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## Project’s basic information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Name** | Environmentally Sound Management of Mercury and Mercury Containing Products and its waste from the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold (MAPE) and Health sectors. |
| PIMS Number / GEF ID | **5484** |
| MTE period of execution | 01/08/18-31/10/18 |
| Report’s date | October 2018 |
| Area of activity / GEF’s strategic program | Pilot sound chemicals management and mercury reduction as well as the FMAM-V Strategy for Mercury programming. |
| Executing Agency | UNDP |
| Implementing Partner | Secretaría de Recursos Naturales y Ambiente (MiAmbiente), through the Centro de Estudios y Control de Contaminantes (CESCCO) and its Departamento de Gestión de Productos Químicos (DGPQ) |
| Acknowledgements | The evaluator would like to thank the entire team of the Project Unit and the technical staff of UNDP Honduras who have facilitated the entire evaluation process in the country and have achieved the expected goals. Likewise, we greatly appreciate the time of all the people interviewed during the visit to Honduras and the time invested by many actors during the preparation of this report. |
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## Acronyms and abbreviations

**Table 1. List of Acronyms**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| AGC | Artisan Gold Council |
| AWP | Annual Work Plan |
| BEP | Best Environmental Practices |
| BAT | Best Available Technologies |
| CDR | Combined Delivery Report |
| CESCCO | Centro de Estudios y Control de Contaminantes |
| CNG | Comisión Nacional para la Gestión Ambientalmente Racional de los Productos Químicos |
| DARA | Dirección Acción de Rentas Aduaneras |
| DGPQ | Departamento de Gestión de Productos Químicos |
| ERM | Environmental Responsible Management |
| GEF | Global Environment Fund |
| HE | Health Establishments |
| HS | Health Secretary |
| HEU | Hospital Escuela Universitario |
| Hg | Mercury |
| HMCR | Hospital Mario Catarino Rivas |
| INHGEOMIN | Instituto Hondureño de Geología y Minas |
| LCFs | Compact Fluorescent Lamps |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MAPE | Artisanal and Small Scale Gold Mining |
| MiAmbiente | Natural Resources and Environment Secretary |
| MdeS | Health Ministry |
| MOU | Memorandum of Understanding |
| MTR | Mid Term Review |
| NGO | Non Governmental Organization |
| PB | Project Board |
| PCO | Project Coordination Office |
| PCU | Project Coordination Unit |
| PIR | Project Implementation Report |
| PPE | Personnel Prevention Equipment |
| PSC | Project Steering Committee |
| ToR | Terms of Reference |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Program |
| UNENVIRONMENT | United Nations Environment Program |
| UNAH | Universidad Autónoma de Honduras |
| WHO | World Health Organization |
|  |  |

## Executive Summary

### Table 2 Project information

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Environmentally Sound Management of Mercury and Mercury Containing Products and its waste from the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold (MAPE) and Health sectors. | | | | |
| UNDP Project ID (PIMS#): | **5229** | PIF Approval date: | | **07th of Octubre, 2013** |
| GEF Project ID (PIMS#): | **5484** | CEO Approval date: | |  |
| ATLAS Project Unit, Case nº; Project ID (Award # Project ID) | **00081014** | Project document signature date (project start date): | | **22nd april, 2015 (Prodoc signature)** |
| Country | **Honduras** | Project Coordinator hiring date: | | **01st June 2016** |
| Region | **LAC** | Inception workshop date | |  |
| Area of activity | **COPS/POPS** | MTR end date: | | **17th august, 2018** |
| GEF Strategic Objective: | **Pilot sound chemicals management and mercury reduction as well as the FMAM-V Strategy for Mercury programming.** | End of Project expected date: | | **April 2019** |
| Trust Fund (indicate GEF TF; LDCF; SCCF; NPIF): | **FMAM Trust Fund** | In case of revision, new expected end of project due date: | | **December 2019** |
| Executing / Implementing Agent | **Natural Resources and Environment Secretary (MiAmbiente+)** |  | |  |
| Implementing partners: | **INHGEOMIN, CESCCO, Health Secretary, UNAH.** |  | |  |
| Project Funding | *CEO approval date (US$)* | | *MTR date (US$)\** | |
| 1. GEF funding | **1,300, 000.00** | | 870,000.00 | |
| 1. UNDP Contribution | **50,000.00** | | 25,000.00 | |
| 1. Government: | **3,784,854.00** | | 2,785,000.00 | |
| 1. Other Partners: | **2,385,000.00** | | 2,345,000.00 | |
| 1. Total cofinancement (2+3+4): | **6,219,854** | | 5,155,000.00 | |
| TOTAL PROJECT COST (1+5): | **7,519,854** | | 6,025,000.00 | |

\*Obtener del último PIR

### Brief Project description

The project "Environmentally Rational Management of Mercury and Mercury-Containing Products and its Wastes from the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining (MAPE) and Health sectors" is an initiative of the Government of Honduras, co-financed by the GEF, UNDP, the Government and the private sector of the Honduran waste sector. The general objective is to support the country to carry out mercury-related assessments and implement mercury activities in the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold and Health Mining areas that can contribute to achieving the objectives of the Minamata Convention, as well as the development of the capacities required in Honduras for the implementation of provisions of the Convention when it enters into force. The project is implemented by UNDP and executed by MiAmbiente according to the NEX implementation modality. Signed in April 2015, it actually came into operation in June 2016, the project document (ProDoc) foresees a duration of 4 years. The project closure is scheduled for April 2019. Table 3 presents the main project information.

### Summary of the project’s progress

The project, which implements the Minamata Agreement, has been running for a total of 48 months. It has made considerable progress in the first two years of implementation, especially in relation to components 1, 2 and 3, exceeding the targets set level of objective indicators and progressing very well with the product’s goals, from the development of socioeconomic baselines in the community of El Corpus in Choluteca, the epidemiological study of the population, the baselines on mercury, the strengthening of CESCCO and INHGEOMIN to perform their duties of monitoring emissions during the first year, and during the second year, planning exercises and preparation of regulatory instruments on the use of mercury at the national level, good practice guides MAPE, training MPA / MTP , the waste management plans in the pilot hospitals, the management plans, the purchase of mercury-free equipment, obtaining or the commitment of the Hospitals Directorates to eliminate mercury and not buy more equipment, the organizational strengthening of the 02 de Julio mining company, the contacts established with the private sector to promote the green gold production chain, the increase in the potential storage of mercury and the analysis at a national level of waste management companies that will be able to treat waste in the long term. More importantly, the project has positioned itself as a benchmark in the environmentally sound management of mercury at the national level, effectively coordinating with public and private actors to achieve its objectives and has managed to communicate with all stakeholders and sensitize the target population about the harmful effects of mercury for human health and the environment in general. All this has been achieved with the daily drive of a very cohesive and willful human team that has taken advantage of the opportunities to coordinate with other initiatives and get more products with the same budget allocated.

### Table 3 Summary of MTR assessment and achievements

| Parameter | MTR assessment | Description of the achievement |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Satisfactory** | The project design is based on the 2011 mercury use diagnosis and detects the main sources of mercury emissions, as well as the main barriers to achieve an environmentally sound management of mercury. It establishes the logic of intervention based on institutional strengthening, regulatory framework and policies, reducing mercury releases from two priority sectors (MAPE and Health) and strengthening technical capacity and infrastructure for temporary storage. It is considered a participatory and inclusive process that takes into account all aspects required by the GEF. ProDoc does not present a theory of change. |
| **Progress towards the achievement of results** | Objective:  **Highly Satisfactory** | The goals established for the achievement of the objective have been fully achieved, both for the MAPE sector and for the health sector. The entry into force of Presidential Decree 018-2016 for the area of ​​El Corpus has specifically reduced the use of Hg by 86.8% without the application of MPA / BAT. Therefore, it can be concluded that the goal is more than fulfilled. The conformation of the 02 de Julio company has been strongly supported, although there is still a way to go. The gravimetric plant has not yet been purchased and therefore 660 kg of Hg is still being used in the harrows. The application of MPA / BAT in the four hospitals, as well as the commitment of the Management of all the hospitals has resulted in a reduction of 65 Kg of Hg / year considerably greater than originally planned in the project. All hospitals have their Hg baselines and their Mercury Substitution Plans, as well as temporary Hg storage donated by the project and work is being done on the final storage location |
| Result 1.1:  ***Highly Satisfactory*** | The project not only managed to perform the national inventory of mercury releases in a timely manner (as envisaged, Level I), but also reached Level II. It has fulfilled the established goal by providing the equipment and strengthening the necessary technical capacity for both CESCCO and INHGEOMIN to comply with its responsibilities for evaluation and monitoring of Hg in the environment. The socio-economic baseline study was completed, which includes, in addition to socio-economic surveys, urine, blood and hair samples to determine the presence of Hg. This is the first study of this type at the national level and its results can be decisive for the future management of ASM and Hg in the health sector. |
| Result 2.1:  ***Satisfactory*** | The Development of the National Plan for ERM Mercury is a good example of the synergy that exists between the project and the UNEP project (today, UN Environment) GEF MIA NAP. Both projects, thanks to the co-coordination by the PcU coordinator, are well aligned. In terms of regulatory instruments, the project has focused on MAPE and Health by reviewing and creating manuals and regulations. The work with DARA is fluid and it has achieved the codes of precision of products and train a good number of customs officers not only on Minamata but also on all the conventions of chemical products (Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm) obtaining seizures of other products at the border. |
| Result 3.1:  ***Satisfactory*** | Within the framework of this component, the project carried out the first baseline study of this type in the country that includes very important data for the development of policies and measures. In general terms, the established goals and indicators have changed, and this is not reflected in the ProDoc. Together with INHGEOMIN, the project supported the legal constitution of the company and is processing the environmental authorization despite strong local pressures. The gravimetric plant has not yet been purchased, which calls into question the success of the intervention. The success of the partnership with Heimerle and Meule and the Green Gold Plan will depend on the installation of the plant. Although leaders have received valuable training, it has not been possible to reduce the use of mercury in the harrows and it has been found that the organization is weak, and they have doubts about their capacity for self-management. In terms of replicability, the project is supporting the community of Macuelizo, which already has its own company, "Minas y Cuevas" who have a lot of support from the Lundin Foundation and the Alliance for Responsible Mining (ARM) and have received approximately USD 1 million. They show a very high level of organization compared to July 02. There is also proof of work in the community of El Paraíso, although this was not visited. Regardless of the changes, the project has developed additional products highly valued by the interviewees. These additional documents have helped maintain the rating as "satisfactory" despite the changes that have taken place with the ProDoc and the uncertainty regarding the achievement of the installation of the gravimetric plant and the management capacity of July 2. |
| Result 3.2:  ***Highly Satisfactory*** | The project is working simultaneously in the four hospitals, managing to carry out the baseline on Hg that serves to define the Mercury Substitution Plan. Hospitals have a latent problem with fluorescent lamp waste. Although they are committed to replacing them, the problem is storage and final disposal. The four Waste Management Plans have also been worked on and 50 hospital representatives have been trained on how to eliminate and replace the Hg and a technical guide was prepared and the personnel trained. Since hospitals were already buying Hg-free devices, the project opted to modify a product and worked on a catalog of alternatives according to the offer of national suppliers. A problem that persists is the lack of suppliers and the quality offered by ONCAE. It is also verified that this initiative is mainly promoted by the administration of each hospital without a clear directive from the Ministry of Health. |
| Result 4:  ***Moderately Satisfactory*** | The project worked hand in hand with the MIA NAP project. This UNAMBIENTE project evaluated the capacities and the UNDP project the Cost Recovery Strategy. The medium and long-term approach to Hg storage will be described in the National Hg Management Plan. However, the project has reached an agreement with MINOSA (Minerales de Occidente SA) and MiAmbiente for the final disposal of 4tn of Hg derived from the mining activity. It will also be possible to dispose of 19-30 kg of Hg from hospitals. The final disposal of this waste will be carried out by the company Veolia in Europe paid by MINOSA and, Miambiente will take care of the permits. Regarding ERM's pilot demonstration of temporary storage of other waste, the project is in the initial stages of designing the project with two luminaire importers. |
| Result 5:  ***Highly Satisfactory*** | Despite the delays suffered at the beginning of the project due to the resignation of the coordinator and the time that was delayed in the hiring of the technical team, the project has achieved a good level of execution and has fulfilled many of the planned goals. There is work to be done and capacities to be strengthened for this reason, it is considered important that I continue the project until December 2019, extending the useful life of the project by 8 months. |
| **Execution and project’s adaptive management** | **Satisfactory** | The project is coordinating perfectly with the MIA NAP project and other GEF projects based at the OCP. Likewise, the goals are met almost in spite of having had less months of execution thanks to the highly professional and committed team of the UdP and the support provided by the main partners of the project. |
| **Sustainability** | **Moderately probable** | The inputs that the project is contributing in terms of regulations, manuals, guides and others, have been very well accepted and valued and will continue to be used beyond the life of the project. In addition, the project will contribute to the Minamata National Implementation Plan and its Action Plan for ASM. The CESCCO and INHGEOMIN partners have the equipment and capacity to perform their monitoring functions of mercury emissions. The four hospitals have a strong commitment to completely eliminate mercury from its operations and facilities and have the tools to do so. It is expected that the Ministry of Health will join the initiative more actively. The MAPE Community of El Corpus through the company O2 de Julio has been strengthened and trained, although they are far from being sustainable. This can be seen when comparing them with the company Minas y Cuevas, which has received a lot of logistical and financial support to be able to totally eliminate mercury from its operations. If the project does not manage to buy, install and train the miners on the gravimetric plant, it is very likely that the long-term objective will not be achieved. The evaluator has not been able to verify the sustainability in relation to the final disposal of mercury and mercury products given that, to date, the Cost Recovery Strategy has not yet been applied. In conclusion, the evaluator hopes that, at least, some results can be sustained over time. |

### Concise summary of conclusions and recommendations

The summary of conclusions is presented according to the criteria of the MTR.

**Relevance**

* **Relevant** project and assigned perfectly to the **national and United Nations priorities**. **Well-designed** project in a participatory way, although without theory of change. The socio-economic approach of working with mining communities for the formation of companies was not included in component 3.
* **The monitoring and evaluation system** focus on the **product** **indicators** (61) and does not have results or effects indicators. The monitoring is **excessive** due to the time invested and the relevance of the indicators. There is room for improvement in the Results Framework.
* **Gender perspective well addressed** in ProDoc and in the gender action plan prepared by the PcU together with OPCs.
* Identified **risks** are still **valid** and the mitigation actions are **well** **designed**.

**Effectiveness**

* The **project** is being **developed**, in general terms, **satisfactorily**. Most of the goals are being achieved, some more than expected and additional products are being created that are very valuable and valued by the actors.
* Project has managed to **eliminate**, thanks to the national legal conjuncture and the actions carried out, **more** **mercury** from the MAPE and Health sector than projected in the ProDoc. Miners from El Corpus continue to use 659 kg of Hg in harrows because they do not have the plant. Key to achieve the total eradication of Hg in The Corpus.
* UNDP **has not been able to award** the purchase of the **gravimetric** **plant** due to the high prices received by interested bidders.
* Local government very important to achieve results and facilitate processes.
* **CDP** **complying** with the most **strategic** **commitments** of the project despite the lack of participation of the Ministry of Health.
* Well monitored project (despite the large number of indicators in the results framework) meeting deadlines and formats. Sufficient resources have been allocated in the M & E plan.

**Efficiency**

* **Good implementation and budget execution** is being achieved, 90% in 2016, 88% in 2017 and 38% in 2018. This is due to the fact that the gravimetric plant has not been purchased. Project well monitored financially and the reports required by the GEF are generated.
* It has been **communicated** both **internally** and **externally**, and awareness has been **raised** about the importance of mercury eradication and the adverse effects on health and the environment on the target population.

**Sustainability**

* **Government institutional continuity is expected**. Changes can affect the execution of the project. The State is committed to the Minamata Convention and is working to fulfill its commitments.
* There are **doubts** about whether the **State** will be able to **implement** all the **norms** and **regulations** that are being drafted for the eradication of mercury and other chemicals.
* The **organization of mining communities in companies is slow and expensive**. The tools developed are highly valued but insufficient to achieve replicability. It is necessary to involve the private sector in order to guarantee financing to start these companies.

The following table shows the summary of the recommendations:

### Table 4 summary of recommendations

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rec #** | **Recommendation** | **Responsible entity** |
| R.1 | Update the ProDoc. Specifically, the logical framework incorporating performance indicators. For example, for result 1.1 on capacity at the institutional level to evaluate and monitor emissions, one could think of an indicator of "number of monitoring reports prepared". Another example, on result 2.1 on regulatory framework and policies, could be used an indicator such as "number of laws and regulations approved" and on result 3.1 on Hg releases from mining communities, the indicator "Kg of Hg used in The Corpus " | PcU; UNDP, PCC |
| R.2 | Location of the project office within the Project Coordination Office to give greater follow-up to administrative processes and streamline processes, as well as seek greater synergies with other projects | PcU; UNDP; PCC; Miambiete |
| R.3 | Make the international purchasing process of the gravimetric plant more flexible to ensure that it is awarded and installed during 2018 and 2019 | UNDP; PcU |
| R.4 | Socialize with taxpayers through the Chamber of Commerce and Competitiveness Committees the implications of the Minamata Convention | PcU; MiAmbiente; DARA |
| R.5 | Involve the General Directorate of Surveillance of the Normative and Normalization Framework of the Ministry of Health | PcU; MiAmbiente; SS |
| R.6 | Develop impact indicators with data from the socioeconomic survey of El Corpus. | PcU |
| R.7 | Expand the duration of the project 8 months (to December 2019). | PcU; UNDP; GEF |
| R.8 | Design Output Strategy by component | PcU, PCC |
| R.9 | Strengthen INGHEOMIN within the framework of the MAPE plan in formulation to include impact indicators. | PcU; PCC; UNDP |
| R.10 | Organize regional closing forum and good practices | PcU; PCC |

## Introduction

### 2.1 MTR Purpose and objectives

The evaluation involves a technical and independent evaluation exercise, commissioned by the client, in this case, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) as the Implementing Agency of the Global Environment Fund (GEF), which contributes to the processes of accountability before donors, national partners and other relevant actors. In addition, it is designed, implemented and presented in a way that facilitates the learning of good practices and, in the case of Mid-Term Review (MTR), are, primarily, monitoring tools aimed at identifying challenges and fixing corrective actions necessary to ensure that a project is on track to achieve the maximum number of results before its conclusion. The main product derived from this process is the report of the MTR.

The MTR will focus on the following four areas: The evaluation involves a technical and independent evaluation exercise, commissioned by the client, in this case, UNDP as the Implementing Agency of the GEF, which contributes to the processes of accountability before donors, national partners and other relevant actors. In addition, it is designed, implemented and presented in a way that facilitates the learning of good practices and, in the case of MTR, are, primarily, monitoring tools aimed at identifying challenges and fixing corrective actions necessary to ensure that a project is on track to achieve the maximum number of results before its conclusion. The main product derived from this process is the report of the MTR[[1]](#footnote-1).  
The MTR will focus on the following four areas:

1. **Project Design;**

The analysis of the project design seeks to determine if the strategy is effective for achieving the expected results and, if it is not, to identify changes to achieve the expected results. For this purpose, the evaluator will analyze in detail the project document (ProDoc) looking for if lessons learned from other projects have been incorporated, if the project is aligned with the national development priorities and priorities of the country, if possible externalities, environmental and social risks, decision-making processes during the design phase of the project and the gender and human rights approach during the formulation phase. In parallel, the evaluator will make an exhaustive analysis of the Results Framework or Logical Framework. For this, the indicators and targets will be reviewed to see if they meet the SMART criteria (abbreviation in English of Specific, Quantifiable, Achievable, Relevant and Subject to Term) and the gender criteria "GENDER" (Sensitive to deficiencies, Inclusive, Disaggregated, Durable and Respectful with rights). This review seeks to recommend improvements in the indicators that facilitate monitoring and the goals of these to ensure that the project can achieve them in the space of time remaining for execution.

1. **Progress towards the achievement of results;**

As specified in the Terms of Reference (TOR), this is one of the main objectives of the MTR and consists in examining the progress made in achieving the expected results. To carry out this analysis, the evaluator will review the GEF monitoring tool, both completed during the CEO approval phase and the one recently filed in the middle of the period. Likewise, the evaluator will offer assessments on the progress made in the achievement of the objectives and each result of the project. For this, the evaluator will be based on the information provided in the ProDoc, in the Project Implementation Reports (PIR) of the first year, second and third year (2016, 2017 and 2018 from June to July) and the Quarterly Reports of all the years which will be corroborated during the interview phase in the mission to then triangulate the information that will serve as the basis for the recommendations. This process will be completed by filling in the matrix of Progress Matrix in the achievement of the results that will go in the executive summary of the final report of the EMT. The table will allow to present the progress in the achievement of the results in a very visual way which will also help to detect those areas that need to be reinforced and where changes must be made to achieve the expected results. For the indicators marked as "not achieved", the evaluator will make recommendations that will be presented summarized in the Recommendations Table.

Finally, the evaluator will assess the progress of the project in achieving the objective and each of the results following table 4 of the Guide to carry out the MTR of the UNDP\_GEF projects.

1. **Project execution and adaptative management**

As in the previous section, the evaluator will analyze the execution of the project and its adaptive management in order to identify the challenges that the project may have and propose additional measures to achieve a more efficient and effective execution. More specifically, the evaluator will analyze the following aspects:

1. **Management tools;**

In this section the evaluator will analyze the quality of the support provided by UNDP to the project, as well as the implementation carried out by the Ministry of Energy, Natural Resources, Environment and Mines (MIAambiente), through the Pollution Control and Study Center (CESCCO) and its Chemical Products Management Department (DGPQ) as the Implementing Entity and its Responsible Partners. For this purpose, the existing management systems will be compared with those originally proposed in the ProDoc and different aspects that intervene in the execution of the project will be analyzed.

1. **Work planning;**

In this section, the evaluator will analyze possible delays in the start-up and execution of the project, identify the causes and examine whether they have been resolved. It will pay special attention to the planning processes to determine if they are based on results and will examine the correct use of the results framework as a management tool.

1. **Financement and co-financement;**

For the financial analysis, the evaluator will analyze the financial controls and if these have allowed informed decisions regarding the budget and how they were reflected in the Annual Work Plans (AWPs), will also analyze possible variations between the originally designed and the actual executed and if the project demonstrates the necessary control in the management of resources. Special attention will be given to the co-financing of the project. Co-financing is indicated in the annual PIR.

1. **Project level monitoring and evaluation systems;**

Monitoring and evaluation is a key element of the project. The evaluator will analyze the monitoring carried out by the UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency as well as the implementing partners. The monitoring and evaluation plan will be analyzed to see if sufficient resources have been designated, if the main parties or partners participate in the monitoring, if effective monitoring is helping in adaptive management and if the plan also includes gender perspectives, as well as the suitability of mitigation measures and management of environmental and social risks.

1. **Interested parties involvement;**

The ProDoc establishes how interested parties and external partners will participate in the project. Establishing links with the parties is vital to achieve the expected results and maximize the potential impact of the project. However, one thing is what is thought to happen during the design phase of the project and another is what actually happens. Therefore, the evaluator will analyze if adequate alliances have been developed to achieve the results, if the national partners continue to have a preponderant role in the decision making of the project and if the interested parties are committed to the success and long-term sustainability term of the project.

1. **Information;**

This section will focus on the analysis of the mechanisms used by the Project Team to report on possible changes in adaptive management, as well as compliance with information requirements to the GEF and how the information generated has been shared with the Board of Directors. Project and finally, it will be analyzed if the lessons derived from adaptive management have been documented and shared.

1. **Communication;**

In this section, the evaluator will analyze both the internal communication of the project with the interested parties, as well as the external communication for the target audience. From the analysis of the work done, the evaluator will also seek to make recommendations in line with the improvement of the communication of achievements and results of the project.

Finally, the evaluator will assess, as was done in the previous section, the execution of the project and the adaptive management according to table 5 of the Guide.

1. **Sustainability**

The sustainability analysis in the MTR will lay the foundations for this analysis during the Final Evaluation of the project. At this point, the evaluator will not analyze financial, socioeconomic, institutional and environmental sustainability in this exercise, but will examine the likely risks that the project faces in order to achieve the results. More specifically, the evaluator will validate the risks identified in the ProDoc, the PIR and if the valuations are up to date and if they are adequate. This exercise should serve so that the Project Team puts the focus of its work, now that it has reached more of the equator of the project, in the sustainability of its actions. Finally, the evaluator will make a global assessment of sustainability.

All this analysis, triangulation of information and interviews will serve the evaluator to make a section of conclusions based on the data collected and proven facts that will make practical and feasible recommendations for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project, recommendations that reinforce the benefits of the project and others that mitigate possible identified risks to achieve sustainability.

### 2.2 Scope and methodology: design principles and MTR execution, MTR approach and data recompilation methods, limitations to the MTR

The evaluation covers, more than half of the cycle of the project under study, from its start in April 2015 to date.

The geographical dimension of the evaluation covers the whole country, but above all, special attention will be paid to the pilots at MAPE in El Corpus (Choluteca), San Pedro Sula (Hospital Nacional Mario Catarino Rivas) and Tegucigalpa (see Annex 3).

In terms of content or programmatic scope, the results framework articulates a series of processes, products, intermediate results and medium-term results that could be grouped into two areas of analysis. In this sense and in order to abstract the different strategies, lines of work, products, intermediate results, actions outside the results framework, in its orientation towards the achievement of the effect, the evaluator has specified three areas of analysis. Obviously, these areas are linked:

1. Project support (and in particular its level of contribution) to national **capacities in the design / implementation of policies, programs / services necessary to comply with the Minamata Convention Mechanism**. The design of technical, legal and institutional aspects for the operationalization, the formalization of the Mechanism and the tools used for it are analyzed in this area. Likewise, the analysis of capacity, the strengthening of this and the organization of the responsible Commission will be analyzed.
2. Project support (and in particular its level of contribution) **to reduce the use and emissions to the environment of mercury through MAPE and Health pilots and work with Customs**; The prioritization of selected areas and the tools and activities designed for the elimination of mercury and its wastes, the baselines and proposed goals, regulations, etc. will be reviewed.
3. Project support for **institutional strengthening and training**. For this purpose, the evaluator will analyze the analysis and identification of technical training needs of the different actors and the training developed.

#### Methodology

#### MTR approach

The evaluation was carried out according to the Standards and Standards, the ethical and conduct guidelines defined by the United Nations System Evaluation Group (UNEG), and took as reference the procedures and guidelines established in the Planning Manual , Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Results[[2]](#footnote-2) and the Guide for the Implementation of the Mid-Term Review in Projects Supported by UNDP and Funded by the GEF prepared by the UNDP-GEF Directorate in 2014. The evaluation will make judgments regarding its definition / design, implementation and achievements based on two main pillars: accountability and learning. It should be noted that the main purpose of the MTR is to identify challenges and establish the necessary corrective actions to ensure that a project is on track to achieve the maximum number of results before its conclusion.

The evaluation has taken a mixed methodological approach, combining quantitative and qualitative research methods.

In this sense it is important to conceptually delimit the nature of the products:  
"The products are considered as operational changes: products and services - knowledge, skills, capabilities. They are the products, capital goods, and tangible services that are obtained from development interventions. The products must be achieved within the project cycle and the managers have a high level of control over them. "[[3]](#footnote-3)

A first **approach to the evaluation** is that it will be based on the analysis of product achievement and progress in achieving the results. Therefore, the evaluation will prioritize the focus on the effectiveness in carrying out the activities.

Likewise, the evaluation took a participatory approach: it sought to combine the external evaluation of the evaluator with the experience of the interested parties, internal and external. Therefore, the evaluator maintained a fluid communication with the teams of the Project Office, as well as representatives of implementing partners. Perspectives and proposals were discussed during the different stages of the evaluation, constituting with the exchange a useful learning community for the strategic objectives of this evaluation.

#### Criterium and evaluation questions

**Project Strategy (Pertinence/Coherence)**

The analysis of pertinence will stop at the strategic formulation of the Project, its coherence with the situational analysis and the problems raised, the degree of participation of the main actors in the construction of the Project, taking into account its link with the priority areas of the GEF.   
This work has been carried out by the consultant mainly through documentary analysis. It has also emerged from the elements that it collects from the different interviews and focus groups carried out by Project actors.

**Progress to the achievement of results**

The evaluator, through the analysis of the documentation, as well as the information obtained first hand through interviews with actors, has analyzed the progress of the project to achieve the results defined in the design phase of the project. For this, the evaluator has used the Progress Towards Results Matrix, which has been completed with the information available. In addition, the evaluator compared and analyzed the GEF’s Results Tracker as a baseline against the last completed prior to the MTR. This exercise has allowed the evaluator to identify existing barriers to achieving the objectives and identify successful aspects of the project. All this information will be collected in the Progress Matrix.

**Project implementation and adaptative management (Efficiency)**

The efficiency analysis has been carried out on the cost-benefit study mainly, analyzing the agility of the administrative processes and compliance with the times established in the planning and the fluency of the financial processes; he stopped especially in the analysis of the administrative / financial action and in the application of the results-based work approach (including the monitoring systems and management instances of the Project); all this to determine the capacity that the Project had to correct directions and strategies in the course of the same, therefore, its capacity of adaptive management.

The analysis will take into account the revisions and budgetary changes that have been made throughout the execution. To this end, the programmatic and financial monitoring instruments, monitoring reports of the Project Unit such as the GEF, operational plans and program reports will be reviewed. They will hold interviews with the main managers of management and administration.

**Effectiveness**

The Effectiveness analysis focused on determining, through the follow-up of the results chain, the correct sequence of this and the fulfillment of the assumptions established for its development, the way in which the activities pay to achieve the results, these at the same time they point to the achievement of the specific objectives, and finally to the attainment of the general objective.

At the same time, special attention has been paid to compliance with the indicators proposed by the Project, both for products and objectives, as well as the monitoring and evaluation instruments developed. Normally, the outcome indicators are analyzed above all. However, in this case and given that the results matrix does not include performance indicators, the consultant has focused on the analysis of the product indicators (see Annex 8).

The group of "key informants" that have been proposed for the information collection phase has been taken into account, as well as others that the evaluator has considered appropriate.  
In a matrix, the concrete advances of the components, results and indicators will be consolidated and comments will be made to each of them (Annex 8). Special attention will be paid to progress in the proposed indicators. In addition, the quality of these will be reviewed and, where appropriate, specific recommendations will be provided for future interventions.

**Sustainability**

We have analyzed sustainability from four areas: financial risks for sustainability, socio-economic sustainability, institutional risks and governance to sustainability and environmental risks. Given the relevance of institutional sustainability for the project, special relevance has been given to this specific issue.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**: Proposals and recommendations are made in order to improve the project during the second half of implementation, which include the critical actions required to solve the problems encountered and generate a proposal to improve the impact. The recommendations will follow the recommendations established in the Guide for the Implementation of the Mid-Term Review of Projects Supported by UNDP and Funded by the GEF.

#### Methods for the recollection of information

Given the nature of the object of study, the methodology of data collection and analysis has been selected combining qualitative (including participatory techniques) and quantitative (data collection, processing, analysis and presentation of information) methods, as well as analytical methods deductive and inductive, which will allow the evaluator to conclude on the achievements at the level of the evaluated project.

The following are the different techniques used to collect and analyze information used during the MTR:

**Review of documentary information:** The main documents related to the Project have been reviewed and analyzed from different perspectives such as the quality and relevance of the information provided, identification of gaps, coherence and correlation between documents, etc. Attached in Annex 3 is the control chart of the information provided by the project.

**Interviews**: Key people of each organization / institution, authorities, responsible for partner organizations, responsible for public institutions, local authorities, responsible for the Project; they were interviewed in a minimum duration of 40 minutes, depending on the relevance and amount of information that the person interviewed could offer. For each interview a specially designed interview guide was developed, which means that there are several interview guide models. They were semi-structured interviews for better driving. See annex 4. In total, 32 actors were interviewed.

**Focus groups**: To collect information on certain groups, 2 focus groups were conducted. Two focus groups were carried out with the two main mining communities with which the project works. The focus group with the company 2 de Julio had the participation of 8 members of the community and with the company Minas y Cuevas, 4 members.

**Return and validation workshops:** At the end of the second phase, a return (debriefing) was held with the Evaluation Reference Group and other stakeholders in which the assessments arising from the phase were offered. This return was made on the last day of the mission and was attended by UNDP staff and the Project Coordinator.

**Direct observation:** provides additional information that allows the evaluator to learn about the context in which the events and processes that are subject to evaluation happen in a routine and / or extraordinary way. The meetings with the groups raised in the agenda allowed to observe motivational aspects, of commitments and particular experiences of using methodologies, of participation, which, although they cannot be extrapolated, are important to assess the usefulness of some products.

**Processing and systematization** of all information collected and analyzed. The synthesis on one hand and deepening on the other of all the information that the evaluator has accumulated through the different instruments, has been ordered in structured and standardized documents previously prepared (Annex 8 and Excel matrix with the control of the interviews), organized based on the evaluation questions by criteria, considering also the logical order of presentation of the information referred to in the annotated index of the final report (which will be adjusted and / or expanded).

For the interpretation of the findings and their subsequent assessment, **triangulation techniques** have been used. For this, the results of the analyzes have been verified by comparing two or three times the same information from different sources and through the different collection methods. For example, the answers obtained in interviews with government personnel with opinions of the beneficiaries or with other sources of statistical information have been verified.

#### Selection of the sample of informants

The determination of the informants was carried out under a selective approach conducted by the Project Office in Honduras together with the advice of UNDP. Obviously, it is about producing exchanges with qualified informants, both from the point of view of the quality of their participation and the role they currently play in the structures they represent in order to extrapolate arguments and valuations.

The Project Office has provided a preliminary list of key actors linked to the different processes carried out and in progress. The mission agenda is presented in annex 2 of this report.

## Project description and context

### 3.1 Development context

Mercury is a neurotoxin that represents a global threat to human and environmental health. In Honduras, artisanal and small-scale mining (ASM) is an important source of income, especially in rural communities, which means significant production at the national level. The Government of Honduras has recognized that mercury causes considerable risks to human health and the environment. Likewise, mercury is used in a variety of other products, including dental amalgam, medical devices such as thermometers and sphygmomanometers, electrical switches and relays and fluorescent lamps. Atmospheric emissions are mainly due to disposal practices at the end of product life. In Honduras, this unsustainable practice counts as the third most significant source of mercury releases.

Likewise, mercury is also used in the sanitary sector, which implies a significant source of mercury discharge to the environment, including waste amalgam that reaches the sanitary sewer directly due to the lack of adequate final storage solutions.  
The Minamata Convention on Mercury is a global treaty to protect human health and the environment from the adverse effects of mercury. It was agreed at the fifth session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee on Mercury in Geneva, held in Switzerland at 7 a.m. the morning of Saturday, January 19, 2013 and was adopted that same year, on October 10, 2013 in the course of a Diplomatic Conference (Plenipotentiary Conference), in Kumamoto, Japan.  
The Minamata Agreement entered into force on August 16, 2017, on the ninetieth day after the date on which the fiftieth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession was deposited.  
The Convention seeks to draw attention to a metal used worldwide and omnipresent that, although it is of natural origin, has a wide use in everyday objects and is released into the atmosphere, soil and water from various sources. The control of anthropogenic mercury emissions throughout its life cycle has been a key factor in determining the obligations of the Convention.

The highlights of the Minamata Convention include:

* the prohibition of new mercury mines,
* the gradual elimination of existing ones,
* reducing the use of mercury in a series of products and processes,
* the promotion of measures to control emissions to the atmosphere and emissions to land and water, as well as the non-existent regulation of the artisanal and small-scale mining sector.

The Convention also deals with the interim storage of mercury and its disposal once it becomes waste, mercury contaminated sites and sanitary issues[[4]](#footnote-4).

The Government of Honduras signed the Convention on September 24, 2014 and ratified it on March 22, 2017. With the objective of providing the country with the development of its capacities to comply with the Convention, as well as carry out inventories of mercury needed in the different sectors (MAPE and health) and activities related to environmentally sound management.

### 3.2 Problems that the Project tried to deal with: threats and barriers

The project identifies the main barriers to the environmentally sound management of mercury in the MAPE sector as well as in the health sector in Honduras. The following table shows the barriers and components designed to address these barriers and threats:

**Table 5 Relation of the barriers identified and the designed components**

| ***Barriers*** | ***Components*** |
| --- | --- |
| *Political and REgulatory Barriers;*   * These barriers imply the lack of legislation that favors the gradual discontinuation of Hg (MAPE) and the use of mercury-free products, as well as the capacities (monitoring, technical, financial, etc.) that need to be improved to apply the country's regulatory framework. * Lack of plans / strategies for the REM of products and wastes containing Hg and the lack of practical guidance for artisanal and small-scale miners (here we are talking about manuals, videos on training in BAT / MPA, etc). | **Component 2**. Strengthening regulatory framework  **Component 1.** Strengthening institutional capacities  **Component 2.** Strengthening regulatory framework  **Component 3.** Reduce releases of mercury from priority sectors (ASM and health) to protect human health and the environment. |
| *Economic Barriers;*   * They refer mainly to the limited availability of alternatives for mercury and the lack of cost recovery mechanisms for the REM of Hg-containing waste. | **Component 4**. Strengthen the technical capacity and infrastructure for the temporary storage of waste containing mercury. |
| Barriers to Awareness and Training;   * They are related to the lack of reliable data on imports of Hg and Hg-containing devices, low level of awareness of ERM of Hg and lack of knowledge about the adoption of best practices in priority sectors. | **Component 4**. Strengthen the technical capacity and infrastructure for the temporary storage of waste containing mercury. |
| Technical Barriers;   * Lack of options for storage and disposal of waste containing Mercutio. | **Component 3.** Reduce releases of mercury from priority sectors (ASM and health) to protect human health and the environment. |

### 3.3 Project description and strategy: objective, products and expected results, description of places where the project is being developed.

The project "Environmentally Rational Management of Mercury and Mercury-Containing Products and its Wastes from the Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold and Health Mining sectors" follows the following strategy. In relation to the MAPE, it will look for the following three great goals:  
1. Shorten the inefficient supply chain of gold and increase the formal income of cooperatives and tax revenues;

2. Leverage new formal income to finance technical and training services and

3. Regionalize the supply chain and link producers with markets for greener or more ethical gold.

Regarding the health sector, the project will seek to gradually discontinue products with mercury from the sector following five goals:

1. Build national capacity to monitor releases / emissions and risks per Hg;

2. Show best practices in a number of health facilities;

3. Create confidence in mercury-free alternatives;

4. Gradually discontinue the use of Hg, through national efforts for the instruction of standards and

5. Create solutions for temporary storage and identify possibilities for their final elimination.

In parallel, the project will support the Government to move towards compliance with its future obligations under the Minamata Convention by sharing valuable experiences in the region.  
The main goal is to support mercury assessments and pilot mercury activities that contribute to achieving the objectives of the Convention and Honduras' ability to implement its provisions.  
The objective of the project is to protect human health and the environment from mercury emissions from the intentional use of mercury in ASM, as well as the inappropriate management and elimination of mercury-containing products from the health sector.  
The proposed project has 5 proposed components with their respective results, products and activities. At this time only, the components are listed:

1. Strengthen institutional capacities to achieve Environmentally Sound Management (REM) of Mercury;

2. Strengthen the regulatory and policy framework to support the reduction in the use of mercury and allow the ERM of mercury-containing products and their wastes;

3. Reduce releases of mercury from priority sectors (artisanal and small-scale mining and health) to protect human health and the environment;

4. Strengthen the technical capacity and infrastructure for temporary storage of mercury-containing wastes;

5. Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback, social projection and evaluation.

Although the project officially has these components, the UdP and the Project Board refocused the work by sectors (3) to facilitate understanding. The following figure presents the sectors and main areas of work.

**Figure 1 Work areas and main action lines**



Source: Project ERM Mercurio, EMT presentation, August 2018, Tegucigalpa.

The project is being executed by MiAmbiente with UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency. The project is directed by a Project Board and a Steering Committee.

In terms of the geographical location of the project's actions, it can be said that, in terms of policy development and capacity building of responsible institutions, this is being done at the national level. In terms of component 3 reduction of mercury releases from the MAPE and Health sector, these are the areas where the actions are being developed:

**Table 6 Geographic location of the project’s main activities**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Component and Result** | **Location** |
| Result 2.1. Regulatory Framework | At the national and departmental level with the DARA (Customs of Puerto Cortés, El Corinto, La mesa, El Florido, Agua Caliente, El Poy, Tocontin, El Amatillo, Las Manos and Guasaule) |
| Result 3.1 Reduce Hg releases in MAPE | Mina Cuculmeca, El Corpus, Choluteca  Mina San Andrés in Copán, Santa Rosa de Copán Department  Mina Macuelizo, Santa Barbara Departament |
| Result 3.2 Reduce Hg releases in Hg in health facilities | Hospital de Especialidades de San Felipe (HESF), Hospital Escuela de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras (HEU/UNAH), Hospital María de Especialidades Pediátricas, in Tegucigalpa and Hospital Dr. Mario Catarino Rivas in San Pedro Sula, Cortés Departament |

It should be noted that although the pilots at MAPE and Health focused on these locations, the project has always sought to add participants from other hospitals or mining communities in the country.

### 3.4 Project execution mechanisms

The project is being executed by MiAmbiente with CESCCO as a focal point and UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency and is being implemented under the National Implementation Modality (NIM). The project is governed, according to the ProDoc, by a Project Board and a Steering Committee.

**Figure 2 Project’s Governance structure**



The ProDoc establishes two clear coordination mechanisms:

1. The **Project Board**. Specifically established to oversee the management of project activities, as well as the strategic direction necessary to achieve or maintain the parties' commitments. The Board will review progress reports, approve programmatic modifications in the POAs in accordance with UNDP procedures, and provide programmatic recommendations. Taking into account that it is a high-level instance, it will only meet once a year and will be made up of MiAmbiente, UNDP, MAPE sector, Health Sector and CNG.
2. The **Steering Committee**. It is a subsidiary coordination mechanism created by delegated authority of the Board to supervise the implementation and adaptive management of the project. The Committee will meet every 3 months and will be chaired by the GEF Focal Point of MiAmbiente. The Committee will provide policy and operational guidelines and seek synergies with other environmental projects funded by the GEF and led by MiAmbiente. The Committee will consist of UNAH-HEU, HMCR of the Ministry of Health, CNG, Miners Cooperative of Corpus and coordinated by the Project Coordinator.

### 3.5 Project execution deadlines and milestones to meet during its development

The project has been designed to last 48 months. The ProDoc does not present a schedule and only the results frame talks about the goals at the end of the project. Therefore, it is not possible to determine the main milestones to be met during the development of the project. At this point the only thing that can be presented are the components, results and expected products of the project.

**Table 7 Relation of Components, results and products**

| **Component** | **Result** | **Product** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| C1 Strengthen institutional capacities to achieve Environmentally Sound Management (REM) of Mercury | 1.1 Improved institutional capacity to evaluate and monitor hg emissions, Hg levels in populations, and generate data and scientific information in order to take action in relation to priority issues | 1.1.1 National inventory of Mercury emissions 1.1.2 Developed the analytical capacity of environmental and health institutions to monitor releases / emissions of hg. 1.1.3 Population risk assessments carried out |
| 1.2 Improved coordination and inter-ministerial communication for Hg REM | 1.2.1 The capacity of the National Commission for the Environmentally Sound Management of Chemical Products has been strengthened to meet future commitments under the Global treaty on hg. |
| C2. Strengthen the regulatory and policy framework to support the reduction in the use of mercury and allow the REM of products containing mercury and its waste | 2.1 Regulatory and policy framework strengthened to reduce dependence on mercury, and products with mercury content, and to improve the appropriate environmental management of mercury. | 2.1 Developed a National Plan for Environmentally Sound Management |
| 2.2 Draft regulatory instruments to reduce the use of mercury and products with mercury content, completed |
| 2.3 Developed a proposal for the harmonization of codes for the classification of mercury-containing products |
| 2.4 Developed standards and technical guidelines for the safe storage, packaging, transportation, data management, inspection and monitoring of mercury-containing waste |
| C3 Reduce releases of mercury from priority sectors (ASM and Health) to protect human health and the environment | 3.1 Releases of Hg from reduced priority mining communities as a result of the adoption of BAT / MPA practices and the gradual discontinuation of inappropriate mining practices | 3.1.1 Complete detailed baseline assessment d hg in a priority ASM community |
| 3.1.2 introduced BAT / MPA practices in an ASM community to reduce releases of Hg and adopt socially and environmentally appropriate mining practices. |
| 3.1.3 Capacity formed in a mining community to improve the gold supply chain |
| 3.1.4 Launched a replicability process of a pilot experience in three additional priority geographic areas. |
| 3.2 Releases of HE Hg reduced through the adoption of BAT / MPA practices and the gradual discontinuation of devices containing Hg | 3.2.1 Detailed Hg baseline assessment completed for two HE |
| 3.2.2 Updated programs for health care facilities to include discontinuation and Hg management |
| 3.2.3 Facility personnel trained in BAT / MPA practices for the management of Hg. |
| 3.2.4 Concluded the comparative study on Hg-free devices and adapted the purchasing processes based on the preferences of the personnel |
| 3.2.5 Launched the replicability process of pilot experiences in two additional facilities for health care. |
| C4 Strengthen technical capacity and infrastructure for temporary storage of mercury-containing waste | 4.1 Established financially sustainable temporary options for mercury-containing wastes, and identified long-term options. | 4.1.1 The evaluation of infrastructure, capacity and cost recovery approaches (CRE) completed |
| 4.1.2 Developed the technical capacity of the key actors for the different stages of the mercury life cycle, and established the CRE |
| 4.1.3 Established temporary spaces for mercury waste from the health care sector |
| 4.1.4 Pilot demonstration of the ERM and temporary storage of other wastes with mercury content initiated at the national level |
| C5 Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback, social projection and evaluation | 5.1 The Project's products are sustainable and replicable | 5.1.1 M & E and adaptive management applicable to the project in response to needs, findings of the midterm evaluation with lessons learned |
| 5.1.2 Lessons learned and best practices disseminated at the national, regional and global levels. |

### 3.6 Main stakeholders: Summary list

According to the ProDoc, the main national actors were:  
1. MiAmbeinte;  
2. Ministry of Health;  
3. Ministry of Industry and Commerce (now the Secretariat of Economic Development);  
4. Ministry of Finance and its Executive Directorate of Revenue (DEI, today DARA) (Customs);  
5. Hospital School of the National Autonomous University of Honduras (HEU / UNAH);  
6. Hospital Mario Catarino Ricas of San Pedro Sula, Cortés (HMCR);  
7. Municipality of El Corpus, Choluteca;  
8. Ministry of Health;  
9. Private Sector (which includes, Environmental Services of Honduras, RECYCLE, Cobra Oro, German Honduran Business Center, among others);  
10. NGOs;  
11. Cooperativa de Mineros Artesanales San Juan Arriba (today, July 2) and  
12. Basel Convention Coordination Center (BCCC) for Latin America and the Caribbean, the Central American Commission for Environment and Development and the Pan American Health Organization.

To these actors, we must add the following:

1. Company Minas y Cuevas de Macuelizo;  
2. German company Heimerle and Meule;  
3. Alliance for Responsible Mining (ARM);  
4. MINOSA;  
5. Lundin Foundation;  
6. Federal Institute of Geosciences and Natural Recruits of Germany;  
7. Specialties Hospital of San Felipe (HESF);  
8. Maria Hospital of Pediatric Specialties and  
9. MIA NAP Project of UN Environment  
10. Productive Landscapes Project of MIAMBIENTE + / GEF / UNDP  
11. Energy Efficiency Project of MIAMBIENTE + / GEF / UNDP  
12. Coastal Marine Project of MIAMBIENTE + / GEF / UNDP  
13. Project for the Strengthening of Water Governance in Region 13 of the Gulf of Fonseca (SDC-MiAMBIENTE)

## 4. Proven Facts

### Project Strategy

In this section the relevance of the design of the project is analyzed. It seeks to answer the following questions:

* What has been the quality and relevance of the general formulation process?
* What has been the relevance of the intervention logic of the project and its indicators?
* What is the current status of the risks and the hypotheses formulated in the ProDoc?
* Is the project still relevant in relation to the Honduran socio-political context?

#### Project Design

The formulation phase of the GEF project and its respective ProDoc (PPG - Project Preparation Grant) had a budget of USD 100,000. The actors interviewed who participated in the formulation process agree that it was a **highly participatory process and consider that the ProDoc is of very good quality**. The following table shows the key stages in the project formulation process.

Table 8 Main stages during project formulation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Stage** | **Date** |
| Date of PIF approval | 07th october 2013 |
| ProDoc signature | 22nd april 2015 |
| Hiring National Coordinator | First coordinator in 2015  Current coordinator, june 2016 |
| Date of Inception workshop | September 2016 |

The evaluator estimates that the formulation process has been very fast and therefore very satisfactory considering that it has been 17 months since the PIF was delivered until the approval of the ProDoc by the GEF.

The start-up phase of the project has suffered certain delays. More than one year from the signing of the ProDoc to the start-up workshop[[5]](#footnote-5). The first Project Coordinator was hired in the second quarter of 2015 but resigned in December 2015. The second and current Project Coordinator was hired in June 2016 and the rest of the team was hired during the course of the year. For the purposes of the project, the PcU considers the actual start date of the project in June 2016.

The logic of the project, in its design, is as follows:

**Figure 3 Project’s logic**

Although the project has 5 components, it has only been considered relevant, in order to describe the logic of the project, to present the 4 main components. The fifth component has to do with the effective management of the project (monitoring, feedback, social projection and evaluation) and is therefore considered transversal to the logic of the project.

#### Pertinence and quality of the Results framework / Logical framework, indicators and project’s activities.

The ProDoc does not present a theory of change. However, the project and its results framework follow the following hypothesis: "(1) if the institutional capacities to manage environmentally sound (RAG) mercury are strengthened; (2) yes the regulatory and policy framework to support a reduction in the use of mercury and allow a GAR of mercury-containing wastes is strengthened; (3) it is possible to reduce mercury releases from priority sectors (artisanal and small-scale mining and health) to protect human health and the environment; (4) if the technical capacity and infrastructure for the temporary storage of waste containing mercury is strengthened and if (5) monitoring, feedback, evaluation and a correct social projection to the project is given; then, human health and the environment will be protected from mercury emissions from the intentional use of mercury in ASM, as well as the inappropriate management and disposal of mercury-containing products from the health sector. Next, the evaluator has reconstructed the logic of the project and presents a theory of change to serve as a basis for the final evaluation of the Project.

**Figure 4. ERM Mercury Project theory of change**



The monitoring and evaluation system foreseen in the results framework is composed of 2 objective indicators and 61 product indicators. It has 5 components, 8 results and 27 products. Results indicators are not presented. The 2 objective indicators are very accurate and well designed, although they specify the target in the text of the indicator itself, for example, "Reduction of 1,000 kg of mercury releases / year of the ASM". The indicator must be neutral. It should be read as "Kg released from mercury / year of the ASM" and the reduction of 1,000kg be left specifically at the end of the project. Likewise, the matrix does not provide information on medium-term goals, which has made it difficult to measure during the MTR. The same goes for indicator 2 of the objective. **The evaluator and the persons interviewed who participate in the monitoring consider the number of product indicators to be excessive and unnecessary**. Many product indicators do not have the associated goals or the goals are not well defined. Here are some examples:

* Indicator 1.1.2.1: "The National Laboratory with the capacity to carry out mercury analysis".  
  This indicator can not be measured exactly as it is written. If the aim is to measure the mercury analysis capacity of the laboratory, an indicator should have been designed, such as "number of mercury analyzes performed", or "number of analytical reports", etc.
* Indicator 1.2.1.2: "The CNG assumes its role as coordinating mechanism for the management of mercury".

Like the previous one, this indicator cannot be measured. The Commission's leading role can be measured, for example, through strategic decisions taken or through its participation in events related to the topic. The evaluator considers that it does not provide monitoring of these indicators as they are written.

* There are other indicators that are directly from activities. For example, Indicator 3.1.1.2 "Hired and trained survey staff". This indicator does not give the evaluator an idea of ​​whether the Hg releases coming from the ASM communities are being reduced, but it does indicate that a recruitment activity has been carried out and its respective training.
* Indicator 3.1.2.3: "5 trainers trained in mercury-free techniques".  
  This is a perfect example of an indicator that mixes the goal in the indicator's own body. As with the objective indicator, this indicator must be neutral and the number indicated in the goal.

Finally, there are a good number of product / activity indicators that do not have an associated goal. Therefore, this makes it difficult to monitor and evaluate the work. The evaluator considers it necessary to **review the results matrix assigning results and pertinent indicators** that serve to measure change and impact for the final evaluation of the project.

* + 1. *Pertinence of the gender dimension in the project*

The gender dimension has been incorporated into the design of the project and is approached from the perspective of the work carried out with mining communities and health centers. In relation to mining, it is emphasized that women are mostly employed in the processing of artisanal mining, including amalgamation with mercury, and often their children and babies are nearby. The ProDoc highlights that the risk assessment, in this case, the baseline developed in the community of El Corpus, may give more information on the impact of mercury in mining communities by differentiating between gender. Regarding the HE, it is specified that women represent the majority of the workers employed in the health services sector and that, therefore, women are a key player in this specific competence.

The project has developed, in the second year of life, a draft Action Plan for the inclusion of the Project's Gender Perspective. In the same, they are pending to develop the general objective and objectives on the part of the OCP, but a specific work plan is presented linked the results of the project with concrete activities for the health sector and MAPE. The evaluator is of the opinion that the project has gone beyond what was foreseen in the ProDoc and has developed, with the support of the gender specialist of the PCU, its own gender action plan and that, therefore, **the dimension is well proposed in the ProDoc and in the project in general**.

* + 1. *Pertinence of the identified risks*

The ProDoc analyzes the environmental and social risks. More specifically, lists 8 risks (1. Lack of coordination of relevant institutions and ministries, 2. New regulatory instruments cannot be formulated and adopted within the timeframe of the project due to the long time the legislative process lasts; slower than expected of the BEP / BAT in the project's ASM communities 4. Little confidence in the care sector facilities in mercury-free devices, resulting in the continued use of mercury-containing devices; Perception by artisanal gold miners that economic incentives are too low to adopt BMP / BAT practices, resulting in continued inappropriate practices and in the use of mercury 6. Distrust of miners towards agencies and entities governments that try to support the formalization of the MAPE sector and the working conditions of the miners, since the miners of the MAPE are often afraid that their property will be transferred to foreign transnational corporations; 7. Current intermediaries can resist the shortening of the gold supply chain, some of which may be linked to organized crime and 8. Less demand for premium and fair trade, or green gold, than its supply) . The evaluator considers that the **proposed mitigation measures are pertinent and are currently maintained**, although in some considerable progress has been made, such as, for example, the confidence acquired by the miners of July 2 and Cuevas y Minas in the INHGEOMIN and MiAmbiente. This is undoubtedly a great achievement since for these communities the State has ceased to be the enemy and has become, in their eyes, an ally.

In the PIRs, it can be seen that there is currently no systematized monitoring of the 8 identified risks. Rather, it is only mentioned if there is any risk to be highlighted during the reporting period and the mitigation measure is discussed, for example, in the PIR 2018, reference is made to an operative risk linked to the failed process of purchase of the plant gravimetric and the actions that you want to carry out to fix the situation. The actors interviewed consider, for the most part, that the risks identified during the elaboration of the project are the appropriate ones and it has also been verified that they have not increased and that therefore the mitigation measures proposed are the correct ones. If it is important to highlight that there are other risks that should be taken into account and possibly start monitoring more systematically. The new risks identified are the following:

1. Type of employment contract of UdP staff and current politicization with hiring. A clear example of this risk is the recent departure of the MAPE specialist who, given the change of Director of INHGEOMIN, has been called to return to the Institution. This means that the project has run out of one of its key pieces and therefore generates instability;
2. Institutional weakness and fragmentation at the level of the Ministry of Health;
3. Change in the authorities and therefore interests and
4. Illegality.
   * 1. *Pertinance of the Project with national policies and strategies and with UNDP’s framework of intervention.*

The evaluator considers that the **logic of intervention is relevant and perfectly aligned with national and United Nations priorities**. More specifically, it is aligned with the Country Vision 2010-2038; to the 2010-2022 Nation Plan and to the DPC, UNDAF (where it will contribute to achieving 3 of the 5 results) and the SAICM Implementation Plan. More specifically, the project is linked to national objective 3 of the Country Vision:

A productive Honduras, that generates opportunities and decent work utilizing the natural Resources in a sustainable way and reducing environmental vulnerability.

Tot he UNDAF:

The population living in poberty and vulnerability to food security in the priority regions has increased their production and productivity, has Access to decent work, has increased their income and responsable consumption taking into consideration Climate change and the conservation and sustainable management of ecosystems.

And the CPD:

Outcome 3: The population living in conditions of poverty and vulnerability to food insecurity in the priority regions has increased their production and productivity, has access to decent work, has increased income and responsible consumption, taking into account climate change and the conservation and sustainable management of ecosystems.

Likewise, the project has done an exercise of linkage with the SDGs (see "ERM Project of Mercury and its link with the SDGs") where it can be seen, comparing the goals established by ODS with the results and products to be obtained by the project . The following table shows the alignment of the objectives and goals of the SDGs:

**Table 9 Relation between SDGs and the ERM Mercury project goals.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Objective** | **Goal** |
| 1. End Poverty | 1.4 |
| 1. Zero Hunger | 2.1 |
| 1. Good Health and Wellbeing | 3.9 |
| 1. Gender Equality | 5.5 |
| 6. Clean water and sanitation | 6.3; 6.6 |
| 7. Affordable and clean energy | 7.1; 7.3 |
| 8. Decent Work and Economic Growth | 8.2; 8.3; 8.4; 8.8 |
| 9. Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure | 9.3; 9.4 |
| 10. Reduced inequalities | 10.3 |
| 11. Sustainable Cities and communities | 11.6 |
| 12. Responsible Production and Consumption | 12.4; 12.5; 12.7 |
| 13. Climate action | 13.1 |
| 14. Life Below Water | 14.1 |
| 15. Life On Land | 15.3 |
| 17. Partnerships for the Goals | 17.1; 17.3 |

### Progress towards the results

* + 1. *Analysis of the progress towards results*

As indicated in the Guide, this process consists of examining the progress made in achieving the expected results. The evaluator has reviewed the GEF monitoring tool, both completed during the CEO approval phase and recently presented in the middle of the period.

According to the information provided by PCU and UNDP in the GEF monitoring tool "Chemical and Waste tracking tool", it can be seen that the project has substantially advanced in some of the planned goals in terms of Reduction / elimination and management of Mercury.

**Table 10. Comparison of goals reported during project approval and the Mid Term Review presented in the PIR.**

| **Indicators** | **Amount** | | **Observations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **During approval** | **Mid Term** |
| Number of tools to manage Hg and waste | 3 | 5 | Two additional tools will be achieved: A National Technical Guide for the use of Mercury and National Certification of origin of gold from MAPE |
| Number of technologies demonstrated, used and transferred | 1 | 1 | The purchase and installation of the gravimetric plant is expected by 2019 |
| Amount of Mercury reduced | 1 tn | 6.2 tn | . The great reduction is due to the Presidential Regulation regulating the mining activity going from 170 to 37 dredges representing the use of 660 kg / year of Hg |
| Reduction and elimination of mercury from emission sources | 0.0148 | 0.0467 | The reduction is related to the suspension of purchase of thermometers from the two hospitals, as well as the safe temporary storage of Hg waste in the 4 hospitals. |

As can be seen from the comparison of Table 11 with the table of the Progress Matrix in the Achievement of Results in the Executive Summary section, the project is making good progress in achieving its results despite the delays suffered in the Start-up of the project described below in section 4.3 of Project execution and adaptive management. It is also noted that there have been changes at the level of the products designed to achieve the results. This has happened due to the correct situational analysis that has allowed the UdP, MiAmbiente, INHGEOMIN and UNDP to adapt the AWP according to the needs. Next, the advances by component are presented. This information arises from the review of the quarterly reports and the two PIRs presented for the first and second year of execution and for the information provided by the PcU as well as the interviews carried out with key actors:

**Table 11. Progress towards the achievement of results per component en los logros del proyecto por resultado y componente**

| **Component** | **Result** | **Product** | **Achivement augst 2018** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1 Strengthen institutional capacities to achieve Environmentally Sound Management (ERM) of Mercury | 1.1 Improved capacity at the institutional level to evaluate and monitor hg emissions, Hg levels in populations, and generate data and scientific information in order to take action in relation to priority issues |  | Developed Mercury Release Inventories (Levels I and II) Analytical Capabilities installed in CESCCO for the environmental and biological determination of mercury (DMA 80) and in INHGEOMIN.  In development Human Mercury Exposure and Intoxication Study in the pilot community of El Corpus, Choluteca. |
| 1.2 Improved coordination and interministerial communication for Hg ERM |  | |
| C2. Strengthen the regulatory and policy framework to support the reduction in the use of mercury and allow the ERM of products containing mercury and its wastes | 2.1 Regulatory and policy framework strengthened to reduce dependence on mercury, and products with mercury content, and to improve the appropriate environmental management of mercury. |  | In force the Minamata Agreement: August 16, 2017 |
|  | Regulation for the Management of Mercury in compliance with the Minamata Agreement (Executive Decree) |
|  | Precision codes generated for the products with added mercury and in the process of issuing the tax instruction by SEFIN for its national application with the support of DARA Others: Regulation of Occupational Health and Safety in Mining Activities. |
| C3 Reduce releases of mercury from priority sectors (ASM and Health) to protect human health and the environment | 3.1 Releases of Hg from reduced priority mining communities as a result of the adoption of BAT / MPA practices and the gradual discontinuation of inappropriate mining practices |  | Developed Economic Community Base Line of Mining Community The Corpus (input for Study of Exhibition and Conformation community enterprise) |
|  | 70 Miners trained in Mining and Environmental Legal Framework (The Corpus, Macuelizo, El Paráiso). |
|  | Established the first company of the social sector of the economy of the Small-scale Mining and Gold Crafts in Honduras, "Mineros 02 de Julio".  Started the process of Environmental Licensing of July 2  The Small Mining Concession application process has begun  Certificate of origin  Regulation on MAPE  Signed a Cooperation Agreement with the Gold Refinery (Heimerle and Meule) and INHGEOMIN for the development of the Gold-Green Plan -Honduras. |
|  | Se trabaja con Cuevas y Minas y El Paraíso |
| 3.2 Reduced EdS Hg releases through the adoption of BAT / MPA practices and the gradual discontinuation of devices containing Hg |  | Base lines on Mercury developed for 4 hospitals |
|  | Established registration protocols and Mercury Temporary Storage equipment in 4 pilot hospitalsDiagnostics on Hospital Solid Waste Management developed for 4 hospitals and proposal of 4 Hospital Waste Management Plans with Mercury Substitution and Management Plans |
|  | 3 Subscribed voluntary agreements (HEU, HNMCR and HSF) for the gradual substitution of mercury and 1 Institutional Policy in HMEP  Adjudicated batches of mercury-free devices for their provision in the 4 pilot hospitals for the application of the Mercury Replacement Plans. |
| C4 Strengthen the technical capacity and infrastructure for temporary storage of mercury-containing waste | 4.1 Established financially sustainable temporary options for mercury-containing wastes, and identified long-term options. |  | Proposal for a National Strategy for Post-Consumption Product Management with Mercury  4 temporary mercury storage sites established in Pilot and Replica Hospitals |
|  | A Technical Cooperation agreement between MINOSA and MiAmbiente for the final disposal of mercury as a by-product and medical devices. |
| C5 Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback, social projection and evaluation | 5.1 The Project's products are sustainable and replicable |  | Elaboration of QPR and PIRs  EMT |

The project has been able, with the time it has had and the available resources, to take advantage of the occasions and opening of the different parties to generate / produce additional products that were not foreseen in the ProDoc. These are the following:

**Table 12 List of additional products achieved per Component**

| **Component** | **Additional products** |
| --- | --- |
| 1 | Inventary Level II |
| Strengthening other laboratories using DMA 80 |
| 2 | Customs training in the country on international conventions on chemical products (Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm and Minamata). Example of added value; We returned 16 containers with wet batteries with lead acid in disuse (it was prevented from being imported, considering that in Honduras the importation of hazardous waste is prohibited. |
| **3** | Occupational Health and Safety Regulations mining activities approved by Law |
| Regulation of Artisanal Mining and Small Mining |
| Small mining handbook |
| Manual Due Compliance for mineral extraction OECD - Agreement Inhgeomin and Heimerle & Meule |
| Certificate of origin. Certificate issued by INHGEOMIN certifying the traceability of traded gold |
| Inventory and all other products in the 4 hospitals. Plans for the elimination and replacement of Hg in hospitals. The waste management plans. |
| Project eliminated HEU esophageal probes and equipped with mercury-free probes |
| **4** | MiAmbiente Agreement - Minosa for final disposal mercury. 4t additional Hg to be eliminated in 2019 |
| Elimination of approx. 30 kg Hg from 4 hospitals (a first shipment of 14 kg to MINOSA occurred in 2018). |

* + 1. *Remaining barriers to the achievement of the project’s objectives*

The analysis of the progress towards achieving the results also implies an analysis of the remaining barriers to the achievement of the project's objectives. Next, the barriers detected are presented by reviewing the documentation and interviewing the actors by expected result:

**Table 13. Identified barriers per Project component**

| **Component** | **Barrier** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. 1. Strengthen institutional capacities to achieve ERM Mercury | General institutional weakness and high volatility of trained personnel. Although the project has managed to strengthen the capacities, many countries in the region and Honduras is not an exception, they suffer from an endemic disease that is the high volatility of the trained personnel. To this we must add the politicization observed at the level of the public sector, which means that there is still greater volatility. |
| 1. Strengthen the regulatory and policy framework | General institutional weakness |
| 1. Reduce releases of mercury from priority sectors (MAPE and Health) | Acceptance by mining communities. Although much progress has been made with the pilot communities, political changes at the INHGEOMIN level can lead to setbacks in the relationship with the communities. It takes a long time to build this trust that is often related to people.  Weakness and fragmentation at the level of the Ministry of Health. Hospitals, for better or for worse, seem to work almost autonomously from the Secretariat. Many of the actions for the elimination or substitution of mercury in their hospitals have been promoted by Hospital Managements by their own conviction, not following clear guidelines from the Secretariat.  Lack of medical staff that makes it more complicated to give a proper follow-up to the environmental actions of reducing mercury in hospitals. |
| 1. Strengthen the technical capacity and infrastructure for temporary storage | Shortage of authorized waste managers at the national level. This shortage limits the possibilities of effective waste management. |

### Project execution and adaptative management

#### Management tools

The project is implemented under the modality of National Implementation (NIM). MiAmbiente, through the Program Office and the effective participation of INHGEOMIN, and CESCCO are the government institutions in charge of the execution of the project. The UNDP in Honduras and the Government have the Project Coordinating Office where most of the UNDP-GEF projects are located. However, the decision was made to locate this project in CESCCO given the specific theme. For this purpose, an office was installed in the building to house the staff of the PcU. The main idea of having the project in CESCCO is mainly to facilitate coordination with the Government. Although having the PcU in CESCCO can provide facilities in the coordination also, for the project, being in the PCO would bring concrete benefits, such as, for example, coordination with other GEF initiatives, follow-up to the administrative procedures promoted by the PCO in addition to logistical benefits, such as, office meetings, parking space for vehicles.

The ProDoc refers to the Project Board as the highest level of coordination and decision making of the project. Textually, the Project Board "will be the group in charge of making decisions regarding the management of the project and will be integrated by MiAmbiente, UNDP, sector MAPE, Health sector and CNG" and should meet, at least once per year, to review the progress of the project, approve work plans and approve the main deliverables of the project ". The project, to date, has convened three Steering Committees. Reviewing the minutes of the meetings, it is noted that, although the name changes, the functions are the same. In the minutes of the second meeting of August 8, 2017, it is mentioned "a Project Board is an instance of decision, which responds to the methodology of project management supported by UNDP, where all members assume responsibility and decisions are made, the progress of the projects is reviewed and the results are valued ". As for the members, the three Directing Committees were attended by high-level officials from MiAmbiente (vice minister), UNDP, UNAH, INHGEOMIN, Ministry of Health, PCO, CESCCO and the PcU through their National Coordinator. and Administrative Assistant of the project. The three Steering Committees follow the same logic, the report from the previous year is presented, the AWP for the following year is revised, budget execution is carried out and strategic aspects are valued. For each CD, the PcU presents a detailed report of the year's progress detailing, by ProDoc result, the indicator, baseline and expected goal, progress according to the goals, difficulties and lessons learned and the goal of the following year.

**Table 14. Main strategic decisions identified by the Steering Committee**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Main agreements** |
| 24 november 2015 | Goals approval, AWP, aquisition plan for 2016 |
| For Monitoring, invite SC members to participate |
| Seek stakeholders participation on coming meetings |
| Sede del proyecto en CESCCO |
| 08 august 2017 | Project must recommend measures for results sustainability |
| Analyze possibility to expand to other hospitals |
| Instruct Technical Committee to look for in situ training options for mining population |
| Explore south-south cooperation options for MAPE |
| Technical Committee will analyze better options for the installation of the gravimetric plant |
| Approve 2017 AWP and acquisition plan |
| UNDP will meet with investors to analyze why the tender did not work |
| Analyze environmental license for 2 of July |
| 6 december 2017 | 2017 annual report approved |
| AWP, PAC and Monitoring plan, 2018 budget for USD 517,196 |
| Update risk matrix to add weakness of corporate governance July 2 |

It should be noted that there was no SC during 2016. This is due to the resignation of the first National Coordinator since the current Coordinator did not start with his functions until June 2016. It should also be mentioned that although the participation of the MAPE benefits on the SC does not seem to be achieved.

As can be seen in table 14, the SC is well informed of the progress of the project and makes strategic decisions relevant to the achievement of the results and goals of the project.

On the other hand, the project has constituted a Technical Committee. This committee is made up of members of the bodies represented in the CPD, but at the operational level they work on a daily basis with the activities of the project to achieve their expected results. For example, there are technical links at the level of hospitals, CESCCO, INHGEOMIN and SS that, in addition to working directly with the project, help coordinate with other actors intra-institutionally (information provided by the Project Coordinator).

UNDP, as the Implementing Agency, provides support services for the administrative and operational execution of the project and participates in all the Direct Committees organized by the project. It has also been possible to confirm a continuous flow of communication with the UNDP Program Officer responsible for the project and with the PCU staff. Therefore, the **evaluator considers**, from the documentary review and interviews carried out, **that the support provided to the project by UNDP is appropriate and satisfactory since, in addition to participating in the Boards of Directors, it continuously supports and monitors the actions of the draft**.

#### Work planning

The project took a long time to start. This was due to the fact that, during the first year, the project had a coordinator who resigned in the second year of the project. From the hiring of the second and current coordinator, June 2016, several months were taken throughout the hiring process of the technical staff of the PcU. As is logical, the change in coordination affects the project times and the planning itself. From the interviews with the actors, it was found that each coordinator took his time to understand the objectives of the project and define the best strategy to move forward.

During the first year of the project's life, they focused on hiring the project team and establishing coordination mechanisms with the pilot hospitals, four, and with the MAPE community. Coordination has also involved establishing the pertinent mechanisms between MiAmbiente (CESCCO and INHGEOMIN) as well as the Ministry of Health and the private sector through the CNHA.It is worth highlighting the joint planning that has been carried out with the MIA-NAP Project of ONUAMBIENTE. This project does not appear in the ProDoc baseline since it was formulated and negotiated later. This coordination has helped, and the coordinator of ERM Mercury is also the coordinator of MIA-NAP. This has been facilitated by MiAmbiente with a view to promoting coordination between projects that have common objectives. The following figure clearly shows the level of coordination between these two projects.

**Figure 5 Sinergy between the projects ERM Mercury and MIA NAP for the formulation of the National Implementation Plan on Mercury**



As can be seen, both projects are perfectly aligned and working synergistically to achieve the National Implementation Plan for the Minamata Convention with a clear division of tasks and following appropriate chronological planning.

As a complement to the National Implementation Plan, it will be its National Action Plan (NAP) for gold MAPE in Honduras. As you can see in the following figure, this is another example of adaptive management and coordination between projects.

**Figure 6. Gold MAPE NAP intervention model for Honduras**

Likewise, there are more examples of adaptive management and coordination of the GAR Mercurio project with other projects and actors:

* As mentioned above, the synergy between the GAR Mercurio and MIA NAP projects for the development of two levels of inventories of mercury releases with optimization of financial, human and time resources;
* Assuming the conduction of the Human Mercury Exposure and Intoxication Study by the project and supported by a Technical Advisory Group (with limited participation of the Ministry of Health at the central level), a very active involvement of the representatives of the SS was achieved. departmental and local level which allowed an appropriation of the process conducted and a greater projection in the stage of communication of results.
* Integration of the health expert by the Artisan Gold Council (AGC) to support the design and application of the scientific research protocol of the referred study, thus compensating for the low participation of the HS.

On the other hand, the PcU has prepared, for the 2017 Steering Committee, a report which presents the cumulative progress of the results and the review of next year's goals, providing a detailed description of the progress and difficulties and lessons learned during the process. Without a doubt, this will be of great value for the final evaluation of the project. An advance of the financial execution was also presented with a traffic light indicating the level of execution (green, yellow and red) and the 2018 AWP together with a risk management plan for the project.

The AWP presents a breakdown of activities by component and product with details of the responsible party, budget line of UNDP and the total financial resources allocated. This facilitates the continuous monitoring of the project.

**The evaluator concludes that the PcU and the PSC have worked in a very coordinated manner with other projects, have been able to adapt to the current situation with the allocated resources and have looked for the best way to achieve greater impact** (this can be verified with the additional products achieved per component) which has been translated into concrete and landed AWPs.

#### Financement and cofinancement

From the analysis of the PIRs and quarterly reports (CDR) it is clear that the budgetary execution of the project is medium-high and that the execution foreseen in the AWPs is being fulfilled except for the international purchase of the gravimetric plant. As of September 2018, the project has executed 61.9%. As can be seen in the following table of annual expenditure, the project has invested the largest amount of resources in Component 3 with 46.4% of the total spent, followed by 15% in management, 14% in component 1 and 12.6% in component 2. Component 4 has invested 8.7% of resources, although this component is expected to increase during the remainder of the year and 2019.

**Table 15. Report of the Annual Combined Expense**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Total expense (january-december)** | | | | | |
| **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018[[6]](#footnote-6)** | **Total** | **%** |
| Activity 1. Capacities strengthening | 4,468.88 | 70,965.45 | 26,803.40 | 14,718.83 | 116,956.56 | 14 |
| Activity 2. Regulatory framowords | 17,866.27 | 33,910.17 | 28,851.55 | 25,310.20 | 105,938.19 | 12.6 |
| Activity 3. Reduce mercury emmissions | 1,295.61 | 82,592.03 | 188,323.30 | 117,367.83 | 389,578.77 | 46.4 |
| Activity 4. Infrastructure strengthening |  | 10,899.05 | 54,900.93 | 7,828.80 | 73,628.78 | 8.7 |
| Activity 5. M&E |  | 8.47 | 8,343.22 | 16,892.58 | 25,244.27 | 3 |
| Activity 6. Project managment | 6,669.39 | 70,239.55 | 42,403.52 | 8,269.20 | 127,581.66 | 15.2 |
| Total | 30,300.15 | 268,974.56 | 350,173.73 | 190,421.33 | 838,928.23 | 100 |

(Source: UNDP CDR)

**Figure 7. Percentage of expense per year and activity**



As can be seen, the first year the project focused more on the regulatory framework, while during the second year (series 2), the project worked more on activity 1 of capacity building and regulatory framework and during the third year (series 3), focused more on reducing mercury releases and strengthening infrastructure. During the fourth year (series 4), the project has spent equally among activities highlighting the M & E activity where this MTR is located.

UNDP carries out the administration of the project and therefore monitoring the co-financing established in the ProDoc.

**Table 16. Co-financing table**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Source of cofinancement | Name of cofinanciement entity | Type of funding | Amount cofinanced at CEO approval date (US$) | Amount really contributed during MTR (US$) | Real Percentage (%) of foreseen amount |
| United Nations | UNDP | In kind | 50,000 | 25,000 | 50 |
| Multilateral | GEF | Cash | 1,300,000 | 870,000 | 67 |
| Public | Honduras Government | In kind | 3,784,854 | 2,785,000 |  |
| Private sector | Recycle | In kind | 2,300,000 | 2,300,000 | 100 |
| HES | In kind | 85,000 | 45,000 | 77.5 |

It is important to highlight that the project has other co-financing actors not foreseen in the ProDoc. These are:

1. Heimerle and Meule;
2. Lundin Foundation;
3. Pilot and replication hospitals;
4. Deputy Directorate of Customs Revenue;
5. Water Governance Program in the Gulf of Fonseca (Swiss Cooperation).

The evaluator does not have the co-financed amounts.

**The analysis of the financial instruments reflects that the project is being well monitored and that all the reports required by the GEF are generated. The project reports adequately.**

#### Project level Monitoring and evaluation systems

The results matrix of the ProDoc is the basis of the monitoring carried out by the PcU through the quarterly reports and the PIRs. A specific progress report is also prepared and presented to the PSC. The project, in the ProDoc, specifies in section VI how the monitoring will be carried out. Reference is made to the start-up workshop, the quarterly reports, the PIR, the monitoring through the field visits, the midterm evaluation and the final evaluation and the audit. For all monitoring a budget of USD 120,000 is allocated for the period. The evaluator has been able to verify how the PcU monitors and has interviewed actors who actively participate in said monitoring. All the reports prepared by the PcU and validated by MiAmbiente and UNDP have also been accessed. The start-up workshop could not be organized in the first two months of the project as foreseen in the UNDP standards. **It is considered that the project has allocated sufficient resources to carry out the monitoring tasks and that the PcU is correctly performing the monitoring functions with the established tools**. The role played by the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser from Panama in the monitoring of the project has also been of great help at the substantive level to guide the Project Coordinator.

As mentioned above, the ProDoc has 61 product indicators. This means that the PcU must invest a lot of time in the preparation of the reports. Reporting on so many products does not provide knowledge about the results. Yes, there is clarity about what the project is doing, but not necessarily if the results are achieved. **It would be advisable to reformulate the indicators and think about those that serve to measure the results exclusively.**

In relation to the disaggregation of the information monitored by sex, the evaluator has not found evidence that this information is being collected. **There is no breakdown by sex of the monitored indicators. This does not mean that the project is not working with key groups, but that the data is not being collected in a disaggregated manner.**

#### Involvment of the interested parties

When we talk about the participation or involvement of the interested parties, what the evaluator asks is the following:

In relation to Project Management: Has the project developed and forged adequate alliances, both with direct stakeholders and with other tangential agents?

The level of coordination, as mentioned throughout the report, has been very high. The project has achieved alliances with private actors, such as, for example, Heimerle and Meule, the Lundin Foundation, ARM, MINOSA, etc., as well as with public actors. We have worked very well with the technical commissions, through bilateral meetings and through the CDP. All this has made the level of participation of public and private actors very high. The level of knowledge of the subject by the technical team has greatly helped this achievement as they themselves have brought other actors to the table.

Regarding Participation and processes promoted from the country: Do the local and national governments support the project's objectives? Do they still have an active role in making decisions regarding the project that contributes to an efficient and effective implementation of it?

The Government, through MiAmbiente, CESCCO and INHGEOMIN, is participating very actively in the CDP and in the coordination of actions with the PcU. It is not the case of the Ministry of Health which has been rather absent from the PSC. As for the local government, the little will of participation of the municipal government of El Corpus draws attention. The evaluator did not manage to meet with the mayor of the town and was informed of everything that said actor is doing against the objectives of the project and of July 2. It would be very important to try an approach through the Central Government with the mayor to try to reverse the current situation. The aforementioned public actors continue to participate in the PSC in a strategic manner. The project also managed to have participation, in two of the three PSCs, with the participation of the mining community.

Finally, on public participation and awareness: To what extent has the involvement and public awareness contributed to progress in achieving the project's objectives? Undoubtedly, the sensitization carried out by the project has been key to achieving the participation of the actors. In the interviews with the actors participating in the project, both in the MAPE and Health sectors, their lack of knowledge of the dangerousness of mercury and its negative impact on health and the environment was highlighted. All the actors interviewed emphasized the **awareness received as a key to achieving their participation.**

#### Information

The project, through its PcU and under the supervision of UNDP and MiAmbiente, **has worked in time and form all the quarterly reports and the three PIRs**. All these reports have been analyzed and reviewed by the evaluator. The quarterly reports and the AWPs have been the bases of the information that has been shared with the actors and decision makers in the two meetings of the PSC carried out.

There were changes from the design phase to the implementation phase of the project. As mentioned above, the approval of the MIA NAP project implied a significant change in the context. Although the ProDoc does not reflect it, it has been verified that there is a very fluid communication and coordination between the projects. This change in context is reflected in the AWPs and in the quarterly reports and the PIRs as well as in the reports submitted to the CPD. This is an example of adaptive management once the project has been able to adapt to changes in the current situation. The key actors have been informed of these changes through the meetings indicated above. On the other hand, UNDP, as the Implementing Agency, has presented all the reports established in the ProDoc to the GEF.

In relation to the documentation of lessons derived from adaptive management, the evaluator has evidence that the project has generated this type of information in the reports that are presented to the CPD and that it will be useful during the final evaluation of the project.

A good number of the interviewed actors consider the project as those responsible for the management of mercury at a national level and take them as references.

#### Communication

In this section, a brief analysis is made of both the internal and external communication of the project. Internally, the project has communicated the main events and PSC to all the expected actors. It has achieved the participation of most of the actors except the HS. The non-participation of the SS has not been due to lack of insistence or communication from the project but due to internal restructuring of the Secretariat. **Communication with the executing agency at the national and regional levels, as well as with the implementing entities, is considered timely**.

External communication, in the face of beneficiaries and partners, is considered optimal. All the informative materials elaborated by the project have been reviewed and it has been verified with the actors the high value they give to them. Therefore, it can be concluded that the project has **effectively communicated the importance of the elimination of mercury both at a general level and in the MAPE and Health sector** (for example, the ASM Regulation, Certificate of Origin, Manual of Good Mining-Environmental Practices for Artisanal Mining and the Manual of Best Environmental Practices in Small-scale Mining) and has participated in events, such as organizers or participants, related to the theme. The project is also active on social networks such as linkedin and Facebook. Special mention is the **MAPE Forum** organized in 2018 by the project. This was the first time that all the actors, public and private, met in one place and had a space to discuss and share. This event was valued very positively by all the actors.

### Sustainability

As the guide specifies, "the purpose of reviewing the sustainability of the project during the MTR is to establish the basis for the TE in which it will proceed to assess its sustainability from each of the four categories established by the GEF (financial, socioeconomic, governance and institutional and environmental framework) ". At this point, the evaluator has not analyzed financial, socioeconomic, institutional and environmental sustainability in this exercise, but has examined the likely risks faced by the project so that the results are achieved.

More specifically, the evaluator has validated the risks identified in the ProDoc, the PIR and if the valuations are up to date and if they are adequate. The following table shows the risks identified in the ProDoc, the valuations of the PcU and the ratings of the interviewed actors. For this purpose, the evaluator has used the PIR and quarterly reports, as well as the responses of the actors to the sustainability questions in the semi-structured interviews.

**Table 17. Comparativa List of identified risks**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Risk | PcU value | Actor’s value | Comments |
| 1 | Lack of coordination of relevant institutions and ministries | Low | Low | The PSC has worked very well and shows coordination. Except with HS. |
| 2 | New regulatory instruments can not be formulated and adapted within the time frame of the project | Low | Low | It has not been the case |
| 3 | Slower than expected implementation of the BAT / BAT in the MAPE communities | Medium | High | The MPA / MTD are linked, in The Corpus, to the purchase and installation of the gravimetric plant. |
| 4 | Little confidence of the institutions of the care sector in the mercury-free devices | Low | Low | It is not the case. Mistrust is with products purchased through the State Purchasing Office |
| 5 | Perception by artisanal gold miners that economic incentives are too low to adopt BMP / BAT practices | NA | NA | It does not apply when there are no economic incentives at present. |
| 6 | Mistrust of miners towards government agencies and entities (as well as their affiliates, such as UNDP) that try to support the formalization of the ASM sector | Low | Low | The perception of the beneficiaries has changed from the beginning to now. Come to the project and Government as partners. |
| 7 | Current intermediaries can resist the shortening of the gold supply chain | High | High | Municipality of El Corpus totally against July 2 |
| 8 | Less demand for premium and fair trade or green gold than the supply of this | Bajo | Bajo | Person interviewed shows no concern about this |
| ***New risks to sustainability identified by the actors interviewed*** | | | | |
| 9 | Type of labor contracts and politicization |  | Medium | This fact can cause the UdP to lose some of its members. |
| 10 | Institutional weakness and fragmentation at the level of the Ministry of Health |  | Medium | Hospitals have been functioning autonomously in the elimination of mercury. Greater presence of the SS will be needed to replicate the model. |
| 11 | Change in the authorities and therefore interests and |  | Medium | Any change can also be an opportunity. It depends on the person who enters. |
| 12 | Hospital Administrations cannot control all device inputs |  | Low | As the Convention is applied and articles with mercury are banned by 2020, it will no longer be a risk. |

Independently of the risk analysis for sustainability, the evaluator has detected two important points to take into account at this point:

* In relation to MAPE, although the Government has the tools and there is clarity on the steps to follow, the evaluator does not see feasible that new communities manage to form the companies, without constant support during the formation and formation period of the companies and without logistical support to establish the value chain. This implies, in addition to having manuals and technical support staff from INHGEOMIN, to have financial resources to support the transformation. As it has been seen in the case of Minas y Cuevas and 02 de Julio, achieving the organization of the communities, processing the permits, shaping the companies and changing the way they operate and work the mine, involves a lot of money.
* The support of the local government is essential to push the MAPE ventures. What is being proposed and being done, giving greater autonomy and power to the mining communities, is a paradigm shift. A clear example is what has happened to the Municipality of El Corpus where the mayor is putting obstacles to boycott the company 02 de Julio. There are strong economic interests that do not see with good eyes that the rules of the game are changed and therefore their benefits are diminished. By organizing mining communities and eliminating intermediaries in the process of selling gold, there are interest groups that are losing large amounts of money.

## 5. Conclusions and recommendations

### 5.1 Conclusions

* The project was designed in a **highly** **participatory** manner and is considered to be **well** **designed** and of good quality. The logic of intervention is relevant and is perfectly aligned with national and United Nations priorities. However, **component** **3** of the ProDoc **did not take into account the socioeconomic component** to work with the **communities** during the design. We thought about the value chain, but not all the work necessary to achieve it, both organizational and administrative.
* The monitoring and evaluation system foreseen in the ProDoc is composed of 2 indicators of objectives and 61 indicators of products. The project has 5 components and 8 results with 27 products. This implies that, on average, 2.2 indicators are being reported per product. Some of these products have been modified in the AWPs but not the ProDoc. It should be noted that no results indicators are presented. This means that monitoring is considered excessive and a large amount of time must be spent. Therefore, **there is room for improvement in the Results Framework** since results indicators can be proposed with their respective goals.
* The **gender** **perspective** is **well** **prepared** and presented in the ProDoc. Likewise, the project went a step further and developed, together with the gender specialist of the PCO, its own gender action plan. This plan determines how to involve people in the activities and also suggests how to carry out the monitoring. Therefore, the gender dimension is well covered in the ProDoc and in the day-to-day of the project.
* The ProDoc presents a risk mitigation plan. The **identified risks are still relevant, and the mitigation measures have been effective and therefore well designed** and are currently maintained.
* In relation to the achievement of the results, **the evaluator considers that the project is developing, in general terms, satisfactorily**. This is due to the fact that it is achieving almost all the planned goals and is even generating additional products that are highly valued by the target audience. This is due to various factors such as, for example, the suitability of the equipment hired, the existing coordination between the different initiatives that make the projects perfectly articulated and therefore be more efficient in the use of resources, the technical knowledge of the team and the contacts they have brought to the project, providing valuable collaboration opportunities.
* The **Project Steering Committee** is meeting as planned in the ProDoc and **fulfilling its most strategic commitments**. The PcU serves as the technical secretariat of the PSC and convenes, prepares the necessary documentation and guides the PSC in making strategic decisions. The Ministry of Health has not participated as actively as expected. On the planning of the work, the evaluator concludes that both the UdP and the PSC have worked in a very coordinated way with other projects and have been able to adapt to the current situation with the allocated resources and have looked for the best way to achieve the greatest impact.
* The project has a good co-financing and is being monitored in a timely manner. More co-financiers have been achieved than those foreseen in the ProDoc. It is considered that the project has a **good implementation**. The project managed to execute 90% of the budget in 2016, 88% in 2017 and 38% in 2018. This level is to July 2018 and partly due to not having yet achieved the purchase of the gravimetric plant. If achieved in 2018, the execution rate would increase considerably. The analysis of the financial instruments reflects that the project is well monitored, and all the reports required by the GEF are generated.
* **Communication** with UNDP at the national and regional levels and therefore with the GEF has been **adequate**. The project has developed effective internal and external communication lines and **has managed to raise awareness** of the importance of mercury eradication and the harmful effects it has on health and the environment for the **target public**.
* **Difficulties in the process of acquiring the plant**. UNDP has launched two international calls for purchase that have been declared void due to the high financial expectations of the companies that showed up. The purchase of the plant is key to component 3 of the project.
* The project has **managed** to **eliminate**, in an active way and also thanks to the Honduran legal context, **a good amount of mercury from both MAPE and the health sector**. However, the miners of El Corpus continue to use 600kg / year of mercury in the harrows. Without the gravimetric plant, the project will not be able to definitively eliminate the use of mercury in this mining area.
* The project is **well** **monitored** and deadlines and formats are met. Sufficient financial resources have been allocated to perform the monitoring tasks and the PcU is performing the tasks correctly **monitoring** tasks both at the **institutional** level and through **field** **visits** to the ASM communities. The monitoring of the 61 **output** **indicators** is **excessive** and does not provide information on the achievement of the results.
* **Institutional** **continuity** is expected for the project (Government) although if there is a change of focal points, it will involve a time to establish contacts and alignment which would imply that the **execution times of the project can be delayed**.
* The **local** **government** is **very** **important** to achieve results and facilitate processes (opposite cases in Macuelizo and El Corpus). Achieving their participation is key to supporting processes at the local level.
* The project and the other initiatives promoted by the United Nations and the Honduran State are generating high-level regulations and regulations. On the part of the governmental and private sector actors interviewed, there is a **doubt** as to whether the **State** has the **capacity** for **implementation**. The entry into force of the Convention is key to the cessation of entry of Hg products into the country. Will the State have the capacity to manage all assets in terms of mercury product waste and storage?
* The work of organizing mining communities in companies to manage concessions legally is slow. **Communities** have many **weaknesses** and **need** **accompaniment** **throughout** the **process**. The tools developed (manuals, regulations, guides) are very good but insufficient to achieve replicability. Achieving the sustainability of these companies implies time and resources as evidenced by the support provided by the Lundin Foundation to the company Minas y Cuevas, estimated at USD 1 million.
* The **project** suffered a considerable **delay** in **its** **beginnings** due to the resignation of the first coordinator and the entire hiring process of the current coordinator and the technical team.

### Recommendations

The recommendations have been divided between those actions related to corrective actions for design, execution, monitoring and evaluation and those focused on continuing or reinforcing the initial benefits of the project.

#### 5.2.1 Corrective actions for the design, execution, Monitoring and evaluation of the project

* In relation to the design of the project and as proposed in section 4.1 Project strategy, the evaluator recommends taking advantage of the MTR to **update** the **logical** **framework** of the **ProDoc**. This will facilitate the monitoring and generation of quarterly reports, as well as provide greater clarity when planning the annual work. On the other hand, the modification of the matrix providing new indicators of results and their goals will allow to better communicate the results at the end of the project, in a more direct and transparent way. What is sought with the change of the indicators of results is to express more reliably what the project is achieving. They do not imply changes of direction but rather of context. Moving from 61 product indicators to 10 or 12 performance indicators will greatly facilitate the monitoring of the PcU and the work of the PSC. Likewise, a theory of change that seeks to reflect the intervention logic of the project has been worked on.
* Explore the possibility of **locating an office in PCO**. Although CESCCO has enabled the space to host the project and it is important to be within the Government to facilitate coordination, having the office in PCO would allow the project, in the year and a half that has left its useful life, to push and give greater follow-up to the project. the administrative processes necessary to execute the funds.
* UNDP is looking at the best way to resume contracting the purchase and installation of the gravimetric plant for El Corpus. One of the options is the **direct** **hiring** of the Colombian company that installed the same plant for Mines and Caves. For this purpose, the possibility of hiring the turnkey option should be explored. The purchase and installation of the plant is key to achieving the goals set forth in component 3 of the project.
* According to the conversations with DARA, it is recommended to **socialize** **with** **taxpayers through the Chamber of Commerce and the Competitiveness Committees the implications** that the implementation and implementation of the commitments assumed with the **Minamata** **Convention** will have. This will be part of the dissemination and awareness of the project and can also be part of the Exit Strategy that the project can develop.
* Seek greater **involvement** of the **Ministry** of **Health** and **MiAmbiente** to monitor the **progress** of the **pilot** **hospitals**. Strengthen and integrate other instances of the SS, such as the General Directorate of Surveillance of the Normative and Normalization Framework who give the licenses for health establishments, public and private. You could explore the possibility of inviting them to a specific CDP where the replicability of health pilots in other hospitals is also explored.
* There is a baseline for the Corpus of socioeconomic uprising. It is a valuable information that in the medium term can help determine the **real** **impact** of the **project**. It is recommended to **develop** **impact** **indicators** to be measured by INGHEOMIN within the framework of the MAPE Plan to be formulated.

#### 5.2.2 Actions to continue or strengthen the initial benefits of the project

* **Extend the useful life of the project by half a year until December 2019.** The project started late. It suffered delays due to the resignation of the first coordinator and the conformation of the team and has suffered delays, such as the declaration void of the international bidding process of the gravimetric plant on two occasions, all that has led the project to have a low execution of 38% in 2018. The evaluator recommends requesting an extension of a minimum of 6 months that will allow compliance with the main goals of the project. The project plans to continue supporting the formation of the 02 de Julio company in its business development. It is appropriate to extend the deadline to allow more time for concepts and processes to be assimilated to help sustain the initiative.
* Design the **exit** **strategy** of the project by component, working actively with the actors using existing spaces such as the PSC or even the Technical Committees. The Exit Strategy will provide guidance and guidelines to achieve the sustainability of the actions. The Strategy can answer some of the questions that still remain to be answered, such as whether the Government has the capacity to implement all the regulations that are being drafted (component 1 and 2) or how INHGEOMIN can continue to replicate the model of The Corpus and Minas y Cuevas counting on the manuals and good practices of the project but knowing that it is necessary to involve the private sector to obtain the financing required for the whole process (component 3); how to achieve the participation and empowerment of the Ministry of Health to reach more hospitals at the country level or how to get importers to participate in the waste management process;
* **Strengthen the CAMINO Commission** (MAPE) to ensure the continuity of coordination between actors. In addition to strengthening it, it is important to get the United Nations to join the Commission. The CAMINO Commission can be the vehicle to obtain the financial and technical support for the replicability of the actions linked to the ASM.
* Dissemination and socialization of the new regulations and procedures established in a **regional closing FORUM**. Given the great success of the first regional forum, it would be useful to study the possibility of organizing a new regional forum to serve as the closure of the project. In this forum one could analyze how to give continuity to the MAPE actions and even in the health sector, counting on all the public and private actors and getting the CAMINO Commission to lead part of the Forum.

## 6. Anexes

### 6.1 ToR de la EMT

### 6.2 MTR evaluation matrix

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Questions** | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| **Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to national priorities and ownership and ownership of the country? Is it the best way to obtain the desired results?** | | | |
| Did the Project take into account the opportunities of the context and capacities of the organizations / institutions in the framework of Sustainable Development to define the implementation strategies? | Existence of national analysis documents and incorporated in the section of situational analysis of PRODOC that feed this reflection. | ProDoc, interviews with Project personnel | Documentary analysisSemistructured interviews with key informants (Government, International Organizations) as detailed in this report. |
| Is the Project in line with the mandate of UNDP on the subject, with the national needs and interests and with the national / regional / international commitments assumed at the regional level regarding mercury? | Degree to which the project's products are coherent with the national priorities, with the strategic areas of UNDP in the matter and are in line with the requirements of the commitments assumed by the countries at a regional / international level. | PRODOC Progress Reports (presented to Donors) AWPs  Specialized Regional Documents  UNDP Strategic Plan  Minamata Convention  Key informants | Analysis of documentation, research, and triangulation of documentary review information and interviews. |
| Have potential externalities (environmental, economic or political) been considered when designing the project? | Degree of analysis and deepening in the risk and mitigation measures section of PRODOC | ProDoc | Document analysis |
| Does the Project's strategy reflect a deep identification of environmental and social risks? Are there adequate mitigation measures? | Existence of the ESMF | ProDoc | Analysis of documentation, research, and triangulation of documentary review information and interviews. |
| Was the perspective of those who would be affected by the decisions related to the project, those who could influence their results and those who could contribute information or other resources during the project design processes taken into account during the project design processes? ? | Presence of specific indicators in the results framework | ProDoc | Documentary analysis and semi-structured interviews |
| In terms of the definition of the theory of change, how were the factors of gender and human rights considered? | • Levels of data disaggregation based on gender that are registered.  • Degree to which the Program invested in specialized technical assistance in these areas. | PRODOC  Progress Reports (presented to Donors)  AWPs  Key informants | Documentary analysis  Semi-structured interviews with key informants |
| Does the Project budget include financing for results, products and activities with gender relevance? | Amount of money allocated to results, products and activities. | ProDoc budget; AWP; Substantive reviews | Documentation review and semi-structured interviews |
| Is the results framework coherent and adequately reflects the theory of change to which the Program intends to contribute? | Adequacy in the description of the different components of the results framework and adequate hierarchy among them. | ProDoc | Documentary analysis  Semistructured interviews with key informants (UNDP, Government, International Organizations) as detailed in this report. |
| Are SMART really the mid-term and final goals? | Degree to which the goals are measurable | Results Matrix; Monitoring Matrix; Substantive reviews | Documentary analysis |
| Are the results and product indicators well designed to support monitoring? Can they be measured? | Degree to which indicators can be considered SMART | Results Matrix; Monitoring Matrix; Substantive reviews | Documentary analysis |
| **Progress in achieving results: What is the degree of compliance with the results and objectives desired so far?** | | | |
| Have the expected products been achieved? | Level of achievement reported in the GEF monitoring tools | GEF Tracking Tool; PIR; Quarterly reports | Documentary analysis  Semi-structured interviews with key informants |
| Have medium-term goals been achieved for each outcome and product? | Level of achievement reported in the GEF monitoring tools | GEF Tracking Tool; PIR; Quarterly reports |
| What have been the main obstacles, as well as the facilitating factors that have limited and / or enhanced the achievement of the expected results? | Extent to which the external factors / risks in the definition of the lines of work were considered. | Stakeholder engagement plan safeguards; ProDoc; Awp; quarterly reports |
| Is the Partner Strategy appropriate, effective and viable for the achievement of the products? | • Effective co-financing level•% achievement of results | Stakeholder engagement plan safeguards; ProDoc; Awp; quarterly reports |
| **Project Execution and adaptive management: So far has the project been implemented efficiently, profitably and adapted to changing conditions? To what extent do the systems for monitoring and evaluation, information and communication of the project contribute to its execution?** | | | |
| Are the available human, technical and financial resources adequately applied to the achievement of activities and products? And in this sense, have the times and amounts foreseen been respected? | • Budget execution level in relation to the programmed in proportion to the activities carried out.  • Degree to which the substantive reviews have applied the criterion of optimization in the investments / disposition of funds.  • National counterpart funds are made effective in time and manner provided in AWPs  • Level at which the implementing partners actively participate in the planning of committed activities. | PRODOCProgress Reports (presented to Donors)AWPsReports generated by UNDP for financial monitoringSubstantive reviewsInformants | Documentary analysis  Semi-structured interviews with key informants |
| Has there been effective coordination between the different actors in the implementation of the project? What have been your specific roles and responsibilities? | Existence of a stakeholder participation strategy;Participation of other actors in the Project Steering Committee | PRODOC Review and Minutes of the meetings of the Project Steering Committee | Documentary analysis Semi-structured interviews with beneficiaries and government representatives. |
| Has there been duplication of effort between the Project's interventions and those carried out by other projects? | Perception of the actors involved on the level of efficiency in relation to the different projects. | Review Minutes meetings Steering Committee. Interviews with beneficiaries. | Documentary analysis Semi-structured interviews with beneficiaries. |
| What is the analysis of the capacity and institutional arrangements for the implementation of the project? | Capacity of the executing agency and national counterparts to execute the project | Capacity analysis of MiAmbienteProDoc | Documentary analysis Semi-structured interviews with beneficiaries. |
| Has the technical assistance provided by UNDP through human resources (offices, external consultants) been sufficient and with the quality necessary to enforce the execution commitments? | * Level of rotation / replacement of UNDP country office staff;   • Favorable / unfavorable perception of national partners on the roles played by UNDP experts and contracted consultants. | PRODOCProgress Reports (presented to Donors)AWPsReports generated by UNDP for financial monitoringSubstantive reviewsInformants | Documentary analysis Semi-structured interviews with beneficiaries. |
| Has co-financing been as planned? | Degree of co-financing | ProDoc and PIR | Documentary analysis  Semi-structured interviews with key informants |
| Has there been a systematic practice of monitoring achievements based on outputs and, where appropriate, has such monitoring contributed to improving the efficiency of the program? | Level of adequacy of SMEs for making operational and management decisions. | Project monitoring reports and Follow-up actions to the missions. | Documentary analysis  Semi-structured interviews with key informants |
| **Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic and / or environmental risks for the long-term sustainability of the project's results?** | | | |
| What are the trends outside the control of the Project that influence the products (including the opportunities and risks that affect the achievement of the products)? | Degree of inclusion of trends in the analysis of environmental and social risks | Documentary analysis | Documentary analysis  Semi-structured interviews with key informants |
| To what extent can it be affirmed that the appropriation of the Program at the national level can ensure the continuity of the services that in terms of mercury elimination were achieved with the support of the Program? | Degree to which the alliances generated with project support will guarantee the continuity of the services. | Shows National Plans with clear emphasis on Mercury.Legislation / National regulations.Key informants | Documentary analysisSemi-structured interviews with key informants |
| What level of dependence on GEF resources does it represent for countries to settle their mercury plans / policies? | • Levels of national investmentPerception of the national partners on the financing gaps in the short and medium term |

### 6.3 Questionaire modelo or interview guide

Semi-structured interview guide for partners (interviews with government partners, NGOs, Civil Society, Private Sector, communities)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** |  |
| **Interviewees** |  |
| **Name** |  |
| **Position** |  |
| **Address** |  |
| **Tel.** |  |
| **Mail** |  |

**Introducción:**

* **Agradecer entrevistado/participante por su disponibilidad para la entrevista.**
* **Presentarse brevemente.**
* **Brevemente introducir el objetivo principal de la evaluación y como vamos a recopilar la información.**
* **Preguntar si el participante/entrevistado tiene alguna pregunta específica o alguna duda antes de empezar la entrevista.**
* **Dejar claro que toda la información recopilada será estrictamente confidencial.**

**Parte I: información General**

1. Por favor explique brevemente el trabajo de su organización y su relación con el proyecto Promesa Chaco.

*Nota: Importante aquí saber exactamente con quién estamos hablando: ¿Es un representante del Gobierno directamente implicado en la ejecución del proyecto? ¿Un represenante de otro Proyecto colaborador del Proyecto? ¿Un miembro de una ONG? ¿Sector privado? Dependiendo de la naturaleza de la colaboración, se deben adaptar las preguntas para hacerlas más específicas.*

*Información Importante:*

* *¿Socio desde cuando?*
* *¿Qué tipo de relación tiene con el proyecto?*
* *¿Hay algún tipo de evidencia de la relación, un acuerdo de entendimiento?*

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Parte II: Estrategia del Proyecto**

1. Por favor explicar brevemente si considera que el Proyecto con sus 5 componentes (Fortalecimiento capacidades; Marco Regulatorio; Reducir liberaciones MAPE y Salud; Fortalecimiento capacidad técnica e infraestructura para almacenamiento y Monitoreo y Retroalimentación, proyección social y evaluación) está bien diseñado y alineado con las prioridades nacionales

(ver si hay alineamiento con la Estrategia Nacional de Desarrollo, etc)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Participó usted o alguien de su unidad / organización en el proceso de formulación del proyecto? Por favor describa el proceso

(n/a con algunos socios o actores)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. ¿Cree usted que el Proyecto ha considerado las externalidad potenciales (ambientales, económicas o políticas en el diseño del proyecto?)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. ¿Cree usted que el Proyecto ha considerado todos los riesgos posibles?

*Nota: Hacer referencia a los riesgos identificados (1. Falta de coordinación de las instituciones y ministerios relevantes; 2. Nuevos instrumentos reglamentarios no pueden formularse y adoptarse dentro del marco de tiempo del proyecto debido al tiempo prolongado del proceso legislativo; 3. Implementación más lenta de lo esperado de las MPA/MTD en las comunidades MAPE del proyecto; 4. Poca confianza de las instalaciones del sector de cuidados en los dispositivos libres de mercurio, lo que resulta en el uso continuado de dispositivos que contienen mercurio; 5. Percepción por parte de los mineros artesanales de oro de que los incentivos económicos son demasiado bajos para adoptar las prácticas MPA/MTD; 6. Desconfianza de mineros hacia las agencias y entidades gubernamentales que traten de apoyar la formalización del sector MAPE; 7. Los intermediarios actuales pueden resistirse al acortamiento de la cadena de suministro de oro; 8. Menor demanda por el comercio premium y justo.*

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. ¿Cree usted que los indicadores de resultados y productos están bien diseñados? ¿Se pueden medir?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. ¿Cree usted que el proyecto ha generado o puede generar efectos de desarrollo beneficiosos para el país o podría catalizarlos en el futuro (eg. Generación de ingresos, reducción de emisiones de Hg) de manera que se deberían incluir en el marco de resultados?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Parte III: Avance hacia los resultados**

¿En qué medida el Proyecto apoya a su Ministerio/Secretaría/Organización al logro de sus resultados?Explicar brevemente.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. ¿Se han logrado las metas de medio término para cada resultado o producto? ¿Qué cree que está funcionando excepcionalmente bien y por qué?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. ¿Cuáles cree usted que han sido los principales obstáculos, así como factores facilitadores para el logro de los resultados? Por favor explicar

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. ¿Ha logrado el Proyecto tener una estrategia de socios apropiada? ¿Se debería sumar a algún otro socio o actor clave al proceso? Por favor explicar

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Parte IV: Implementación del proyecto y Gestión Adaptativa**

1. Cree usted que la estructura y organización del Proyecto son los adecuados (oficina central, apoyo del PNUD)? ¿Dispone el proyecto de suficiente equipo humano y técnico y recursos para lograr los resultados?

*Nota: En caso de no saberlo, preguntar si ha sido informado/a de cambios en el proyecto y si ha podido incidir o transmitir inquietudes en las distintas instancias de coordinación*

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. ¿Han habido cambios sustantivos en el proyecto? ¿Ha sido capaz el proyecto de adaptarse a dichos cambios?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. ¿Cómo ha sido la coordinación entre actores? ¿Han funcionado los distintos comités de coordinación? (junta directiva, comité coordinación nacional) ¿Se puede mejorar?

(n/a para ciertos actores)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**PARA GOBIERNO**

1. ¿Cree usted que ha habido duplicidad de esfuerzos con otros proyectos?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. ¿Apoyan los gobiernos locales los objetivos del proyecto? ¿Tienen un papel activo en la toma de decisiones?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. ¿Han aportado los diferentes socios al co-financiamiento? ¿Cómo se le está dando seguimiento?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. ¿Ha participado usted o la organización a la que representa en el monitoreo del proyecto? ¿Cree que ha sido efectivo? ¿Se puede mejorar? ¿Sabe si se están utilizando datos nacionales, estadísticas, información generada a nivel nacional?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Parte V: Sostenibilidad**

1. ¿Una vez concluya el Proyecto y el apoyo financiero del FMAM, podrá el Gobierno seguir impulsando esta iniciativa?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. El proceso de inventariado, eliminación y disposición final del Hg es costoso y complejo. ¿Cree usted que los productos generados por el Proyecto y la capacidad fortalecida de las partes responsables es suficiente para seguir eliminando el uso de Hg tanto en la MAPE como en el sector salud?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. ¿Hay nuevos riesgos a tomar en cuenta para la sostenibilidad del proyecto? (por ejemplo, inestabilidad política, de mercado). ¿qué medidas se podrían tomar para mitigar dichos riesgos?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Muchas gracias!

¿Tiene algún otro comentario, algo que añadir?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

### 6.4 Evaluation ratings

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Progress Towards Results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)** | | |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective / outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets. |
| **Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: (one overall rating)** | | |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and cofinance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial actions. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |

### 6.5 MTR Agenda

Proyecto 00090481: Gestión Ambientalmente Racional del Mercurio y Productos Conteniendo Mercurio y sus desechos de los sectores de la Minería Artesanal y a Pequeña Escala de Oro (MAPE) y de la Salud.

**PROGRAMA DE ENTREVISTAS PARA LA EVALUACIÓN DE MEDIO TÉRMINO (EMT) DEL PROYECTO GAR DE MERCURIO**

**Consultor responsable:** Guido Fernández de Velasco

**Origen:** España

**Periodo de la Misión:** Domingo 12 al sábado 18 de agosto de 2018

**OBJETIVO DEL PROYECTO:**

Proteger la salud humana y el ambiente de emisiones de mercurio provenientes del uso intencional de mercurio en la MAPE, así como del manejo y eliminación inapropiados de productos que contienen mercurio del sector de la salud.

**COMPONENTES DEL PROYECTO:**

Componente 1. Fortalecer capacidades institucionales para lograr la Gestión Ambientalmente Racional (GAR) del Mercurio

Componente 2. Fortalecer el marco regulatorio y de política para la reducción de uso de productos con mercurio añadido y la GAR de desechos con mercurio.

Componente 3. Reducir las emisiones de mercurio de sectores prioritarios (minería artesanal y a pequeña escala, y sector de la salud)

Componente 4. Fortalecer la capacidad técnica y de infraestructura para el almacenamiento temporal de desechos con mercurio

Componente5. Monitoreo, aprendizaje, retroalimentación adaptativa, proyección social y evaluación

**PROGRAMA Y ACTORES A SER ENTREVISTADOS:**

| **No.** | **Fecha** | **Reunión**  **SEDE** | **Actores** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **0** | Domingo 12 de Agosto | Traslado de Asunción – Tegucigalpa | **Señor Guido Fernández de Velasco.**  Arribo a Honduras del |
| **1** | Lunes 13 de Agosto  **8:00 am**  **9:00 am**  **2:00 pm**  **3:30 pm** | PNUD (Edificio de las Naciones Unidas  Oficina Coordinadora de Proyecto (OCP)  Despacho Director. Edificio CESCCO  Despacho de Directora. INHGEOMIN | **Ing. Dennis Funes**  Oficial de Programa  PNUD  **Unidad Coordinadora:**  Pablo Rodríguez, Mirtha Ferrary, Marcia Suazo, David Alcántara, Nolvia Velásquez.  **Lic. Thompson** (Director)/Representante (Departamento Gestión de Productos Químicos)/Marco Cálix (Asesor legal)/Ana Castillo/Aracely Membreño/Dixy Avila  **Abogada Ericka Molina**  (Directora por Ley)/Fernando Erazo, Sergio Molina, Claudia Torres, Dania Baca. |
| Pernocta: Tegucigalpa | | | |
| **2** | Martes 14 de Octubre  **8:00 am**  **10:00 am**  **1:00 pm** | Hospital Escuela Universitario (HEU)  Hospital de Especialidades San Felipe (HESF)  Hospital María de Especialidades Pediátricas. | **Dr. Concepción Zúniga (Enlace).** Elmer Murillo (Servicios Generales) Doris Vargas (Supervisora) Representante de (Compras). Sergia Nuñez (Directora Enfermería). Angie Méndez  **Dr. Manuel Gamero (Enlace).** Joaquín Arias (Jefe de Desechos Sólidos).  **Ing. Oscar Bustamente (Enlace)** Vanessa Pérez (Servicios Generales) Alejandro Castellanos (Biomédica) Ligia Montoya (Adquisiciones) |
|  | Viaje a San Pedro Sula (Pernocta: SPS) | | |
| **3** | Miércoles 15 de Agosto  **9:00 am**  **1:00 pm** | Hospital Nacional Mario Catarino Rivas  Retorno a Tegucigalpa | **Leddy Brizzio (Directora General).** Ing. Luisa María Pineda (Enlace). Ing. Danilo Núñez (Servicios Generales) Rosa Karina Sabillón (Calidad - Enfermería) |
|  | Pernocta: Tegucigalpa | | |
| **4** | Jueves 16 de Agosto  **6:00 am**  **9:00 am**  **1: 30 pm**  **2:30 pm** | Salida de Tegucigalpa a Choluteca  Reunión en Centro de Salud San Juan Arriba – El Corpus  Retorno Tegucigalpa | **José Edas Rivera** (Presidente de Junta Directiva) y miembros  **Dr. Roman Mayorga** (Jefe de Centro Integral de Salud) El Corpus. |
|  | Traslado a la Ciudad de Tegucigalpa: Pernocta en Tegucigalpa. | | |
| **5** | Viernes 17 de Agosto  **9:00 am**  **11:00 am**  **1:00 pm**  **3:00 pm** | Centro de Negocios Hondureño Alemán (CNHA)  Dirección Adjunta de Rentas Aduaneras (DARA)  Oficina Coordinadora de Proyecto MIAMBIENTE  Secretaría de Salud  Oficina Coordinadora de Proyecto MIAMBIENTE  Reunión de Cierre  PNUD (Naciones Unidas) | **Antonio Portillo** (Director Ejecutivo CNHA); Carlos Batres (Fundación Lundin); Sandra Leiva (minas y cuevas)  **Abogada Sarina Murillo** (Jefe de Clasificación Arancelaria); Eddy Ramos; Tania Aguilar (Secretaría de Finanzas)  **Dra. Diana Núñez**; Dra. Angela Salgado  **Sr. Guido Fernández de Velasco** |

### 6.7 List of reviewed documents

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item #** | **Items (siempre que sea posible son preferibles las versiones electrónicas)** | **Comentarios** |
| 1 | PIF | √ |
| 2 | Plan de Iniciación del PNUD |  |
| 3 | Documento de Proyecto final del PNUD y documentos finales de aprobación del FMAM (solicitud de autorización del CEO, etc). | √ |
| 4 | Resultados del Diagnóstico Medioambiental y Social de CI | En ProDoc |
| 5 | Informes de progreso (trimestrales, semestrales, o anuales) con los planes de trabajo del proyecto e informes financieros correspondientes | √ |
| 6 | Informe de Iniciación del Proyecto | √ |
| 7 | Todos los Informes de Ejecución del Proyecto (PIRs) | Se dispone del PIR año 1 y se espera el PIR 2 para finales julio 18 |
| 8 | Informes trimestrales de progreso y planes de trabajo de los diversos equipos de tareas encargados de la ejecución | √ |
| 9 | Informes de auditoria (copias electrónicas si es posible) |  |
| 10 | Copias electrónicas de las Herramientas de Seguimiento finalizadas y relevantes del FMAM, desde la autorización del CEO a la mitad del ciclo (*indicar las TTs específicas para esta área de actuación del proyecto*) | √ |
| 11 | Informes de supervisión del proyecto | √ |
| 12 | Minutas de las reuniones de la Junta del Proyecto y de cualquier otro órgano relacionado (p.ej. reuniones del Comité de Evaluación Preliminar del Proyecto) | √ |
| 13 | Mapas de los lugares de ejecución del proyecto, según sea necesario | Incluidos en el ProDoc |
| 14 | Otros documentos de gestión relacionados: informes de gestión adaptativa, memorandos de la Dirección, etc | Se han presentado informes post-misión de CI |
| 15 | Copias electrónicas de productos del proyecto: boletines, folletos, manuales, informes técnicos, artículos, etc. | Se ha dado al evaluador acceso al Dropbox del proyecto |
| 16 | Lista resumen de las reuniones formales, talleres, etc. que se hayan realizado, indicando fecha, lugar, tema tratado y cifra de participantes | Información disponible en informes trimestrales |
| 17 | Cualquier información disponible sobre los datos de seguimiento relevantes en material medioambiental (indicadores de especies, etc.), más allá de lo que haya disponible sobre indicadores en el marco lógico de los PIRs | NA |
| 18 | Cualquier dato de seguimiento relevante en materia socio-económica, como la renta media/niveles de empleo de las partes interesadas en el área de actuación, cambios en ingresos relacionados con las actividades del proyecto | NA |
| 19 | Gastos reales por resultado del proyecto, incluyendo los costos de gestión, así como la documentación de cualquier revisión presupuestaria significativa | √ |
| 20 | Lista de contratos y artículos adquiridos por valor superior a ~$5.000 US$ (por ejemplo, entidades o compañías contratadas para los productos del proyecto, etc., excepto en casos de información confidencial) | √ |
| 21 | Tabla de cofinanciación con un desglose de los totales previstos y reales en efectivo y en especie, así como por su origen, si está disponible | √ |

### 6.8 Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

**Evaluators:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded

2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their

limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.

3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and: respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.

4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriateinvestigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.

5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.

6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/ or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.

7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of consultant: Guido Fernández de Velasco Sert\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (when relevant): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct

for Evaluation.

Signed in Barcelona, November 30th *2018*

Signature: 

### 6.09 MTR final report approval form signed

1. Guía para la Realización del Examen de Mitad de Periodo en Proyectos Apoyados por el PNUD y financiados por el FMAM, PNUD FMAM, 2014 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. PNUD. Manual de Planificación, Seguimiento y Evaluación de los Resultados de Desarrollo, 2011 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Ninamata Convention (<http://www.mercuryconvention.org>) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. According to UNDP, this phase can last between two to three months. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. From january to june 2018 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)