



United Nations
Environment Assembly of the
United Nations Environment Programme

Distr.: General
15 February 2019

Original: English



**United Nations Environment Assembly of the
United Nations Environment Programme**
Fourth session
Nairobi, 11–15 March 2019
Item 6 of the provisional agenda*

Evaluation of the implementation of the integrated approach to financing the sound management of chemicals and waste

Note by the Executive Director

Summary

The integrated approach to financing sound management of chemicals and waste (hereafter: the integrated approach) was proposed by UN Environment Programme Executive Director as the final outcome of the consultative process on financing options for chemicals and waste launched at the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants in May 2009. This process aimed to address the increased need for “sustainable, predictable, adequate and accessible financing for the chemicals and waste agenda while also increasing the political priority accorded to the sound management of chemicals and waste”.

The integrated approach was adopted by the UN Environment Programme Governing Council in 2013 (GC27/12). It is composed of three complementary and interlinked components: (i) Mainstreaming of the sound management of chemicals and waste into development planning; (ii) Industry involvement; and (iii) Dedicated external financing. The Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme, in its decision,¹ requested the Executive Director to facilitate an evaluation of the implementation of the integrated approach in cooperation with all relevant stakeholders and submit the evaluation, including recommendations, within six years for consideration by the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum, the relevant COPs and ICCM5. This present INF document fulfils the Governing Council request.

The report presents the completed analysis and appendices for consideration. This report is presented without formal editing.

*

¹ UNEP/GC.27/17 : Decision 27/12: Chemicals and waste management, VIII, para.18

Annex

Evaluation of the implementation of the integrated approach to financing the sound management of chemicals and waste

I. Purpose and context of the evaluation

A. Purpose

1. The overarching purpose of this evaluation is to evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of the integrated approach with the aim of assessing how the integrated approach has contributed to the implementation of the chemicals and waste activities and to inform future refinements and adjustments for the integrated approach. As per Governing Council decision 27/2, the evaluation aims to assess *the effectiveness of each of the three components of the integrated approach and the linkages and synergies between them*. Some elements to the integrated approach were deliberately left undefined to allow flexibility in the first 6 years of implementation. Therefore, the evaluation will assist with clarifying how implementation is happening in practice and whether this is sufficient to achieve the desired impacts of the integrated approach, as were envisioned in 2013.

B. Context

2. In addition to the 2009-2011 consultative process and the Governing Council 27/7 decision, other related processes and events since 2013 shape the expectations and implementation of the integrated approach. The post-2015 Sustainable Development Agenda includes specific reference to chemicals and waste management, with calls for adequate financial and other resources for the sound management of chemicals and waste under SDG12 -Ensure sustainable consumption². A second notable process is the intersessional process on SAICM and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020 [hereafter: intersessional process] currently underway.

C. Evaluation scope and objectives

3. Within available resources, the evaluation focuses on implementation from 2014 to 2018 by UN Environment Programme, the BRS Conventions, SAICM and the Global Environment Facility [hereafter: GEF], and impacts at global, regional, national and sub-national levels that can be distilled from available documents; and not on data from national governments or other actors. The evaluation objectives are to:

- (a) Provide further clarity, as needed, on the intended steps to implement the integrated approach and related impacts of the integrated approach as it was implemented from 2014 to end 2018.
- (b) Establish a baseline for 2013 and evaluate current implementation modalities and impacts, with evidentiary support from 2014 to end 2018.
- (c) Provide input to integrated approach actors by identifying gaps and possible options for future implementation.
- (d) Provide recommendations on how to further strengthen the integrated approach for enhanced impact at the global, regional and national level.

II. Evaluation framework and methods

4. The evaluation was conducted by an independent consultant who has no obligations or conflicts of interest with respect to the integrated approach, BRS and Minamata Conventions, SAICM or key constituencies in its implementation (See Appendix 1 for the Terms of Reference).

A. The evaluation approach

5. The integrated approach was established to build upon and increase synergies across many efforts. This is complex terrain, with many actors and ongoing initiatives. Attribution problems arise for evaluating the integrated approach as a result because:

- (a) Activities that could be categorised as implementation of the integrated approach may have happened regardless of the approach;

² <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/topics/chemicalsandwaste>, last accessed 8 February 2019

(b) Outcomes observed for resource mobilization, financial flows, institutional strengthening and project arrangements may be the consequences of multiple causes; and

(c) The approach is open and flexible, intended for implementation by many different stakeholders at different levels, with no one programme defining specific activities, setting expected outcomes, and measuring and monitoring impacts.

6. Given these attribution problems, the evaluation seeks to understand the possible *contribution* of the integrated approach to the stated goals of improving financing for the sound management of chemicals and waste for the long term and at all levels.³ The evaluation builds a contribution narrative (Section III.B) based on a review of decision documents and stakeholder input and then tests this narrative by (i) documenting examples of implementation and comparing those to what was originally intended in the Governing Council 27/7 decision (Section III, and Appendix 3); and (ii) constructing some illustrative cases of achieved impacts on integrated financing (Section IV). Given this data, evaluator's comments explore whether the contribution narrative appears reasonable. The final two sections report on lessons and recommendations for future implementation of the integrated approach. (Section V, VI).

B. A proposed contribution narrative for the integrated approach

7. The contribution narrative tested in this evaluation is:

The integrated approach of mainstreaming, industry involvement and dedicated external financing will provide sufficient enabling conditions for effective financing at different levels and for the long term because its components are used synergistically and by different stakeholders in a mixture of:

(a) **Normative uses:** The integrated approach is used to prescribe pathways and standards for integrated financing pathways that ultimately reinforce efforts at global, regional, national and subnational levels on financing sound management of chemicals and waste;

(b) **Strategic uses:** The integrated approach is used as a mandate or as a support to gain additional mandates for co-financing policies; proposals for new programmes of work, co-financed activities; or advocacy on integrated financing of sound management of chemicals and waste.

(c) **Catalytic uses:** The integrated approach is used to kickstart new sustainable and predictable funding flows through enhanced institutional capacity, relationships and joint actions (new networks, collaborations, partnerships);

(d) **Instrumental uses:** The integrated approach is implemented as a specific activity in projects, whereby it at least two components of the integrated approach is are used deliberately to generate novel financing and supporting institutional arrangements;

(e) **Conceptual uses:** The integrated approach is used to introduce a new framing of issues or perspectives on financing of sound management of chemicals and waste in the chemicals and waste community internationally, regionally and nationally;

So that clear and measurable outcomes⁴ emerge in the form of:

Increased mobilisation of financial or in-kind resources, dedicated specifically to sound management of chemicals and waste for the long-term and at all levels; and

Institutional strengthening for implementation of sound management of chemicals and waste at regional, national and sub-national governmental levels, in private sector operations and in civil society actions for the long-term and at all levels;

That have a strong likelihood of contributing to on-the-ground impact on improved environmental quality, human health and sustainable economic development.

C. Evaluation framework, methods and data sources⁵

8. Questions guiding the analysis documents and stakeholder perspectives are listed in Table 1. The integrated approach is not a formal programme with specific goals, objectives, targets, agreed measurements, or monitoring and ongoing evaluation procedures to rely upon for a full evaluation. Therefore, the independent consultant prepared an appropriate evaluation framework and approximate

³ A contribution narrative is one form of a Theory of Change. Mayne, J. (2008). Contribution analysis: an approach to exploring cause and effect. Institutional Learning and Change Initiative, CGIAR. Retrieved from: <https://cgspace.cgiar.org/handle/10568/70124> ; Patton, M. (2011) *Developmental Evaluation: Applying complexity concepts to enhance innovation*. Gillford Press: New York.

⁴ These impacts synthesise those mentioned explicitly in the founding documents for the integrated approach.

⁵ See Appendix 2 for more details on methods, data sources and the lessons learning procedure.

baseline (See III.A, B, C) for the integrated approach. Subsequently, a desktop review of available documents was used to generate a set of examples on which to assess implementation modalities and activities (See Appendix 3). Stakeholder perspectives were elicited through a series of stakeholder interviews. A call for written perspectives on this evaluation report was disseminated to the SAICM stakeholders. Original submissions will be made available on the UN Environment Programme webpage in advance of UNEA4 or when received to share these stakeholder voices. A lessons learning discussion was facilitated by the independent consultant with UN Environment Programme, SAICM and Special Programme representatives.

Table 1: Evaluation framework for the implementation of the integrated approach 2014-2018

<p>Is the integrated approach being implemented as intended?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How was the integrated approach intended to be implemented? • What type of implementation modalities are emerging? • How does implementation in practice compare with what was expected in 2013?
<p>Are the intended outcomes of the integrated approach being realised?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the intended outcome and impact of the integrated approach? • Are financial flows to sound management of chemicals and waste increasing? Are there examples of institutional strengthening emerging? • Is the integrated approach contributing? How?
<p>What major lessons are being learned?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is working? What is less effective? • What are some key strengthening actions? What are key barriers?

D. Limitations and assumptions

9. No formal baseline exists for the integrated approach. Moreover, the integrated approach is a guiding concept that can be adopted by any organisation at any level. Given the resources available for this evaluation, a comprehensive and systematic review and evaluation of how the integrated approach is being implemented by different actors across the chemicals and waste communities at international, regional, national and subnational levels is not currently feasible.

10. Some key assumptions made in this analysis include:

- (a) The Governing Council decision 27/7 supersedes all previous articulations of the integrated approach and is used as the baseline for intended implementation and impacts in this report.
- (b) GEF external dedicated financing support is used as a model of how the integrated approach can and is being implemented, but does not imply GEF activities are directed by the integrated approach.
- (c) Evidenced examples of implementation by UN Environment Programme, the Chemicals and Waste Conventions, SAICM and the GEF are sufficient to test the contribution narrative.

III. Implementation 2014-2018 review

11. The guiding questions for evaluating implementation of the integrated approach are:
 - (a) How was the integrated approach intended to be implemented?
 - (b) What type of implementation modalities are emerging?
 - (c) How does implementation in practice compare with what was expected in 2013?

A. How was the integrated approach intended to be implemented?

12. The baseline in 2013 can be characterised as: Mainstreaming implementation was supported by a number of guidance documents on mainstreaming practices primarily directed at national governments. UN Environment Programme published the Global Chemicals Outlook (1st edition) in 2011 to give a rationale to mainstreaming efforts at regional and national levels. Outreach to other international organisations and agencies requesting that they strengthen their efforts to support governments in implementing mainstreaming and industry involvement largely involved the ongoing Inter-Organisation Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals [hereafter: IOMC]. Industry engagement through financial contributions and in-kind contributions were ad-hoc, driven case-by-case and not measured or understood in a comprehensive or transparent way. In 2013, the GEF-5 cycle was three years in to implementation, with 1 global project and 27 other projects supporting action on persistent organic pollutants (Stockholm Convention), ozone depleting substances (Montreal

Protocol), Sound chemicals management (SAICM and mercury reduction in 26 countries approved prior to 2013. The total envelope for chemicals and waste was \$420 million.⁶ The Special Programme to support institutional strengthening at the national level for the implementation of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions, the Minamata Convention and SAICM did not yet exist. The Quick Start Programme [hereafter: QSP] had declared non-Trust Fund contributions of US\$3,644,000. 16 countries and 2 Civil Society Organisations [hereafter: CSOs] in the regions of Asia-Pacific, CEE, Africa and GRULAC received QSP funding through 17 projects totalling US\$3,743,071. The outcome of the consultative process on financing had shown however that funding was not sustainable and predictable, and this was a source of growing frustration for developing and donor states, international agencies and CSOs alike.

13. Implementation of the three components was foreseen to be undertaken by a broad number of stakeholders and “*would require that dedicated and concerted efforts be taken through, but not limited to*” the following⁷:

- (a) Decisions of the Governing Council, the conferences of the parties to the chemicals- and waste-related conventions and the International Conference on Chemicals Management would be made in support of efforts at the national level to further enhance efforts on mainstreaming and industry involvement for the sound management of chemicals and waste;
- (b) Requests to other international development organizations and agencies that they strengthen their efforts to support Governments in implementing elements of the non-exhaustive lists on mainstreaming and industry involvement set out in the integrated approach;
- (c) Sustainable and predictable funding provided both by donor and recipient countries for the implementation of the elements of institutional strengthening set out in the integrated approach;
- (d) Establishment of a revised focal area on chemicals and waste under the GEF, with new and additional resources being provided through the replenishment process.

B. Findings: What type of implementation modalities are emerging?

14. Casting a wide net to understand how the integrated approach is being realised in practice, this review is based on nine examples of implementation (*See* Appendix 3) and findings are discussed under the five possible modalities in which the integrated approach could be used: normative, strategic, catalytic, instrumental and conceptual.

15. **Finding 1: Normative uses.** The integrated approach is being used formally to establish prescribed pathways and standards for integrated financing of sound management of chemicals and waste. Direct invitations were extended by Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm Conventions [hereafter: BRS] and SAICM (Examples 1,2,3) to GEF, UN Environment Programme, national governments and other stakeholder to implement the integrated approach. These decisions should support efforts at regional, national and subnational levels to further enhance efforts on financing, through mainstreaming, industry involvement and seeking dedicated external financing, as per the intended implementation efforts on (a) Decisions and (b) Requests. However, evidence that these decisions are yielding new national actions on mainstreaming and industry involvement as a result of the integrated approach itself is lacking. One stakeholder pointed to the lack of “integration and prioritisation of chemicals and waste” in a large number of UN Development Assistance Frameworks [hereafter: UNDAFs] as a clear example that the invitations to implement the integrated approach have not been taken up to the extent intended.

16. **Finding 2: Strategic uses.** There is evidence that the integrated approach was used as a support to gain additional mandates for co-financing policies and proposals for new programmes of work with co-financed activities dedicated to chemicals and waste, as per the intended effort on (d) GEF Chemicals and Waste focal area strategy and structure and in laying the foundations for sustainable and predictable funding. GEF reports⁸ shows the move towards an integrated focal area on chemicals and waste is happening with additional resources being included for chemicals and waste in each successive replenishment since 2013 (*See* Section IV below). However, there are different opinions among stakeholders regarding the actual influence of the integrated approach in the changes in the GEF strategy (Example 3). The direct link to the mandate of the Special Programme is clear

⁶ https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF-5_FOCAL_AREA_STRATEGIES.pdf;

http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/GEF_R.6_17_Fifth_Overall_Performance_Study%2C_final%2C_November_20%2C_2013_4.pdf

last accessed on 8 February 2019.

⁷ Governing Council 27/7, para. 50.

⁸ GEF/A.6/07, pg 77. Available at : http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/GEF.A6.07_OPS6.pdf, last accessed 8 February 2019 ;

(Example 4) with the total amount pledged and contributed to date since the establishment of the Special Programme Trust Fund (2015 – 2018) is US\$ 25,898,357.

17. **Finding 3: Catalytic uses.** The normative and strategic uses of the integrated approach are leading to catalytic efforts to kickstart sustainable and predictable funding flows through the GEF and the Special Programme, as per the intended implementation for sustainable and predictable funding. One fundamental design element of these programmes is the deliberate connection of donor and recipient country co-financing to generate new financial and in-kind contributions (*See* Section IV below for further discussion). New institutional strengthening and joint action outcomes are evidenced at global, regional levels and national levels in GEF and Special Programme projects (Examples 5,6,7). In some cases, the transition to a more regionalised approach has been a challenge for some developing countries whose near-term funding at national level has not met their expectations (Examples 7).

18. **Finding 4: Instrumental uses.** There is evidence that the integrated approach is explicitly implemented as an activity by some national governments in certain fora and in the project funding review procedures (Examples 8 and 9) to shape financing flows and reduce duplication, as per intended implementation for sustainable and predictable funding. However, deliberate instrumental use of the integrated approach by national governments at scale in to trigger new financial and in-kind participation of industry and other partners is not strongly evidenced. This is partly a result of no data collection on implementation at these levels⁹. However, some stakeholders also refer to barriers like the vagueness of what it means to implement the integrated approach and perceptions in some developing countries that it is only for developed countries as a way of implementing their own chemicals and waste programmes and organising their donor contributions. One interviewee reflected: “we have this [integrated approach] for over half a decade. We need to not just to communicate around it. It has to be operationalised in countries by countries. There needs to be a stronger sense of ownership across the board”.

19. **Finding 5: Conceptual uses.** Though this is not a specific intended implementation of the integrated approach, the integrated approach is used to conceptualise financing challenges and actions in some sections of the chemicals and waste community. Those who were part of the original UN Environment Programme consultative process and conventions synergies process (which happened in parallel, with a lot of cross-fertilisation) share the integrated approach as a common idea. Over time, this conceptual influence may be waning. Not all stakeholders consider their actions on financing to be connected to the integrated approach (Example 3). Though as one stakeholder who was part of the consultative process reflects: “Perhaps no one outside of the process itself knows what the integrated approach is, per se, or uses the term. But they do use and implement ‘mainstreaming’ and ‘industry involvement’”.

C. **Evaluator’s comment: Is the integrated approach being implemented as intended?**

20. There is evidence to support a conclusion that the integrated approach is being implemented as intended, broadly speaking, though instrumental use in countries is less developed than appears to have been expected in 2013. The examples explored suggest multiple stakeholders are involved and the three components are being developed simultaneously with linkages and synergies in certain cases. Decisions are being made on the basis of or at least referencing the integrated approach. Requests to national governments, international development organisations and agencies, and the private sector have been made but have not always had the desired response. Funding is being provided both by donor and recipient countries for the implementation of the elements of institutional strengthening set through the Special programme but not enough possibly given the “sustainability and predictability” requirement. The establishment by “the GEF Council and the GEF Assembly of a revised integrated focal area on chemicals and waste, including the proposed characteristics of the focal area, with new and additional resources being provided through the replenishment process” has occurred, though it is not possible to conclude that this was driven exclusively by the integrated approach. The integrated approach has had a strong conceptual influence that perhaps was not considered in setting expectations for implementation in 2013. One stakeholder refers to the integrated approach as an idea “ahead of its time” considering that it was discussed and formulated ahead of the Sustainable Development Goals.

⁹ There are some relevant indicators in existing reporting systems but no data could be found to evidence progress at the time of this evaluation. For example, the GEF Chemicals and Waste tracking tool 2015: “Indicator 6.1: The extent to which countries have successfully mainstreamed chemical priorities into national budgets.1” – reporting column is marked NA, presumably for “Not Available”

IV. Outcomes review 2014-2018

21. Recalling that this evaluation can, at best, infer contribution of the integrated approach to desired outcomes of guiding questions for evaluating whether or not the expected impacts of the integrated approach are being observed are:

- (a) What is the intended outcome and impact of the integrated approach?
- (b) Are financial flows to sound management of chemicals and waste increasing? Are there examples of institutional strengthening emerging?
- (c) Is the integrated approach contributing? How?

A. What is the intended outcome and impact of the integrated approach?

22. While not articulated in terms of formal expected outcomes or impacts in GC27/7, the intention appears to have been to trigger change in funding priority, approach, policy, practices or other behaviours that could reasonably be expected to result in: (i) **Increased mobilisation of financial or in-kind resources**, dedicated specifically to sound management of chemicals and waste for the long-term and at all levels; and (ii) **Institutional strengthening for implementation** of sound management of chemicals and waste at regional, national and sub-national governmental levels, in private sector operations and in civil society actions for the long-term and at all levels.

B. Are financial flows to sound management of chemicals and waste increasing?

23. Table 2. gives some illustration of the evolution in funding made available to implementers of sound management of chemicals and waste that since 2013. An important caveat is that much of the necessary information to compile a robust assessment of funding trends is not available at the time of writing this report. Most notably, the table does not include an analysis of co-finance leveraged through the QSP, Special Programme and GEF grants. However, it provides a basic understanding from which the state of financial flows to sound management of chemicals and waste can be evaluated. Further evaluative work on the integrated approach – and the real state of financing for sound management of chemicals and waste – could be undertaken in future.

Table 2: Overview of known financial flows to sound management of chemicals and waste under the integrated approach components

Year	(a) Mainstreaming		(b) Industry involvement	(c) Dedicated External Financing		
	New and additional national budget allocations (US\$)	Leveraged co-financing arrangements (US\$)	Annual SAICM industry contribution (EUR) ^a	QSP (US\$) / Special Programme seed funding (US\$) ^b	Annualised average committed per 5-year GEF cycle, (US\$)	Other bilateral sources (US\$)
Baseline: 2013	Unknown	Unknown	150,000	3,743,07	84,000,000 (GEF-5)	Unknown
2014	Unknown	Unknown	150,000	929,939	84,000,000 (GEF-5)	Unknown
2015	Unknown	Unknown	150,000	QSP closed SP established	110,000,000 (GEF-6)	Unknown
2016	Unknown	Unknown	150,000	1,750,000 (7 projects)	110,000,000 (GEF-6)	Unknown
2017	Unknown	Unknown	150,000	5,096,735 (17 projects)	110,000,000 (GEF-6)	Unknown
2018	Unknown	Unknown	150,000	- ^c	110,000,000 (GEF-6)	Unknown
2019	Unknown	Unknown	150,000	4,703,849 (18 projects)	131,000,000 (GEF-7 ^d)	Unknown

^a Does not include Responsible Care operations costs, or costs to implement Responsible Care in member companies, nor ad-hoc financial and in-kind contributions or voluntary actions that are taking place.

^b Does not include co-financing contributions leveraged by or operations costs of the Special Programme.

^c No projects approved in 2018. 4th Executive Board meeting was postponed to early 2019

^d Final allocations within each focal area will be determined by country demand. Projections are indicative. pg13 GEF/R.7/22

Mainstreaming

24. To the best of the knowledge of the stakeholders interviewed, there is no ongoing, scaled monitoring of the financial and in-kind contributions being triggered by the various mainstreaming (but not limited to). This includes the reporting through the SAICM progress report process which does not provide such information: (i) Development assistance programmes and other bilateral agreements that result in resource mobilization by national governments for sound management of chemicals and waste in recipient countries; (ii) Synergy funding from inter-ministerial action on and joint financing of sound chemicals and waste management activities in-country; and (iii) Other co-financing partnerships with the private sector, research educations, and civil society groups resulting in financial and/or in-kind contributions in-country that support implementation of national actions and/or reduces cost burdens on national budgets. Examples are available of what the ambitions could look like in future (*See* Appendix 3, Examples 5, 6, 9, 10). However, because these are not available in a more aggregated form, these contributions are listed as “unknown” in Table 2 above.

Industry involvement

25. Industry is one of the non-government contributions to the SAICM secretariat. The industry stakeholder interviewed suggested that “because of SAICM, industry is at the table and it is much easier to make partnerships [with national governments]. However, not all resulting activities are being tracked and evaluated. There is not enough clarity or agreement on what should count or be sought as industry contributions, and no concerted effort seems underway to resolve this. Similar to the mainstreaming data gaps, understanding exactly how industry might be participating at national level (tax, implementation of sound management of chemicals and waste legislation, public-private partnerships on infrastructure, capacity development) and the financial mobilisation outcomes of this participation is not currently possible. For this reason, these contributions are listed as “unknown” in Table 2 above.

Dedicated external finance

26. The Special Programme is enjoying funding success in its early years, however there is a recognised need to go beyond the traditional donor base, which was effectively inherited from the QSP. Successful award of a Special Programme project requires a minimum of 25% co-financing from the applicant country. So far, the trend has shown 100% co-financing is common¹⁰. The Argentina model of national government and private sector co-financing partnership, and its resulting success in securing co-financing letters of support from private sector for a forthcoming GEF-7 application (Appendix 3, Example 10) is a taste of what leveraging outcomes might become the standard to strive for in future Special Programme projects.

27. Table 3 shows the evolution of GEF financing to chemicals and waste over time. GEF-5 focussed on POPs and ODS. In GEF-6, the Chemicals and Waste strategy sought to support the development of enabling environments, economic models and financial mechanisms for sound management of chemicals and waste. In GEF-7, more emphasis is placed on sustainable production and consumption including stronger private sector engagement and sustainable financing at the national level. GEF replenishments are leading to increased funding share for the Chemicals and Waste focal area, largely reflecting growing implementation of the Minamata Convention. GEF-7 also sees the creation of proposed Impact Programs, two of which (out of three) promising to deliver on chemicals and waste outcomes. However, actual financial contributions to sound management of chemicals and waste activities are unclear as yet. Co-financing outcomes for GEF-6 in the chemicals and waste portfolios are recorded at 3.1 billion leveraged in financial and in-kind contributions from a range of stakeholders, but most notably from the private sector.¹¹

28. A number of stakeholders interviewed mentioned other potential sources of dedicated external financing – particularly bilateral funding – that might serve both catalytic and instrumental implementation uses. For this reason, these contributions are listed in Table 2 above.. However, because of the original definition of the integrated approach explicitly mentions the GEF and the Special Programme, these other sources not being recognised sufficiently as being part of, or the product of, the integrated approach amongst key constituencies.

¹⁰ Special Programme 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th Executive Board reports

¹¹ GEF programming documents and performance reports Available at

: http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/GEF.A6.07_OPS6.pdf

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF-5_FOCAL_AREA_STRATEGIES.pdf

<https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF-6%20Programming%20Directions.pdf>

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/GEF-7%20Resource%20Allocation%20and%20Targets%20-%20GEF_R.7_22.pdf

Table 3: Overview of the evolution in GEF Chemicals and Waste

	GEF-5 2010-2014	GEF-6 2014-2018	GEF-7* 2019-2023	TOTALS (2010-2023)
GEF replenishment Chemicals and Waste Focal Area Envelope (US\$, millions)	420	554	655	1,629
Share of total fund	10.00%	12.50%	14.48%	
Stockholm / Persistent organic pollutants	375	375	392	1,142
Montreal / Ozone depleting substances	25	25	25	75
Sound chemicals management and mercury reduction				
SAICM (and mercury until GEF-6 cycle)	20	13	13	46
Minamata	0	141	225	366
Impact programmes (by chemicals and waste targets) (US, millions)				
9. Chemicals of global concern reduced or eliminated (1,000 metric tons)				
Food, Land-use and restoration (US\$470m)	n.a.	n.a.	**	**
Sustainable Cities (US\$ 170 million)	n.a.	n.a.	0	0
Sustainable Forest Management in Major Biomes (US\$ 285 million)	n.a.	n.a.	**	**
10. POPs to air reduced or avoided (gTEQ)				
Food, Land-use and restoration (US\$470m)	n.a.	n.a.	0	0
Sustainable Cities (US\$ 170 million)	n.a.	n.a.	**	**
Sustainable Forest Management in Major Biomes (US\$ 285 million)	n.a.	n.a.	0	0
*Final allocations within each focal area will be determined by country demand, and the line-item projections are therefore only indicative. pg13 GEF/R.7/22				
**Chemicals and Waste impact is expected (in terms of metric ton reductions) but not clear as to how much of the impact programme funding is being allocated to safe chemicals use or sound management of chemicals and waste activities)				
Source documents				
https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF-5_FOCAL_AREA_STRATEGIES.pdf				
https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF-6%20Programming%20Directions.pdf				
https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/GEF-7%20Resource%20Allocation%20and%20Targets%20-%20GEF_R.7_22.pdf				

C. Are there examples of institutional strengthening emerging?

29. It is relatively early days for the Special Programme, with most of its projects not yet through full implementation. However, as one example, having successfully received funds from the pilot round of applications from the Special Programme, Benin used their new capacity to draft a project proposal under the Minamata Convention Specific International Programme [SIP] which was also approved for funding. A quote the Benin focal point: "...under this last [SIP] project, Benin used the capacities acquired during the drafting of the Special Programme." (Appendix 3, Example 5)

30. The GEF move towards a regional approach is regional networks, facilitating knowledge exchange and efficient use of technical capacity (Example 7). The GEF-7 co-financing policy also presents a new categorisation of co-financing modalities and models that disaggregates source of co-financing by actor type. This may not be a direct result of the integrated approach, but it speaks to its call to understand and document industry involvement better. This is potentially a key driver for a more comprehensive implementation of the integrated approach in future given that it will be clear who is, and is not, participating in meeting GEF co-financing requirements.¹²

D. Evaluator's Comment: Is the integrated approach contributing to financing and institutional strengthening outcomes? How?

31. In the case of the Special Programme, progress on resource mobilisation and institutional strengthening can be seen in the early examples emerging from the programme; and because the Special Programme was set up as a direct implementation of the integrated approach, the contribution is clear. Even if the exact nature of the integrated approach's influence on the evolutions in the GEF Chemicals and Waste focal area is not understood in the same way by all stakeholders, the results being observed is what was originally intended as an outcome by the integrated approach. While some data and evidence exists but due to the lack of baseline, indicators and verification methods, mainstreaming and industry involvement financing and institutional strengthening outcomes are difficult to evaluate.

¹² GEF-7 Co-financing policy changes were shared in a stakeholder interview.

V. Lessons learned

32. Stakeholder assessments¹³ of what is effective or less effective in the integrated approach are used to distill some key lessons and identify elements that to be strengthened to improve delivery.

A. What is working well in the integrated approach?

33. Stakeholders identified five key areas that are working well for implementation and intended outcomes of the integrated approach, and are relayed in their voice:

(a) The direct access to funds for developing country governments provided by the Special Programme is working.

(b) The connection between health and chemicals and waste issues, and chemicals and trade, seems to be an effective entry point at national levels.

(c) The integrated approach is raising awareness about the financing needs of developing countries and it does have the support of some key development partners for those countries.

(d) The integrated approach is generating new commitments to creating new institutions and enhanced capacities for sound management of chemicals and waste through the Special Programme. For example, there are stated objectives for establishing national level capacities on chemicals and waste in Special Programme projects.

(e) Good examples of multi-stakeholder participation and coordination are emerging, with some evidence of more strategically designed projects and implementation coherence. Real outcomes will have to be assessed in future, but it is promising. Examples include GEF GOLD Program and the SAICM project on emerging policy issues and knowledge management (Appendix 3, Examples 6, 11).

B. What is less effective in the integrated approach?

34. Six key areas that are less effective for the implementation and intended outcomes of the integrated approach were identified by stakeholders, and are relayed in their voice:

(a) Financial allocations to the chemicals and waste agenda are growing, but not at the rate expected. Moreover, while the funding base remains somewhat stable is not expanding significantly beyond the traditional donors. In some cases, existing donors have shifted their contributions between a growing number of financial mechanisms. So, while the landscape for financing sound management of chemicals and waste has diversified, it has also become more complex and competitive.

(b) There are good examples of industry involvement emerging but the experiences are not being pooled and synthesised to create replicable models that explicitly address equity considerations, perceived institutional barriers and ethical concerns. We do not have a clear and shared idea of what successful industry involvement should look like in its mechanisms or in its financial or in-kind contribution outcomes as yet.

(c) Civil society has lost out from the closure of the QSP to which civil society could apply for funding. The Special Programme does not consider CSOs as an institution for implementation and this has generated concerns among civil society organizations.

(d) There is a perception in some developing country governments that the integrated approach is mainly for developed countries towards encouraging greater financing commitments from the traditional donors. Political will is needed at national level in developing countries to implement the integrated approach, in particular mainstreaming but ownership may be lacking.

(e) Links to other focal areas and clusters in GEF and in the Sustainable Development Goals that could result in new finance sources are not being adequately explored. Is the integrated approach, as it is currently defined, stifling our creativity?

(f) After only three years of operations, some outcomes expected by stakeholders are not being met by the Special Programme as yet. Sustainability concerns are present because in some cases national government staff are still paid by project money and when that is over, capacity is lost.

¹³ Elicited through stakeholder interviews and a mini-workshop held with three representatives of UN Environment Programme and SAICM on 7 February 2019 (see Appendix 2 for the lessons learning discussion plan).

C. Five key lessons on achievements and challenges

35. Five key lessons were identified by stakeholders, and are relayed in their voice:

(a) The experience of the GEF and the Special Programme shows how money acts as a “centre of gravity”, focussing partnerships, project structures and reporting mechanisms. We need other centres of gravity to strengthen cooperation and implementation of the integrated approach. Focussing on impact, showing how the strategic objectives of other programmes and projects can be achieved through implementation of the integrated approach, and the chemicals and waste agenda more broadly, might provide an alternative focus.

(b) Being an environment-focussed organisation, and being hosted in such an organisation in the case of Chemicals and Waste-related conventions, means our national governments focal points are also typically environment-focussed, i.e. in Ministries of Environment. This has contributed to a lack of exposure for the chemicals and waste agenda in line ministries for planning, finance, trade and economic development and perhaps fewer “doors opening” in international and regional development banks. Others are not perceiving the chemicals and waste agenda as an integrated agenda.

(c) The experience of the Special Programme shows it takes time and a concerted effort on trust-building in order to mobilise the desired scale of finance. Early on, we had feedback that donors would like to support the Special Programme but it is challenging to ask for money from finance ministries for something that does exist yet or does not have a long track record. Demonstrating best use of resources, efficient running of secretariat, openness and transparency are key for future activities.

(d) When it comes to industry involvement, we have been interpreting this as the chemicals industry and focussing on this part of the private sector exclusively. Could we expand beyond that into high-intensity chemicals users in the value chain, and downstream retailers?

(e) The integrated approach is not clearly linked to on-the-ground outcomes for environment and health. As a result, the impact story is weak. This contributes to misinterpretations about what the integrated approach is and achieves. The Special Programme is clearly defined; but other elements of the integrated approach are being lost. Moreover, without definitions of what social, environmental and economic outcomes and impacts could be expected from the integrated approach its relevance is unclear for national governments, private sector and other stakeholders.

D. Key areas to strengthen based on these lessons

36. For these lessons to be learned, we should strengthen:

(a) The chemicals and waste agenda in the implementation of the 2030 Sustainable Development agenda, beyond the current focus on SDG12. In developing future policy approaches, in particular mainstreaming and national action, real and effective linkages need to be made to integrating mechanisms like UNDAFs.

(b) Interagency collaboration and multi-stakeholder cooperation to create other “centres of gravity” linked to environmental impact social impact we want and to increase our knowledge about and inclusion in other outside processes (not just IOMC).

(c) Monitoring and evaluation, and communication about what the integrated approach is and what the value-added of participating in its implementation for national governments, private sector and CSOs.

E. Barriers

37. Key barriers to be considered are:

(a) Certain key constituencies do not consider themselves implementers of the integrated approach. For example, some IOMC organisations seem originally to have it as a source of funding for their programmes. When no funding appeared, the integrated approach ceased to be relevant to them. Similarly, mindset shifts are going to be necessary to move from “grant recipient” to a “resource mobilisation” mentality in some national governments. Moreover, as new people enter into the chemicals and waste community, awareness about the integrated approach as a holistic umbrella is dissipating.

(b) Some stakeholders hold the assumption that the integrated approach would stay static as it was originally formulated. In reality, the approach is evolving as it is practised. That is beneficial because it shows the governance realities the integrated approach is operating in and how the approach has to be adapted. Changing towards an iterative approach for the integrated approach might be a challenge however.

(c) Austerity impacts are still being felt in financing flows.

VI. Recommendations

A. Main findings: Does the available evidence support the contribution narrative?

38. **Where intentions and directions were specific, the integrated approach is being implemented as intended and it is yielding results that are consistent with the contribution narrative proposed in Section II.B above.** Special Programme outcomes, such as they are after only three years of operations, can be attributed to the integrated approach. Contributions can be inferred for evolutions and outcomes on the GEF Chemicals and Waste Focal Area, but this requires further exploration given the perception of some stakeholders that the integrated approach has little to do with the GEF. Neither outcomes, nor the contributions to these by the integrated approach, can be sufficiently evaluated for mainstreaming and industry involvement.

39. **The basic idea underpinning integrated approach is correct and targets the very real and continuing challenge of adequate financing for sound management of chemicals and waste. However, it needs to be fully operationalised at national level.** The three components of the approach are the obvious pathways for achieving the intended outcomes on resource mobilisation and institutional strengthening. How to make the approach operational at national and subnational levels is the question to be addressed by future implementation of the integrated approach. There was a lot of goodwill and ownership for the integrated approach built through the consultative process on financing; this is dissipating in some cases because of lack of communication on the integrated approach and clear, ongoing demonstration of its value-add to developing country national governments, private sector and civil society groups.

40. **A more strategic and programmatic approach among all stakeholders on the implementation of the integrated approach could further enhance progress in certain areas of the integrated approach, as well as outcome and impact monitoring and assessment that could help with strategic decision making on future implementation.** There are two major issues in this regard: (i) the integrated approach is not clearly and consistently defined and used by all stakeholders as an approach; and (ii) because there is no dedicated programme on the integrated approach that defines expected outcomes and impacts and resources monitoring, progress is difficult to measure and evaluate.

B. Recommended actions for consideration

41. **Recommended action 1.** One stakeholder comments: "If the integrated approach could trigger specific action on including chemicals and waste in national UNDAFs, then no other approach is needed." This is a good moment for action on this given the UN reform process, and the fact that BRS Conventions have already begun some activities in this regard. The UN Environment Programme, in cooperation with relevant IOMC organizations, through appropriate multi-stakeholder process, could:

(a) Formulate an approach on how the integrated approach whereby through its next iteration specific expected outcomes for mainstreaming are established for United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks.

(b) Review capacities and procedures required to achieve this outcome with all relevant stakeholders.

(c) Give guidelines to national governments on language to be used in mentioning and setting targets for sound management of chemicals and waste in UNDAFs

(d) Make a formal request to donors to make an overt signal that chemicals and waste are a fundable component of development plans in fora and language that does not violate country-driven process but does give support to line ministries responsible for chemicals and waste issues to approach national line ministries for planning and finance with requests to insert specific mention and targets for chemicals and waste.

(e) Choose a small number of influential national test cases and document the process and lessons learned carefully so that a procedure could be institutionalised thereafter for scaled implementation.

42. **Recommended action 2.** The UN Environment Programme could prepare an updated guidance on the integrated approach in recognition that the integrated approach is an evolving idea, including:

(a) Clarifying different possible co-financing modalities with all stakeholders for the next iteration and giving an explicit extended definition of elements of dedicated external financing that are implied in the current common usage of the integrated approach as a concept, but have not been established in normative or strategic mandates. For example, the Specific International Programme of the Minamata Convention, bilateral funding; particular forms of industry contributions, including in-

kind; financial and in-kind, from chemicals CSOs and other sectors than chemicals and waste, i.e. biodiversity conservation, health sectors.

(b) Guidelines for industry involvement, identifying particular opportunities where there is an economic case for participation of the industry in clean-up and other activities on sound management of chemicals and waste.

(c) Proposed solutions to address civil society financing concerns, for example, raising awareness and enhance capacity on accessing the GEF small grants programme; changing Special Programme grants to include the possibility of sub-grants to CSOs.

(d) Commission studies as background research to this action on:

(i) Establishing a baseline against which the next iteration of the integrated approach can be evaluated.

(ii) Market-based instruments for cost internalisation and incentives for sustainable consumption and production, particularly for green chemistry investments.

43. **Recommended action 3.** Establish a multi-stakeholder task force to define expected outcomes and the value-add of the integrated approach, and set standards and mechanisms for testing these.

44. **Recommended action 4.** Identify a clear hub for strategic and technical guidance to countries and other stakeholders on implementing the integrated approach to financing, with clearly defined execution roles and resources.

45. **Recommended action 5.** Re-frame the narrative around the integrated approach as a contribution to the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda. The integrated approach fits strongly with approaches sought through the SDGs. The climate provided by the 2030 Agenda means now is the time where its full potential can be more fully developed and exploited. Supporting actions would include:

(a) Commission a study on chemicals and waste financing links across the SDGs

(b) Strengthen engagement at the High-Level Political Forum aiming to support the efforts of the recently established High Ambition Alliance on Chemicals and Waste.

(c) Secure a resolution for the above action under ICCM5.

46. **Recommended action 6.** Recognise the role of UN as intermediary in how financing flows may need to change and focus instead on strengthening the enabling conditions for increased sustainable and predictable finance to sound management of chemicals and waste through actions like:

(a) Convening stakeholders on UNDAFs and the chemicals and waste agenda

(b) Map current private sector partnerships with the UN and develop from that learning on how these are governed and how they function in practice

(c) Focus on brokering co-financing relationships between:

(i) Private sector and national governments, acting as verifier and third-party ethics safeguard;

(ii) Private sector and civil society groups, acting as verifier and third-party ethics safeguard;

(iii) Regional development banks and national governments on chemicals and waste infrastructure investments.

47. **Recommended action 7.** The SAICM secretariat has emerged as one key broker in the integrated approach through their explicit inclusion of the idea in its guidance to SAICM stakeholders on implementing the overall Strategic Approach. Review and assess a potential role for SAICM as a broker for implementation of the integrated approach in parallel with the intersessional process, including the technical capacity required to fulfil such a role.

48. **Recommended action 8.** Review reporting requirements and strengthen existing monitoring, evaluation and learning strategies and approaches for the implementation of the integrated approach in UN Environment Programme and the Chemicals and Waste Conventions. The changes in co-financing policy in GEF-7 is an opportunity in this regard.

APPENDIX 1: Evaluator's terms of reference

Terms of Reference

EVALUATION OF THE INTEGRATED APPROACH TO FINANCING SOUND MANAGEMENT OF CHEMICALS AND WASTE

Mission

History of the integrated approach to the financing of sound management of chemicals and waste. The integrated approach as adopted by UNEA can be found in document "Consultative process on financing options for chemicals and waste: implementation of Governing Council decisions SS.XI/8, 26/7 and SS.XII/4 : Report of the Executive Director: UNEP/GC.27/7".

Assignment mandate

The mandate for this assignment comes from Governing Council decision 27/12 and in particular paragraph 60 which states the following:

60. Requests the Executive Director to facilitate an evaluation of the implementation of the integrated approach, which should be done in cooperation with all relevant stakeholders and submit the evaluation, including recommendations, within six years for consideration by the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum, the relevant COPs and ICCM5;

As GC/27 took place in 2013, the requirement is that the above report is submitted within six years, i.e. 2019 at UNEA4.

Objectives

The purpose of the evaluation is to:

- Provide further clarity, as needed, on the intended impacts the integrated approach as they were being implemented from 2014 to end 2018.
- Establish a baseline for 2013 and evaluate current implementation modalities and impacts, with evidentiary support from 2014 to end 2018.
- Provide input to integrated approach partners by identifying gaps and possible options for future implementation.
- Provide recommendations on how to further strengthen the integrated approach for enhanced impact at the global, regional and national level.

The primary end users of the evaluation are the United Nations Environment Assembly, United Nations Environment Programme, though all stakeholders in the integrated approach should find value in the analysis.

Main tasks

An independent external consultant will lead the evaluation under the overall guidance of the Chemicals and Health Branch, UN Environment Programme. The consultant will work with relevant stakeholders.

The evaluation will be based on evidence from written materials provided by the Chemicals and Health Branch and other stakeholders and interviews. Written materials will include the founding documents of the integrated approach, key partners at UN Environment Programme, SAICM Secretariat, GEF Secretariat, Special Programme staff, in the Chemicals and Waste related Conventions, in national governments and in civil society organisations. Other documents will be made available as requested.

It is anticipated that the evaluation will include interviews with UN Environment Programme staff, Chemicals and Waste related conventions secretariat staff, an ICCA representative and a civil society representative. The evaluator will, at his or her discretion, also conduct interviews with any available relevant stakeholder identified in the course of the assignment.

The evaluation is expected to begin in mid-January 2019 and conclude by 15 February 2019, at the latest. The main tasks include:

1. Carrying out and drafting the evaluation of the implementation of the integrated approach, which should be done in cooperation with all relevant stakeholders and submit the evaluation, including recommendations, within six years for consideration by the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum, the relevant COPs and ICCM5.
2. Carrying out the necessary desk-based research relevant to the evaluation, including reviewing UNEA 2 report (attached) and input that is to be received from stakeholders in the implementation of the integrated approach (NB Information on the implementation of component on 'dedicated external financing', i.e. GEF and the Special Programme is easily available from the GEF Secretariat and from the Special Programme secretariat within UN Environment Chemicals and Health Branch).
3. Conducting telephone and in-person interviews.
4. Preparing and presenting recommendations for consideration at UNEA.
5. Facilitating a lessons learning discussion with the Chemicals and Health Branch and others.
6. Compile all documents used in the evaluation.

Expected Deliverables:

By 6 February: An appropriate evaluation framework give the context and purpose

On 8 February: A 10-12 page INF document for submission to UNEA4, with further detail in appendices as appropriate. At least 2 pages will contain recommendations for potential actions to improve the implementation of the integrated approach to financing in the chemicals and waste cluster.

On 8 February: A message to the defined stakeholder group to accompany the evaluation report send out, seeking feedback.

Before 15 February: Conduct any necessary follow up, including preparing a final document compilation that may be useful to the Chemicals and Health Branch and others in future evaluations of the integrated approach.

Scope:

Max. 10 days

APPENDIX 2: Methods, data sources and lessons learning procedures

The integrated approach is not a formal programme with specific goals, objectives, targets, agreed measurements, or monitoring and ongoing evaluation procedures to rely upon for a full evaluation. As such, the independent consultant applied the following approach:

- 1) Establish an evaluation framework and an approximate baseline for the integrated approach in 2013, using the following documents:
 - The original decision: UNEP/GC.27/17: Decision 27/12: Chemicals and waste management, VIII, para.18; and its supporting documents:
 - Consultative process on financing options for chemicals and waste: final report on the implementation of Governing Council decisions SS.XI/8 and 26/7. UNEP/GCSS.XII/8.
 - Documents on mainstreaming provided by UN Environment Programme staff.
- 2) Conduct a desktop review of the following documents to review reported implementation modalities and activities in mainstreaming, industry involvement and/or dedicated external financing:
 - Formal progress reports
 - Relevant project documents, progress reports and final reports for GEF, Special Programme, Quick Start Programme (until 2015) strategies, project portfolios and selected example projects.
 - Earlier evaluations for SAICM, GEF co-financing Quickstart Programme.
- 3) Elicit stakeholder perspectives through:
 - 9 stakeholder interviews using the evaluation framework as the guiding set of questions for a semi-structured discussion with staff in UN Environment Programme, SAICM secretariat; GEF (Chemicals and Waste), Special Programme; BRS Conventions staff; an ICCA representative; and an IPEN representative.
 - In collaboration with UN Environment Programme staff, a call for written perspectives on this evaluation report was requested of stakeholders.
- 4) Facilitated a facilitated “lessons learning” discussion with UN Environment Programme, SAICM and Special Programme representatives. Lesson learned processes are best guided by a set of structured questions to elicit the most critical lessons and generate learning that should be applicable in more than a singular instance. The session plan for this discussion is shared below:

Lessons learning on the integrated approach to financing sound management of chemicals and waste

7 February 2019

Introduction

- Purpose: Lessons learning on the implementation of the integrated approach to financing sound management of chemicals and waste. Why do it in a group?
- What and who is actually being evaluated...
- Roles for each of us for the next 1.5 hours

Harvesting lessons

Thinking about how you understand the integrated approach and how you observe it being used:

- *Step 1: Think of one contribution it SHOULD be making to:*
 - Increasing finance allocations to sound management of chemicals and waste
 - Strengthening the institutions for sound management of chemicals and waste
- *Step 2: Thinking of the specific contribution you have in mind:*
 - What is working? Write 3 responses on separate post-its
 - What is not working? Write 3 responses on separate post-its
 - Synthesis exercise: “Snap!”
 - Keep adding post-its; cluster observations
- *Step 3: Roundtable*
 - What steps are being taken to address some challenges raised?
 - What barriers are blocking progress?

Open reflection

- What is your major take away lesson?
- What would have to change in order to show that this lesson has been learned?

APPENDIX 3: Implementation examples

Example 1: BRS Conventions →welcomes and takes note of the Governing Council Decision 27/7 → invites implementation of the integrated approach at the BRS Second simultaneous extraordinary meetings 28 April-10 May 2013.

The near collapse of the Stockholm Convention in 2009 was one trigger for the UN Environment Programme consultative process on finance for sound management of chemicals and waste. The integrated approach, at that time, was seen as a way of taking an approach that was going nowhere and put it into a larger approach. It was promising as a solution for a specific problem that was being experienced in the conventions; and this led to the BRS Conventions welcoming the integrated approach and “inviting governments, relevant organizations and entities and other stakeholders to apply an integrated approach to financing sound management of chemicals and waste”¹⁴. In terms of the outcomes today, there is a perception that this invitation had no real impact on financing actions at national level. Implementation of the integrated approach happens within the BRS Convention, i.e. in their action to increase visibility and impact for the chemicals and waste focal area within GEF, not the actual national governments.

Example 2: SAICM Overall Orientation and Guidance for Achieving the 2020 Goal voluntary tool¹⁵ → invites implementation of the integrated approach specific → gives guidance to SAICM stakeholders on mainstreaming, industry involvement and seeking dedicated external financing.

Paragraphs 83.-87 in SAICM/OEWG.2/13* illustrates how the integrated approach is being used to guide action by SAICM Stakeholders at regional, national and subnational levels. It is difficult to know what is actually happening on the ground but the clear intention is to support national efforts on mainstreaming and institutional strengthening outcomes, as well as releasing new financing.¹⁶

Example 3: BRS Conventions →cites the Governing Council Decision 27/7 in 2013→ invitation to revise the GEF Chemicals and waste focal area.

The GEF was named explicitly as a means of implementing the integrated approach in the Governing Council decision 27/7 in the expected action (d) leading to a broader treatment of financing sound management of chemicals and waste. The BRS Conventions specifically invited the GEF, in the context of preparing for their 6th replenishment process [hereafter: GEF-6] to *revise its focal area structure and strategy in order to address the chemicals and waste agenda, and consider ways of further strengthening its relations with the conventions it serves as a financial mechanism*.¹⁷ However, stakeholders suggest that the cumulative effect of SAICM and then the later Minamata Convention being included under the GEF mechanism that actually triggered the evolution in the GEF Chemicals and Waste focal area structure and strategy.

Example 4: Governing Council Decision 27/7 → UNEA.1 Resolution 1/5 → Establishment of the Special Programme.

The establishment of the Special Programme is a direct result of the integrated approach. The Special Programme was established by UNEA 1/5 and this resolution contains a reference to the integrated approach. The Special Programme is intended to support institutional strengthening at the national level for implementation of the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Waste and Their Disposal, the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade, the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, the Minamata Convention on Mercury and the Strategic Approach, “including through mainstreaming and the financing of all aspects of chemicals and waste management”¹⁸.

Example 5: Special Programme→ Benin: Legal and Institutional Strengthening for the Sound Management of Chemicals¹⁹→ Strengthened capacity in project proposal development and resource mobilisation.

This project, launched in 2017, aims to strengthen Benin’s legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks ensure the sound management of chemicals and their waste and meet its obligations under the Stockholm and Basel Conventions. US\$ 250,000 was matched with US\$62,000 from the Government of Benin. Overall, the project progressed well, though with some delays in the adoption of new legislation and some stakeholder resistance. Having successfully received funds from the pilot round of applications from the Special Programme, Benin used their new capacity to draft a project proposal under the Minamata Convention Specific International Programme [SIP] which was also

¹⁴ UNEP/FAO/CHW/RC/POPS/EXCOPS.2/INF/20, Section VIII. Consultative process on financing options for chemicals and waste, para. 43-57.

¹⁵ <http://www.saicm.org/Portals/12/Documents/OOG%20document%20English.pdf>, last accessed 8 February 2019

¹⁶ Requests have been made by SAICM secretariat and the UN Environment Programme Chemicals and Health branch to governments and others to report on their implementation of the integrated approach in early 2019.

¹⁷ Ibid., para. 54

¹⁸ SAICM/OEWG.2/13, para 5.

¹⁹ <https://www.unenvironment.org/explore-topics/chemicals-waste/what-we-do/special-programme/special-programme-projects-database-1>, last accessed 8 February 2019

approved for funding. A quote the Benin focal point: "...under this last [SIP] project, Benin used the capacities acquired during the drafting of the special programme."

Example 6: GEF-6 (Chemicals and Waste Focal Area)→ SAICM Secretariat coordination role in a new global project on emerging chemical policy issues of concern²⁰ → regional approach with 40 countries.

The GEF Secretariat approached the SAICM Secretariat in 2016 expressing a desire for SAICM to take on a coordinator role for a global project on lead in paint to evolve away from a modality of individual small projects in separate countries and towards a more regional and scaled approach. In 2017, a project was launched to accelerate adoption of national and value chain initiatives to control Emerging Policy Issues (EPIs), and contribute to the 2020 SAICM goal and 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The GEF Project Grant of US\$ 8,190,000 is matched with US\$ 21,312,903 of co-financing. SAICM secretariat acts a broker for a joint implementation by 40 countries, enhancing their regional networks, facilitating knowledge exchange and efficient use of technical capacity.

Example 7: Regional implementation of sound management of chemicals and waste→ requests for additional guidance and technical support on financing²¹.

In 2014: African region challenges: Financing was a particular challenge, including with regard to how to involve industry and how to access external funding (para. 20). Asia-Pacific regional meeting had also resulted in the conclusion that limited financial resources and financing mechanisms, a lack of information exchange and a lack of appropriate technical support were significant challenges to achieving the 2020 sound chemicals management goal (para. 21). Regional focal point for Central and Eastern Europe quoted the integrated approach in requesting detailed user-friendly information regarding the procedures for applying for GEF funds for projects in the chemicals and waste focal area as well funds from the special programme. (para. 22). Noting some items that had not been included on the agenda for the current meeting, the Latin American and Caribbean region underscored the need for the Working Group to discuss the financial status of the Strategic Approach and the availability of funds and appropriate financing mechanisms. He said that the overall orientation and guidance document should include financing as a central item over and above the special programme and GEF and should consider whether the Strategic Approach would have financing beyond 2020. (para. 23)

Example 8: Special programme and GEF, BRS/Minamata Conventions joint review procedure→ Reduced duplication

In October 2017, a country project under review at the Minamata Convention SIP programme. There were parts of the project that was ideal for SIP funding; other parts were more suitable under the Special Programme. The prevention of duplication was a successful outcome – an outcome this particular stakeholder attributes to the implementation of the integrated approach as a guiding principle. The conversation between the secretariats, institution-to-institution, has been enabled by the way in which the various financing mechanisms have been designed through the influence of the integrated approach, even if this is not directly viewed or felt by all other stakeholders.

Example 9: Special programme→ Interministerial cooperation and co-financing in Viet Nam → Mainstreaming sound management of chemicals and waste

The Special Programme funds a project on 'Strengthening national capacity in sound chemical and waste management for the implementation of the Stockholm, Basel, Rotterdam, Minamata Conventions, SAICM in Viet Nam' that may be a model for the future. It enhances collaboration between the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment and the Ministry of Industry and Trade to ensure national legislation and institutions are strengthened for implementation of the Chemicals and Waste Conventions. The SP Trust Fund contribution is US\$493,500, which has catalysed US\$656,500 in co-financing for implementing this 2-year project.²²

Example 10: Special programme → Argentina → new Chemicals Directorate and private sector co-financing arrangements outcomes.

The main objective of this project is to generate capacity in the national environmental authority to promote the effective implementation of the Multilateral Environmental Agreements on chemicals and waste and the Strategic Approach for International Chemicals Management considering national needs and priorities and New Emerging Issues. The Special Programme Trust Fund contribution of USD 245,564 was complemented with USD 395,000 of national government and private financing. A second directorate of Substances and Chemical Products was successfully established in March 2018 and has so far been working in with two main action lines: fulfilling international commitments by identifying weaknesses for meeting its obligations under the Basel, Stockholm, Rotterdam and Minamata Conventions; fostering involvement of other Ministries with clear roles and responsibilities; and designing and systematizing processes. In addition, the project earned the support of several governmental and

²⁰ <https://www.thegef.org/project/global-best-practices-emerging-chemical-policy-issues-concern-under-strategic-approach>, last accessed 8 February 2019

²¹ 2014 / SAICM/OEWG.2/13

²² <https://www.unenvironment.org/explore-topics/chemicals-waste/what-we-do/special-programme/special-programme-projects-database-24>

non-governmental actors such as industrial associations, civil society organizations, scientific-academic organizations as well as the Ministries of Production, International Affairs, Work and Health, amongst others. Furthermore, it has established the framework necessary to gain access to financial and other resources for the implementation of instruments available to the Conventions parties.

Example 11: GEF Gold Program²³

The GEF Council approved the global program to address "The Global Opportunities for Long-term Development "GOLD" in the Artisanal Scale Gold Mining (ASGM) sector, including provisions to address mercury pollution from the sector in 2016. The GEF GOLD program has strong private sector engagement, including major jewelers, electronics manufacturers, gold refiners, and potentially commercial banks. The project was launched in 2017 with a US\$ 32,620,000 GEF project grant leveraging US\$ 135,174,956 in co-financing and is implemented by Burkina Faso, Colombia, Guyana, Indonesia, Kenya, Mongolia, Peru, and the Philippines.

²³ <https://www.thegef.org/project/global-opportunities-long-term-development-asgm-sector-gef-gold>, last accessed 10 February 2019.

APPENDIX 4: Evaluator's extended notes on outcome and impact definition for the integrated approach

These notes are shared here as an incomplete starting point for future discussions on performance and impact monitoring, and for future evaluative procedures, for the integrated approach.

In preparing the contribution narrative and evaluation framework for the integrated approach, the evaluator prepared notes based on a reading of the founding documents and discussions with interviewed stakeholders on what might be used to measure mobilisation of financial or in-kind resources, industry involvement and dedicated external financing outcomes and potential impacts. On the ground implementation of new projects is part of the implied impact of the integrated approach but since it was not stated explicitly it was considered outside of the scope of this particular evaluation. However, in future it may gain in importance if the next iteration of the integrated approach focusses on national and sub-national implementation. As such it is included in the below framework.

A multi-stakeholder and synergised implementation of the integrated approach of mainstreaming, industry involvement and dedicated external financing will provide the sufficient enabling conditions for effective financing at different levels and for the long term because its components are used synergistically and by different stakeholders to trigger change in funding priority, approach, policy, practices or other behaviours that could reasonably be expected to result in:

1) **Increased mobilisation of financial or in-kind resources dedicated specifically to sound management of chemicals and waste for the long-term and at all levels that could result from:**

A. Actions to realise mainstreaming of and institutional strengthening for sound management of chemicals and waste, which establishes new stated objectives in key national strategies and therefore enables national budget allocations to chemicals safety and sound management of chemicals and waste in the country, supported with contributions from (but not limited to):

1. Development assistance programmes / bilateral agreements under general budget support approaches or other that results in resource mobilization for sound management of chemicals and waste in recipient countries;
2. Synergy funding from inter-ministerial action on and joint financing of sound chemicals and waste management activities in-country
3. Other co-financing partnerships with the private sector, research educations, and civil society groups resulting in financial and/or in-kind contributions that could include:
 - a) Direct implementation of sound management of chemicals and waste practices in private sector operations that reduces costs in national government budgets
 - b) Direct action on clean-up that reduces costs in national government budgets
 - c) In-kind services
 - d) Education and training
 - e) Research
 - f) ?

B. New forms of industry involvement in (but not limited to):

1. Implementation of legislation and regulations for sound management of chemicals and waste, taxes, rebates (cost sharing of implementation costs, internalisation of previously external costs; responsible services provision)
2. Dialogue (Financing / co-financing of events)
3. Capacity development (Financing / co-financing of events)
4. Development of policies (cost-sharing for research; in-kind capacity contributions)
5. New partnerships (with co-financing arrangements)
6. New voluntary action for sound management of chemicals and waste (Cost sharing or internalisation implementation costs)
7. Investment in green chemistry for design, production and use of products (new investment)
8. ?

C. Allocations of dedicated external finance that result in new financial flows emerging, that are chemicals and waste-specific, from different sources external to national budgets of countries implementing sound management of chemicals and waste initiatives, including, but not limited to:

1. Non-Chemicals and Waste international agencies co-financing
2. Investment by regional development banks
3. New access to credit
4. ?

- 2) **Institutional strengthening** for implementation of sound management of chemicals and waste at regional, national and sub-national governmental levels, in private sector operations and in civil society actions, **as a result of mainstreaming, industry involvement and/or dedicated external finance efforts**, including but not limited to:
- A. Ratification of conventions.
 - B. National focal points , national units.
 - C. National plans and indicators being established or updated. New inter-ministerial national strategies, legislation, regulations for the sound management of chemicals and waste, with budget and capacity that are supported by a diversity of sources (as per the outcome on finance mobilization above).
 - D. Reporting mechanisms being established
 - E. New and measurable capacities
 - F. New synergies [Example: New legislation leading to new collaborations and new financial flows]
 - G. New awareness, culture on and around the integrated approach to financing the sound management of chemicals and waste in the chemicals and waste communities and beyond in key constituencies that are important for the chemicals and waste communities
 - H. ?
- 3) **Increased on-the-ground implementation** catalyzed by but also independent of mainstreaming, industry involvement, and/or dedicated external financing for institutional strengthening, as well as other project-based activities, **for “long term and at all levels”**, including but not limited to:
- A. New financing collaborations and activities (projects, networks, initiatives) dedicated to the sound management of chemicals and waste for the long term
 - B. Companies instituting policies and procedures for chemical safety and sound management of chemicals and waste
 - C. Business creation around responsible chemical and waste management
 - D. National education, training and research programmes established and resourced through local education institutions
 - E. ?

APPENDIX 5: Extended note on main findings

Where intentions and directions were specific, the integrated approach is being implemented as intended and it is yielding some results that are consistent with the contribution narrative proposed in Section II.B above.

Special Programme outcomes, such as they are after only three years of operations, can be attributed to the integrated approach. Contributions can be inferred for evolutions and outcomes on the GEF Chemicals and Waste Focal Area, but this issue further exploration given the perception of some stakeholders that the integrated approach has little to do with the GEF. Neither outcomes, nor the contributions to these by the integrated approach, can be evaluated for mainstreaming and industry involvement.

- The Special Programme was not the focus of this evaluation and will need its own dedicated evaluation process at an appropriate time.
- While the BRS Conventions direction to the GEF²⁴ undoubtedly began a process of consolidation and integration on financing chemicals and waste, is difficult to evaluate the extent to which (if at all) the integrated approach might be contributing to the continued progression towards a more integrated approach on chemicals and waste at GEF. The GEF secretariat are guided by their own strategy at this point and do not lean on the integrated approach to do what they are doing.
- Some definitions and prescriptions for dedicated external finance are overly narrow in the written decisions, even if the original spirit seems to have been always to be open and inclusive as to what this strand of the integrated approach could look like. Moreover, the original framework was open and flexible regarding areas like mainstreaming, industry involvement and other instrumental actions towards sustainable and predictable financing. This has left a lot of latent potential in the integrated approach unexplored.

The basic idea underpinning integrated approach is correct and targets the very real and continuing problem of adequate financing for sound management of chemicals and waste. However, it needs to be operationalised at national level. The three components of the approach are the obvious pathways for achieving the intended outcomes on resource mobilisation and institutional strengthening. How to make the approach operational at national and subnational levels is the question to be addressed by future implementation of the integrated approach.

- The integrated approach is providing a common language and conceptual reference point in formulating new programmes and projects for some people. It served an important purpose even in its formulation in that it gave hope and a new pathway to the chemicals and waste community at a difficult period for the Stockholm Convention. For those who were involved in the consultative process, the integrated approach remains important in their activities. For others, different factors have perhaps been more directly influential, even if the integrated approach process may have been a distant trigger for those factors.
- There was a lot of goodwill and ownership for the integrated approach built through the consultative process on financing; this is dissipating somewhat because of lack of communication on the integrated approach and clear, ongoing demonstration of its value-add to developing country national governments, private sector and civil society groups.

A more strategic and programmatic approach by all stakeholders is needed on the integrated approach to further progress in certain areas, as well as outcome and impact monitoring and assessment that could help with strategic decision making on future implementation. i) the integrated approach is not clearly and consistently defined and used by all stakeholders as an approach; and (ii) because there is no dedicated programme on the integrated approach that defines expected outcomes and impacts and resources monitoring, progress is difficult to measure and evaluate.

- Currently, there are no transparent measurements on financial flows to the sound management of chemicals and waste, beyond the GEF and Special Programme. What bilateral funds are being transferred really? What industry-government partnerships are being formed? What co-financing outcomes are being leveraged from mainstreaming
- Secondly, there is no consensus about what the measure of impact should be for increased mobilisation of financial and in-kind resources, and institutional strengthening; on implementation of sound management and chemicals and waste and intended environmental, social and economic outcomes.