.	--
Monitoring and Evaluation	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	The project seems to have been fairly compliant but there is no evidence to suggest that reports were used as a tool in project management.	The UNEP EOU concern has been addressed sufficiently and the Evaluator feels the original rating should stand.
Overall Rating	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory		While the overall score is 1.36 this has been rounded upwards to the nearest whole number, that is 2, since the scoring system does not allow for intermediate rankings. Using the principles of arithmetic, any score less than 0.5 should ideally be revised downwards to the nearest whole number which would agree with the rating of the Evaluator. In the absence of such finer rating, the Evaluator has rated the overall score as 2.

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

www.unep.org

United Nations Environment Programme
P.O. Box 30552 Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: ++254-(0)20-762 1234
Fax: ++254-(0)20-762 3927
Email: unep@unep.org
web: www.unep.org



Evaluation and Oversight Unit
United Nations Environment Programme
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +(254-20) 7623387
Fax: +(254-20) 7623158
Email: Segbedzi.Norgbey@unep.org
Email: eou@unep.org
URL: <http://www.unep.org/eou>