

Management Response: Implementation Plan for Evaluation Recommendations

General Information

Eval ID	686
Evaluation Manager	Myles Hallin
Project Evaluation Title	Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP/GEF project "Development of a Plan for Global Monitoring of Human Exposure to and Environmental Concentrations of Mercury" GEF Id no 5409
PIMS #	
GEF ID	5409
UNEP Sub-programme	SP5 – Chemicals, Waste and Air quality
GEF Focal Area	Chemicals & Waste
Project Manager/ Task Manager	Ludovic Bernaudat; Jacqueline Alvarez
Office/Division	Economy Division
Branch & Unit	Chemicals & Waste
Final PDF Report distributed by Evaluation Office (Date)	09/08/2021
Total # of Recommendations as per Report	3
Implementation Plan Sent to PM/TM (Date)	16/08/2021
Implementation Plan Returned by PM/TM (Date)	17/08/2021
Implementation Plan finalized (if different from the date above)	17/08/2021

Implementation Plan

No	Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation	Recommendation	Priority level	Type of Recommendation	Responsibility	Proposed Implementation time-frame	Acceptance	Reason if not Accepted or Partially Accepted	Management Action(s) to be taken
1	The pilot projects on human biomonitoring were implemented in six countries and were planned to be implemented in seven countries. As Costa Rica did not receive approval to implement the biomonitoring project, this country did finally not participate. In the other six countries the human biomonitoring activities were successfully implemented. Some	UNEP/WHO to follow-up with countries involved in the pilot tests to see what may be further needed for support.	Important	Project	Project Team	Within the next half year	Partially Accepted	Mercury monitoring needs to be aligned with the requirement of the Convention. Otherwise, neither UNEP nor the GEF would have any mandate to work on	Integrate participating laboratories in future Minamata Convention implementation projects.

No	Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation	Recommendation	Priority level	Type of Recommendation	Responsibility	Proposed Implementation time-frame	Acceptance	Reason if not Accepted or Partially Accepted	Management Action(s) to be taken
	<p>respondents to the questionnaire mentioned that they are extending their work on biomonitoring thanks to the capacity built within this project. Respondents also noted that further support is needed from UNEP and WHO in order to sustain the results of the pilot studies, to extend the work or to start human biomonitoring. It can support the sustainability of project results if it is clear what are the current/follow-up needs of the pilot countries involved in this project, for the air monitoring component and specifically the human biomonitoring component. A survey could be organized and a concise report could be prepared to capture the benefits and results of the pilot studies and the follow-up needs.</p>							<p>this topic. So far, the means to assess the effectiveness of the Convention have not been approved by the parties. The aim of this project was to confirm the media to be monitored in the future, to develop Standard Operating Procedures and to build capacity in laboratories. UNEP and WHO will rely on the data provided by the project and integrate the participating laboratories in the projects under development, but no further monitoring project will be developed until mandate is provided by the COP.</p>	
2	<p>Large amounts of co-finance were generated within this project that helped to implement all activities and deliver all outputs. The co-financing table contained total amounts of co-</p>	<p>UNEP should consider documenting co-finance of project activities at a more detailed level. This may help to raise the visibility/validity of partner contributions.</p>	<p>Opportunity for improvement</p>	<p>UNEP-wide</p>	<p>UNEP-wide</p>	<p>In future projects</p>	<p>Accepted</p>		<p>GEF Coordination Office to consider portfolio-wide uniform procedure</p>

No	Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation	Recommendation	Priority level	Type of Recommendation	Responsibility	Proposed Implementation time-frame	Acceptance	Reason if not Accepted or Partially Accepted	Management Action(s) to be taken
	<p>financing and no detail was provided. UNEP requested partner organizations to submit only a total number, and indicated to these organizations what would be regarded as co-finance. Also, some respondents to the questionnaire remarked that they implemented activities making use of other national projects. It is not fully clear if (some of) these projects mentioned by the national focal points are included within the co-finance table of the partner organizations, or that these projects could be considered even as additional co-finance.</p> <p>Providing more detail on co-finance can help to make clear what the co-finance of the organizations consisted of, how it was generated, and in this way contribute to making the co-finance of partner organizations and at national level more visible. It is important to see that organizations, institutions, governments and other (local) stakeholders actively support the project by contributing with finances, time, human resources, and logistics (often making use of other (national) projects). It can also help to raise the interest of new donors that could support mercury monitoring activities.</p> <p>To better capture the full amounts of co-finance provided by UNEP, partner organizations and at national and local level, a co-finance template could be prepared for future projects that would provide better detail and could be easily filled in by the</p>								

No	Challenge/problem to be addressed by the recommendation	Recommendation	Priority level	Type of Recommendation	Responsibility	Proposed Implementation time-frame	Acceptance	Reason if not Accepted or Partially Accepted	Management Action(s) to be taken
	partner organizations and at national/local level.								
3	<p>Although the communication and awareness raising efforts implemented within the project were implemented well, they were implemented ad hoc and not all communication and awareness raising activities planned at project design were fully implemented. Also, communication, awareness raising and outreach activities were not (consistently) monitored or evaluated during project implementation. Respondents and interviewees remarked that (continuous) awareness raising and outreach are essential to raise the profile of the results, and that community sensibilization is needed to have full commitment of all country (and other) stakeholders. Therefore, for future outreach projects, it should be considered to develop a methodical communication strategy and allocate specific budget to implement the strategy.</p>	<p>UNEP should consider preparing a methodical/strategic communication strategy for future outreach projects including budget for the communication activities.</p>	<p>Opportunity for improvement</p>	<p>UNEP-wide</p>	<p>UNEP-wide</p>	<p>In current and future outreach projects</p>	<p>Accepted</p>		<p>Global mercury partnership to consider improving communication on these projects.</p>