



UNITED NATIONS



## **FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT**

**May 2021**

### **ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNT PROJECT 16/17 Z**

**Addressing critical socio-environmental  
challenges in Latin America  
and the Caribbean**



UNITED NATIONS



## **FINAL ASSESSMENT REPORT**

### **ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNT PROJECT 16/17 Z**

**Addressing critical socio-environmental  
challenges in Latin America and the Caribbean**

**May 2021**

This report was prepared by Jon García, an external consultant, who led the evaluation. Mr. García worked under the overall guidance of Raúl García-Buchaca, Deputy Executive Secretary for Management and Programme Analysis of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), and Sandra Manuelito, Chief of the Programme Planning and Evaluation Unit of ECLAC; and under the direct supervision of Anne-Sophie Samjee, Programme Management Officer of the same Unit, who provided strategic and technical guidance, coordination, and methodological and logistical support. The evaluation also benefited from the assistance of Paula Muñoz Gilloux, Programme Management Assistant of the same Unit.

The evaluator is grateful for the support provided by the project partners at ECLAC, all of whom were represented in the Evaluation Reference Group. Warm thanks go to the programme managers and technical advisers of ECLAC for their cooperation throughout the evaluation process and their assistance in the review of the report.

All comments on the evaluation report by the Evaluation Reference Group and the evaluation team of the Programme Planning and Evaluation Unit were considered by the evaluator and duly addressed, where appropriate, in the final text of the report. The views expressed in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Commission.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>ACRONYMS</b> .....	<b>v</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>vi</b>
<b>1. EVALUATION, OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>2. BACKGROUND</b> .....	<b>11</b>
2.1 GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE PROJECT .....	11
2.2 STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS.....	13
<b>3. METHODOLOGY</b> .....	<b>14</b>
3.1 EVALUATION QUESTIONS .....	14
3.2 REVIEW METHODS .....	14
3.3 CHALLENGES AND POTENTIAL LIMITATIONS .....	15
<b>4. FINDINGS</b> .....	<b>16</b>
4.1 RELEVANCE.....	16
4.2 EFFECTIVENESS .....	27
4.3 EFFICIENCY .....	39
4.4 SUSTAINABILITY .....	47
4.5 CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES .....	52
<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b> .....	<b>54</b>
5.1 RELEVANCE.....	54
5.2 EFFECTIVENESS .....	54
5.3 EFFICIENCY .....	55
5.4 SUSTAINABILITY .....	56
5.5 CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES .....	57
<b>6. LESSONS LEARNED</b> .....	<b>58</b>
6.1 GENERAL.....	58
6.2 ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL COSTS AND EXPENDITURES.....	58
6.3 EPR .....	59
6.4 RIGHTS OF ACCESS .....	59
<b>7. RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>61</b>
7.1 GENERAL.....	61
7.2 ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL COSTS AND EXPENDITURES.....	61
7.3 EPR.....	62
7.4 RIGHTS OF ACCESS TO INFORMATION, PARTICIPATION AND JUSTICE ON ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS .....	62
<b>ANNEXES</b> .....	<b>63</b>
ANNEX 1 EVALUATION MATRIX.....	64

ANNEX 2	LIST OF CONSULTED DOCUMENTS .....	71
ANNEX 3	LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED.....	72
ANNEX 4	SEMI STRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS.....	73
ANNEX 5	ONLINE SURVEY .....	76
ANNEX 6	ACHIEVEMENT OF END OF THE PROJECT TARGETS .....	80
ANNEX 7	COMMENTS TO THE INDICATOR SYSTEM AND REPORTING.....	83
ANNEX 8	EVALUATOR'S REVISION MATRIX.....	87

# ACRONYMS

ACRONYM	DEFINITION
<b>ANLA</b>	National Environmental Licensing Authority of Colombia (initials in Spanish)
<b>COP</b>	Conference of the Parties
<b>COVID-19</b>	The 2019 coronavirus disease
<b>DA</b>	Development Account
<b>EA</b>	Expected accomplishment
<b>ECLAC</b>	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
<b>EPR</b>	Environmental performance review
<b>FAOSTAT</b>	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) Corporate Database for Substantive Statistical Data (FAOSTAT)
<b>GIZ</b>	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (German Agency for International Cooperation)
<b>IA</b>	Indicator of achievement
<b>IPU</b>	Inter-Parliamentary Union
<b>M&amp;E</b>	Monitoring and evaluation
<b>MoU</b>	Memorandum of understanding
<b>NGO</b>	Non-governmental organization
<b>OECD</b>	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
<b>OECS</b>	Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States
<b>OHCHR</b>	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
<b>PPOD</b>	Programme Planning and Operations Division
<b>ProDoc</b>	Project document
<b>PoW</b>	Programme of work
<b>RF</b>	Results framework
<b>SDG</b>	Sustainable Development Goal
<b>SDHSD</b>	Sustainable Development and Human Settlements Division
<b>TAI</b>	The Access Initiative
<b>ToR</b>	Terms of Reference
<b>UNECE</b>	Economic Commission for Europe
<b>UNEG</b>	United Nations Evaluation Group
<b>UNEP</b>	United Nations Environment Programme
<b>UNFCCC</b>	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
<b>UNITAR</b>	United Nations Institute for Training and Research

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## OVERVIEW OF THE EVALUATION SUBJECT

1. Before the project, Latin American and Caribbean governments had committed to fostering sustainable development. However, their capacity to monitor environmental matters was still limited, regarding both environmental costs and expenditures. Such monitoring helps countries understand where environmental priorities stand with respect to other policy areas, and the effectiveness or performance of environmental policy, which is to say the overall environmental consequences of development policies. In addition, environmental policy development, implementation and monitoring were often not very participatory. Under its tenth tranche (2016–2019), the Development Account (DA) funded a project to address these challenges: “Addressing critical socio-environmental challenges in Latin America and the Caribbean”, with the reference 1617Z. The project, implemented by the Policies for Sustainable Development Unit of the Sustainable Development and Human Settlements Division (SDHSD) of ECLAC between January 2016 and December 2020, aimed to improve the capacity of selected countries in the region to monitor environmental matters and to support countries in adopting a participatory and evidence-based approach to environmental policymaking.

## EVALUATION OBJECTIVES, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

2. The purpose of this evaluation is to conduct the end-of-cycle review of the above-mentioned project. This assessment covers all the activities implemented by the project. The project has been screened through evaluation questions assessing the following aspects: (i) relevance; (ii) effectiveness; (iii) efficiency; (iv) sustainability; and (v) consideration of human rights and gender issues.
3. The findings of this assessment are based on a desk review of relevant documents, interviews of a wide range of stakeholders in the project at the national and regional levels, and an online survey. Based on the information collected, the evaluator has cross-analysed and triangulated the data in order to inform the selected indicators and answer the evaluation questions presented in annex 1. The evaluation has been conducted in accordance with the Norms and Standards for Evaluation of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and with the ECLAC guiding principles for evaluations. In addition, the UNEG ethical principles have been strictly observed. This evaluation was conducted by Jon García between January and May 2021.

## MAIN FINDINGS

### Relevance

4. The project is very relevant to the needs and problems of participating countries. The project is very well aligned with the needs and problems of the region regarding the rights of access to information, public participation and justice in environmental matters (component 3), but less so on the assessment of environmental costs and expenditures (component 1) and environmental performance (component 2), where there is less regional demand, despite the relevance of those issues. The project is aligned with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (the 2030 Agenda) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and with the ECLAC programmes of work (PoW) applicable during its implementation.

## Effectiveness

5. The achievement of indicators in the results framework (RF) has been highly satisfactory. All eight end-of-project targets had been met by project completion. Three targets were exceeded. The project promoted notable changes. The technical capacity of government officials and other stakeholders increased as a result of project activities, although processes for assessment of environmental costs and expenditures have not been institutionalized in participating countries. Reports informed policy dialogue and had some specific effects on policymaking, fostering sustainable development in participating countries. The project made an outstanding impact regarding the three rights of access at the regional level, by playing a key role in the development, approval, ratification and operationalization of the Regional Agreement on Access to Information, Public Participation and Justice in Environmental Matters in Latin America and the Caribbean (Escazú Agreement), the first regional environmental treaty. The project had significant unplanned positive development impacts. It was innovative in terms of topics and processes.

## Efficiency

6. Timing of output delivery was excellent: outputs were delivered earlier than planned. The project was expanded in July 2019 to add two activities. The project was extended a second time in May 2020, owing to the impact of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic. All planned activities were implemented. Because the planned activities of the project were completed earlier than planned, complementary activities were performed that were aligned with the project objectives. By April 2021, 100% of the planned budget for the project had been executed or committed. The project put in place practices to promote sound financial and administrative management.
7. The project document (ProDoc) provides only a very generic monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan, with limited resources. The definition of roles and responsibilities is broad. The RF had significant caveats in terms of structure, indicators, baselines, targets and means of verification. The reporting template is comprehensive and useful, but with room for improvement regarding information on completion of activities and finance. Overall, reports were produced in full in a timely manner and their quality is good. Reporting on the challenges encountered and actions taken to overcome them is generally good. Collection and dissemination of lessons learned on the thematic areas of the project and project implementation were limited. The project collaborated with governments of some participating countries and development partners, within and outside the United Nations system.

## Sustainability

8. Environmental cost and expenditure assessments will probably be performed in participating countries only once development partners provide additional resources or there is specific external pressure to conduct the assessments. Chile will likely conduct environmental performance reviews (EPRs) in the future and implement some of the recommendations of the 2016–2017 EPR, although this is uncertain given the political context. It is also uncertain whether Peru will conduct EPRs in the future, but it will likely implement many of the recommendations of the 2016–2017 EPR. Progress at the national level on the three rights of access is likely.
9. Substantive regional cooperation on assessment of environmental costs and expenditures seems unlikely. Regional cooperation on EPRs is moderately unlikely. Regional cooperation on the three rights of access is highly likely. A key element will be the practical relevance of the Escazú Agreement in helping countries develop policies in a participatory way and demonstrating the benefits of this.



## Cross-cutting issues

10. The work on the assessments of environmental costs and expenditures contributes indirectly to progress on human rights and gender equality. The EPR work contributes to this both in terms of the process and the content of the reports. The work on the three rights of access made a notable contribution to promoting human rights, in terms both of the content of the ratified text and the process that led to it. The Agreement contributes to gender equality, given its focus on leaving no one behind.

## LESSONS LEARNED

### General

11. International processes and their outputs can be crucial drivers of change in environmental matters, especially if they are linked to prestigious institutions. Often the outputs gain importance on their own and can trigger change in environmental matters even if the broader processes are not embraced. In this regard, change can happen on different fronts (legislature, executive and judiciary, and in policymaking, monitoring and implementation) and does not necessarily happen on all fronts simultaneously and at the same pace. High-level political endorsement is not vital (or sufficient on its own) for change in environmental matters.
12. International exchanges are very important to trigger change in environmental matters, by providing useful information and promoting political, technical and social ownership.
13. The integration of DA projects into the internal work of executing agencies allows quick responses and ensures technical soundness.
14. It is important that DA projects have the flexibility to add new elements and to provide additional resources and time to conduct essential complementary activities that were not originally planned.

### Related to a specific component

15. Some institutional changes take time, particularly when they are very technical or seem so, such as assessment of environmental costs and expenditures. When selecting the beneficiary institutions, it is important to focus on those that are most likely to have the technical and human capacity to conduct such assessments regularly and establish clear and adequate institutional arrangements.
16. Environmental performance is driven not only by environmental laws, policies, strategies and practices, but also and perhaps more importantly by those traditionally related to the economy, social matters, rule of law and governance. EPRs are very useful to understand the need for a comprehensive, whole-of-government, whole-of-society, systemic approach, revealing linkages between different elements.
17. Latin American and Caribbean countries remain a minority in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and similar organizations. Their views and perspectives are not always well reflected or sufficiently considered in these forums. Regional institutions have a crucial role to play as brokers or intermediaries.
18. On and beyond the three rights of access, regional integration is crucial. Regional agreements increase relevance, ownership and commitment more than global agreements, even though the latter are fundamental.
19. Environmental performance is complex and involves multiple fronts. Overall, but especially in developing regions, and particularly in Latin America and the Caribbean, it is crucial to consider

and address the human rights dimension of the environment, including the rights of access to information, public participation and justice, and the protection of environmental defenders.

20. International treaties need to be negotiated in participatory and democratic ways. Such an approach is not only effective in developing robust agreements—as it allows a more balanced and realistic view by integrating the perspectives of all parties (instrumental value)—but is also fairer (intrinsic value). Although the process can take a long time and patience is needed, it has long-lasting benefits.
21. It is fundamental to integrate the production and dissemination of knowledge and direct capacity-building in negotiations, especially when stakeholders with different levels of capacity and views, (some based on fake news) negotiate a new and sensitive topic. Well-respected technical institutions such as ECLAC can play a crucial role in steering discussions.
22. International agreements do not conclude with adoption. Their signature, ratification and operationalization are all equally important, and may require support.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

23. **Recommendation 1:** ECLAC should draw lessons from project implementation and systematically disseminate and use them in the design and implementation of future projects on sustainable development and other topics. The dissemination strategy should distinguish between types of lessons and audiences.
24. **Recommendation 2:** ECLAC should explore the possibility of promoting regional agreements on other environmental topics.
25. **Recommendation 3:** ECLAC should explore ways of increasing the uptake of the assessment of environmental costs and expenditures by integrating this exercise into broader and longer processes with a financing component. A database should be created for Latin America and the Caribbean, working more closely with potential users and using lighter channels and formats to increase the use of information.
26. **Recommendation 4:** ECLAC should further promote regional knowledge and exchange on EPRs, by assessing regional progress and organizing a regional workshop.
27. **Recommendation 5:** ECLAC should further support implementation of the Escazú Agreement by continuing to be the secretariat of the Agreement, maintaining and feeding the Observatory on Principle 10 in Latin America and the Caribbean, funding public participation in Escazú meetings, building capacity of stakeholders, performing strategic assessments of where progress can be made more effectively, with a greater multiplier effect and longer-lasting impact, and exploring ways for further engagement with the private sector.

# 1. EVALUATION OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

1. This evaluation was conducted by Jon García between January and May 2021, and was commissioned by ECLAC. The objective was to conduct, as per the Terms of Reference (ToR), an end-of-cycle review of the DA tenth tranche project entitled “Addressing critical socio-environmental challenges in Latin America and the Caribbean”, with reference 1617Z. This assessment covers all the activities implemented from the project start, in January 2016, to its end, in December 2020. The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the Norms and Standards for Evaluation of UNEG and the ECLAC guiding principles for evaluations. In addition, UNEG ethical principles were strictly observed.
2. The evaluation assesses the achievement of project results, documents good practices and draws lessons to improve the sustainability of the benefits generated by the project and to foster potentialities for replication. Following UNEG guidelines, the evaluator has focused on assessment of the extent to which the project addressed human rights and gender aspects, making every effort to produce and analyse gender-disaggregated data.

## 2. BACKGROUND

### 2.1 GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE PROJECT

3. Before the project, in 2015, Latin American and Caribbean governments had committed to fostering sustainable development, as evidenced by their active participation in international forums and the design of sustainable development policies and plans over recent decades. However, significant obstacles remained for implementation of environmentally sustainable development.
4. In 2015, the capacity to monitor environmental matters was still limited, including environmental costs and expenditures. Such monitoring helps countries understand where environmental priorities stand with respect to other policy areas, and the effectiveness or performance of environmental policy, which is to say the overall environmental consequences of development policies. In both areas there were deficiencies in the institutional capacity to generate data and to use (analyse and interpret) it in policy decisions and strategic planning in order to effectively design, implement and adjust policy and development planning conducive to sustainability. For these reasons, there were still opportunities to reinforce the development of evidence-based sustainable-development-related policies in Latin America and the Caribbean.
5. In addition, in 2015, environmental policy development, implementation and monitoring were often not very participatory in Latin America and the Caribbean. Indeed, despite progress on the legal front, citizens' ability to make informed decisions and exercise their right to public participation and justice in environmental matters was obstructed in Latin America and the Caribbean by a lack of information<sup>1</sup> and by shortcomings in the dissemination of information in a timely and user-friendly way and in participation mechanisms. In 2015, Latin American and Caribbean countries had limited capacity to ensure that rights of access to information, public participation and justice in environmental matters ("access rights") were exercised; these rights are critical to protection of citizens and communities from the negative environmental externalities of public and private undertakings.
6. Under its tenth tranche (2016–2019), the DA, a capacity development programme of the United Nations Secretariat, funded a project to address these challenges: "Addressing critical socio- environmental challenges in Latin America and the Caribbean", with the reference 1617Z. The project, implemented by the Policies for Sustainable Development Unit at the SDHSD of ECLAC between January 2016 and December 2020, aimed to improve the capacity of selected countries in the Latin American and Caribbean region to monitor environmental matters and to support countries in adopting a participatory and evidence-based approach to environmental policymaking.
7. The project sought to contribute to achievement of subprogramme 8 of the ECLAC PoW for 2016–2017 (now subprogramme 7), as well as the SDGs, including SDG 11 on making cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable; SDG 12 on ensuring sustainable consumption and production patterns; SDG 14 on conserving and sustainably using the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development; and SDG 17 on strengthening the means of implementation and revitalizing the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development.
8. The project planned to achieve the following three expected accomplishments (EAs) which are reflected in the 3 components of the projects:

---

<sup>1</sup> Environmental expenditures and performance assessment are not only key tools for informed policymaking, but also key instruments to ensure transparency and public awareness of policy decisions and their consequences, so their limited availability negatively affects public participation in environmental matters.

- (i) Enhanced capacity of civil servants to collect and analyse information related to environmental costs and expenditures.
  - (ii) Enhanced capacity of civil servants in the target countries to assess environmental performance.
  - (iii) Enhanced capacity of countries in the region to ensure the rights of access to information, public participation and justice in environmental matters, in the context of a regional agreement on the implementation of Principle 10 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development<sup>2</sup>.
9. Therefore, the 3 components of the projects were:
- (i) Component 1: Assessment of environmental costs and expenditures
  - (ii) Component 2: Environmental Performance Review
  - (iii) Component 3: rights of access to information, public participation and justice in environmental matters / Escazú agreement
10. With a total budget of US\$ 815,000, the project included the following planned activities to achieve these EAs:
- (A1.1) One regional workshop to support progress in tracking environmental costs and expenditures.
  - (A1.2) Advisory services and one national meeting in two countries on tracking of environmental costs and expenditures.
  - A2.1) Advisory services to produce and compile information on environmental performance and sustainability (EPRs) according to international standards in two selected countries.
  - A2.2) Four national meetings in the two countries selected for activity A2.1, on EPRs or sustainability assessments, with full participation of civil servants, civil society and entrepreneurs.
  - A2.3) Two publications, based on the results of A2.1 and A2.2, providing policy recommendations to countries committed to improving their environmental performance.
  - (A3.1) Two regional meetings in support of the Principle 10 process. These meetings would provide continuity to the ongoing intergovernmental process.
  - (A3.2) Three training and capacity-building meetings in support of the Principle 10 process.
  - (A.3.3) A regional implementation guide for the Escazú Agreement that systematizes common understandings on the scope and national implications of regionally agreed commitments and includes a gap analysis.
  - (A3.4) A regional expert meeting for the signatory countries to the Escazú Agreement<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> Principle 10 was adopted in 1992 as a part of the Rio Declaration, stating that “Environmental issues are best handled with the participation of all concerned citizens, at the relevant level. At the national level, each individual shall have appropriate access to information concerning the environment that is held by public authorities, including information on hazardous materials and activities in their communities, and the opportunity to participate in decision-making processes. States shall facilitate and encourage public awareness and participation by making information widely available. Effective access to judicial and administrative proceedings, including redress and remedy, shall be provided”. Principle 10 thus sets out three fundamental rights: access to information, access to public participation and access to justice, as key pillars of sound environmental governance.

<sup>3</sup> The ProDoc includes a problem analysis (pp. 11–17) and a project strategy, but no theory of change linking them nor any figure illustrating the problem and the solution, such as a problem and solutions tree.

11. The project was initially designed to last for four years (January 2016–December 2019), with a budget of US\$ 615,000. However, the project was extended twice. In July 2019 it was extended until September 2020, adding two activities related to EA3 (A3.3 and A3.4) and providing US\$ 200,000 of additional funding. The project was extended a second time in May 2020, until December 2020. The second extension was mostly related to the impact of COVID-19 and did not involve additional activities or funding.

## 2.2 STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS

12. The project included regional meetings and workshops open to all countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, and other activities specifically targeting selected countries. Table 1 summarizes the countries that received specific support per activity.

**Table 1**  
Country level support

Activity	Beneficiary countries
Advisory services on tracking of environmental costs and expenditures (activity 1.2).	Chile, Costa Rica, Venezuela.
Advisory services to produce and compile information on environmental performance and sustainability (EPR) according to international standards, including meetings and publications. (activities 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3).	Chile and Peru.
Training and capacity-building in support of the Principle 10 process (activity 3.2). <sup>4</sup>	Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Barbados, Chile, Colombia, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Trinidad and Tobago and Uruguay.

**Source:** Evaluator, based on the project's final report and the summary of activities and publications document.

13. The project primarily targeted government authorities and civil servants, but also engaged with civil society and representatives of the private sector in selected activities, due to the centrality of these stakeholders in the generation and use of information and in the exercise of access rights. In addition to ECLAC, the project was supported by several international organizations.

<sup>4</sup> The countries mentioned as beneficiaries of this activity are countries where specific capacity-building activities were conducted according to the project's final report (pp. 7–8) and the summary of activities and publications document. As discussed in section 4.2.2 on impacts, component 3 had a regional scope and benefited at least the 24 countries that negotiated the Escazú Agreement. The publications benefited the 33 countries in the region.

## 3. METHODOLOGY

### 3.1 EVALUATION QUESTIONS

14. The evaluation is guided by evaluation questions. These were defined based on the ToR, the indicators of achievement (IAs) provided in the ProDoc, UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation and ECLAC guiding principles for evaluations. The evaluation questions were grouped under the evaluation criteria described in the ToR: (i) relevance; (ii) effectiveness; (iii) efficiency; and (iv) sustainability. A section on cross-cutting issues focusing on human rights and gender issues was also added. Broad evaluation questions were proposed in the evaluation framework, encompassing the questions from the ToR and covering all relevant aspects of the project design, process, results and impacts. The DA criteria were incorporated as cross-cutting aspects in the matrix (see annex 1 for the evaluation matrix detailing all the evaluation features as well as below for more methodological details).

### 3.2 REVIEW METHODS

15. The findings of the end-of cycle evaluation are based on a desk review of relevant documents and interviews and surveys of key national and regional stakeholders.

#### 3.2.1 Desk review

16. The evaluator systematically reviewed all the project documentation available. Relevant background documentation, M&E documents and policy documents were screened to ensure coverage of all five evaluation criteria. The in-depth documentation review included the PoWs of ECLAC (2016–2017, 2018–2019 and 2020), the ProDoc, annual progress reports, workshop and meeting reports, reports from technical assistance missions, the evaluation survey, and national and regional policies and strategies, among other documents. A list of the documentation reviewed during the evaluation is presented in annex 2.

#### 3.2.2 Interviews and surveys with key stakeholders and beneficiaries

17. In February and March 2021, the evaluator conducted thirteen semi-structured interviews with strategic informants at the programme, national and regional levels.<sup>5</sup> A list of interviewees is presented in annex 3. The semi-structured interview protocols are presented in annex 4.
18. In addition to this, an e-survey was conducted with the assistance of ECLAC, in Spanish and English, with additional key beneficiaries and cooperating stakeholders including government officials; other national concerned stakeholders, such as universities and non-governmental organizations (NGOs); and collaborating agencies and organizations. The survey was open between 21 February and 25 March 2021. A total of 211 invitations were sent successfully, and 34 responses were received, giving an overall response rate of 16%.<sup>6</sup> Annex 5 lists the questions posed and the possible answers.
19. The data collected were compiled and analysed using the evaluation matrix. Triangulation was applied to all the data collected through documentation review, interviews and on-survey responses.

<sup>5</sup> 15 people were invited.

<sup>6</sup> The Spanish version was sent to 176 people, and 29 responses were received, 41% of which were complete. The English version was sent to 35 people and 5 responses were received, 60% of which were complete.

### 3.3 CHALLENGES AND POTENTIAL LIMITATIONS

20. The review was comprehensive in terms of scope, collected data from various sources through different instruments, and a robust data analysis method was employed. The only limitations were timing and resources. While interviews provided detailed insights from some stakeholders and the online survey provided some insights from a wide range of stakeholders, this evaluation is not informed by in-depth interviews with a large number of stakeholders. In addition, the assessment is not informed by direct observation, as no country visits were conducted. A broader number of in-depth in-person in-country interviews might have provided more insights. In any case, these limitations are typical of regional evaluations. More importantly, the data collection instruments used ensure that sufficient evidence has been collected and the data analysis methods used ensure that the findings, lessons and recommendations are evidence-based.



## 4. FINDINGS

### 4.1 RELEVANCE

#### 4.1.1 How in line were the objective, activities and outputs delivered with the priorities of the targeted countries?<sup>7</sup>

#### Level of alignment between the project (objective, EAs and activities) and national needs and problems when it was developed and during the implementation

21. The project is very well aligned with the needs and problems of participating countries. When the project was designed, there was clearly a need to strengthen evidence-based and participatory environmental policymaking in participating countries, and these countries had limited capacities to make progress on that front by themselves. The activities conducted as part of the project helped participating countries conduct relevant analyses and establish a regional agreement that have improved environmental policymaking and implementation and have great potential to improve them even further (see section 4.2.2 on impacts for further details). Specific assessments for the three main components are worthwhile, examining why the outcomes of the project were relevant and why the activities conducted as part of the project were pertinent to those outcomes.

#### Component 1: Assessment of environmental costs and expenditures

22. Assessment of environmental costs and expenditures provides very relevant strategic evidence to guide spending towards environmental sustainability. In particular, environmental expenditure analysis provides information on percentages of total expenditure and distribution between: (i) objectives or areas, such as biodiversity or soil or air pollution; (ii) institutions, as environmental expenditure is often fragmented and not only the responsibility of institutions with a strong environmental focus, such as ministries of the environment; and (iii) types of expenditure, such as current expenditure, investment and interest payments. This type of analysis also examines which actions actually produce environmental benefits, and what the balance is if these are set against actions that are detrimental to environmental sustainability. This information enables adjustments on the basis of existing legal or policy frameworks, seeking greater consistency between these frameworks and actual expenditures, or on the basis of which measures are more effective or efficient. For example, the analysis may lead to: (i) increases in the budgets for activities that contribute to environmental sustainability, if environmental spending is considered too low in relation to total spending; (ii) changes to the delegation of activities that contribute to environmental sustainability, if most environmental spending is executed by non-environmental institutions and this is deemed inappropriate; (iii) reallocation of resources to certain areas that are considered higher priority in the legal or policy framework; or (iv) increasing or cutting budgets for actions according to their contribution to environmental sustainability. Because environmental expenditure analysis uses standard methodologies, international comparisons can also be made.
23. In addition to being useful in its own right, environmental expenditure analysis enables countries to meet international obligations and catch up with international developments. Environmental expenditure analysis is part of EPR which, although not a formal OECD obligation, is a core element of membership. The Statistical Conference of the Americas of ECLAC is also promoting environmental expenditure analysis as part of the satellite accounts.

<sup>7</sup> As explained in table 1, activities 1 and 2 had a clear focus on a few countries and did not target all Latin American and Caribbean countries. Activity 1 targeted Chile, Costa Rica and Venezuela. Activity 2 targeted Chile and Peru. This section focuses on the relevance of the project for these countries.

24. Despite its relevance, with the exception of Mexico, before the project Latin American and Caribbean countries found it difficult to carry out environmental expenditure analyses. It is a very time-consuming and technical exercise, and many countries in the region, including Chile and Costa Rica, were not familiar with the methodologies. Moreover, as this is a novelty in the region, before the project, Chile and Costa Rica did not recognize the multiple uses of the information generated by environmental expenditure analysis.

### Component 2: Environmental Performance Review

25. EPR is also highly relevant. It provides analysis that is: (i) independent and comparable, facilitating exchange with other countries within and outside the region; (ii) long-term, shedding light on trends beyond one term of office; (iii) holistic and comprehensive, cutting across the economy and society; (iv) rigorous and exhaustive, built on consultations with many actors, from government and civil society, using a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach. The process is very valuable for strengthening capacities to assess environmental performance and its outcome (the report) provides solid evidence to inform environmental policymaking.
26. EPRs are very useful in promoting environmental sustainability, not only because of the vision they offer and their technical robustness, but also because of their credibility, because of who endorses them. In many countries, external demands, such as free trade agreements, external pressures or comparisons with other countries make reactionary sectors accept progress on environmental sustainability. Dialogue with peers and the process of accessing certain international groups, such as OECD, can trigger change in favour of environmental sustainability. As regards EPRs, ECLAC and OECD provide non-binding recommendations for countries to improve their environmental performance. For example, in Chile, the 2005 EPR resulted in a new and stronger environmental institutional framework. Given who endorses them, EPRs are also key instruments of transparency and accountability that benefit citizens and civil society.
27. In addition, although they are not mandatory, EPRs are a useful tool in the OECD accession process. Accession to OECD has its own mechanism with a broad and comprehensive approach that encompasses environmental aspects, but does not necessarily follow the course of an EPR. Accession depends not so much on the results of the assessment in terms of strict compliance with certain standards, including environmental ones, but on political considerations, for example a geographical balance among the countries that are members. In any case, many national actors see EPRs as a requirement for OECD membership. This was the case in Peru, where the government's priority at the start of the project was accession to OECD, given that Mexico and Chile were already members and Colombia was on its way to becoming a member. In 2012, Peru began the process of accession to OECD, developing a country programme for this purpose. This programme included some key steps, such as an EPR. Once accession to OECD is achieved, the EPR is not mandatory, but it is recommended, and peers exert pressure on member countries to carry it out every 10 years. This was the case for Chile, which carried out an EPR in 2015.
28. However, countries in the region have limited capacities to develop and disseminate EPRs. As mentioned, this is a complex, rigorous and exhaustive exercise, which requires collecting information on many topics in a robust manner, following precise protocols. In Peru and Chile, the capacities to do this were insufficient, for example, to project some data ten years ahead. In Peru, ECLAC was able to mobilize evaluators from Spain, Germany and Chile, and, with a lot of internal work, complete the process at a lower cost than OECD claims (US\$ 150,000). Once a country becomes a member, EPRs are produced by OECD in English. This facilitates their international dissemination and exchange but hinders their national dissemination and ownership, even though EPRs have great potential to bring about changes in national non-environmental authorities. In 2016--2017, Chile lacked the financial resources to translate the 2016 EPR into Spanish, publish it and organize dissemination workshops, including the launch workshop. The project covered these needs. In addition, countries have limited influence as interlocutors with OECD. Interviews suggest that ECLAC acted as

a bridge between OECD and Latin American and Caribbean countries, in terms of understanding their contexts, providing relevant recommendations, and comprehending that circumstances are likely to be different in most OECD member countries regarding aspects such as the relative weight of mitigation in the climate change agenda. Prior to the project, ECLAC had extensive experience in developing EPRs in Latin America and the Caribbean at the national level in partnership with OECD (Chile, 2005; Colombia, 2014), the subnational level (Estado de Amazonas, 2006–2009; Estado de Acre, 1999–2012) and the sectoral level.

### Component 3: The Escazú Agreement

29. Most countries in the region have advanced environmental legislation, although its design and implementation are not always evidence-based. Prior to the project, however, national environmental legislation and practice in most countries in the region were generally weak in terms of the rights of access to information, public participation and justice. For the most part, they were seen as governmental processes, where civil society, in a broad sense and including the business sector, played a marginal role. Countries had a limited number of relevant studies on the topic and did not have good knowledge of how to move forward in this area, which is strategic in the region. Throughout the region, there is an escalation of socioenvironmental conflicts linked to the management of natural resources, particularly mining, oil and timber extraction. Often biodiversity-rich zones are areas where there are human settlements, mining concessions and oil plots. There was a need to create spaces that minimized conflict and drove dialogue.
30. Relevant studies were in Colombia and Peru as part of the project. In addition, the project provided technical assistance on how to make progress in this area, especially by supporting the development, approval, ratification and operationalization of the Escazú Agreement (see section 4.1.2). Tailored support to countries was also provided. This is the case of Colombia's National Environmental Licensing Authority (ANLA in Spanish). Although at the time of writing the Colombian government has not ratified the Agreement, ANLA did embrace it, establishing a subdirectorate for citizen participation to promote mechanisms for citizen participation in environmental matters. Because it was only recently established, the institution had doubts about how to put this into practice. Specific and tailored support was provided through the project. In particular, an expert in citizen participation was hired to assess how the institution was doing, what it should do and how it should change to implement the Escazú Agreement, which is to say how the Agreement translates into the management of the authority. The recommendations will become a roadmap for the entity.
31. Of the online survey respondents, 88% confirmed that the project was fully aligned with the development priorities of the participating countries.

### Level of stakeholder consultation in the design and implementation process of the project

32. Interviews show that stakeholders were consulted during project design. Interviews and a documentation review suggest that there was significant participation during project implementation, particularly on EPRs and the Escazú Agreement. The vast majority of online survey respondents said they were satisfied with their involvement in project design and implementation: 17% of respondents were highly satisfied, and 75% were satisfied. However, the survey shows mixed results regarding participation. While 71% of respondents said that project design and implementation were very participatory or participatory, 25% of respondents indicated that project design and implementation were not very participatory. This can perhaps be explained by many stakeholders being involved in project activities without necessarily knowing the name of the project these activities were part of—which is not a concern—or wanting to be involved in more activities.

#### 4.1.2 How in line were the objective, activities and outputs delivered with the priorities of Latin American and Caribbean countries?<sup>8</sup>

Level of alignment between the project (objective, EAs and activities) and regional needs and problems when it was developed and during the implementation

33. Work on expenditure analysis and EPRs focused on the national level, and on some specific countries. However, there was a need for dissemination and integration into regional coordination mechanisms, such as the Statistical Conference of the Americas of ECLAC, which the project has addressed.
34. The greatest needs at the regional level related to the rights of access to information, public participation and justice in environmental matters. Although there were international agreements in some regions —particularly in Europe, through the Aarhus Convention— there was no equivalent in Latin America and the Caribbean. These international agreements are important because they encourage more reticent countries to embrace these principles, and foster peer-to-peer knowledge exchange, which should result in more evidence-based policies.
35. As explained in more detail in section 4.2.2, the development of a regional agreement on the rights of access to information, public participation and justice in environmental matters required a party to act as secretariat for the negotiations, to gather information, conduct studies, provide logistical support for meetings and foster the participation of all relevant actors, including civil society. ECLAC played that role.
36. Of the respondents to the online survey, 25% stated that the project was fully aligned with the regional priorities and 63% said that the project was mostly aligned.

#### Level of regional stakeholder consultation in the design process of the project

37. At the regional level, the project fostered exchanges between countries with respect to environmental expenditure and EPRs. The institutions where it was integrated, such as the Statistical Conference of the Americas of ECLAC, are highly participatory. Where the consultative process stands out most, however, is in the development of the Escazú Agreement. As underlined in section 4.2.6, this was in fact one of the great strengths of the project and one of its most important innovations. The process included all parties in a very horizontal manner, and was aligned with the priorities of all actors, particularly civil society. The process was less aligned with the priorities of the business sector; this was not primarily because it was not invited, but rather because the sector was reluctant to participate very actively.

#### 4.1.3 How in line were the objective, activities and outputs delivered with international commitments on sustainable development?<sup>9</sup>

#### Level of alignment of the project activities with SDGs

38. The project is aligned with the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs, which were adopted in September 2016, after the project was approved.
39. Components 1 and 2 of the project contribute to SDGs related to environmental sustainability, as these components promote more evidence-based and thus effective environmental policies,

<sup>8</sup> As explained in table 1 in page 4, activities 1 and 2 had a clear focus on a few countries and did not target all Latin American and Caribbean countries. Activity 1 targeted Chile, Costa Rica and Venezuela. Activity 2 targeted Chile and Peru. This section focuses on the relevance of the project for the whole Latin America and the Caribbean region, beyond these few specific target countries.

<sup>9</sup> Has and how has the project contributed to the achievement of the SDGs?

strategies, plans and actions. This can contribute to reducing negative impacts on the environment, such as pollution, and protect and restore degraded natural areas, with positive impacts on human well-being and biodiversity. Specifically, these components contribute directly to SDG 11 on sustainable cities and communities and SDG 12 on responsible consumption and production. These components contribute indirectly to SDG 3 on good health and well-being, SDG 4 on quality education, SDG 6 on clean water and sanitation, SDG 7 on affordable and clean energy, SDG 9 on industry, innovation and infrastructure, SDG 13 on climate action, SDG 14 on life below water, SDG 15 on life on land and SDG 17 on partnerships for the goals.

40. Component 3 of the project contributes to SDGs related to human rights and governance and international partnerships. In particular, this component contributes directly to SDG 16 on peace, justice and strong institutions and SDG 17 on partnerships for the goals, especially through the work that supported the development of the Escazú Agreement. In addition, through its promotion of participatory policymaking processes, the project contributes indirectly to SDG 4 on quality education, SDG 5 on gender quality, SDG 6 on clean water and sanitation, SDG 10 on reduced inequalities, SDG 11 on sustainable cities and communities, and SDG 12 on responsible consumption and production.
41. The ProDoc identified some project contributions to SDGs. The final report identified more contributions. This evaluation has identified some additional ones. Table 1 details the specific targets the project components contribute to.
42. The online survey follows the same line, since 46% of the respondents considered that the objective of the project was fully aligned with the international commitments of the participating countries, and 33% considered it mostly aligned.

**Table 2**  
Contributions of the project to the SDGs<sup>10</sup>

SDG	Target		Project components
<b>Direct contributions</b>			
Goal 11: sustainable cities and communities	11.6	By 2030, reduce the adverse per capita environmental impact of cities, including by paying special attention to air quality and municipal and other waste management.	1 and 2
	11.3	By 2030, enhance inclusive and sustainable urbanization and capacity for participatory, integrated and sustainable human settlement planning and management in all countries.	3
Goal 12: responsible consumption and production	12.4	Achieve the environmentally sound management of chemicals and all wastes throughout their life cycle, in accordance with agreed international frameworks, and significantly reduce their release to air, water and soil in order to minimize their adverse impacts on human health and the environment.	1 and 2
	12.8	Ensure that people everywhere have the relevant information and awareness for sustainable development and lifestyles in harmony with nature.	3

<sup>10</sup> In black, the contributions that were identified in the ProDoc. In blue the additional contributions that were identified in the final report. In green the additional contributions that have been identified in this evaluation.

Goal 16: peace, justice and strong institutions	16.3	Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all.	3
	16.6	Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels.	
	16.7	Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels.	
	16.8	Broaden and strengthen the participation of developing countries in the institutions of global governance.	
	16.10	Ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements.	
	16.b	Promote and enforce non-discriminatory laws and policies for sustainable development.	
Goal 17: partnerships for the goals	17.9	Enhance international support for implementing effective and targeted capacity-building in developing countries to support national plans to implement all the sustainable development goals, including through North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation.	1 and 2
	17.17	Encourage and promote effective public, public-private and civil society partnerships, building on the experience and resourcing strategies of partnerships.	3
	17.18	By 2020, enhance capacity-building support to developing countries, including for least developed countries and small island developing States, to increase significantly the availability of high-quality, timely and reliable data disaggregated by income, gender, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, geographic location and other characteristics relevant in national contexts.	1, 2 and 3
	17.19	By 2030, build on existing initiatives to develop measurements of progress on sustainable development that complement gross domestic product, and support statistical capacity-building in developing countries.	1 and 2
	17.14	Enhance policy coherence for sustainable development.	
	17.16	Enhance the global partnership for sustainable development, complemented by multi-stakeholder partnerships that mobilize and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources, to support the achievement of the SDGs in all countries, in particular developing countries.	
<b>Indirect contributions</b>			
Goal 3: Good health and well- being	3.9	By 2030, substantially reduce the number of deaths and illnesses from hazardous chemicals and air, water and soil pollution and contamination.	1 and 2
	3.d	Strengthen the capacity of all countries, in particular developing countries, for early warning, risk reduction and management of national and global health risks.	
Goal 4: Quality education	4.7	By 2030, ensure that <b>all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development</b> , including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and <i>appreciation of cultural diversity</i> and of culture's contribution to sustainable development.	1, 2 and 3
Goal 5: Gender equality	5.5	Ensure women's full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision making in political, economic and public life.	3

Goal 6: Clean water and sanitation	6.3	By 2030, improve water quality by reducing pollution, eliminating dumping and minimizing release of hazardous chemicals and materials, halving the proportion of untreated wastewater and substantially increasing recycling and safe reuse globally.	1 and 2
	6.b	Support and strengthen the participation of local communities in improving water and sanitation management.	3
Goal 7: Affordable and clean energy	7.2	By 2030, increase substantially the share of renewable energy in the global energy mix.	1 and 2
	7.3	By 2030, double the global rate of improvement in energy efficiency.	
Goal 9: Industry, innovation and infrastructure	9.4	By 2030, upgrade infrastructure and retrofit industries to make them sustainable, with increased resource-use efficiency and greater adoption of clean and environmentally sound technologies and industrial processes, with all countries taking action in accordance with their respective capabilities.	1 and 2
Goal 10: Reduced inequality	10.2	By 2030, empower and promote the social, economic and political inclusion of all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion or economic or other status.	3
	10.3	Ensure equal opportunity and reduce inequalities of outcome, including by eliminating discriminatory laws, policies and practices and promoting appropriate legislation, policies and action in this regard.	
Goal 13: Climate action	13.2	Integrate climate change measures into national policies, strategies and planning.	1 and 2
Goal 14: Life below water	14.1	By 2025, prevent and significantly reduce marine pollution of all kinds, in particular from land-based activities, including marine debris and nutrient pollution.	1 and 2
	14.2	By 2020, sustainably manage and protect marine and coastal ecosystems to avoid significant adverse impacts, including by strengthening their resilience, and take action for their restoration in order to achieve healthy and productive oceans.	
Goal 15: Life on land	15.1	By 2020, ensure the conservation, restoration and sustainable use of terrestrial and inland freshwater ecosystems and their services, in particular forests, wetlands, mountains and drylands, in line with obligations under international agreements.	1 and 2
	15.2	By 2020, promote the implementation of sustainable management of all types of forests, halt deforestation, restore degraded forests and substantially increase afforestation and reforestation globally.	
	15.5	Take urgent and significant action to reduce the degradation of natural habitats, halt the loss of biodiversity and, by 2020, protect and prevent the extinction of threatened species.	

**Source:** Prepared by evaluator on the basis of the project document, final report, and other documents reviewed for the evaluation.

#### 4.1.4 How aligned was the proposed project with the activities and programmes of work of ECLAC?

##### Level of alignment of the project activities with the ECLAC 2016–2017, 2018–2019 and 2020 PoWs

43. The project was very well aligned with ECLAC PoWs during its implementation, namely the 2016–2017, 2018–2019 and 2020 PoWs. The project is particularly in tune with the EAs and IAs of ECLAC subprogramme 7 on sustainable development and human settlements, led by SDHSD at ECLAC, which was responsible for the implementation of the project. In fact, the project contributes to all the EAs and IAs identified for this subprogramme in the 2016–2017 and

2018–2019 PoWs. In addition, the project contributes to EAs and IAs in other subprogrammes, namely no. 4 on social development and equality, no. 5 on mainstreaming the gender perspective in regional development, no. 8 on natural resources and infrastructure, no. 9 on planning of public administration, no. 10 on statistics, and no. 13 on support for regional and subregional integration and cooperation processes and organizations.<sup>11</sup> Table 2 below details the EAs and IAs the project contributes to. Unlike the 2016–2017 and 2018–2019 PoWs, the 2020 PoW does not explicitly indicate the EAs and IAs related to each subprogramme. The project is certainly in line with the activities indicated for the policies for sustainable development and environmental performance work area of subprogramme 7 on sustainable development and settlements.

---

<sup>11</sup> Numbering corresponds to 2018–2019 PoW.



**Table 3**  
Contribution of the project to ECLAC EAs and IAs in its 2016–2017 and 2018–2019 PoWs

Subprogramme		EA		IA		Project component
No.	Name	No.	Name	No.	Name	
<b>Direct contribution</b>						
7	Sustainable development and human settlements	EA1	Increased capacity of Latin American and Caribbean countries to integrate sustainability criteria into development policies and measures, particularly in relation to sustainable development, climate change adaptation and mitigation measures and human settlements.	IAai	Increased number of policies, measures or actions adopted by countries in the areas of sustainable development, climate change and human settlements, in line with ECLAC recommendations.	1 and 2
				IAaii	Percentage of surveyed participants in meetings, workshops and training courses acknowledging that they have benefited from the ECLAC analysis and policy recommendations on sustainable development, climate change and human settlements to integrate sustainability criteria into their work on development policies and measures.	
		EA2	Enhanced capacity of the Governments of the region and other stakeholders to follow up and make progress in the implementation of international agreements relating to sustainable development, climate change and human settlements.	IAbi	Increased number of policy actions, measures or steps undertaken by Governments and other stakeholders in the region that follow up on and make progress in the implementation of international agreements relating to sustainable development, including urban development, in line with ECLAC recommendations.	1, 2 and 3
<b>Indirect contribution</b>						
4	Social development and equality	EA1	Enhanced capacity of the central or subnational governments in the region to formulate policies, plans and programmes that address the structural and emerging equality gaps affecting different socioeconomic and population groups, with an approach based on human rights and sustainable development.		(none of the IAs apply due to their focus on social policies, institutions or publications, but the EA applies as long as the project aims to promote evidence-based environmental policies that respect the right to justice in environmental matters, addressing equality gaps).	2 and 3
5	Mainstreaming the gender perspective in regional development		Strengthened capacity of countries in the region to implement gender equality policies in line with the regional consensuses, the	IAai	Increased number of policies, measures or actions adopted by the countries of the region in priority areas for gender equality in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda.	2 and 3

			2030 Agenda and other international agreements.			
8	Natural resources and infrastructure	EA1	Strengthened institutional capacity in the countries of the region to formulate and implement public policies and regulatory frameworks to increase efficiency in the sustainable management of natural resources and in the provision of public utilities and infrastructure services.	IAai	Increased number of new policies, measures or actions adopted by countries of the Latin American and Caribbean region in the areas of sustainable management of natural resources and the provision of public utilities and infrastructure services in line with ECLAC recommendations.	1 and 2
				IAaii	Increased number of stakeholders acknowledging that they have benefited from ECLAC technical cooperation services to improve their work in the area of sustainable management of natural resources and the provision of public utilities and infrastructure services.	
		EA2	Enhanced coordination and policy harmonization on sustainable management of natural resources and the provision of public utilities and infrastructure services at the subregional and regional levels.	IAbi	Increased number of public, academic and business institutions taking action to coordinate or harmonize policies for the management of natural resources and/or for the provision of public utilities and infrastructure services at the subregional and regional levels in line with ECLAC recommendations.	3
9	Planning of public administration	EA1	Strengthening of competencies and capabilities in the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean in matters of planning and public administration for development with a regional perspective and gender sensitivity.	IAaii	Increased number of participants who acknowledge having benefitted from the training services provided by the subprogramme to develop more efficient planning and public administration programmes.	1, 2 and 3
				IAaiii	Increased percentage of readers who acknowledge having benefitted from the analysis and recommendations contained in publications prepared by the subprogramme to develop more efficient planning and public administration programmes.	
		EA2	Increased coordination and exchange of best practices, and enhanced cooperation between Governments in the region and other stakeholders in matters of planning and public administration for development.	IAbi	Increased number of public agencies and other key stakeholder organizations that participate in seminars and networks supported by the subprogramme that acknowledge enhanced cooperation, improved institutional coordination and best practices feedback.	1, 2 and 3
				IAbii	Increased percentage of participants in forums supported by the subprogramme who acknowledge having benefited from activities and improved their coordination and exchange with participants from other Governments of the region.	
10	Statistics	EA2	Increased technical capacity of Latin American and Caribbean countries to monitor	IAbii	Increased number of actions taken by countries to implement ECLAC recommendations aimed at developing	1 and 2

			economic, environmental and social trends and to formulate evidence-based policies.		statistics to monitor economic, environmental and social trends.	
13	Support for regional and subregional integration and cooperation processes and organizations	EA1	Improved capacity of regional and subregional mechanisms to deepen their integration processes and promote their convergence.	IAai	Increased number of technical and substantive inputs provided by the Commission that are used to facilitate regional debate and consensus-building on social (including gender equality), economic and sustainable development issues, at the request of regional and subregional mechanisms.	1, 2 and 3 (especially 3)
				IAaii	Increased number of joint activities or initiatives in which various regional and subregional schemes and mechanisms participate to deepen their integration processes and promote their convergence.	
		EA2	Enhanced political dialogue of regional and subregional schemes with third parties and extraregional actors.	IAbii	(ii) Increased number of instances in which regionally agreed positions are presented in global forums or summits with technical support from ECLAC .	3

**Source:** Desk review.

## 4.2 EFFECTIVENESS

### 4.2.1 To what extent were the expected accomplishments met?

#### Level of achievement of the indicators from the results framework

44. As noted in section 4.3.2, and detailed in annex 7, the RF has significant deficits in terms of structure, indicators, baselines, targets and means of verification, making it difficult to measure the effectiveness of the project.
45. The achievement of indicators from the RF has been highly satisfactory. All eight end-of-project targets of the indicators had been met by project completion. In three cases,<sup>12</sup> the target was exceeded. The text below provides further details. Annex 6 provides this information in a table format.
- Of the participants at the meetings, 80% acknowledge having enhanced capacity to collect and analyse information related to environmental costs and expenditures
46. Three workshops on environmental costs and expenditures were organized in Costa Rica, in 2016, 2017 and 2018.<sup>13</sup> Civil servants from Costa Rica also participated in a regional workshop on this subject in Brazil in 2017. Quantitative information on enhanced capacity is only available for the 2016 national workshop and 2017 regional workshop. Responses to surveys conducted at the end of the workshops suggest the target was exceeded, as more than 80% of participants from Costa Rica acknowledged having enhanced their capacity to collect and analyse information related to environmental costs and expenditures. In Chile a workshop was organized in 2017. Civil servants from Chile also participated in the 2017 regional workshop. Responses to the survey conducted at the end of that workshop suggest the target was met, as 80% of participants acknowledged having enhanced their capacity to collect and analyse information related to environmental costs and expenditures. Based on the results for both countries, the target can be considered to be exceeded.
47. As explained in more detail in section 4.3.2 on the M&E system, the project does not have an adequate indicator to measure changes in the capacities of civil servants. Changes in capacity are measured through self-assessments conducted immediately after workshops, but should be measured through more objective means and sources of verification at the end of the project. Moreover, reporting on this is not always complete, as responses to the survey are not provided for all workshops, or significant, as satisfaction with the content of a course does not necessarily mean capacity was enhanced.<sup>14</sup> The project's impacts on the capacity of civil servants to collect and analyse information related to environmental costs and expenditures is assessed below.
- Draft environmental cost and expenditure assessments have been prepared in the two target countries
48. Environmental cost and expenditure assessments were prepared in Chile, Costa Rica and Venezuela as a result of the project. In that regard, the target was exceeded. This assessment assumes advisory activities conducted in the three countries actually resulted in the preparation of the assessments, which is unclear based on the project reporting. In Costa Rica, the assessment was published in 2018.
- Environmental performance and sustainability assessments prepared in two target countries

<sup>12</sup> In particular, IA1.1, IA1.2 and IA3.4.

<sup>13</sup> The 2017 workshop discussed the methodology to identify the environmental costs and expenditures, while the 2018 workshop presented results on the analysis of environmental expenditures for the country.

<sup>14</sup> The final report indicates that "90% of the participants [in the 2016 workshop] found the contents of high relevance for their jobs and for the policies of their country", ("Final Progress Report for Development Account Project 'Addressing Critical Socio-Environmental Challenges in Latin America and the Caribbean'", January 2021, unpublished) but this is not adequate evidence that participants found that their capacity had increased as a result of the workshop.

49. Environmental performance and sustainability assessments were prepared in Chile in 2016 and Peru in 2017. In that regard, the target was met.
- Commitment from the governments in the two target countries that the environmental performance and sustainability assessments will be used to design evidence-based policies
50. The indicator is very vague, as it does not define what a commitment is. Means of verification are not robust. The Government of Peru has made clear commitments to implement the recommendations of the environmental performance and sustainability assessment. It released a supreme decree to create a working group to implement the recommendations included in the EPR and two decrees following the recommendation of the review. The Government of Chile expressed its willingness to design further environmental policies following the recommendations of the environmental performance assessments in an official thank you letter to ECLAC and during the launch event. Moreover, following the recommendations of the EPR, a Household Solid Waste Management Survey was carried out in 2019. Given the vagueness of the indicator, it can be considered that the end-of-project target was achieved. Section 4.2.2 assess the extent to which EPR has resulted in evidence-based policies, or more simply the extent to which recommendations in the EPR have been implemented and their implementation followed up. Section 4.4 assesses the likelihood of these recommendations being implemented in the future.
- A negotiated draft text for the regional instrument on Principle 10 has been concluded
51. A draft text was concluded. The target was therefore met. The draft text was indeed adopted on 4 March 2018 by 24 countries. The official text was opened for signature between 27 September 2018 and 26 September 2020, at United Nations Headquarters in New York. By March 2021, the Agreement has been signed by 24 countries and ratified by 12.<sup>15</sup> It will enter into force on 22 April 2021. Countries recognize the importance of ECLAC support in the development, adoption, signature, ratification and operationalization of the text.
- 80% of the participants at the training and capacity-building meetings acknowledge having enhanced capacity to contribute to government efforts to ensure rights of access to information, participation or justice in environmental matters
52. During project implementation, 16 workshops were organized in 13 countries on the three rights of access. Available evidence suggests the target was met: 80% of participants acknowledged enhanced capacities on environmental access rights as a result of the trainings conducted by the project.
- Prepare a regional implementation guide for the Escazú Agreement to systematize common understandings on the scope and national implications of regionally agreed commitments and carry out a gap analysis
53. The guide was completed in a participatory manner, including two expert meetings in October 2019 and January 2020. The target has thus been met. The guide is being edited and put to public consultations, including by governments of the region and the general public, and will be translated and published. The regional implementation guide will assist countries of the region in taking stock of their current capacities and levels of implementation of environmental access rights in light of the commitments assumed under the Escazú Agreement, defining the scope of obligations, and reaching common understandings on agreed commitments.
- Organized a regional expert meeting of the signatory countries to the Escazú Agreement

<sup>15</sup> Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bolivia, Ecuador, Guyana, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Uruguay. See [online] <https://observatoriop10.cepal.org/en/treaties/regional-agreement-access-information-public-participation-and-justice-environmental>.

54. Two regional expert meetings of the signatory countries to the Escazú Agreement were held, one in Costa Rica (October 2019) and one online meeting under the auspices of Antigua and Barbuda (December 2020). The target has thus been exceeded.

#### 4.2.2 To what extent was the overall goal of the project achieved?

##### Assessment of environmental costs and expenditures

##### Level of progress on the capacity of civil servants in target countries (Chile and Costa Rica) and Latin America and the Caribbean broadly to collect and analyse information related to environmental costs and expenditures

55. National and regional workshops on this subject were organized as part of the project, and environmental cost and expenditure assessments were prepared in Chile and Costa Rica, applying suitable methodologies, which contributed to learning by doing. Interviews suggest these activities resulted in increased capacity of civil servants in Chile and Costa Rica to collect and analyse information related to environmental costs and expenditures. Importantly, this was achieved across sectors, allowing better policy dialogue. In particular, the project helped bridge the gap between finance experts, statisticians and environmental experts. In Costa Rica, economists in the Ministry of Finance and budget experts in line ministries, and to a lesser extent central bank staff, tended to have limited environment-related capacities, while environmentalists in the Ministry of the Environment tended to have limited capacity on economic, financial and statistical matters. The project helped fill some of these gaps, ensuring basic knowledge across sectors and providing a common language for these two types of stakeholders, thus improving their dialogue.
56. ECLAC supported Chile with assessment of environmental costs and expenditures over several years prior to this project, making it difficult to determine whether changes in related capacities in Chile can be attributed to this specific project. ECLAC supported the Government of Chile on this matter in 2013– 2015, when a methodology was agreed, a platform was developed and a document was published.
57. In addition, as the assessment of environmental costs and expenditures is part of the EPR, the review was conducted in Peru. The impact on capacities to assess environmental costs and expenditures in this country is not clear.
58. The project also enhanced the capacity to track environment-related resources in the region, through regional workshops. However, there is no clear evidence of the extent to which capacity was enhanced.
59. The online survey echoes this finding, since 50% of the respondents considered that the project had contributed significantly to increasing capacities to assess environmental costs and expenditures and 20% considered that it had contributed quite significantly.

##### Level of progress on institutional capacity to use the information generated on environmental costs and expenditures in policy decisions and strategic planning, in order to effectively design, implement and adjust policy and development planning conducive to sustainability, in target countries (Chile and Costa Rica) and Latin America and the Caribbean more broadly

60. Support from the project on the assessment of environmental costs and expenditures resulted in institutionalization of some methodologies in both target countries. In Costa Rica, the Ministry of Finance institutionalized identification of environmental costs and expenditures, by establishing guidance and codes. Today, this is a standard practice in annual budgeting processes. This generates information for other indicators such as the environmental accounts that the central bank manages. In Chile, as a result of the support provided through the project, international accounting standards were adopted and a standardized, clear, user-friendly online platform was designed and rolled out, to collect data.

### Number and quality of national policies and strategies using evidence generated by the assessments of environmental costs and expenditures supported by the project

61. While the project increased technical and institutional capacity, the impact on policies was more limited. In Costa Rica, although codes were systematized and the identification of such costs is now a standard practice, environmental costs and expenditures have not been assessed again or are not regularly assessed, and there is no evidence of this type of information being used to formulate or reformulate environmental policies. Changes in key government positions and limited human and technical resources explain this. Although technical capacities increased as a result of the project, they did not increase enough to enable civil servants to conduct this type of exercise without support.
62. In Chile, this type of analysis has been conducted again only in the framework of the EPR and is not standard practice. Interviews suggest that information from this type of analysis is used informally to reformulate policies. While more formal channels may have a greater impact, these informal channels are fundamental and do have had a significant impact. For instance, the low relative expenditure on biodiversity was used as an argument for the creation of a biodiversity and protected areas unit, and to strengthen solid waste management. Importantly, information from the environmental cost and expenditure assessments is used in other documents, such as the state of the environment and the EPR, which have their own channels for informing policymaking (see below).
63. The results of the online survey are mostly aligned with these findings: 47% of respondents said the project had contributed significantly to development and implementation of more evidence-based policies that better address critical socioenvironmental problems, as a result of the support on assessment of environmental costs and expenditures, and 27% said it had contributed quite significantly to it.

### Environmental performance review

#### Level of progress on the capacity of civil servants in the target countries (Chile and Peru) and Latin America and the Caribbean more broadly to assess environmental performance

64. The impact on capacity of civil servants in Peru and Chile to assess environmental performance is mixed. The project had some impact in Peru, where the involvement of the project in the development of EPR was significant. Civil servants in this country would most likely have increased their technical capacity to assess environmental performance as result of the advisory services, technical advisory missions, national meetings and publications. However, specific evidence on this is scarce. For instance, the project's RF does not include an indicator for this.
65. The impact of the project in increasing the capacity of civil servants in Chile to assess environmental performance is likely to be more modest than in Peru, as the country had more capacities, having already developed a EPR in 2005. However, as in Peru, the support provided through the project is likely to have resulted in increased technical capacity of civil servants to assess environmental performance, through learning by doing. Evidence on this impact is limited.
66. The project promoted a more comprehensive view of environmental performance and contributed to identifying strategic changes in Peru and disseminating identified strategic changes in Chile to improve environmental policymaking. In Chile, this included civil servants at the national and subnational levels. In addition to civil servants, dissemination involved the private sector, increasing the capacity of this stakeholder in relation to Chile's environmental performance and the sector's, and changes that could be triggered by the recommendations in the EPR.
67. There is no evidence of impacts on the capacity to assess environmental performance of civil servants in Latin American and Caribbean countries other than Chile and Peru.

68. The results of the online survey are mostly aligned with these findings: 63% of respondents said the project had contributed significantly or quite significantly to increasing capacities for assessment of environmental performance, and 37% said it had contributed only a little or not at all.

**Level of progress on institutional capacity to use the information generated in the environmental performance review in policy decisions and strategic planning, in order to effectively design, implement and adjust policy and development planning conducive to sustainability, in target countries (Chile and Peru) and Latin America and the Caribbean more broadly**

69. The project had a mixed impact on strengthening the institutional capacity of Chile and Peru to use information generated in their EPRs in policy decisions and strategic planning. This impact was significant in Peru, where the EPR was considered a useful strategic tool by at least three of the four governments in office between 2016 and 2021. Interviews suggest that the project's support helped Peru make considerable progress on the production, collection, processing and analysis of environmental data. The country established institutional structures to monitor implementation of the EPR recommendations. In 2016, the government prepared an action plan with monitoring mechanisms, including a working group to follow up and monitor implementation of the EPR recommendations. This was approved through a decree in 2017 by the next government. In 2019, through another project, ECLAC supported a review of implementation in the country of the EPR recommendations regarding the mining sector. By March 2021, a new government was assessing the progress made on implementing the EPR recommendations, to strategically fast-track their implementation.
70. In Chile, the impact of the project on strengthening institutional capacity to use information generated in the EPR in policy decisions and strategic planning has been more limited. The 2005 EPR had a great impact on this, resulting in restructuring of environmental institutions. The 2016 EPR did not have the same impact, as there was no need to adjust the institutional framework significantly again and the recommended changes were perhaps more challenging (see below). The EPR did however result in enhanced systems to generate, collect, process and analyse environmental data. Interviews revealed that a multisectoral government group formulated a sort of action plan to implement the EPR recommendations, assessing how they could be applied, although this was not formalized in a decree, unlike in Peru. While mid-term evaluations of implementation of recommendations in year five are a good international practice, by March 2021, Chile had not made any progress on such an evaluation of implementation of the recommendations of its 2016 EPR.

**Number and quality of national policies and strategies using evidence generated by the EPRs supported by the project**

71. In Peru the EPR has informed policy dialogue, largely regardless of the priority governments have given to joining OECD. Although the importance attached to accession decreased between 2017 and 2020, the EPR and its recommendations were still considered key institutional and policy tools and have been used across different terms of office. Even if accession is not prioritized, OECD is considered an important benchmark of where the country would like to be, and the EPR and its recommendations are considered rigorous, independent and transparent, with some life of their own. In fact, EPR recommendations had some specific impacts on environmental policymaking. In 2017, the Government of Peru issued several decrees to implement recommendations. Recommendations from the EPR also contributed to the development and approval of the country's climate change law and its regulations, as well as the drafting of a national environmental policy, in terms of the actions (developing them), the processes followed (i.e. public consultation, evidence-based formulation) and their content. The 2019 review of the mining sector found that in 2018 the country had mixed results in implementing EPR recommendations. There had been significant progress in some areas, particularly in reducing illegal mining, and limited progress in others. Although none of the recommendations had been fully implemented, overall, the country had made important steps to strengthen environmental performance in the mining sector.
72. The EPR has also informed policy dialogue in Chile, where it has been considered a sound and trustworthy benchmark by many stakeholders, including at the subnational level and in the private



sector. Interviewees said that the EPR could inform the new constitution, for example regarding water. They also suggested some of the recommendations of the 2016 EPR were being addressed. In particular, the country has prepared a draft revised environmental impact assessment law, in line with EPR recommendations. Chile is also working on a biodiversity law, but progress is limited (to date, work has focused on definitions), because it is a little contentious, as it would entail institutional restructuring and there is resistance from existing institutions. In addition, the resources of the Ministry of the Environment are limited. Following the recommendations of the EPR, a household solid waste management survey was carried out in 2019, through a partnership between Business Commitment to Recycling Chile (CEMPRE in Spanish), the Ministry of the Environment of Chile and ECLAC, and the collaboration of the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile. At the time of writing, this has not resulted in changes in the policy framework.

73. The results of the online survey are mostly aligned with these findings: 47% of respondents said the project had contributed significantly to development and implementation of more evidence-based policies that better address critical socio-environmental problems, as a result of the support for assessment of environmental performance, and 27% said it had contributed quite significantly.

### Rights of access to information, public participation and justice in environmental matters

#### Level of progress on technical capacity to ensure the rights of access to information, public participation and justice in environmental matters

74. The project contributed significantly to increasing the capacity of a wide range of stakeholders (government officials from different branches of government of different countries, non-governmental stakeholders and the general public) on two fronts: (i) the technical aspects related to the rights of access to information, public participation and justice in environmental matters; and (ii) the technical aspects related to international negotiations. The project increased capacities through the preparation of technical documents and other publications (5 documents were published),<sup>16</sup> the creation and maintenance of a website,<sup>17</sup> capacity-building workshops (18 were organized)<sup>18</sup> and more recently the regional implementation guide for the Escazú Agreement, which systematizes common understandings on the scope and national implications of regionally-agreed commitments and includes a gap analysis. There was indeed an excellent integration of capacity-building and negotiation processes, with the aim of ensuring that all actors had access to the same information (levelling the playing field) and that information was robust, thus following the

<sup>16</sup> The project published the following documents: (i) ECLAC/OHCHR, Society, rights and the environment: International human rights standards applicable to access to information, public participation and access to justice (LC/W.712), Santiago, 2016; (ii) ECLAC, Access to information, public participation and justice in environmental matters in Latin America and the Caribbean: towards the achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (LC/TS.2017/83), Santiago, 2017; (iii) ECLAC/Caribbean Court of Justice Academy of Law (CCJ Academy of Law), Ensuring environmental access rights in the Caribbean: analysis of selected case law (LC/TS.2018/31/Rev.1), Santiago, 2018; (iv) ECLAC/OHCHR, Climate Change and Human Rights: Contributions by and for Latin America and the Caribbean (LC/TS.2019/94), Santiago, 2019. In addition, the project supported the publication Ibero-American Federation of Ombudsman (FIO)/ECLAC/Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), "Recomendaciones para la incorporación del enfoque de derechos humanos en la evaluación de impacto ambiental de proyectos mineros", Project Documents (LC/TS.2020/97), Santiago, 2020. Interviews suggest that the second publication (LC/TS.2017/83) was particularly important.

<sup>17</sup> The Observatory on Principle 10 in Latin America and the Caribbean [online] <https://observatoriop10.cepal.org>

<sup>18</sup> Since the project start date, 11 intergovernmental negotiation meetings have been held (both in person and online), enabling adoption of the Agreement, and over 8 national capacity-building activities took place. Moreover, countless other workshops and seminars were organized with complementary resources and the support of governments and regional partners. These courses continued despite the COVID-19 pandemic. For example, between March and December 2020, ECLAC participated in 28 virtual events related to the Escazú Agreement. Sessions on the Escazú Agreement were delivered at broader high-level regional and subregional meetings, such as the OECS Council of Ministers on Environmental Sustainability and the Forum of Ministers of the Environment of Latin America and the Caribbean.

principles of evidence-based and participatory policymaking. Each negotiation meeting was in fact paired with capacity-building activities on the meeting topics and a capacity-building workshop took place on the first day of the meeting, before negotiations started. This was one of the key factors of success of the project, and a vital lesson to be drawn. This was particularly important because the negotiation involved stakeholders with very different technical capacities and perspectives, and some of the views were not necessarily evidence-based. Capacity-building on the three access rights in environmental matters was especially important for stakeholders with non-environmental governance backgrounds, such as experts in international relations and negotiation of treaties. However, it was also important for some stakeholders with environmental backgrounds, as many of them had limited capacity on these specific aspects, that are often related to governance. Capacity-building on international relations and negotiation of treaties was particularly important for stakeholders with environmental backgrounds, within and outside governments, as many of them had limited capacity on these international aspects. Capacity-building played a key role in levelling the playing field not only among types of stakeholders (for example, governmental versus non-governmental stakeholders, environmental experts versus international relations experts and governance experts), but also among countries with different characteristics (such as large and middle-income countries versus small island developing states (SIDS)). As part of the project, a significant conscious effort was made to provide more support to those that required it, for some SIDS, by performing activities such as preparing specific technical documents for them. Despite the breadth of the topics to be covered, the project was able to establish partnerships (see section 4.3.4) and mobilize relevant external expertise. Overall, through the project, ECLAC made sure that the negotiation was evidence-based and balanced, ensuring a sound and participatory deliberation process.

75. Capacity-building was instrumental not only for the development of the Escazú Agreement, but also for its signature and ratification, as stakeholders participating in negotiations had to convince others of the importance of signing and ratifying it. Some of the capacity-building strategies, particularly regarding publications and the website, also supported capacity-building beyond project implementation and the main beneficiaries. Capacity-building sessions at wider environmental seminars and meetings also contributed to this. The publications and the website also help maintain capacity as there is often significant turnover in government officials in Latin America and the Caribbean. In this regard, the project contributed to enhancing the capacities of representatives of participating countries, experts, representatives of international organizations and of civil society, as well as the general public, including youth, women, indigenous persons and persons with disabilities, among others.
76. In Colombia, the project is also contributing to the capacity of ANLA to implement the Escazú Agreement.
77. The results of the online survey follow the same lines: 57% of the respondents said the project had contributed significantly to increasing capacities on the three rights of access and 21% considered that it had contributed quite significantly.

#### **Number and quality of national policies and strategies developed ensuring the rights of access to information, public participation and justice in environmental matters as a result of the project**

78. The main impact of the project in terms of the rights of access to information, public participation and justice in environmental matters is the development, approval, ratification and operationalization of the Escazú Agreement, which is the first regional environmental treaty. The project has also had a considerable indirect impact at the national level on this front, as a result of ratification of the Escazú Agreement, and a direct impact in Colombia.

79. Available evidence shows that the Escazú Agreement is informing environmental performance in all countries covered by this review<sup>19</sup>, even those that had not signed the Agreement at the time of writing and where there is strong or evident opposition, such as Peru. In some cases, the Agreement has resulted in new legislation or policies. In other cases, the Agreement has resulted in adjustments to the judicial system or changes to environmental data collection systems. Available evidence suggests the Agreement does not need to have been signed to trigger changes in legal, regulatory and policy frameworks, or in systems and processes related to access to information, public participation and justice in environmental matters. Progress is not always commensurate in the three rights of access. In some countries there is more progress on access to information, while in others there is more progress on access to justice.
80. Chile had not signed the Agreement by April 2021. Peru had signed it but had not ratified it. However, the principles of the Agreement have informed the development of new laws and policies in these countries. In Chile, the two main laws currently being prepared —the law on climate change and the reform of the environmental impact assessment system— integrate the principles of the Escazú Agreement, the former regarding the right of access to information and public participation, and the latter regarding all three rights of access. In fact, both include explicit references to the Escazú Agreement. In addition, the Agreement has informed the development of new plans and cooperation agreements. The Agreement is also informing political processes, particularly regarding the new constitution, which the country was electing representatives to develop. A set of “Ten Green Commandments” has been developed – candidates that comply with them are given a sort of distinction. The Escazú Agreement is part of the “commandments”. Civil society is actively promoting the Agreement.
81. In Peru, although the legislature has not approved ratification of the Agreement, and there is strong opposition to it, a decree on the protection of human rights defenders, including environmental defenders, has been issued. In parallel, the executive and judicial powers are promoting the Agreement. They are jointly promoting mechanisms to improve access to environmental justice and creating an observatory on environmental justice. Civil society is also promoting the agenda of the Agreement.
82. Ecuador ratified the Agreement in May 2020. In this country, the Agreement has contributed to adjustments that improve access to environmental information and justice. At a wider level, the environmental information system has been revised, under the leadership of the Ministry of the Environment, and the systems concerning biodiversity have been revised, under the leadership of the National Biodiversity Institute. The changes regarding biodiversity have enhanced information generation, processing and management. Similarly, the country has made progress on protecting environmental defenders. The Ombudsman’s Office approved a policy to protect them; the country is working on an integral policy that would also include the Office of the Public Defender, the National Council of the Judiciary, the Public Prosecutor and the Human Rights Secretariat, thus including executive, judicial and ombudsman bodies. However, Ecuador has made limited progress on strengthening the right of access to public participation in environmental matters, as this is seen by some stakeholders as a less technical and a more political domain, and there are conflicts with extractive industries. Interviews suggest there is an urgent need to strengthen capacity-building and awareness-raising, as there is widespread misunderstanding of the Agreement and what it entails.
83. In Antigua and Barbuda, where the Agreement has also been signed, this has contributed to approval of the Environmental Protection and Management Act, which promotes the right of access to public participation.

---

<sup>19</sup> As noted below, 24 countries signed the Agreement and 12 have ratified it. This evaluation selected a sample of countries to assess whether environmental performance is being informed by the Escazú Agreement. The text below discusses this in Antigua and Barbuda, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru.

84. Colombia has signed the Agreement but has not ratified it. Some private sector groups that fear the Agreement could result in rights being enforced have conducted effective disinformation campaigns and there is a widespread perception that the Agreement has some risks. Nonetheless, there is no evidence of impacts of the Agreement in Colombia yet. However, there are good prospects regarding environmental licensing. Support from the project to ANLA is ongoing. The recommendations provided by the project are very likely to improve access to information, public participation and justice in environmental matters, almost certainly with an emphasis on citizen participation. While changes in processes and practices within ANLA are likely, legal or regulatory changes may be trickier, as they have to be endorsed by the Ministry of the Environment and ANLA itself does not have the autonomy to approve them. Promotion of the Escazú Agreement remains, at this stage, a priority of ANLA rather than a wider priority. Civil society, including both NGOs and academia, is actively promoting the agenda of the Agreement.
85. In the online survey, 67% of respondents said the project had contributed significantly to development and implementation of national and regional policies that promote the three rights of access in environmental matters and 20% said it had contributed quite significantly.
86. In the same survey, 53% of respondents said the Escazú Agreement had contributed significantly to development and implementation of environmental policies that promote the three rights of access in environmental matters and 27% said it had contributed quite significantly.

#### **Number and quality of regional policies and strategies developed ensuring the rights of access to information, public participation and justice in environmental matters as a result of the project**

87. The project has been vital to the development, adoption, ratification and operationalization of the Escazú Agreement. This impact cannot be overstressed. On 4 March 2018, Latin American and Caribbean governments adopted the Agreement, after several negotiation meetings. The official text was opened for signature between 27 September 2018 and 26 September 2020, at United Nations Headquarters in New York. A total of 24 countries have signed it. By March 2021, 12 countries had deposited their instruments of ratification. The Agreement entered into force in April 2021, as the threshold of ratification (11 countries) had been exceeded.
88. As indicated in the final report of the project (p. 4), “the Escazú Agreement aims to safeguard the right of every person of present and future generations to live in a healthy environment and to sustainable development by establishing procedural rights and guarantees. Such an instrument promotes access rights and the effective engagement of all sectors of society while also reinforcing and complementing the ability of government to address the environmental problems the region is currently facing”.<sup>20</sup> The Agreement focuses on persons and groups in vulnerable situations, pledging to leave no one behind in ensuring basic democratic principles, human rights and environmental protection. The Agreement provides a framework for countries of the region to continue implementing access rights over time in a sustained, cooperative and coherent manner.
89. The Escazú Agreement is the first treaty concluded under the auspices of ECLAC, the only treaty stemming from the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20), the first environmental treaty of the region and the world’s first to require States to specifically protect environmental human rights defenders from harm.
90. Interviews suggest that without ECLAC support this Agreement would most likely not have materialized. Challenges included: (i) an array of stakeholders to involve (most with limited capacity in at least one aspect of this complex Agreement); (ii) differences of opinion; (iii) countries that were reluctant to be scrutinized under an international agreement; (iv) limited financial support from

<sup>20</sup> “Final Progress Report for Development Account Project ‘Addressing Critical Socio-Environmental Challenges in Latin America and the Caribbean’”, January 2021, unpublished.

development partners that traditionally support such endeavours (such as European countries) following the global financial crisis that began in 2008; and (v) limited regional integration in Latin America and the Caribbean. The Escazú Agreement is a tangible expression of the support provided under project EA 3 and the additional funding obtained in 2020. In this regard, integration of capacity-building activities into negotiations and the effectiveness of mechanisms to enhance capacity (technical documents, publications, a website and workshops), were crucial in creating common understanding, building bridges and making the Agreement a reality. The participatory nature of the process itself was also crucial, allowing all stakeholders to feel their voices were being heard. The process entailed the development and strengthening of partnerships between ECLAC and key development partners, such as the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and their own networks, such as the Network of National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in the Americas. Another success factor was the capacity to draw on aspects of relevant conventions (particularly the Aarhus Convention) that could be useful for Latin America and the Caribbean, such as a committee to support implementation and compliance, and learning from the experiences of those conventions, to avoid repeating mistakes.

91. Importantly, ECLAC support did not come to an end with adoption of the Agreement in 2018. The project played a key role in ratification and operationalization of the Agreement, and supported two regional expert meetings of the signatory countries, one in October 2019 in Costa Rica<sup>21</sup> and an online meeting in December 2020, under the auspices of Antigua and Barbuda.<sup>22</sup> These meetings were crucial to maintaining momentum and calling for prompt ratification and entry into force of the treaty.<sup>23</sup> They were also important in fostering discussions and preparing documents that will be reviewed at the first Conference of the Parties (COP) such as: rules of procedure, including the modalities for significant participation of the public,<sup>24</sup> the structure and functions of the Committee to Support Implementation and Compliance<sup>25</sup> and the financial provisions necessary for the functioning and implementation of the Agreement.
92. At the subregional level, the project has also resulted in a memorandum of understanding (MoU) being signed by ECLAC and the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) in May 2020, to assist Eastern Caribbean countries in implementing the environmental dimension of the 2030 Agenda through the Escazú Agreement.
93. While ratification by 12 countries and subsequent entry into force of the Agreement is an outstanding achievement, there is strong opposition in some countries, and the lack of ratification by some, such as Chile, which championed it in initial negotiations, has discouraged other countries, such as Colombia and Peru, from ratifying. Restrictions on social gatherings may have limited the effectiveness of advocacy and awareness-raising efforts in some countries. Nonetheless, there is progress at the national level in some of the countries that have not ratified the Agreement.

<sup>21</sup> This meeting of the signatory countries was attended by representatives of 21 countries (19 signatory and 2 observers), 6 international organizations and United Nations agencies, 5 experts and 31 members of the public. The meeting was webcast.

<sup>22</sup> This meeting of the signatory countries was attended by representatives of 20 signatory countries, 17 international organizations and United Nations agencies, 17 experts, and the 6 elected representatives of the public. The meeting was webcast.

<sup>23</sup> The 24 countries that signed the Agreement did not all negotiate it, and 2 of the countries that have ratified it did not participate in the negotiations.

<sup>24</sup> "Proposed rules of procedure of the Conference of the Parties to the Escazú Agreement" [online] [https://acuerdodeescazu.cepal.org/s2/sites/acuerdodeescazu2020/files/2000843\\_esz.2\\_ddr1\\_proposed\\_rules\\_of\\_procedures\\_conference\\_parties.pdf](https://acuerdodeescazu.cepal.org/s2/sites/acuerdodeescazu2020/files/2000843_esz.2_ddr1_proposed_rules_of_procedures_conference_parties.pdf).

<sup>25</sup> "Proposed core elements for consideration in the preparation of rules relating to the structure and functions of the Committee to Support Implementation and Compliance of the Escazú Agreement" [online] [https://acuerdodeescazu.cepal.org/s2/sites/acuerdodeescazu2020/files/2000868\\_esz.2\\_ddr2\\_proposed\\_elements\\_committee\\_support\\_and\\_compliance.pdf](https://acuerdodeescazu.cepal.org/s2/sites/acuerdodeescazu2020/files/2000868_esz.2_ddr2_proposed_elements_committee_support_and_compliance.pdf).

### 4.2.3 How has the project contributed to enhancing the ECLAC programme of work, priorities and activities?

#### Evidence of changes in the ECLAC programme of work, priorities and activities that can be attributed to the project

94. As explained in section 4.1.4, the project was aligned with the ECLAC PoW for 2016–2017, 2018–2019 and 2020. The project contributed to enhancing ECLAC PoWs through its work on the Escazú Agreement, which was not originally considered a priority activity and has proved to be a great contribution of the project. The support provided by the project to advance the Escazú Agreement included establishment of an online observatory—a web-based repository of documents—which was not originally included in ECLAC PoWs, but was later added. Other divisions of ECLAC have shown interest in creating and maintaining similar observatories in their own topics.

### 4.2.4 Did the project produce results not reflected in the results framework?

#### Number and type of unplanned consequences from project activities or outputs to date

95. The RF accurately reflects the results of the project. The original RF was adjusted in 2020 to add two activities related to operationalization of the Escazú Agreement. Four main project results are not reflected in the project's RF, including the Principle 10 observatory. The project was to support negotiation of the Escazú Agreement by producing technical publications, among other activities, but a website to gather and disseminate them was not planned. As the project progressed, materials and data were produced and collected, therefore ECLAC thought it would be a good idea to create such a website. It was originally funded by the project and was later supported by UNEP and Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ). The observatory has proven very relevant. Articles 10, 11 and 12 of the Escazú Agreement explicitly refer to it, institutionalizing it as the Agreement's centre for information exchange. Other divisions of ECLAC are interested in developing similar websites in their fields.
96. The project did not include planned direct support to ANLA in Colombia. While specific impacts are not yet evident, because the technical assistance document with recommendations is yet to be completed, this technical assistance is very significant and the impact is likely to be significant.
97. Furthermore, the RF did not include signing an MoU with regional institutions to further support implementation of the Escazú Agreement. As a result of the project, in May 2020, ECLAC signed an MoU with OECS to assist Eastern Caribbean countries in implementation of the Escazú Agreement. ECLAC has also received expressions of interest from different countries to support them with environmental costs and expenditures and EPRs, although it could be argued that this was implicit in the project design.
98. Interviews suggest that the processes promoted by the project for the development, adoption, ratification and operationalization of the Escazú Agreement (see below) have established a new legitimacy standard and a precedent and resulted in a paradigm shift in international negotiations in the region. Respondents also indicated that there may be calls for other international negotiations, for example on free trade, to be more transparent and open as a result.

### 4.2.5 How satisfied are project beneficiaries with the services received?

#### Level of satisfaction with the benefits received from the project

99. Interviews show a high level of satisfaction with the benefits provided by the project. Thank you letters were sent to ECLAC by stakeholders from Chile and Saint Lucia.

#### 4.2.6 Did the project contribute to innovation?

##### Evidence of inclusion of innovative aspects in the project and demonstration of them being successful<sup>26</sup>

100. The project contained several innovative aspects. While some of them apply to the three components, most of them apply to specific components. The project was innovative in its use of online formats, which was not initially foreseen but used complementarily throughout project implementation and intensified as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. This included virtual workshops and meetings as well as web-based tools such as the Observatory on Principle 10. These formats proved successful in ensuring broader outreach, accessibility and replicability.
101. Assessment of environmental costs and expenditures is not an innovation in the world or the region, as Mexico is a global champion for it and some Latin American and Caribbean have several experiences of performing such assessments. As mentioned in section 4.1.1 on relevance, Chile and Costa Rica nevertheless had limited capacity in this regard and the project's support introduced processes that were innovative in these countries. In particular, the use of international accounting standards and the design and use of a standardized, clear, user-friendly online platform to collect data were innovative.
102. EPRs are innovative in Latin America and the Caribbean. Before the project, only Mexico (1998, 2003, 2013), Chile (2005) and Colombia (2014) had conducted these assessments in the region, the latter two with support from ECLAC. By March 2021, only Peru had joined the list, with support of the project. Being subject to an external, rigorous, comprehensive and transparent evaluation by peer countries that will themselves be assessed through the same process is an innovate and useful procedure in the region. The assessment process results in innovations in the type of data that is produced, collected and processed and the institutional structures in charge of these processes.
103. Innovation has been particularly outstanding regarding the Escazú Agreement, the outcome itself being an innovation. This is the first treaty concluded under the auspices of ECLAC, the only treaty stemming from the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20), the first environmental treaty in the region and the world's first to require States to specifically protect environmental human rights defenders from harm.
104. Work on the Agreement was also highly innovative in terms of development processes, participants, means of participation, and basis of participation. Interviewees indicated that it was a refreshing experience. The negotiation was open to all, involving not only governments and international organizations but also civil society at large, including NGOs civil society organizations, the private sector, trade unions, academia and the general public. International negotiations often involve only governments. In the negotiations of the Escazú Agreement, the only restriction was that proposals from civil society had to be adopted by a government. The close and continuous involvement of non- governmental stakeholders was relatively innovative for ECLAC, which is more used to working with governments. An innovative process to select civil society representatives was also developed.
105. Negotiations were transparent and balanced. They included a regional public mechanism to ensure that all stakeholders had access to the discussions and their outcomes. Negotiations were broadcast

---

<sup>26</sup> The project's final report includes a section on good practices, innovative approaches and lessons learned (p. 13). In that section, the report claims that "The project built on past successful practices and lessons learned and also introduced innovative approaches" ("Final Progress Report for Development Account Project 'Addressing Critical Socio-Environmental Challenges in Latin America and the Caribbean'", January 2021, unpublished). Is it however unclear which aspects are good practices, which ones are innovative approaches and which ones are lessons learned, and whether the lessons learned were identified in other projects and used in this project or learned in it. This section considers some of the aspects mentioned in the project's final report, but also builds on interviews with stakeholders and reflects the evaluator's own analysis.

and documents made available to all stakeholders. Stakeholders could register and then receive all the relevant information from the negotiation meetings. They could also receive a bulletin every two or three months. By March 2021, over 6,000 people had registered. Stakeholders could also send questions by email, which were answered by the secretariat. This was an innovation, as most international negotiations, in the region and globally, are not public.

106. During the in-person and online meetings, innovative participation protocols were followed. In international negotiations, when civil society is allowed to participate, governments talk first and civil society is only allowed to talk afterward. In the negotiations of the Escazú Agreement there was no prioritization based on who the participant was. Instead, statements were made in the same order that requests to speak were received. Governmental and non-governmental stakeholders worked hand in hand, not entirely as equals, but almost.
107. Development of the Escazú Agreement was innovative in its integration of capacity-building, including dissemination of information (e.g. Observatory of Principle 10) and negotiation processes, aiming to level the playing field and promoting evidence-based negotiations. International negotiations sometimes include dissemination of technical or scientific reports but do not generally include a strong formal capacity-building component. For example, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) COP negotiations are typically informed by reports. The involvement of the academia and technical experts more broadly, bringing evidence and more neutral perspectives, was also innovative. The role of ECLAC as secretariat of an international negotiation was also innovative, as not only did it steer the process it also ensured technical robustness and consistency in terms of principles, practices and processes. Usually, secretariats of this type of negotiations take notes, but do not play a technical and political role. For ECLAC, this role was also innovative, as it does not usually act as secretariat of international negotiations or agreements.
108. The integration of certain topics was also innovative. The linkage between the environment (and climate change) and human rights was new to many stakeholders, particularly regarding the attention paid to vulnerable groups, indigenous communities and environmental defenders.

## 4.3 EFFICIENCY

### 4.3.1 To what extent were the services and support delivered in a timely and cost-effective manner, according to the priorities established by the project document?

#### Timing and sequence of outputs against workplan/delays (in months) generated by implementation bottlenecks

109. Timing of output delivery was excellent. Outputs were delivered earlier than planned, as a result of the high interest and engagement of beneficiary countries and the substantive leverage of complementary funding (see section 4.3.4 below). EA 2 had been completed by the end of 2017, EA 3 was completed in 2018 and EA 1 was almost completed in 2018 and fully completed in 2019. The project was extended in July 2019 for nine months (from the original completion date of December 2019 to September 2020). This extension was not related to delays in project implementation, but to the addition of two activities related to EA 3 (A3.3 and 3.4), which was paired with US\$ 200,000 of additional funding. The project was extended a second time in May 2020, until December 2020. This extension was mostly related to the impact of COVID-19. While it could be considered that the project had a three-month delay (from September 2020 to December 2020), this was very reasonable given the unexpected pandemic and the challenges it created worldwide.

#### Divergences between planned and actual activities and nature of changes

110. All planned activities were implemented. As the planned project activities were completed earlier than planned, mostly in 2019 and 2020 but also in 2018, complementary activities were performed that were in line with the project objectives, following up on completed activities and



laying the foundations for continuity and sustainability. Additional opportunities to advance the objectives of the project led to further products and activities, building on the initial outputs of the project and providing additional tools and spaces for capacity-building for beneficiary countries. This included creation and maintenance of the Observatory on Principle 10, which was not included in the RF, preparation of a regional implementation guide for the Escazú Agreement and organization of regional expert meetings of the signatory countries, which were included in the RF in 2020. As indicated, the added activities were very relevant and significantly increased the impact of the project.

#### Level of alignment between planned and incurred project costs and nature of divergences

111. By April 2021,<sup>27</sup> 98% of the project's planned budget had been executed and the remaining 2% had been committed, for the purpose of this evaluation. Expenditure was higher than planned on consultant experts, other staff costs, contractual services and general operating expenses (in all cases there was overspending of around 40%). In contrast, expenditure was lower than planned on staff travel and grants and contributions (for travel of meeting participants) (42% and 77% of the budgeted amounts, respectively), owing to restrictions on travel related to the COVID-19 pandemic. ECLAC will redistribute the funds, which has been allowed by DA, given the special circumstances of the pandemic.

#### Level of alignment between planned and incurred project management costs and nature of divergences

112. The project budget reflects the DA structure and line items. DA projects are supposed to complement PoW activities, and entities are supposed to use their existing personnel, which is why they do not have staff costs, besides general assistance, which is meant to be temporary. It is thus not possible to assess project management costs. As noted, expenditure on staff travel was lower than planned.

#### Evidence of use of financially and management sound practices for project execution and management

113. Under the project, practices were put in place to promote sound financial and administrative management. Complementarities were sought with other programmes, projects and initiatives, the governments of participating countries and other development partners. Section 4.3.4 provides more details of complementarities. To limit equipment rental expenses, every effort was made to organize project training in halls and auditoriums owned by ECLAC or beneficiary countries. Multiple online workshops were organized well before the COVID-19 pandemic. Within ECLAC, collaboration between SDHSD, administrative staff, the Programming Planning and Operations Division (PPOD), and the Office of the Secretary of the Commission was important.

#### 4.3.2 To what extent was the M&E plan well-conceived and sufficient to monitor results and track progress toward achieving objectives? To what extent was the M&E plan effectively and efficiently implemented?

##### Existence of a clear and appropriate M&E plan including scheduling, assignment of roles and responsibilities, and provision of adequate resources

114. The ProDoc provides only a generic M&E plan. Roles and responsibilities are imprecisely defined. According to the ProDoc (p. 28), monitoring was to be ensured by SDHSD and PPOD at ECLAC Headquarters in Santiago, Chile. SDHSD was to be responsible for producing annual progress reports and PPOD for supervising an external terminal evaluation. The schedule is not very detailed, but the ProDoc provides key information: that progress reports would be issued annually and that the external evaluation would be performed at the end of the project. However, the content of the reports is not described. The M&E plan does not include a mid-term review, but this is reasonable because it is a short (three-year) project.

<sup>27</sup> This assessment is based on financial information made available to the evaluator on April 12th, 2021.

115. The ProDoc allocates resources for the M&E plan, although no resources are directly allocated to monitoring. Resources allocated for the terminal evaluation are rather low compared to the typically allocations: the ProDoc allocates a total of US\$ 14,000 for this regional-level terminal evaluation, while country-level terminal evaluations are usually allocated US\$ 25,000 to 30,000, and regional-level terminal evaluations are sometimes budgeted US\$ 100,000. While the percentage of total project resources allocated to the terminal evaluation (2.2%) is reasonable—the total budget is also small—in absolute terms, the allocation could compromise the depth and breadth of data collection and therefore the soundness of the evaluation. This undermines the independent nature of the evaluation and could become a monitoring challenge if staff already have significant non-project work. Allocation for the evaluation was not binding, in line with DA requirements at the time, and the project was given the flexibility to increase that amount, especially because the overall budget of the project was increased. The allocated budget was enough to ensure a robust evaluation.

#### Existence of appropriate performance indicators, and adequate baseline information

116. The RF has significant deficits that hinder measurement of the project's effectiveness. The EAs are adequate. The approach to indicators is adequate and consistent in EA 1 and EA 3, but it is not adequate in EA 2, where changes in capacities of civil servants are not directly measured and the proxy is not robust. The logical framework does not provide baselines. The ProDoc does not provide mid-term targets, although this makes sense because it is a short project (three years). Most of the indicators are adequate. However, there are considerable shortcomings in the measurement of changes in civil servants' capacity, regarding the audience and the means and sources of verification (self-assessment surveys immediately after the workshops as opposed to more objective ways of measuring capacity in the medium term against a baseline). Some other indicators are also vague and the means of verification does not provide more clarity (for example, on commitments to use project outputs and letters from beneficiary countries). Annex 7 provides detailed comments.

#### Types, number and quality of reporting materials submitted a) correctly and b) on time

117. Annual progress reporting follows the outline of DA projects. This includes a brief project table (project title, DA project code, executing entity, reporting period, total and annual implementation rate and important issues); an open summary of achievements to date; a section reviewing performance indicators for EAs and activities; a section on challenges or problems encountered and the actions taken to solve the issues; a section on revisions; a supplementary funding table; additional information; and financial information, by object class.
118. Overall, the template is comprehensive and useful. However, there is room for improvement in certain aspects. In table 2 on the review of activities, it would be good to add a workplan for the next year (which was only included in the 2016 annual report), showing whether the activities planned for previous years were completed on time. The table for reviewing activities has a column indicating the status (cancelled, delayed, not yet started, in progress, completed). This is useful, but it would be helpful to note the length of delays, if any, as activities could be both delayed and in progress. The financial information provides cumulative numbers per object class. It would be good to also have information by year, EA and activity. Using object classes, it is also difficult to analyse expenditure in a way that links it with project results.
119. Progress reports were produced in a timely manner. Annual progress reports were prepared for 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019. All the reports are complete and provide a good level of detail, reporting on all indicators and all activities. However, there are some key shortcomings. Reporting often presents information that is not relevant in the sense that it does not directly relate to the indicator (e.g. IA 3.2). Reporting is sometimes incomplete (i.e. IA 1.1) or inconsistent (i.e. IA 1.2). The final report is comprehensive and provides a good summary of the execution of the project, except that as from mid-April 2021 onward the financial information was not complete.

## Number, type and quality of project management responses to issues raised in M&amp;E reports

**Table 4**  
Challenges encountered and actions taken to solve them

Challenge encountered	Annual Progress Report	Action(s) taken to solve it
High priority of the activities by beneficiary countries, which required immediate implementation, providing products and results earlier than expected.	2018, 2019, 2020	Implementation of this project became the priority of SDHSD of ECLAC. Soon after the start of the project, beneficiary countries attributed high priority to the project activities and requested immediate support. Since the EAs and original activities had been completed in 2018, during the remaining years focus was placed on the additional activities and on following-up the original activities, dissemination, and ensuring the sustainability of the impact beyond the project implementation period. In 2020, additional funding was provided in response to country demands and because of the early project implementation. Furthermore, several opportunities arose with relevant partners and donors to broaden the objectives of the project beyond the initial EAs, allowing for a greater impact and sustainability.
Changes in government and civil servants	2017, 2018, 2019, 2020	Regular changes in government and civil servants are a general trend in the region. In 2016, the key focal point in Peru changed. In 2018, elections were held in Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Grenada, El Salvador, Mexico and Paraguay. Moreover, a new government took office in Chile. In some countries, the environmental authorities also changed, such as in Ecuador. In 2019, elections were held in Argentina, Bolivia, Dominica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Panama and Uruguay. Once the majority of the project had been completed, such changes did not significantly affect project implementation. However, contact was maintained, to ensure continuity and implementation beyond the project. Multi-stakeholder teams were fostered to enable continuity. The participation of institutions (instead of individuals) was promoted, and replication within institutions to ensure dissemination was encouraged.
Limited resources to fully cover demand	2018, 2019, 2020	The limited resources to fully cover demand for capacity-building and technical assistance required prioritization. Having an all-of-government and all-of-society approach required identification of key stakeholders as well as wide dissemination, awareness-raising and capacity-building in different sectors. The provision of additional funding allowed EA 2 and EA 3 to be developed further, with three specific products that benefited targeted countries.
COVID-19 and meeting and travel restrictions	2020	Since the original project EAs and core activities had been completed before the COVID-19 pandemic, only the additional funding was affected. However, the impact was mitigated significantly, as the hiring of home-based consultants and the holding of virtual meetings enabled the expected results to be completed. Adjustments were required in the format of meetings, which resulted in greater use of information and communications technology (ICT) platforms and wider outreach (more participants were able to connect).
Difficulties travelling to Venezuela and providing technical assistance owing to limited flights and connectivity	2016, 2017	A 'virtual workshop' was conducted as a solution to provide technical assistance to the government representatives and overcome the logistical challenges of an in-person session.

Difficulties owing to extreme weather conditions	2017	Due to Tropical Storm Bret in June 2017, the first workshop in Grenada for public officials had to be postponed. However, since there was a second meeting scheduled for civil society, the public officials were invited to attend, creating an opportunity for sharing of experiences and dialogue between government and civil society. More public officials were also invited to attend the second meeting. Changes were made to the agendas to accommodate the mix of participants.
--------------------------------------------------	------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Source:** 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019 annual progress reports and 2020 final report.

120. The annual progress reports include a section on challenges encountered and actions taken to solve them. Reporting on this is good, identifying challenges as they emerge and monitoring the actions taken and their impact. The final report summarizes the challenges and actions taken to solve the issues.
121. The project faced four main challenges. The first was the need to implement activities immediately and thus earlier than expected, particularly those related to EA1 and EA2, owing to the high priority given to these activities by beneficiary countries. Moreover, some related activities had started earlier. In response, implementation of the project became the priority of SDHSD of ECLAC, which was able to respond rapidly given the integration of SDHSD internal work and project activities.<sup>28</sup> As a result, the EAs and original activities were completed in 2018. As the project was still open, the focus was then placed in the remaining years on additional activities and on following-up the original activities, dissemination and ensuring the sustainability of the impact beyond the project implementation period. Additional funding in 2020 and synergies with partners allowed a greater impact and sustainability.
122. The second main challenge came from changes in government and civil servants. In 2016, the key focal point in Peru changed. During the project implementation period, elections were held in Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominica, Grenada, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay and Uruguay. Moreover, a new government took office in Chile. In some countries, such as Ecuador, the environmental authorities also changed. To respond to these changes, the project team established relationships with the new governments and civil servants. Once most of the project had been completed, these changes did not significantly affect project implementation. However, the project team maintained contact to ensure continuity and implementation beyond the actual project. Multi-stakeholder teams were fostered, to allow for continuity. The participation of institutions (instead of individuals) was promoted and replication within institutions was encouraged, to ensure dissemination.
123. The third main challenge was that limited resources were available to fully cover demand. This was managed by prioritizing activities and stakeholders, mobilizing additional resources and partnering with stakeholders.
124. The fourth and final main challenge came from COVID-19, which resulted in restrictions on gatherings and travel. This only affected the activities added in 2020,<sup>29</sup> and was suitably managed by hiring national consultants, organizing virtual meetings and requesting a three-month extension. Remote meetings had also been organized previously, for instance with Venezuela owing to limited travel connectivity. Mitigation measures had some positive impacts, including an increased number of participants.

<sup>28</sup> Linkages between DA projects and executing agencies' internal work allows a quick response and ensures technical soundness. Limited integration between project activities and an executing agency's internal work is likely to result in strong reliance on procuring external consultants, which tends to be a drawn-out process and results in less relevant, sound and credible support.

<sup>29</sup> This also slowed down ratification of the Escazú Agreement.

125. The ProDoc anticipated the risk of government and civil servant turnover and provided an adequate mitigation response, which was put into place during implementation. COVID-19 was not anticipated, but it was very difficult, if not impossible, to do so. Two of the risks included in the project design did not materialize at all or only partially: (i) there were no setbacks in participating countries regarding the practices promoted by the project; (ii) there were some setbacks regarding political commitments to Principle 10, for example in Chile, which had negative repercussions in Peru and Colombia, but overall there was a firm commitment to Principle 10, as ratification of the Escazú Agreement demonstrates.

#### **4.3.3 The flexibility and responsiveness of ECLAC to meet the requirements of the project and the needs of the countries involved, reducing or minimizing the negative effects of externalities.**

##### **Number of monitoring missions of ECLAC and meetings held**

126. ECLAC SDHSD conducted monitoring, as per the ProDoc. However, the ProDoc gives very little information about the project management structure, or monitoring and reporting. Annual reports and the final report provide limited information on monitoring. The chief of SDHSD and its team participated in no less than 13 workshops, seminars, trainings and meetings. Although the project entailed a lot of work for the division, the human resources were sufficient for managing and monitoring the project and providing technical assistance, as early completion shows.

##### **Evidence of the ECLAC management response and changes in project strategy or approach as a direct result of information in progress reports, missions or meetings**

127. See section 4.3.2 above. ECLAC being an implementing entity of the DA, the project manager was an ECLAC official. The project did not have a separate project team. For that reason, the responses of the project were entirely ECLAC responses.

##### **Evidence of collection of lessons learned and good practices on project activities and dissemination to relevant stakeholders**

128. It is important to distinguish between lessons on the thematic areas covered by the project, and lessons on implementing a project in those areas. The ProDoc included some relevant activities to collect lessons on the thematic areas covered by the project and to disseminate them. In particular, the project planned to conduct regional workshops on assessment of environmental costs and expenditures (A1.1) and on the three rights of access (A3.1), and to publish the supported EPRs (A2.3). These activities were implemented. While relevant, they are not sufficient to systematically collect lessons and disseminate them. During implementation, collection of lessons improved regarding the three rights of access, through the preparation of relevant documents. There were no improvements regarding collection of lessons on EA 1 or EA 2. During implementation, dissemination of lessons EA 2 and EA 3 improved significantly on. On EA 2, exchanges between Chile and Peru were promoted. On EA 3, several documents were published and a website was created (Observatory on Principle 10). Conducting online workshops also contributed to further disseminating lessons learned.
129. Collection and dissemination of lessons regarding project implementation was limited. During project implementation, lessons were only collected more or less systematically regarding workshops, through evaluations that offered participants the opportunity to make recommendations for subsequent workshops, but these have not been compiled or shared. Annual progress reports do not collect lessons. The final report includes a section on good practices, innovative approaches and key lessons learned, but this could be further developed. In that section, the report (p. 14) claims that “The project built on past successful practices and lessons learned and also introduced innovative approaches”.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>30</sup> “Final Progress Report for Development Account Project ‘Addressing Critical Socio-Environmental Challenges in Latin America and the Caribbean’”, January 2021, unpublished.

However, it is unclear which are good practices, which are innovative approaches and which are lessons learned, and whether lessons were learned in other projects and applied in this project or learned in this project. The concept of lessons learned comprises more than success stories, and it is critical to document what works well, what works less well and what does not work. Moreover, lessons should be documented and shared with a wide range of stakeholders, not only within ECLAC.

#### 4.3.4 Were there any complementarities and synergies with other work being performed by beneficiary countries, ECLAC or other development partners?

##### Evidence of efforts to optimize synergies and avoid duplications with the other activities implemented by beneficiary countries

130. Available evidence shows that the Governments of Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia and Uruguay provided in-kind co-financing for the project, in particular to fund capacity-building activities related to assessment of environmental costs and expenditures and the three rights of access, by providing facilities or coffee breaks. In addition, the Ministry of the Environment of Chile provided US\$ 24,000 for EPR work in Chile, and in-kind co-finance for advisory support to Peru on this matter. There is no additional evidence of complementarities of project activities with other activities of beneficiary countries.

##### Evidence of efforts to optimize synergies and avoid duplications with the other activities implemented by ECLAC

131. ECLAC provided non-project related funds to the project. In particular, ECLAC provided US\$ 50,000 to finance capacity-building activities regarding the three rights of access. In addition, care was taken to align most activities of SDHSD and other units and divisions of ECLAC with the project. In almost all the missions carried out within the project, SDHSD officers carried out coordination tasks related to the regular programme of ECLAC, such as updating databases and information systems, coordinating technical assistance activities, meetings of experts, studies and publications, and seeking synergies with regional initiatives.

##### Evidence of efforts to optimize synergies and avoid duplications with other initiatives developed by other development partners

132. The ProDoc states that the project promoted collaboration with other agencies, initiatives and regional institutions active in the sustainable development and human rights sectors. Table 4 provides details.

**Table 5**  
Supplementary funding

Institution	Purpose	Amount raised	
		US\$	In-kind
ECLAC	Finance capacity-building activities (A.3.2)	50,000	
UNEP	Capacity-building activities (A.3.1 and A.3.2)	32,000	Meeting participants, experts, facilities, coffee breaks, etc.
OECD	Environmental Performance (A.2.3)	21,000	Advisory support.
Regional Environmental Center	Advisory support and finance for capacity-building activities in Grenada and Dominica. Travel of experts (A.3.2).	6,000	Advisory support.

UNECE	Advisory support on capacity-building activities (A3.3)		Advisory support.
OECS	Finance for capacity-building activities (A.3.2)		Facilities, coffee breaks, etc.
Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU)	Finance for capacity-building activities (A.3.2)		Facilities, coffee breaks, etc.
The Access Initiative (TAI)	Finance capacity-building activities (A.3.2)		Facilities, coffee breaks, etc.
World Bank	National workshops on environmental expenditures (A.1.1)		Advisory support, facilities.
Government of Germany	Evaluation of the environmental performance of Peru (A.2.1, A. 2.2 and A. 2.3)	141,600	Advisory support.
Government of Spain	Evaluation of the environmental performance (A. 2.1)		Advisory support.
Governments of Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia and Uruguay	Finance for capacity-building activities (A.1.1, 3.1 and 3.2)		Facilities/coffee breaks, etc.
Government of Brazil	National workshops on environmental expenditures (A.1.1)		Advisory support, facilities.
Government of Chile - Ministry of the Environment	Evaluation of the environmental performance of Chile (A.2.1 and A.2.3)	24,000	
Government of Chile	Evaluation of the environmental performance (A. 2.1)		Advisory support.
		274,600	

**Source:** 2020 final report, with additions based on comments from the project team.

133. Most of the collaboration took place on the three rights of access. On this matter, the project collaborated with UNEP, the Regional Environmental Centre, the Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), OECS, IPU and TAI. UNEP provided significant funding (US\$ 32,000) including for meeting participants, experts, facilities and coffee breaks. The Regional Environmental Centre also provided some cash funding (US\$ 6,000). UNECE, OECS, IPU and TAI provided in-kind co-financing. The project also raised co-financing for the work on the EPR. In particular, co-financing was obtained from OECD, and the governments of Germany and Spain. The Government of Germany provided the largest amount of co-financing, with US\$ 141,600 for advisory services on EPR. In fact, EPR was the component with the largest amount of co-financing. OECD provided substantive resources (US\$ 26,000). The Government of Spain provided unquantified in-kind co-financing. There was no co-financing on the assessment of environmental costs and expenditures from development partners.
134. In total, the project mobilized US\$ 274,600, as well as an unquantified amount of in-kind co-financing from development partners and beneficiary countries to support project activities, for advisory support, facilities and catering for meetings.
135. One of the reasons for the project's success in mobilizing additional resources was management using project resources as a sort of a secure funding that would only be mobilized if complementary

resources could not be leveraged.<sup>31</sup> The nature of the work supported also promoted collaboration with other stakeholders. EPR is a comprehensive exercise and a sound assessment, which requires involvement from governments. The three rights of access are a cross-cutting topic involving many different stakeholders, and ECLAC needed to mobilize external expertise. For instance, the partnership of ECLAC with OHCHR and UNECE was very important for the project, although OHCHR is not mentioned in the table on co-financing in the final document.

136. The only key stakeholder that was not involved was the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR). According to the ProDoc, UNITAR was to be involved in capacity-building on the Protocol on Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers to the Aarhus Convention. As this was not prominent in the project, a partnership was not formed with UNITAR.
137. In the online survey, 50% of respondents said the complementarity with existing national and regional interventions was very high, and 21% said it was fairly high. A total of 47% of said coordination with other national and regional interventions was very high, and 33% said it was high.

## 4.4 SUSTAINABILITY

### 4.4.1 What is the likelihood of project results being incorporated in future strategies and policies in participating countries?

#### Assessment of environmental costs and expenditures

##### Existence of technical capacity in the participating countries

138. Technical capacity to assess environmental cost and expenditures is likely to be maintained in Chile and Costa Rica. The project trained a significant number of stakeholders, seeking to build capacity of government institutions rather than individuals, which is critical given the rapid civil servant turnover in the region. In addition, the project produced documents explaining the methods used, which can be consulted by external stakeholders or participant stakeholders to check specific elements. The project used internationally established and tested methodologies, which ensures the availability of international guidance documents, including manuals. Lastly, ECLAC is ready to provide technical advice, if needed.

##### Existence of legal mechanisms in place ensuring the implementation of the sustainability policy and strategies in the participating countries/Perceived level of ownership of the policy documents and strategies elaborated in the participating countries

139. Chile's and Costa Rica's national legal and policy frameworks do not directly contribute to continuation of environmental cost and expenditure assessments. However, the two countries' international commitments do contribute to continuation of those assessments, owing to environmental provisions in international agreements, such as the 2030 Agenda. The Statistical Conference of the Americas also promotes such assessments. In addition, assessment of environmental costs and expenditures is part of the EPR, which Chile will very likely undertake in 2025 and Costa Rica will carry out soon if it accedes to OECD, which is likely. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) also promotes this type of assessment. Furthermore, assessment of environmental costs and expenditures can be easily paired with or extended to measuring expenses connected to climate change, which has gained increased international attention over the last decade. The climate change agenda under UNFCCC will likely promote such analysis as part of its enhanced transparency framework, which would contribute to continuation of this type of analysis. In this regard, existing and likely future international obligations and commitments of Latin American and Caribbean countries will contribute to the sustainability of work on assessment of environmental costs and expenditures.

<sup>31</sup> Annual spending is not a good indicator of the performance of DA projects. Performance can be good and spending low if significant complementary funds are mobilized.



### Existence of institutional frameworks ensuring sustainability of the project results, including a knowledge-sharing platform, in the participating countries

140. In Chile, Costa Rica and Peru codes to identify environmental costs and expenditures have been institutionalized. Identification of environmental costs and expenditures will therefore likely be sustained. However, assessment of these costs and expenditures has not been institutionalized and is not likely to be institutionalized, since this has not happened in the four years following the end of the support in 2017. The main challenges in this regard are that the roles and responsibilities for conducting the assessment are either not clearly defined or inadequately assigned, and the relevant institutions have limited human resources. In Chile, roles and responsibilities have not been clearly delimited between the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of the Environment. In Costa Rica, the Ministry of Finance is in charge of this assessment, but it is a mostly operative institution, focused on collecting taxes and estimating expenditure, and does not typically conduct research or analysis, as well as having limited financial and human resources. In contrast, the central bank has a clear research remit, and has more financial and human resources, with a unit that deals specifically with environmental accounts. In some countries, ownership and interest is personal rather than institutional, so when the interested people leave there is no continuity. Ministries of finance usually have the information, but the ministries of the environment have the greatest interest. These institutional bottlenecks are unlikely to be solved soon, indeed they have not been solved in the last four years. Working more closely with potential users, using flexible dissemination channels and formats, including social media, and a regional database in the style of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) Corporate Database for Substantive Statistical Data (FAOSTAT) would have contributed to the sustainability of project results.

### Level of dependence on future funding for the sustainability of national progress and likely availability of such resources

141. Regular funding from Latin American and Caribbean countries to conduct assessments of environmental costs and expenditures does not seem likely. As such assessments are increasingly appreciated at the international level, Latin American and Caribbean countries may receive external support in the future to conduct them. The integration into linkage processes with a financing component, such as budget support loans where part of the support is conditional on fulfilment of certain objectives, for example rises in environmental spending, would have helped the sustainability of project results on this front.
142. Overall, therefore, the assessment of environmental costs and expenditures seems rather unlikely to be sustained. Such assessments will probably be performed once development partners provide additional resources or there is specific external pressure to conduct the analyses, such as in the framework of EPRs. In the absence of these factors, it seems improbable that Chile, Costa Rica and Peru will conduct assessments in the future, indeed they have not conducted them in the four years following project completion.

## Environmental performance review

### Existence of technical capacity in the participating countries

143. Technical capacity to assess environmental performance is likely to be maintained in Chile and Peru. The project trained a significant number of stakeholders, seeking to build capacity of government institutions rather than individuals, which is critical given rapid civil servant turnover in the region. In addition, the project helped produce documents that explain the methods used, which can be consulted by external stakeholders or participant stakeholders to check specific elements. Moreover, the project used internationally established and tested methodologies, which ensures the availability of international guidance documents. ECLAC is also ready to provide technical advice, if needed. Importantly, other international forums are also requesting that Chile and Peru develop and disseminate

performance reviews, such as UNFCCC through biennial update reports, national communications and the upcoming biennial transparency reports. This assessment and reporting exercises will contribute to strengthening the capacity of Chile's and Peru's civil servants to assess and report their country's environmental performance.

#### **Existence of legal mechanisms in place ensuring the implementation of the sustainability policy and strategies in the participating countries/Perceived level of ownership of the policy documents and strategies elaborated in the participating countries**

144. In Chile, OECD membership will ensure that follow-up EPRs are conducted every 10 years —the next one in 2025/2026. In Peru, the new government has shown interest in becoming an OECD member. Indeed, the country is currently taking diplomatic steps to receive an invitation from OECD to formally initiate the accession process. The outcome of this process is hard to predict. It is also hard to predict whether the accession process will be linked to preparation of an EPR in 2027 or earlier —as discussed, it is not compulsory at the moment.
145. It is not clear how probable it is that the recommendations of the EPR will be implemented in Chile in the near future. The presidential elections in November 2021 will likely be crucial in terms of government interest in implementing them. In the meantime, implementation of the recommendations may be on standby, especially given the elections to the constituent assembly. There is no mid-term review of implementation of the recommendations or a clear plan to conduct one shortly, meaning that no such review will contribute to implementation. That said, as many political parties in the country and the OECD working groups of which Chile is part attach importance to OECD membership, there is pressure from peers that will likely result in implementation of many of the EPR recommendations. Chile's legal, regulatory and policy frameworks —including the policies being discussed— and its international commitments will also contribute to implementation of the EPR recommendations.
146. In contrast, in Peru, regardless of the OECD accession process, the new government will likely implement many of the EPR recommendations, based on the ongoing assessment of implementation, in coordination with the working group, and in line with the supreme decree on implementation. The policies being discussed, such as the draft national environmental policy, will further enhance implementation of the EPR recommendations. However, as the mining sector assessment demonstrates, implementation of some recommendations is unlikely, owing to their political sensitivity or technical or institutional complexity. Implementation of recommendations for which the Ministry of the Environment is primarily responsible is more likely than implementation of recommendations which are predominantly the responsibility of other ministries.
147. Beyond OECD, both Chile and Peru have international commitments that support conducting assessments of environmental performance and implementing most recommendations included in their EPRs. Both countries are signatories of the Paris Agreement on climate change and the Convention on Biological Diversity, among other relevant international agreements. While these agreements do not require that EPRs be conducted or that recommendations included in EPRs be implemented, they do require performance assessments, which will put international pressure on the Governments of Chile and Peru to implement some of the recommendations included in the 2016–2017 EPRs. Chile and Peru have not ratified the Escazú Agreement, article 6 of which recognizes the importance of EPRs and could promote their wider use in the region. Support from ECLAC will further promote EPRs in 2027 in these countries and implementation of the recommendations of the 2016–2017 EPRs. Peru's progress in implementing the EPR recommendations regarding mining is one example of this.

### Existence of institutional frameworks ensuring sustainability of the project results, including a knowledge-sharing platform, in the participating countries

148. In Chile, OECD membership and participation in OECD working groups will contribute to development of follow-up EPRs and implementation of EPR recommendations. In Peru, the existence of a working group on implementation of the recommendations will contribute to their implementation.

### Level of dependence on future funding for the sustainability of national progress and likely availability of such resources

149. As an OECD member, Chile will likely mobilize funding, either domestic or external, to conduct an EPR in 2027. It is uncertain whether Peru will mobilize funding for such an exercise. Chile and Peru will likely leverage domestic funds to implement some of the recommendations of the 2016–2017 EPRs. External funding will likely be available to both countries to implement some recommendations, particularly those regarding climate change in which relevant international funds are active. ECLAC will very likely continue to support implementation of the EPR recommendations on several fronts, through different projects, as the support on mining in Peru shows.

## Escazú Agreement

### Existence of technical capacity in the participating countries

150. Regarding EA 1 and EA 2, the technical capacities regarding the three rights of access will likely be sustained. Numerous stakeholders were trained. Relevant publications were produced. Most importantly, the Observatory on Principle 10 provides relevant information on a continuing basis, including both updates and access to all relevant documents.

### Existence of legal mechanisms in place ensuring the implementation of the sustainability policy and strategies in the participating countries/Perceived level of ownership of the policy documents and strategies elaborated in the participating countries

151. Some laws, regulations and policies in Latin American and Caribbean countries already promoted the three rights of access. The Escazú Agreement, which is binding, will likely result in the development and approval of new laws, regulations and policies that contribute to the three rights in the countries that have ratified it. It will likely also contribute to the rights in countries that have not ratified it, as Chile and Peru, as current evidence shows. Indeed, the Agreement has already resulted in the drafting or approval of laws, regulations and policies that contribute to the three rights, even in countries that have not signed or ratified it. National implementation of the three rights of access will likely increase if more countries sign and ratify the Agreement. More countries are likely to join the Agreement as implementation shows that the feared damaging impacts will not occur and that such fears were unjustified. As countries join, even more will be encouraged to do so, as they are very unlikely to want to be one of the few that have not ratified. Signature and ratification by key peers will be crucial—for instance, for Chile, Colombia and Costa Rica would be important, as Mexico and Argentina have already signed and ratified, and for Peru, Chile would be important. Ratification by Brazil, Chile, Colombia and Peru would give the Agreement crucial impetus. Of course, changes in government will be important; for example, elections are planned for May 2021 in Ecuador and November 2021 in Chile.
152. Some of the characteristics of the Escazú Agreement will contribute notably to sustained and sustainable efforts to promote the three rights of access in the countries that have ratified it. As noted in the final report, regional treaty obligations are less prone than national laws or policies to circumstantial changes or modifications, providing more stability and predictability in the implementation of the Agreement's provisions. As also argued in the final report, "since the regional agreement is a floor, not a ceiling, and calls for non-regression and progressive

realization, it allows to include improvements and further advances while discouraging rollbacks in the rights safeguarded”.<sup>32</sup>

#### **Existence of institutional frameworks ensuring sustainability of the project results, including a knowledge-sharing platform, in the participating countries**

153. The institutional structures of the Agreement at the regional level, particularly COPs, will contribute to sustainable promotion of the three rights of access. At the national level only a few countries seem to have made progress on creating institutional structures to promote these rights. In countries that have made progress, such as Peru (e.g. Observatory on Environmental Justice), Ecuador (information system) and Colombia (ANLA division on public participation), promotion of these rights is more likely to continue.

#### **Level of dependence on future funding for the sustainability of national progress and likely availability of such resources**

154. Ratification of the Agreement will likely attract the attention of development partners, as it is an important achievement at the global level (the first treaty to require States to specifically protect environmental human rights defenders from harm and stemming from the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20)) and regional level (the first regional environmental treaty in the region and the first one concluded under the auspices of ECLAC) and it addresses some very urgent issues in the region. The partnerships built by ECLAC during implementation of the project will further contribute to this. The existing capacities of ECLAC and those which it developed through the project will also enable it to provide permanent support and advisory services to the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean at very low cost, beyond project implementation. Development of the structure and functions of the Committee to Support Implementation and Compliance could help mobilize resources for implementation of the Agreement. Countries that have ratified the Agreement are more likely to provide domestic funds, given pressure from peers to move forward with this agenda, although they may have more pressing priorities.
155. In the online survey, 47% of respondents said the project results are very likely to be sustainable at the national level, and 20% considered it likely.

#### **4.4.2 What is the likelihood of regional cooperation efforts being sustained?**

156. Substantive regional cooperation on assessment of environmental costs and expenditures seems unlikely. Some collaboration may take place in the framework of the Statistical Conference of the Americas, but it seems unlikely that this will result in specific cooperation between countries in the region.
157. Regional cooperation on EPRs is more likely, but still moderately unlikely. Collaboration on development of EPRs seems unlikely given that Latin American and Caribbean countries are not expected to develop a new EPR in the near future. Some collaboration could materialize on implementation of the EPR recommendations in the region, although this is more likely to be partial, around topics such as climate change, rather than comprehensive.
158. Regional cooperation on the three rights of access is highly likely. The binding nature of the Escazú Agreement is a very strong driver of sustainability. The recent development of its rules of procedure, and the structure and functions of the Committee to Support Implementation and Compliance are very positive. The two first meetings of signatory countries revealed great interest (19 and 20 signatory countries participated, respectively), which will likely increase, as the Agreement entered into force

<sup>32</sup> “Final Progress Report for Development Account Project ‘Addressing Critical Socio-Environmental Challenges in Latin America and the Caribbean’”, January 2021, unpublished.

in April 2021. However, there is still room for the Agreement to be ratified by more countries, despite significant opposition in some. Ratification by certain countries could be crucial. A key element will be the practical relevance of the Agreement in helping countries develop policies in a participatory way and demonstrating the benefits of this. In this regard, it will be important for there to be proven results not only regarding environmental justice and public participation—which may be more sensitive—but also on the right of access to information, which may be considered less political. Some best practices discussed in the framework of the Agreement could provide tangible benefits in less controversial aspects. That said, it will be crucial to ensure the continuation of a dynamic secretariat, the Observatory on Principle 10, public participation in Escazú Agreement meetings, and capacity- building, particularly when new topics are discussed.

159. Signatory countries have made progress on the financial provisions necessary for the functioning and implementation of the Agreement. International organizations also showed strong interest in the process in the first two meetings of signatory countries (6 and 17 international organizations, respectively, including United Nations agencies that participated in these meetings). Some of these organizations are quite likely to mobilize funds for operationalization of the Agreement. Regional cooperation is more likely in the Eastern Caribbean, where ECLAC will be providing tailored support.
160. In the online survey, 33% of respondents said project results were very likely to be sustainable at the regional level, and 33% considered it likely.

## 4.5 CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

### 4.5.1 To what extent did project design, implementation, and monitoring take into consideration human rights and gender issues?

161. It is important to distinguish between the three components. The work on the assessments of environmental costs and expenditures was not based on a human rights or gender analysis or a related strategy. This component contributes in an indirect way to advancing human rights and gender equality, by promoting evidence-based environmental policy, which would result in a healthier environment and thus a better life.
162. The work on EPRs was not based on a human rights or gender analysis or a related strategy. However, Chile's and Peru's EPRs include a section on environment and social aspects, assessing human rights and vulnerable groups, including women, and particularly the rights of access.
163. The work on the three rights of access made an outstanding contribution to promoting human rights, as that is the focus of that component. The contribution is noteworthy in terms of the content of the text that was adopted, signed and ratified. The text embraces the principle of leaving no one behind, has a clear focus on vulnerable persons and groups and protects environmental defenders, most of whom are women. As mentioned in the final report (p. 4), "The regional agreement establishes specific measures under each pillar to promote the equal access and participation of all. In so doing, it aims to reach those that have traditionally been excluded or marginalized or face particular difficulties in fully exercising environmental rights, such as women, youth, rural communities, persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples or human rights defenders in environmental matters, precisely in the world's most unequal region".<sup>33</sup>
164. The final report highlights that "The principle of leaving no one behind was consistently upheld [...] seeking to reach all sectors of society at the national level. Project activities, such as meetings and workshops, therefore always targeted vulnerable groups and populations and specific groups such

<sup>33</sup> "Final Progress Report for Development Account Project 'Addressing Critical Socio-Environmental Challenges in Latin America and the Caribbean'", January 2021, unpublished.

as civil society, youth, women and indigenous peoples”.<sup>34</sup> This does not seem to be the case on EA 1, where the principle was not particularly relevant. However, this approach was followed to a certain extent in the support provided to Peru to develop its EPR and to Chile to disseminate its EPR, as the consultation and dissemination processes were society-wide. Despite this, it is unclear whether indigenous peoples were sufficiently involved. Development of the Escazú Agreement was very participatory. This was one of the key outcomes and innovations of the project: not just the content of the Agreement, but also the process that led to it. Importantly, the project produced assessments on the three rights of access to inform negotiations.

165. In the online survey, 55% of respondents said that the project’s design and implementation took both human rights and gender issues into account significantly, and 36% considered it did so quite significantly.

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

### 5.1 RELEVANCE

166. The project was very well aligned with the needs and problems of participating countries. When the project was designed, there was clearly a need to strengthen evidence-based and participatory environmental policymaking in participating countries, which had limited capacities to make progress on that front by themselves. The project activities helped participating countries conduct relevant analyses and establish a regional agreement that have improved environmental policymaking and policy implementation and have a great potential to further do so. The project is very well aligned with the region's needs and problems regarding the rights of access to information, public participation and justice in environmental matters, and less so on the assessment of environmental costs and expenditures and environmental performance, where regional demand is less prominent, despite their importance. The project is in line with the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs. Components 1 and 2 directly contribute to SDGs related to environmental sustainability, while Component 3 directly contributes to SDGs related to human rights and governance and international partnerships. The project contributes indirectly to a significant number of SDGs. The project was well aligned with ECLAC PoWs during its implementation, namely the 2016–2017, 2018–2019 and 2020 PoWs. The project is particularly in tune with the EAs and IAs of ECLAC subprogramme 7 on sustainable development and human settlements, but also contributed to EAs and IAs in other subprogrammes.

### 5.2 EFFECTIVENESS

167. Achievement of indicators in the RF was highly satisfactory. All eight end-of-project indicator targets had been met by project completion. In three cases, the target had been exceeded.
168. Interviews suggest project activities resulted in increased capacity of civil servants in Chile and Costa Rica to collect and analyse information related to environmental costs and expenditures. This was achieved across sectors, allowing better policy dialogue. Support from the project resulted in the institutionalization of some methodologies in both target countries. However, environmental costs and expenditures are not assessed regularly in either country. The policy impact has been limited. In Chile, interviews suggest information from this type of analysis is used in an informal way to reformulate policies. In Costa Rica, there is no evidence of this type of information being used to formulate or reformulate environmental policies.
169. The impact of the project on the technical and institutional capacities of Peru and Chile to assess environmental performance has been mixed: it was substantive in Peru and more limited in Chile. In Peru, the EPR has informed policy dialogue and recommendations have had some specific impacts on environmental policymaking, regardless of the priority governments in office have given to joining OECD. The EPR has also informed policy dialogue in Chile, where interviews indicated the EPR could inform the new constitution. Some of the recommendations of the 2016 EPR are being addressed in the country.
170. The project contributed significantly to increasing the capacity of a wide range of stakeholders on technical aspects related to the rights of access to information, public participation and justice in environmental matters, and technical aspects related to international negotiations. There was excellent integration of capacity-building and negotiation processes. This contributed to the Escazú Agreement being evidence-based and participatory. The project has made a considerable indirect impact at the national level in terms of the three rights of access, as a result of development and ratification of the Escazú Agreement. This impact has been seen even in countries that have not signed or ratified and where opposition is strong or evident. The impact in Colombia was direct. The

main impact of the project on the rights of access is the development, approval, ratification and operationalization of the regional treaty, the Escazú Agreement, which is an outstanding achievement. The Escazú Agreement is the first treaty concluded under the auspices of ECLAC, the only treaty stemming from the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20), the first environmental treaty in the region and the world's first to require States to specifically protect environmental human rights defenders from harm. Without ECLAC support, this agreement would most likely not have materialized.

171. The original RF was adjusted in 2020 to add two activities related to operationalization of the Escazú Agreement. The project RF did not include the establishment or maintenance of the Observatory on Principle 10, direct support to ANLA in Colombia, signature of an MoU with regional institutions to further support the implementation of the Escazú Agreement, or establishment of a new legitimacy standard in international negotiations in the region. All of these are important project impacts.
172. In general, the project was innovative in its use of virtual formats, even well before the COVID-19 pandemic struck. The assessment of environmental costs and expenditures was innovative in the region. In particular, the use of international accounting standards and the design and use of a standardized, clear, user-friendly online platform to collect data were innovative. Similarly, EPRs are innovative in Latin America and the Caribbean. Being subject to an external, rigorous, comprehensive and transparent evaluation by peer countries is an innovate process in the region. EPR also results in innovations in the type of data that is produced, collected and processed and the institutional structures in charge of these processes. Innovation has been particularly outstanding regarding the Escazú Agreement. The outcome itself is an innovation. The work on this agreement was also highly innovative in terms of the development processes, participants, means of participation, and basis of participation. The integration of the environment and human rights was also innovative.

### 5.3 EFFICIENCY

171. The timing of output delivery was excellent: outputs were delivered earlier than planned. The project was extended in July 2019 to add two activities. The project was extended a second time in May 2020, related to the impact of COVID-19.
172. All planned activities were implemented. As the planned project activities were completed earlier than planned, complementary activities were performed that were in line with the project objectives. This included creation and maintenance of the Observatory on Principle 10, preparation of a guide on regional implementation of the Escazú Agreement and organization of regional expert meetings of the signatory countries.
173. By April 2021, 100% of the project budget had been executed or committed. COVID-19 resulted in overspending on some budget codes and underspending on others. Available information does not permit assessment of project management costs. Under the project, practices were put in place to promote sound financial and administrative management, including internal and external cooperation and the use of online tools.
174. The ProDoc provides only a very generic M&E plan. Roles and responsibilities are imprecisely defined. The ProDoc does not allocate resources for monitoring and allocates limited resources for a terminal evaluation. The RF had significant caveats. The EAs are adequate. The approach to indicators is adequate and consistent for EA 1 and EA 3, but it is not adequate for EA 2. The logical framework does not provide baselines. Most of the indicators are adequate, but there are significant shortcomings in measuring changes in capacity of civil servants and other indicators are vague.



175. Annual progress reporting follows the outline of DA projects. Overall, the template is comprehensive and useful. However, there is room for improvement regarding information on completion of activities and finance. In general, reports were produced in a timely manner and are complete and of good quality.
176. Reporting on challenges encountered and actions taken in response is generally good. The project faced four main challenges: (i) the need to implement activities immediately and thus earlier than expected; (ii) changes in government and civil servants; (iii) limited resources to fully cover demand; and (iv) the COVID-19 pandemic, which restricted gatherings and travel. The ProDoc anticipated the second challenge and provided an adequate mitigation response, which was applied during implementation. COVID-19 was not anticipated, but it was very difficult, if not impossible, to do so. Two of the risks included in the project design did not materialize.
177. Monitoring at ECLAC was conducted as planned. Human resources were sufficient. Collection and dissemination of lessons learned on the thematic areas covered by the project was limited in the ProDoc, but improved during implementation, with room for further enhancement. Collection and dissemination of lessons regarding project implementation was limited.
178. The governments of 13 participating countries provided co-financing for the project. This was mostly in kind, but 1 participating country also provided cash co-financing. ECLAC provided cash co-financing to the project. The project also promoted collaboration with other agencies, initiatives and institutions active in the sustainable development and human rights sectors, including UNEP, OHCHR, UNECE, the Regional Environmental Centre, OECS, IPU, TAI, OECD, and the Governments of Germany and Spain. In total, the project mobilized US\$ 274,600, as well as an unquantified amount of in-kind co-financing to support project activities, including advisory support, facilities and catering for meetings.

#### 5.4 SUSTAINABILITY

179. Technical capacity to assess environmental costs and expenditures is likely to be maintained in Chile and Costa Rica. Their national legal and policy frameworks do not directly contribute to a continuation of environmental costs and expenditures assessments, but their international commitments do. In Chile, Costa Rica and Peru codes to identify environmental costs and expenditures have been institutionalized. However, the assessment of these costs and expenditures has not been institutionalized. Regular funding from Latin American and Caribbean countries to conduct these assessments does not seem likely, but the countries may receive external support in the future to do so. These will probably be performed only once development partners provide additional resources or there is specific external pressure to conduct the analyses.
180. Technical capacity to assess environmental performance is likely to be maintained in Chile and Peru. In Chile, OECD membership will ensure that follow up EPRs are conducted every 10 years – the next one in 2025–2026. It is hard to predict whether Peru will conduct an EPR soon. Chile will likely implement some of the recommendations of its EPR, although constitutional and presidential elections make this uncertain. In Peru, regardless of the OECD accession process, the new government will likely implement many of the EPR recommendations. However, implementation of some is unlikely in Peru, owing to the recommendations' political sensitivity or technical or institutional complexity. Both countries will probably leverage domestic funds to implement some of the recommendations of the 2016–2017 EPRs. External funding will likely be available to both countries to implement some of the recommendations, particularly those regarding climate change in which large international funds are active. ECLAC will very likely continue to support implementation of the EPR recommendations on several fronts.
181. The technical capacities regarding the three rights of access will likely be sustained. Some of the laws, regulations and policies in Latin American and Caribbean countries promote these rights. The Agreement, which is binding, will probably result in the development and approval of new laws,

regulations and policies that contribute to these rights in the countries that have ratified it and even in those that have not do it. At the national level only some of the countries seem to have made progress on creating institutional structures to promote these rights. Development partners, including ECLAC, and the Agreement itself, will likely provide funding for implementation of the Agreement at the national level. Countries will probably mobilize domestic funds for implementation, although they may have more pressing priorities.

182. Substantive regional cooperation on the assessment of environmental costs and expenditures seems unlikely. Regional cooperation on EPRs is moderately unlikely. Regional cooperation on the three rights of access is highly likely, given the binding nature of the Escazú Agreement and the interest shown in the first meeting of the signatory countries. A key element will be the practical relevance of the Agreement in helping countries develop policies in a participatory way and demonstrating the benefits of this. International organizations will likely support the functioning of the secretariat and implementation of the Agreement. Regional cooperation is more likely in the Eastern Caribbean, where ECLAC will be providing tailored support.

## 5.5 CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

183. The work on the assessments of environmental costs and expenditures contributes indirectly to advancing human rights and gender equality. The EPR work contributes to this in terms of the process and the content of the reports. The work on the three rights of access made an outstanding contribution to promoting human rights, in terms of the content of the text that was adopted, signed and ratified and the process that led to it. The Agreement contributes to gender equality, given its focus on leaving no one behind.

## 6. LESSONS LEARNED

### 6.1 GENERAL

184. International processes and their outputs can be crucial drivers of change in environmental matters across government institutions (beyond ministries of the environment and related agencies) and non-governmental stakeholders (including the private sector), especially if these processes and outputs are linked to prestigious institutions, such as ECLAC and OECD. Often the outputs gain importance on their own and can trigger change in environmental matters even if the broader processes are not embraced. In particular, EPRs can trigger change regardless of the willingness of governments or parliaments to join OECD and even if a particular country decides not to become a member of OECD. In Peru, the EPR has informed policy dialogue and its recommendations have had some specific impacts on environmental policymaking, to a great extent regardless of the priority governments in office have given to accessing OECD. Similarly, there has been progress in the promotion of the three rights of access in countries that have not signed or ratified the Escazú Agreement. In this regard, change can happen on different fronts (legislature, executive and judiciary, and making, monitoring and implementation of policy) and does not necessarily happen on all fronts simultaneously and at the same pace. For instance, in Peru, the legislature has not signed or ratified the Escazú Agreement, and there is evident opposition, but new laws are being discussed in parliament and there has been progress in the executive and judiciary. High-level political endorsement is not a necessary (or sufficient) condition for change in environmental matters.
185. International exchanges are very important to trigger change in environmental matters. The Escazú Agreement promotes regional exchange. EPRs promote exchanges with other OECD members, not only of Latin America and the Caribbean, but also of other regions, which is very helpful in terms of information and political, technical and social ownership.
186. Integration of DA projects with executing agencies internal work enables a quick response and ensures technical soundness. In this project, integration of project activities with ECLAC internal work was key to responding quickly to the immediate needs of beneficiary countries, and to providing relevant, solid and credible support on the three components. Limited integration between project activities and an executing agency's internal work is likely to result in significant reliance on procurement of external consultants, which tends to be a drawn-out process, with less relevant, solid and credible support.
187. It is important that DA projects have the flexibility to add new elements (for example, the Observatory on Principle 10 and support to ANLA in this project) and to provide additional resources and time to conduct essential complementary activities that were not originally planned (activities 3.3 and 3.4 in this project).

### 6.2 ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL COSTS AND EXPENDITURES

188. Some institutional changes take time, particularly when they seem technical or are indeed very technical. When selecting beneficiary institutions, it is important to focus on those that will most likely have the technical and human capacity to analyse environmental costs and expenditures regularly, and establish clear and adequate institutional arrangements.
189. Assessment of environmental costs and expenditures is more likely to be sustainable when it is part of broader and longer processes. Its integration into the EPR is a good example of a useful linkage. Outcomes have a greater impact if the environmental cost and expenditure assessment is integrated into processes with a financing component. One example is budget support loans, where part of the

support is subject to fulfilment of certain objectives, such as increases in environmental spending. Other options are green exceptions and credits. For instance, the Government of Costa Rica has a loan from Agence française de développement (the French Development Agency), whereby support is tied to progress on the government's decarbonization plan.

190. To promote assessment of environmental costs and expenditures, a database in the style of FAOSTAT could prove very helpful, allowing countries to make initial estimates. This should ensure that data is commensurable, has been standardized and is consistent.
191. When promoting assessment of environmental costs and expenditures, it is fundamental to work closely with potential users (for instance, establishing fluid communication with academia) and use light channels and formats, including social media (such as short YouTube videos) to increase the use of information.

### 6.3 EPR

192. Environmental performance is driven not only by environmental laws, policies, strategies and practices, but also and perhaps more importantly by laws, policies, strategies and practices traditionally related to the economy (on issues such as competitiveness or international trade) and social domains (such as the fight against poverty), the rule of law and governance. Environmental performance is a multisectoral and cross-sectoral issue, not just an environmental issue. EPRs are very useful to understand the need for a comprehensive, whole-of-government and whole-of-society, systemic approach, revealing linkages between different elements.
193. Latin American and Caribbean countries remain a minority in OECD and similar organizations. Their views and perspectives are not always well reflected or sufficiently considered in these forums. Regional institutions such as ECLAC have a crucial role to play, as brokers or intermediaries between countries in their region and global institutions where countries in a region are a minority, contributing to a better understanding of national needs and perspectives in global institutions.
194. South-South and triangular cooperation on this topic can be very useful, as Chile's support to Peru demonstrates. There is room for further exchange between Latin American and Caribbean countries that have conducted EPRs such as Chile, Colombia, Mexico and Peru, others in the process of accession that may need to conduct them (such as Costa Rica) and other countries that are not involved in the process. A regional progress assessment could be helpful to inform exchanges.

### 6.4 RIGHTS OF ACCESS

195. Regional integration is crucial. For a region such as Latin America and the Caribbean, it does make a lot of sense to develop regional agreements as a complement to global agreements. Regional agreements increase relevance, ownership and commitment compared to global agreements, although the latter are still fundamental. In this regard, it is important that Latin American and Caribbean countries consider themselves not just individual countries and members of the international community but also members of the Latin American and the Caribbean community.
196. Environmental performance is complex and involves multiple fronts (the importance of economic, social and political dimensions has been highlighted above). In general, but especially in developing regions, and particularly in Latin America and the Caribbean, it is very important to consider and address the human rights dimension of the environment. This covers the rights of access to information, public participation and justice and includes the protection of environmental defenders, who are often overlooked in environmental agendas. Environmental democracy and human rights in environmental matters are not unimportant or deferrable issues.

197. International treaties need to be negotiated in participatory and democratic ways. In this regard, negotiations need to be horizontal, a collaboration between governments and the public, rather than top-down. The negotiation process of the Escazú Agreement shows that this is possible. Such an approach is not only effective to develop robust agreements, as it allows a more balanced and realistic view by integrating the perspectives of all parties (instrumental value), but is also more fair (intrinsic value). Although the process can take long and patience is needed, such an approach has long-lasting benefits.
198. It is fundamental to integrate the production and dissemination of knowledge and direct capacity- building in negotiation processes, especially when stakeholders with different levels of capacity and distinct views, some of them based on fake news, negotiate over a new and sensitive topic. A website such as the Observatory on Principle 10 can bring evidence to negotiations and build bridges. Well- respected technical institutions such as ECLAC can play a crucial role in steering discussions.
199. An international agreement does not come to an end with adoption of a text. Signature, ratification and operationalization are all equally important, and may require support. Some countries may adopt the text but not ratify the Agreement. Different stakeholders may need to move forward with its ratification. The steering process often needs to continue after approval of the text and even signature of the Agreement. Moreover, an agreement may be ratified and yet its key operationalization features may not be defined or in place. The continuous participation of the public needs to be ensured. Capacity-building may still be important. Well-respected technical institutions such as ECLAC can play a crucial role in supporting these necessary steps.
200. Engaging the private sector in agreements that promote the rights of access is challenging. Some companies may fear the outcomes and conduct disinformation campaigns. Early engagement may be crucial. Production and dissemination of evidence-based knowledge is fundamental. However, even in those circumstances, the private sector may be reluctant to embrace such an agreement and may lessen the willingness of others, including governments, to embrace it. Continuing to produce and disseminate evidence-based knowledge is therefore critical. It is also important to demonstrate the tangible benefits of promoting the rights of access. In this regard, it is advisable to perform strategic assessments of the areas in which progress can be made more effectively, with a greater multiplier effect and a longer-lasting impact, in terms of the legislature, executive and judiciary, the rights of access (for example, access to information may be a less controversial issue) and topics (such as biodiversity). Further engaging the private sector may also require strengthening the links with the corporate responsibility agenda, initiatives and actors.

## 7. RECOMMENDATIONS

### 7.1 GENERAL

#### **Recommendation 1. ECLAC should draw lessons from project implementation and systematically disseminate and use them**

201. The project did not systematically document and share lessons on the technical areas covered by the project or project implementation. ECLAC should fill this gap. The exercise should consider the lessons presented in section 2 of the final report and in section 6 of this evaluation but should also go further. ECLAC should distinguish between two types of lessons: (i) those on project design and implementation from the project itself; (ii) those on the three technical areas covered in this project. The dissemination strategy should distinguish between the audiences for these two types of lessons. Lessons on project design and implementation should be shared with development project designers and implementers at ECLAC, DA and other development partners, as well as with consultants supporting these institutions on project design. Lessons on the three technical areas covered by the project should be shared with practitioners in participating countries, other countries covered by ECLAC, other institutions in Latin America and the Caribbean, and other regions of the world. In addition to documenting and sharing lessons, ECLAC should make sure that the lessons learned from this project are used in the design and implementation of future projects. This is particularly important for projects focusing on the three thematic areas covered by the project, but should also be applied to other topics. One way to ensure this would be to incorporate the lessons learned into a set of project design guidelines, including for instance a checklist of good practices.

#### **Recommendation 2. ECLAC should explore the possibility of promoting regional agreements on other environmental topics**

202. One of the greatest contributions of this project has been the adoption, signature, ratification and operationalization of the Escazú Agreement on the rights of access to information, public participation and justice in environmental matters. The adoption, signature, ratification and operationalization of other regional agreements would also make a significant contribution on different environmental topics. ECLAC should explore the possibility of promoting regional agreements in those areas.

### 7.2 ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL COSTS AND EXPENDITURES

#### **Recommendation 3. ECLAC should explore ways of increasing the uptake of the assessment of environmental costs and expenditures**

203. When promoting the assessment of environmental costs and expenditures, ECLAC should explore the possibility of integrating this exercise into broader and longer processes, including in processes with a financing component. One example is budget support loans, where part of the support is subject to fulfilment of certain objectives, for example increases in environmental spending. To that end, ECLAC should liaise with institutions that provide this type of support such as World Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, Development Bank of Latin America (CAF) and Agence française de développement.
204. ECLAC should explore the possibility of creating a database for Latin America and the Caribbean, in the style of FAOSTAT, that would allow countries to produce initial estimates. This should ensure that data is commensurable, has been standardized and is consistent.

205. When promoting assessment of environmental costs and expenditures, ECLAC and key ministries in participating countries should work more closely with potential users (for instance, establishing a more fluid communication with academia) and use lighter channels and formats, including social media (such as short YouTube videos) to increase the use of information.

### 7.3 EPR

#### Recommendation 4. ECLAC should further promote regional knowledge and exchange on EPRs

206. ECLAC should conduct a comprehensive and systematic regional progress assessment, broadening the scope of the analysis that was conducted on mining in some countries (e.g. Peru), building on the assessments conducted in the countries where EPRs have been conducted (e.g. the assessment being conducted in Peru and the mid-term assessment that may be conducted in Chile). On this basis, ECLAC should promote further exchange between countries on EPRs and implementation of their recommendations. The example of Chile supporting Peru could be scaled up, to involve Colombia and Mexico. A workshop could be organized for Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico and Peru.

### 7.4 RIGHTS OF ACCESS TO INFORMATION, PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND JUSTICE IN ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS

#### Recommendation 5. ECLAC should further support implementation of the Escazú Agreement

207. While there has been significant progress regarding the signature, ratification and operationalization of the Escazú Agreement, there are key areas where support is needed. ECLAC should explore the possibility of continuing to act as secretariat of the Agreement, promoting it as a dynamic meeting space, similar to the role of the secretariat in UNFCCC. ECLAC should also explore the possibility of continuing to maintain and expand the Observatory on Principle 10. In addition, ECLAC should explore ways of maintaining funding for public participation in Escazú Agreement meetings and capacity-building for stakeholders, particularly if and when new topics are discussed, following the approach applied during the negotiation process.
208. To the extent possible, ECLAC should strategically assess where progress can be made more effectively, with a greater multiplier effect and a longer-lasting impact, in terms of the legislature, executive and judiciary, the rights of access (e.g. access to information may be a less controversial issue) and the topics (i.e. biodiversity). This should be published and disseminated on the Observatory on Principle 10.
209. ECLAC should explore ways of further engaging the private sector. To that end, it should consider strengthening the links of the Escazú Agreement with the corporate responsibility agenda, initiatives—including global platforms such as the United Nations Global Compact and regional projects such as Responsible Business Conduct in Latin America and the Caribbean<sup>35</sup> and actors (for example, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), UNEP (including UNEP Finance Initiative)<sup>36</sup> and OHCHR). ECLAC should build on its work on this, as it did on mining.

<sup>35</sup> Funded by the European Union and implemented in collaboration with OECD and OHCHR, the project aims to promote smart, sustainable and inclusive growth in the European Union and in Latin America and the Caribbean, by supporting responsible business conduct practices, in line with the United Nations, International Labour Organization (ILO) and OECD instruments. See [online] [https://www.ilo.org/americas/programas-y-proyectos/WCMS\\_735906/lang-en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/americas/programas-y-proyectos/WCMS_735906/lang-en/index.htm).

<sup>36</sup> See [online] <https://www.unepfi.org>.

# ANNEXES

ANNEX 1	EVALUATION MATRIX
ANNEX 2	LIST OF CONSULTED DOCUMENTS
ANNEX 3	LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED
ANNEX 4	SEMI STRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS
ANNEX 5	ONLINE SURVEY
ANNEX 6	ACHIEVEMENT OF END OF THE PROJECT TARGETS
ANNEX 7	COMMENTS TO THE INDICATORS SYSTEM AND REPORTING
ANNEX 8	EVALUATOR'S REVISION MATRIX



# ANNEX 1

## EVALUATION MATRIX

Evaluation questions	Indicators	Information source	Data collection method
<b>A. Relevance</b>			
(1) How in line were the objective, activities and outputs delivered with the priorities of the targeted countries?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of alignment between the project (objective, EAs and activities) and national needs and problems when it was developed and during the implementation</li> <li>• Level of national stakeholder consultation in the design process of the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ProDoc</li> <li>• Other project documentation (e.g. progress reports)</li> <li>• Environment-related policy and planning documents in Chile, Costa Rica, Peru and Venezuela</li> <li>• Interviews with government partners (representatives of the Ministry of Environment in Chile, Costa Rica, Peru and Venezuela)</li> <li>• Interview with ECLAC staff</li> <li>• Interview with the project coordinator</li> <li>• Survey responses from Private sector, Universities and CSOs in Chile, Costa Rica, Peru and Venezuela</li> <li>• Interview with UNECE or UNEP</li> <li>• Survey results from development partners (UNECE, UNEP, UNITAR, German Cooperation, and OHCHR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Survey</li> </ul>
(2) How in line were the objective, activities and outputs delivered with the priorities of LAC countries?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of alignment between the project (objective, EAs and activities) and regional needs and problems when it was developed and during the implementation</li> <li>• Level of regional stakeholder consultation in the design process of the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ProDoc</li> <li>• Other project documentation (e.g. progress reports)</li> <li>• Interviews with government partners (representatives of the Ministry of Environment in Chile, Costa Rica, Peru, Venezuela, Colombia or Ecuador and a Eastern Caribbean country)</li> <li>• Survey responses from representatives of the Ministry of Environment in LAC</li> <li>• Interview with ECLAC staff</li> <li>• Interview with the project coordinator</li> <li>• Survey results from the private sector, Universities and CSOs in LAC</li> <li>• Interview with UNECE or UNEP</li> <li>• Survey results from development partners (UNECE, UNEP, UNITAR, German Cooperation, and OHCHR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Survey</li> </ul>

Evaluation questions	Indicators	Information source	Data collection method
(3) How in line were the objective, activities and outputs delivered with international commitments on sustainable development? (Has and how has the project contributed to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of alignment of the project activities with the SDGs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ProDoc</li> <li>• Other project documentation (e.g. progress reports)</li> <li>• SDGs</li> <li>• Interviews with government partners (representatives of the Ministry of Environment in Chile, Costa Rica, Peru and Venezuela)</li> <li>• Interview with ECLAC staff</li> <li>• Interview with the project coordinator</li> <li>• Survey responses from Private sector, Universities and CSOs in Chile, Costa Rica, Peru and Venezuela</li> <li>• Interview with UNECE or UNEP</li> <li>• Survey results from development partners (UNECE, UNEP, UNITAR, German Cooperation, and OHCHR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Survey</li> </ul>
(4) How aligned was the project with the activities and programmes of work of ECLAC?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of alignment of the project activities with ECLAC's 2016-2017, 2018-2019 and 2020 programmes of work (PoWs)?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ProDoc</li> <li>• Other project documentation (e.g. progress reports)</li> <li>• DA project criteria</li> <li>• ECLAC PoWs</li> <li>• Interview with ECLAC staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
<b>B. Effectiveness</b>			
(1) To what extent were the expected accomplishments met?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of achievement of the impact indicators from the results framework: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 80% of the participants at the meetings acknowledge having enhanced capacity to collect and analyse information related to environmental costs and expenditures</li> <li>– Draft environmental costs and expenditures assessments have been developed in the two target countries</li> <li>– Environmental performance and sustainability assessments developed in two target countries</li> <li>– Commitment from the governments in the two target countries that the environmental performance and sustainability assessments will be used to design evidence-based policies</li> <li>– A negotiated draft text for the regional instrument on Principle 10 has been concluded</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ProDoc</li> <li>• Project progress reports</li> <li>• Activity reports and evaluations surveys (trainings, seminars, workshops)</li> <li>• Interviews with government partners (representatives of the Ministry of Environment in Chile, Costa Rica, Peru and Venezuela)</li> <li>• Interview with ECLAC staff</li> <li>• Interview with the project coordinator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Survey</li> </ul>

Evaluation questions	Indicators	Information source	Data collection method
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 80% of the participants at the training and capacity-building meetings acknowledge having enhanced capacity to contribute to government efforts to ensure rights of access to information, participation or justice on environmental matters</li> </ul>		
(2) To what extent was the overall goal of the project achieved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of progress on the capacity of civil servants in target countries (Chile, Costa Rica and Venezuela) and LAC broadly to collect and analyse information related to environmental costs and expenditures</li> <li>• Level of progress on the capacity of civil servants in the target countries (Chile and Peru) and LAC more broadly to assess environmental performance</li> <li>• Level of progress on technical and institutional capacity to use the information generated (on environmental costs and expenditures and environmental performance) in policy decisions and strategic planning, in order to effectively design, implement and adjust policy and development planning conducive to sustainability, in target countries (Chile, Costa Rica, Peru and Venezuela) and LAC more broadly</li> <li>• Level of progress on technical and institutional capacity to ensure the rights of access to information, participation and justice on environmental matters, in the context of a regional agreement on the implementation of Principle 10 of the Rio Declaration</li> <li>• Number and quality of national policies and strategies using evidence generated by the project</li> <li>• Number and quality of national policies and strategies developed ensuring the right of access to information, participation and justice on environmental matters as a result of the project</li> <li>• Number and quality of regional policies and strategies developed ensuring the right of access to information, participation and justice on environmental matters as a result of the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ProDoc</li> <li>• DA project criteria</li> <li>• Project progress reports</li> <li>• Project planning documents (quarterly and annual work plans)</li> <li>• National and regional policies and planning documents</li> <li>• Interviews with government partners (representatives of the Ministry of Environment in Chile, Costa Rica, Peru, Venezuela, Colombia or Ecuador and a Eastern Caribbean country)</li> <li>• Survey responses from representatives of the Ministry of Environment in LAC</li> <li>• Interview with ECLAC staff</li> <li>• Interview with the project coordinator</li> <li>• Survey results from the private sector, Universities and CSOs in LAC</li> <li>• Interview with UNECE or UNEP</li> <li>• Survey results from development partners (UNECE, UNEP, UNITAR, German Cooperation, and OHCHR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Surveys</li> </ul>

Evaluation questions	Indicators	Information source	Data collection method
(3) How has the project contributed to enhancing ECLAC's programme of work/priorities and activities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of changes in ECLAC's programme of work, priorities and activities that can be attributed to the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PoWs</li> <li>Project progress reports</li> <li>Project planning documents (quarterly and annual work plans)</li> <li>Interview with ECLAC staff</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>
(4) Did the project generate results not reflected in the results framework?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number and type of unplanned consequences from project activities or outputs to date</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project progress reports</li> <li>Interviews with government partners (representatives of the Ministry of Environment in Chile, Costa Rica, Peru, Venezuela, Colombia or Ecuador and a Eastern Caribbean country)</li> <li>Interview with ECLAC staff</li> <li>Interview with the project coordinator</li> <li>Interview with UNECE or UNEP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>
(5) How satisfied are project beneficiaries with the services received?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of satisfaction of the participating countries with the benefits received from the project</li> <li>Perception of the quality of the supervision and guidance of ECLAC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews with government partners (representatives of the Ministry of Environment in Chile, Costa Rica, Peru, Venezuela, Colombia or Ecuador and a Eastern Caribbean country)</li> <li>Survey responses from representatives of the Ministry of Environment in LAC</li> <li>Interview with ECLAC staff</li> <li>Interview with the project coordinator</li> <li>Survey results from the private sector, Universities and CSOs in LAC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews</li> <li>Surveys</li> </ul>
(6) Did the project contribute to innovation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of inclusion of innovative aspects (adding new topics or using new means of delivery or a combination thereof) in the project</li> <li>Demonstration of innovative aspects in the project being successful</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project progress reports</li> <li>Interviews with government partners (representatives of the Ministry of Environment in Chile, Costa Rica, Peru, Venezuela, Colombia or Ecuador and a Eastern Caribbean country)</li> <li>Interview with ECLAC staff</li> <li>Interview with the project coordinator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>
<b>C. Efficiency</b>			
(1) To what extent were the services and support delivered in a timely and cost- effective manner, according to the priorities established by the project document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Timing and sequence of outputs against work plan</li> <li>Nature and total delays (in months) generated by implementation bottlenecks</li> <li>Divergences between planned and actual activities and nature of delays</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring and reporting document</li> <li>Project planning documents (quarterly and annual work plans)</li> <li>Interview with ECLAC staff</li> <li>Interview with the project coordinator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>

Evaluation questions	Indicators	Information source	Data collection method
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of alignment between planned and incurred project costs and nature of divergences</li> <li>• Level of alignment between planned and incurred project management costs and nature of divergences</li> <li>• Evidence of use of financially and management sound practices for project execution and management</li> <li>• Evidence of the project using the technical, human and other resources available in participating countries to increase efficiency</li> <li>• Existence of coordination mechanisms between the ECLAC and other cooperating agencies ensuring efficiency in delivering project outputs and coherence of response</li> </ul>		
<p>(2) To what extent was the M&amp;E plan well-conceived and sufficient to monitor results and track progress toward achieving objectives? To what extent was the M&amp;E plan effectively and efficiently implemented?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existence of a clear and appropriate M&amp;E plan including scheduling, assignment of roles and responsibilities, and provision of adequate resources</li> <li>• Existence of appropriate (SMART) performance indicators, and adequate baseline information</li> <li>• Proportion of executed monitoring budget against planned monitoring budget</li> <li>• Types, number and quality of reporting materials submitted a) correctly and b) on time</li> <li>• Number of project management responses to issues raised in M&amp;E reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring and reporting documents including financial reporting</li> <li>• Project planning documents (quarterly and annual work plans)</li> <li>• Interview with ECLAC's staff</li> <li>• Interview with the project coordinator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>
<p>(3) The flexibility and responsiveness of ECLAC to meet the requirements of the project and the needs of the countries involved, reducing or minimizing the negative effects of externalities (for example, those derived from important</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of monitoring missions of ECLAC and meetings held</li> <li>• Evidence of ECLAC's management response/changes in project strategy/approach as a direct result of information in progress reports, missions or meetings, responding to changes in context (e.g. COVID-19, new priorities of Member States)<sup>1</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring and reporting documents</li> <li>• Project planning documents (quarterly and annual work plans)</li> <li>• Interviews with government partners (representatives of the Ministry of Environment in Chile, Costa Rica, Peru, Venezuela, Colombia or Ecuador and a Eastern Caribbean country)</li> <li>• Interview with ECLAC staff</li> <li>• Interview with the project coordinator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> What adjustments, if any, were made to the project activities and modality, as a direct consequence of the COVID-19 situation or in response to the new priorities of Member States?

Evaluation questions	Indicators	Information source	Data collection method
changes in the management of UN administrative processes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of collection of lessons learned and good practices on project activities and dissemination to relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>		
(4) Were there any complementarities and synergies with other work being developed by beneficiary countries, ECLAC or other development partners?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of efforts to optimize synergies and avoid duplications with the other activities implemented by beneficiary countries</li> <li>Evidence of efforts to optimize synergies and avoid duplications with the other activities implemented by ECLAC</li> <li>Evidence of efforts to optimize synergies and avoid duplications with other initiatives developed by other development partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ProDoc</li> <li>Other project documentation</li> <li>Interviews with government partners (representatives of the Ministry of Environment in Chile, Costa Rica, Peru, Venezuela, Colombia or Ecuador and a Eastern Caribbean country)</li> <li>Survey responses from representatives of the Ministry of Environment in LAC</li> <li>Interview with ECLAC staff</li> <li>Interview with the project coordinator</li> <li>Survey results from the private sector, Universities and CSOs in LAC</li> <li>Interview with UNECE or UNEP</li> <li>Survey results from development partners (UNECE, UNEP, UNITAR, German Cooperation, and OHCHR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review</li> <li>Interviews</li> <li>Survey</li> </ul>
<b>D. Sustainability</b>			
(1) What is the likelihood of project results being incorporated in future strategies and policies in participating countries?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Perceived level of ownership of the assessments generated by the project</li> <li>Perceived level of ownership of the policy documents and strategies elaborated based on the evidence produced by the project</li> <li>Existence of capacity building follow up strategy in the participating countries</li> <li>Existence of legal mechanisms in place ensuring the preparation of expenditure review and environmental performance reviews in the future</li> <li>Existence of institutional frameworks ensuring sustainability of the project results, including a knowledge sharing platform, in the participating countries</li> <li>Existence of legal mechanisms and institutional frameworks ensuring the rights of access to information, participation and justice on environmental matters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project progress reports</li> <li>Interviews with government partners (representatives of the Ministry of Environment in Chile, Costa Rica, Peru, Venezuela, Colombia or Ecuador and a Eastern Caribbean country)</li> <li>Survey responses from representatives of the Ministry of Environment in LAC</li> <li>Interview with ECLAC staff</li> <li>Interview with the project coordinator</li> <li>Survey results from the private sector, Universities and CSOs in LAC</li> <li>Interview with UNECE or UNEP</li> <li>Survey results from development partners (UNECE, UNEP, UNITAR, German Cooperation, and OHCHR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review</li> <li>Interviews</li> <li>Survey</li> </ul>

Evaluation questions	Indicators	Information source	Data collection method
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of dependence on future funding for the sustainability of national progress and likely availability of such resources</li> </ul>		
(2) What is the likelihood of regional cooperation efforts being sustained?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceived level of ownership of national and regional bodies of the regional strategy on rights of access to information, participation and justice on environmental matters</li> <li>• Existence of capacity building follow up strategy at the regional level</li> <li>• Existence of legal mechanisms in place ensuring the implementation of the regional strategy</li> <li>• Existence of an institutional framework ensuring sustainability of the project results, including a knowledge sharing platform, at the regional level</li> <li>• Level of dependence on future funding for the sustainability of national progress and likely availability of such resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project progress reports</li> <li>• Interviews with government partners (representatives of the Ministry of Environment in Chile, Costa Rica, Peru, Venezuela, Colombia or Ecuador and a Eastern Caribbean country)</li> <li>• Survey responses from representatives of the Ministry of Environment in LAC</li> <li>• Interview with ECLAC staff</li> <li>• Interview with the project coordinator</li> <li>• Survey results from the private sector, Universities and CSOs in LAC</li> <li>• Interview with UNECE or UNEP</li> <li>• Survey results from development partners (UNECE, UNEP, UNITAR, German Cooperation, and OHCHR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Survey</li> </ul>
<b>E. Crosscutting issues</b>			
(1) To what extent did project design, implementation, and monitoring take into consideration human rights and gender issues?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of assessment of possible gender inequality and specific human rights issues in the expenditure and environmental performance reviews</li> <li>• Gender balance in participation to project workshops, seminars, meetings and study tours</li> <li>• Existence of a HR and GE strategy in the regional and national policies and strategies informed by the evidence generated by the project</li> <li>• Perception of stakeholders on gender impacts of the project</li> <li>• Perception of stakeholders on human right impacts of the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ProDoc</li> <li>• Project progress reports</li> <li>• National and regional policies and planning documents</li> <li>• Interviews with government partners (representatives of the Ministry of Environment in Chile, Costa Rica, Peru, Venezuela, Colombia or Ecuador and a Eastern Caribbean country)</li> <li>• Survey responses from representatives of the Ministry of Environment in LAC</li> <li>• Interview with ECLAC staff</li> <li>• Interview with the project coordinator</li> <li>• Survey results from the private sector, Universities and CSOs in LAC</li> <li>• Interview with UNECE or UNEP</li> <li>• Survey results from development partners (UNECE, UNEP, UNITAR, German Cooperation, and OHCHR)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review</li> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Survey</li> </ul>

## ANNEX 2

### LIST OF CONSULTED DOCUMENTS

- Programmes of work of ECLAC (2016-2017, 2018-2019 and 2020)
- DA project criteria
- The project document
- Project extensions
- Annual reports of advance
- Workshops and meetings reports
- Reports from technical assistance missions
- Publications
- Evaluation surveys
- National and regional policies and strategies
- [www.observatoryp10.cepal.org](http://www.observatoryp10.cepal.org)



# ANNEX 3

## LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

No	Name	Institution	Country	Component			Date
				Env. Costs and Exp.	EPR	Rights of access	
1	Carlos de Miguel	ECLAC					23/02/2021
2	Francisca Farias	Ministry of Environment	Chile				08/02/2021
3	Constance Nagelach	Consultant					16/02/2021
4	Alvaro Shee	Ministry of Environment					09/03/2021
5	Ivania Garcia	Ministry of Economy and Planning	Costa Rica				12/02/2021
6	Laura Gaitan	ANLA	Colombia				12/02/2021
7	Mariano Castro	Ministry of Environment	Peru				19/02/2021
8	Rocio Garcia	Consultant					22/02/2021
9	Daniel Barragan	Academia	Ecuador				09/02/2021
10	Raul Figueroa	INEGI	Mexico				26/02/2021
11	Cesar Cabrera						
12	Victor Holguin						
13	Maureen Payne	Ministry of State	Antigua and Barbuda				22/02/2021
14	Ruth Spencer	Civil society					09/02/2021
15	Francisco Xavier Mena	OHCHR					17/02/2021
16	Jaime Godoy						

# ANNEX 4

## SEMI STRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

	Government stakeholders (Representative of ministries of environment)	ECLAC staff	Project coordinator	Development partner
<b>General</b>				
How long have you been involved in the project and what is the nature of your involvement (specific activities)?	X	X	X	X
<b>Relevance</b>				
To what extent was the project aligned to with the priorities of your country / the targeted countries? Please explain.	X	X	X	
To what extent was the project in line with the priorities of LAC countries/regional priorities? Please explain.	X	X	X	X
Were the national and regional stakeholders consulted during the design process of the project? Please explain.	X	X	X	
How in line was the project with the international commitments on sustainable development (SDGs)? Please explain.	X	X	X	X
To what extent was the project in line with the activities and programmes of work of ECLAC, specifically those of the subprogrammes in charge of the implementation of the project? Please explain.		X	X	
<b>Effectiveness</b>				
To what extent do you consider that project activities, including the meetings conducted, have enhanced the technical and institutional capacity to collect and analyse information related to environmental costs and expenditures in beneficiary countries? Please explain	X	X	X	X
To what extent do you consider that the project activities, including the meetings conducted, have enhanced the technical and institutional capacity to collect and analyse information related to environmental performance in beneficiary countries? Please explain	X	X	X	X
To what extent do you consider that the environmental costs and expenditures assessments and the capacity built on this front have been used and will be used to design evidence-based policies in beneficiary countries and implement them based on evidence? Please explain and provide examples (Number and quality of national policies and strategies using evidence generated by the project).	X	X	X	X
To what extent do you consider that the environmental performance and sustainability assessments and the capacity built on this front have been used and will be used to design evidence-based policies in beneficiary countries and implement them based on evidence? Please explain and provide examples (Number and quality of national policies and strategies using evidence generated by the project).	X	X	X	X
To what extent do you consider that the project activities, including the training and capacity-building meetings conducted, have enhanced the technical and institutional capacity of governments in beneficiary countries to ensure rights of access to information, participation or justice on environmental matters?	X	X	X	X
To what extent do you consider that the capacity built on the right to access in environmental matters has been used and will be used to design policies that respect the right to access in beneficiary countries? Please explain and provide examples (Number	X	X	X	X

	Government stakeholders (Representative of ministries of environment)	ECLAC staff	Project coordinator	Development partner
and quality of national policies and strategies developed ensuring the right of access to information, participation and justice on environmental matters as a result of the project).				
To what extent do you think the regional instrument on Principle 10 will actually improve the rights of access to information, participation or justice on environmental matters in LAC? Please explain and provide examples (Number and quality of regional policies and strategies developed ensuring the right of access to information, participation and justice on environmental matters as a result of the project).	X	X	X	X
Has the ECLAC' PoW been in any way revised as a result of the project? Please explain.		X	X	
Have there been any unintended results (environmental, social, economic - positive or negative) and what were they?	X	X	X	
How satisfied are you with the benefits received from the project?	X			
To what extent did the project contribute to innovation? Did it address new topics or use new means of delivery or a combination thereof? Did these innovations prove successful?	X	X	X	X
<b>Efficiency</b>				
Did the project implementation face any significant delays in terms of delivery of activities and disbursement? Which? Why? What were the implementation bottlenecks?	X	X	X	
Were any measures put in place to ensure/ enhance cost and time effectiveness? To what extent did they enhance efficiency? Please explain.		X	X	
To what extent did the project use the human, technical and other resources available at country level to enhance efficiency? Please explain.		X	X	
Were M&E roles and responsibilities and timing clear? Was the M&E budget enough to conduct the necessary M&E tasks? Please explain		X	X	
Were the indicators SMART? Were baseline, targets and sources of verification robust? Please explain.		X	X	
Was the M&E plan effectively and efficiently implemented? What aspects could have been improved? Please explain.		X	X	
To what extent was technical and financial reporting timely and complete? Please explain		X	X	
To what extent did management respond to issues raised in M&E reports? Was it able to adapt to new circumstances (e.g. COVID-19, new government priorities)? Please explain	X	X	X	
In your opinion was the oversight by ECLAC effective? Were any corrective actions taken in response to monitoring reports? Please explain.	X			
To what extent was the project complementary to other existing interventions by beneficiary countries, ECLAC or development partners (e.g SE4ALL)? Were efforts coordinated to avoid duplication and optimize synergies? Please explain.	X	X	X	X
<b>Sustainability</b>				
What conditions have been put in place by the project in your country to ensure the sustainability of its results after project end (ownership, capacity building follow up strategy, legal mechanisms, institutional frameworks, funding opportunities, etc.)? Do you believe they are sufficient? Please explain.	X	X	X	X
What conditions have been put in place by the project in the region to ensure the sustainability of its results after project end (ownership, capacity building follow up strategy, institutional and organizational arrangement, political and social conditions, funding opportunities, etc.)? Do you believe they are sufficient? Please explain.	X	X	X	X

	Government stakeholders (Representative of ministries of environment)	ECLAC staff	Project coordinator	Development partner
In your opinion, to what extent are the activities and outputs from the project likely to continue after the end of the project and/or be replicated? Why?	X	X	X	X
<b>Cross cutting issues</b>				
Did the project take into consideration human rights and gender issues in its design, implementation and monitoring? How? Was it enough? What was the impact of the project at this regard? Please explain.	X	X	X	
Are there any lessons learned from the Project to be shared with other stakeholders in the region or the country? Please explain.	X	X	X	X
Do you have any recommendations?	X	X	X	X

# ANNEX 5

## ONLINE SURVEY

La CEPAL tiene el agrado de invitarle a participar en la encuesta de evaluación del proyecto de "Abordando cambios socio-ambientales críticos en América Latina y el Caribe" (Proyecto 16/17Z), financiado por la Cuenta para el Desarrollo de las Naciones Unidas.

Este proyecto fue ejecutado por la CEPAL entre enero 2016 y diciembre 2020 con los objetivos de:

- Reforzar la capacidad de los funcionarios de gobierno de países seleccionados en la recolección y análisis de información relacionada con gastos ambientales
- Reforzar la capacidad de los funcionarios de gobierno de los países seleccionados para analizar el desempeño ambiental
- Reforzar la capacidad de los países de la región para garantizar el derecho de acceso a la información, la participación y la justicia en materia ambiental, en el contexto de un acuerdo regional para la implementación del principio 10 de la Declaración de Río

Los datos recogidos mediante esta encuesta serán tratados con la debida confidencialidad al contener datos personales, o sea protegiendo el anonimato de los encuestados.

Completar la encuesta solo tomará unos 10 minutos. Esta encuesta estará disponible desde el XX/XXX hasta el XX/XX de 2021

1. ¿Para qué tipo de organización(es) trabajó usted durante el período en que participó en las actividades del proyecto? (Marque todas las opciones que correspondan)

Organización gubernamental o institución pública de un país participante/Organización de la sociedad civil (incluidas ONG, asociaciones y sindicatos) de un país participante/Institución académica o instituto de investigación de un país participante/Organización del sector privado de un país participante/Agencia u organismo de desarrollo bilateral o multilateral (incluidos los organismos de las Naciones Unidas, Bancos de Desarrollo)/Otro (por favor especifique)

2. ¿Cuál era su posición al momento de su participación en las actividades del proyecto?

Gerencia senior/Gerencia intermedia/Personal técnico/profesional/Consultor(a)/Personal administrativo/Otra (por favor especifique)

3. ¿Está satisfecho con su participación en el diseño del proyecto en general?

- Muy satisfecho                      Satisfecho                      Un poco satisfecho                      Insatisfecho

- ¿Puede explicar su nivel de satisfacción? \_\_\_\_\_

4. ¿Basado en su conocimiento del proyecto, el objetivo del proyecto (fortalecer la capacidad de los países beneficiarios de adoptar una aproximación basada en evidencia y participativa en el desarrollo de políticas ambientales) le parece alineado con las prioridades de desarrollo de su país/ de los países participantes?

- Totalmente                                      Mayormente                                      En cierto modo                                      Para nada

5. En qué medida fueron participativos el diseño e implementación del proyecto en su país / los países participantes?

- Muy participativos Bastante participativos Poco participativos  
Nada participativos

- ¿Puede explicar su respuesta? \_\_\_\_\_

6. ¿Basado en su conocimiento del proyecto, el objetivo del proyecto le parece alineado con las prioridades regionales?

- Totalmente Mayormente En cierto modo Para nada

7. ¿Basado en su conocimiento del proyecto, el objetivo del proyecto le parece alineado con los compromisos internacionales de los países participantes sobre el desarrollo sostenible, en particular con los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible (ODS)?

- Totalmente Mayormente En cierto modo Para nada

8. ¿Ha participado Usted en un taller de reforzamiento de capacidad, en el desarrollo de estudios, o alguna otra actividad del proyecto?

- Sí No

**Solo si la respuesta es afirmativa a la pregunta anterior:**

- ¿En qué actividad(es) participó? \_\_\_\_\_
  - Taller de reforzamiento de capacidad
    - Gasto ambiental
    - Desempeño ambiental
    - Derecho de acceso a la información, la participación y la justicia en materia ambiental
  - Desarrollo de estudios y publicaciones
    - Gasto ambiental
    - Desempeño ambiental
    - Derecho de acceso a la información, la participación y la justicia en materia ambiental
  - Desarrollo del texto del Acuerdo de Escazú sobre el derecho de acceso a la información, la participación y la justicia en materia ambiental
- ¿Cómo calificaría los siguientes aspectos de la(s) actividad(es)?  
(Excelente/Bastante bueno/Mejorable/Muy mejorable)
  - Objetivo de la actividad(es) (pertinente con las prioridades de mi país)
  - Contenido de la actividad(es) y de las presentaciones
  - Formato de la actividad(es) (e.g. ejercicios prácticos en el caso de talleres, extensión, estructura y lenguaje en el caso de estudios, modalidad de negociación en el caso del Acuerdo de Escazú)
- ¿Puede explicar sus respuestas? \_\_\_\_\_

9. ¿En qué medida contribuyó el proyecto a aumentar la capacidad de los actores nacionales y regionales en el desarrollo de análisis de gasto ambiental?

Contribuyó mucho                      Bastante                      Un poco                      No contribuyó

- ¿Puede explicar su respuesta? \_\_\_\_\_

10. ¿En qué medida ha contribuido el incremento en la capacidad de los actores nacionales y regionales en el desarrollo de análisis de gasto ambiental al desarrollo e implementación de políticas ambientales más basadas en evidencia y que abordan mejor cambios socio-ambientales críticos?

Contribuyó mucho                      Bastante                      Un poco                      No contribuyó

- ¿Puede explicar su respuesta? \_\_\_\_\_

11. ¿En qué medida contribuyó el proyecto a aumentar la capacidad de los actores nacionales y regionales en el desarrollo de análisis de desempeño ambiental?

Contribuyó mucho                      Bastante                      Un poco                      No contribuyó

- ¿Puede explicar su respuesta? \_\_\_\_\_

12. ¿En qué medida ha contribuido el incremento en la capacidad de los actores nacionales y regionales en el desarrollo de análisis de desempeño ambiental al desarrollo e implementación de políticas ambientales más basadas en evidencia y que abordan mejor cambios socio-ambientales críticos?

Contribuyó mucho                      Bastante                      Un poco                      No contribuyó

- ¿Puede explicar su respuesta? \_\_\_\_\_

13. ¿En qué medida contribuyó el proyecto a aumentar la capacidad de los actores nacionales y regionales en el respeto del derecho de acceso a la información, la participación y la justicia en materia ambiental?

Contribuyó mucho                      Bastante                      Un poco                      No contribuyó

- ¿Puede explicar su respuesta? \_\_\_\_\_

14. ¿En qué medida ha contribuido el incremento en la capacidad de los actores nacionales y regionales en el derecho de acceso a información, participación y justicia en materia ambiental al desarrollo e implementación de políticas ambientales que lo promueven más a nivel nacional?

Contribuyó mucho                      Bastante                      Un poco                      No contribuyó

- ¿Puede explicar su respuesta? \_\_\_\_\_

15. ¿En qué medida ha contribuido el instrumento regional relativo al principio 10 de la Declaración de Río al desarrollo e implementación de políticas ambientales que promueven el derecho de acceso a información, participación y justicia en materia ambiental?

Contribuyó mucho                      Bastante                      Un poco                      No contribuyó

- ¿Puede explicar su respuesta? \_\_\_\_\_

16. ¿Cómo calificaría la coordinación del proyecto con las otras intervenciones existentes a nivel nacional y regional? (Excelente/Bastante buena/Mejorable/Muy mejorable)

- Complementariedad de las actividades
- Coordinación entre las intervenciones para evitar duplicación y optimizar las sinergias
- Muy alta          Bastante alta          Bastante baja          Muy baja
- ¿Puede explicar sus respuestas? \_\_\_\_\_

17. En su opinión, ¿cuál es la probabilidad que los resultados del proyecto se mantengan después de la terminación del proyecto a nivel nacional? (es decir, un mayor conocimiento y capacidad de los diseñadores e implementadores de políticas ambientales sobre los análisis de gasto y desempeño ambiental y sobre el derecho al acceso a la información, la participación y la justicia en materia ambiental, y un diseño e implementación de política ambiental más basado en evidencia (incluidos análisis de gasto y desempeño) y más participativo (que respeta el derecho al acceso a la información, la participación y la justicia)

- Muy alta          Bastante alta          Bastante baja          Muy baja
- ¿Puede explicar su respuesta? \_\_\_\_\_

18. En su opinión, ¿cuál es la probabilidad que los resultados del proyecto se mantengan después de la terminación del proyecto a nivel regional? (un diálogo constante sobre los análisis de gasto y desempeño ambiental, y de manera más general sobre el diseño e implementación de políticas ambientales basados en evidencia, y un diálogo constante sobre el derecho al acceso a información, participación y justicia ambiental, y de manera más general sobre el diseño e implementación de políticas ambientales participativas)

- Muy alta          Bastante alta          Bastante baja          Muy baja
- ¿Puede explicar su respuesta? \_\_\_\_\_

19. En su opinión, ¿el proyecto tuvo en cuenta de manera suficiente los derechos humanos y las cuestiones de género en su diseño e implementación?

- Mucho                  Bastante                  Poco                  Nada No tengo  
suficiente información
- ¿Puede explicar su respuesta? \_\_\_\_\_



## ANNEX 6

### ACHIEVEMENT OF END OF THE PROJECT TARGETS

Expected Accomplishment	Indicator of achievement (T0)	Indicator of achievement (T1)	Assessment of progress
EA1 Enhanced capacity of civil servants to collect and analyze information related to environmental costs and expenditures	IA 1.1 80% of the participants at the meetings acknowledge having enhanced capacity to collect and analyse information related to environmental costs and expenditures.	<p>In 2016, a national workshop was jointly organized and executed in Costa Rica, with the World Bank. The evaluations of the event indicated that 90% of the participants found the contents of high relevance for their jobs and for the policies of their country.</p> <p>In June 2017, a workshop was organized in Costa Rica to discuss the methodology to identify the environmental costs and expenditures.</p> <p>In September 2017, a seminar was organized in Chile to train government officials.</p> <p>In 2017, another regional workshop was organized in Brazil. Participants from Costa Rica and Chile attended and presented their progress tracking environmental expenditures. Based on the evaluations, 80% of the participants found the contents of high relevance for their jobs and useful to collect and analyze information related to environmental costs and expenditures.</p> <p>In 2018, a seminar was organized in Costa Rica for government officials to present results on the analysis of environmental expenditures for Costa Rica.</p>	Although there are important shortcomings in the indicator and reporting, it can be argued that the target was exceeded, considering participants to workshops in Costa Rica and Chile, and self-assessment surveys immediately after the workshops.
	IA 1.2 Draft environmental costs and expenditures assessments have been developed in the two target countries.	<p>Advisory activities were carried out to support Chile, Costa Rica and Venezuela.</p> <p>In 2018, a publication on environmental expenditures was launched in Costa Rica.</p>	The target was exceeded at the end of the project period, assuming the assessments were developed in Chile, Costa Rica and Venezuela.
EA 2 Enhanced capacity of civil servants in the target countries to assess	IA 2.1 Environmental performance and sustainability assessments developed in two target countries.	Environmental performance and sustainability assessments were developed in Chile (2016) and Peru (2017).	The target was achieved as expected at the end of the project period.

environmental performance.	IA2.2 Commitment from the governments in the two target countries that the environmental performance and sustainability assessments will be used to design evidence-based policies.	<p>Both Governments (Chile and Peru) expressed their willingness to design further environmental policies following the recommendations of the environmental performance assessments.</p> <p>The Government of Chile indicated such willingness in an official thank you letter to ECLAC and during the launch event.</p> <p>Following the recommendations of the EPR, a Household Solid Waste Management Survey was carried out in 2019, through a partnership between CEMPRE Chile, the Ministry of the Environment of Chile and ECLAC, and the collaboration of the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile. The results of the survey were presented on 15 December 2020.</p> <p>The Government of Peru released a supreme decree to create a working group to evaluate the recommendations included in the Environmental Performance review.</p> <p>Also in 2017 two decrees were released following the recommendations of the review.</p>	Given the vagueness of the indicator, it can be considered that the end of the project target was achieved. A detailed assessment is provided in Section 4.2.2.
EA 3 Enhanced capacity of countries in the region to ensure the rights of access to information, participation and justice on environmental matters, in the context of a regional agreement on the implementation of Principle 10 of the Rio Declaration	IA 3.1 A negotiated draft text for the regional instrument on Principle 10 has been concluded.	<p>A draft text for the regional instrument was adopted on 4 March 2018. The official text was opened for signature between 27 September 2018 and 26 September 2020, at UN Headquarters in New York.</p> <p>The text was adopted by 24 countries and signed by 24 countries. Ten countries have deposited their instruments of ratification to date, with two others having concluded their internal processes.</p> <p>Since adoption, two signatory countries meetings have taken place: October 2019 in Costa Rica and December 2020 virtually, under the auspices of Antigua and Barbuda.</p> <p>Countries have recognized the importance of ECLAC's support in the promotion of access rights in environmental matters.</p>	The target was achieved at the end of the project.
	IA3.2 80% of the participants at the training and capacity-building meetings acknowledge having enhanced capacity to contribute to government efforts to ensure rights of access to information, participation or justice on environmental matters.	<p>During the project implementation period, national workshops took place in several countries of the region.</p> <p>In 2016, events were carried out in Chile, Dominica Republic and Saint Kitts and Nevis.</p> <p>In 2017, workshops were organized in Dominica and Grenada.</p>	The target was achieved at the end of the project.

		<p>In 2018, activities took place in Antigua and Barbuda, Guatemala and Guyana.</p> <p>In 2019, there was a regional seminar at ECLAC and workshops in Argentina, El Salvador, Guyana, Saint Lucia and Uruguay.</p> <p>In 2020, workshops took place in Antigua and Barbuda, Colombia and Saint Lucia.</p> <p>From the survey responses received, 80% of participants rated the events overall as excellent or good, stated that the event lived up to their initial expectations and considered it very useful or useful for their work, resulting in enhanced capacities on environmental access rights as a result of the trainings.</p>	
Preparation of a regional implementation guide of the Escazú Agreement to systematize common understandings on the scope and national implications of regionally agreed commitments and carry out a gap analysis.	<p>Consultants were hired to assist in the preparation of the guide. In person expert meetings took place in San José, Costa Rica in October 2019 and at ECLAC in Santiago in January 2020, and regularly in virtual format.</p> <p>The guide has been completed and will be translated as well as subject to editorial review and public consultations, including by countries of the region and the general public.</p> <p>Once published, the regional implementation guide will assist countries of the region in taking stock of their current capacities and levels of implementation of environmental access rights in light of the commitments assumed by means of the Escazú Agreement, define the scope of obligations and reach common understandings on agreed commitments.</p>	The target was achieved at the end of the project.	
Organized a regional expert meeting of the signatory countries to the Escazú Agreement.	Two regional expert meetings of the signatory countries to the Escazú Agreement were held in Costa Rica (October 2019) and virtually under the auspices of Antigua and Barbuda (December 2020).	The target was exceeded at the end of the project period.	

# ANNEX 7

## COMMENTS TO THE INDICATOR SYSTEM AND REPORTING

Expected Accomplishment	Indicator of achievement (T0)	Indicator of achievement (T1)	Comments to the indicator system and reporting
			<p>The EAs are adequate. Approach to indicators is consistent in EA1 and EA3, but not in EA2.</p> <p>Following M&amp;E approaches of the DA and UN Secretariat entities, all the indicators are indicators of achievement that in M&amp;E approaches used by UN System agencies are targets rather than indicators. In the latter an indicator would be formulated as “number of or percentage of”, while a target would be formulated as “X number of or Y percentage of”, in both cases with a time reference.</p> <p>The M&amp;E system does not indicate the baseline, or means and sources of verification.</p>
EA1 Enhanced capacity of civil servants to collect and analyze information related to environmental costs and expenditures.	IA 1.1 80% of the participants at the meetings acknowledge having enhanced capacity to collect and analyse information related to environmental costs and expenditures.	<p>In 2016, a national workshop was jointly organized and executed in Costa Rica, with the World Bank. The evaluations of the event indicated that 90% of the participants found the contents of high relevance for their jobs and for the policies of their country.</p> <p>In June 2017, a workshop was organized in Costa Rica to discuss the methodology to identify the environmental costs and expenditures. In September a seminar was organized in Chile to train government officials (no originally reported in the matrix).</p> <p>In 2017, another regional workshop was organized in Brazil. Participants from Costa Rica and Chile attended and presented their progress tracking environmental expenditures. Based on the evaluations, 80% of the participants found the contents of high relevance for their jobs and</p>	<p>The two impact indicators are relevant, although there are caveats in the way IA1 is formulated (see below).</p> <p>The indicator is a target rather than an indicator. It is not specific, as it does not clarify when exactly this capacity will be measured. As it is used the indicator informs about perception of increased capacity just after the workshop. This is useful, but only partially, as the key issue is whether capacity has increased by the end of project, in the medium term.</p> <p>The means of verification is not totally appropriate in terms of the source. A self-assessment may not be the better way to assess changes in capacity.</p> <p>Furthermore, the audience is not specified. The indicator does not clarify if the audience is civil servants in Costa Rica and Chile or elsewhere.</p> <p>Reporting is not adequate. It reflects the caveats of the indicator, in terms of the timeline of the assessment, and the audience. Reporting considers different audiences, including both public servants in Costa Rica and Chile, which is relevant.</p>

		<p>useful to collect and analyze information related to environmental costs and expenditures. In 2018, a seminar was organized in Costa Rica for government officials to present results on the analysis of environmental expenditures for Costa Rica.</p>	<p>Results of workshop surveys are not always provided, and not all workshops are reported.</p> <p>In addition, it refers to the relevance of training contents, but not to the impact of the training, in terms of increased capacity. Contents may be relevant and yet not result in enhanced capacity, for example because of the training modality.</p>
IA 1.2 Draft environmental costs and expenditures assessments have been developed in the two target countries.	<p>Advisory activities were carried out to support Chile, Costa Rica and Venezuela.</p> <p>In 2018, a publication on environmental expenditures was launched in Costa Rica.</p>	<p>The indicator and target are relatively adequate. This is however not an indication of increased capacity to develop reports because i) these are not developed by trainees alone; and ii) these are developed just after the training (e.g. 2017, 2018) and do not inform about the capacity to develop reports in the medium term (e.g. 2019 or 2020).</p> <p>The indicator and reporting are not fully consistent. The indicator refers to the result (assessments developed) and reporting to the activity (carrying out advisory services), but it is unclear whether the activity resulted in the expected result.</p>	
EA 2 Enhanced capacity of civil servants in the target countries to assess environmental performance.			<p>The indicator system for this EA is not fully relevant, in the sense that it does not measure changes in capacity of civil servants to assess environmental performance. It is surprising that the indicator system for EA2 is different to the indicator system of EA1 and EA3. If indicators about perception are not adequate for EA2, they should not be adequate either for EA1 and EA3.</p>
IA 2.1 Environmental performance and sustainability assessments developed in two target countries.	<p>Environmental performance and sustainability assessments were developed in Chile (2016) and Peru (2017).</p>	<p>The indicator and reporting are adequate. This is however not an indication of increased capacity to develop reports because i) these are not developed by trainees alone (ECLAC developed some parts); and ii) these are developed just after the training (e.g. 2016, 2017) and do not inform about the capacity to develop reports in the medium term (e.g. 2019 or 2020).</p>	

	<p>IA2.2 Commitment from the governments in the two target countries that the environmental performance and sustainability assessments will be used to design evidence-based policies.</p>	<p>Both Governments (Chile and Peru) expressed their willingness to design further environmental policies following the recommendations of the environmental performance assessments.</p> <p>The Government of Chile indicated such willingness in an official thank you letter to ECLAC and during the launch event.</p> <p>Following the recommendations of the EPR, a Household Solid Waste Management Survey was carried out in 2019, through a partnership between CEMPRE Chile, the Ministry of the Environment of Chile and ECLAC, and the collaboration of the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile. The results of the survey were presented on 15 December 2020.</p> <p>The Government of Peru released a supreme decree to create a working group to evaluate the recommendations included in the Environmental Performance review.</p> <p>Also in 2017 two decrees were released following the recommendations of the review.</p>	<p>The indicator is not specific. The term commitment is very vague and can mean very different things. Indicating means and sources of verification would be particularly important here.</p> <p>Reporting reflects this shortcoming. In Peru a strong proof of commitment is mentioned. In Chile evidence of commitment is vague (a thank you letter) or very vague (a statement in a launch event), and partial in terms of sectoral scope (solid waste management) and type of action (household survey).</p>
<p>EA 3 Enhanced capacity of countries in the region to ensure the rights of access to information, participation and justice on environmental matters, in the context of a regional agreement on the implementation of Principle 10 of the Rio Declaration</p>	<p>IA 3.1 A negotiated draft text for the regional instrument on Principle 10 has been concluded.</p>	<p>A draft text for the regional instrument was adopted on 4 March 2018. The official text was opened for signature between 27 September 2018 and 26 September 2020, at UN Headquarters in New York.</p> <p>The text was adopted by 24 countries and signed by 24 countries. Ten countries have deposited their instruments of ratification to date, with two others having concluded their internal processes.</p> <p>Since adoption, two signatory countries meetings have taken place: October 2019 in Costa Rica and December 2020 virtually, under the auspices of Antigua and Barbuda.</p> <p>Countries have recognized the importance of ECLAC's support in the promotion of access rights in environmental matters.</p>	<p>The indicator system is adequate. It is consistent with EA1.</p> <p>The indicator is adequate, although attribution is complex. Reporting is adequate.</p>

	<p>IA3.2 80% of the participants at the training and capacity-building meetings acknowledge having enhanced capacity to contribute to government efforts to ensure rights of access to information, participation or justice on environmental matters.</p>	<p>During the project implementation period, national workshops took place in several countries of the region.</p> <p>In 2016, events were carried out in Chile, Dominica Republic and Saint Kitts and Nevis.</p> <p>In 2017, workshops were organized in Dominica and Grenada.</p> <p>In 2018, activities took place in Antigua and Barbuda, Guatemala and Guyana.</p> <p>In 2019, there was a regional seminar at ECLAC and workshops in Argentina, El Salvador, Guyana, Saint Lucia and Uruguay.</p> <p>In 2020, workshops took place in Antigua and Barbuda, Colombia and Saint Lucia.</p> <p>From the survey responses received, 80% of participants rated the events overall as excellent or good, stated that the event lived up to their initial expectations and considered it very useful or useful for their work, resulting in enhanced capacities on environmental access rights as a result of the trainings.</p>	<p>As with IA1, the indicator is not specific, as it does not clarify when exactly this capacity will be measured. As it is used the indicator informs about perception of increased capacity just after the workshop. This is useful, but only partially, as the key issue is whether capacity has increased by the end of project, in the medium term.</p> <p>The means of verification is not totally appropriate in terms of the source. A self-assessment may not be the better way to assess changes in capacity.</p> <p>Reporting is mostly adequate. The required information is provided. Additional information is also provided. That information is important, but does not directly relate to the indicator and should be reported elsewhere.</p>
<p>Preparation of a regional implementation guide of the Escazú Agreement to systematize common understandings on the scope and national implications of regionally agreed commitments and carry out a gap analysis.</p>		<p>Consultants were hired to assist in the preparation of the guide. In person expert meetings took place in San José, Costa Rica in October 2019 and at ECLAC in Santiago in January 2020, and regularly in virtual format.</p> <p>The guide has been completed and will be translated as well as subject to editorial review and public consultations, including by countries of the region and the general public.</p> <p>Once published, the regional implementation guide will assist countries of the region in taking stock of their current capacities and levels of implementation of environmental access rights in light of the commitments assumed by means of the Escazú Agreement, define the scope of obligations and reach common understandings on agreed commitments.</p>	<p>The indicator and reporting are adequate.</p>
<p>Organized a regional expert meeting of the signatory countries to the Escazú Agreement.</p>		<p>Two regional expert meetings of the signatory countries to the Escazú Agreement were held in Costa Rica (October 2019) and virtually under the auspices of Antigua and Barbuda (December 2020).</p>	<p>The indicator and reporting are adequate.</p>

# ANNEX 8

## EVALUATOR'S REVISION MATRIX

### Evaluation Report Feedback Form: Evaluation Reference Group

SPECIFIC COMMENTS		
PARAGRAPH NUMBER	COMMENT	EVALUATOR'S RESPONSE
5 pág 2	"In 2015, the..." Early 2010s?	The reference here is to the period before the project. An explicit reference has been added.
5 pág 2	"...matters was limited, ..." Still was.	"still" has been added.
5 pág 2	"For these reasons, sustainable development related policies were indeed often not evidence-based in LAC." there were still opportunities to reinforce evidence-based sustainable development related policies in LAC.	The proposed phrasing has been added.
8 pág 2	No incluía referencia al ODS 16?	The project document that I have only indicates linkages with SDGs 11, 12, 14 and 17. There are no references to SDG 16 (see page 10 of the prodoc).
12 Table 1. Pág 4	"Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Barbados, Chile, Colombia, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Grenada, Peru, Paraguay, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Trinidad and Tobago and Uruguay." Me parece un listado muy acotado, al menos los 24 países que negociaron Escazú se vieron beneficiados, pero además las publicaciones regionales beneficiaron a los 33.	<p>Se ha agregado una nota a pie de página explicando que la lista de países en esa tabla para la actividad 3.2 se refiere a países donde actividades específicas de construcción de capacidades se llevaron a cabo de acuerdo con el informe final y el documento resumen de actividades y publicaciones, y que el component 3 benefició al menos a los 24 países que negociaron el acuerdo y que las publicaciones beneficiaron a los 33 países de la región.</p> <p>Es importante destacar lo siguiente:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) la lista de países en la tabla se deriva de los documentos consultados. Véase en concreto la información reportada para el indicador IA3.2 (ligado a la actividad 3.2) en el informe final (pp. 7-8).</li> <li>ii) esta sección pretende describir el proyecto más que analizar los resultados o el impacto. Este se analiza en la sección 4.2.2 (ver páginas 23-24).</li> </ul>
7 pág 5	"– 34 responses were received out of 211 successfully sent invitations, giving an overall response rate of 16%." Que baja la tasa de respuesta	Efectivamente, es una tasa de respuesta baja, pero esa fue, a pesar de que se extendió el plazo en dos ocasiones.
24 pág 8	Prior to the project, ECLAC had a long experience in developing environmental performance reviews in LAC, at national level in partnership with the OECD (Chile, 2005; Colombia; 2014), subnational level (Estado de Amazonas, 2006-2009; Estado de Acre, 1999-2012) and sectoral level.	It has been added in paragraph 26, where it fits better as it refers to the relevance of ECLAC, and not to the relevance of EPRs, which is the focus of paragraph 24.



24 pág 8	“...in <b>OECD's</b> EPR...” ECLAC-OECD.	There was a typo. The text was meant to be: “in EPRs OECD provides”. A reference to ECLAC has been added.
30 pág 9	ES difícil para los beneficiarios de los DA ver que las actividades se financian con este proyecto. Tal vez habría que relevarlo en las actividades (al inicio, cierre, programa, no sé... para conversar.	Se ha agregado ese matiz.
30 pág 9	No tengo clara la pregunta. Las actividades son participativas pero no todos los beneficiarios participan en todas, por tanto puede haber algunos que les hubiera gustado tener una evaluación de desempeño pero su país no fue beneficiario, etc...	En mi opinión, la pregunta radica en si las actividades en las que participó el encuestado se diseñaron y desarrollaron de manera participativa, no si en el encuestado participó en todas las actividades. Convengo, con todo, en que la pregunta podría eventualmente interpretarse de la segunda forma y genera cierta ambigüedad. Se ha agregado una referencia, pero, si se estima oportuno, se puede eliminar ese punto.
19 pág 18	Discrepo totalmente de esta aseveración. Si el proyecto tuviera déficits de estructura u objetivos no hubiera tenido ni los productos ni los impactos que ha tenido. Además, la estructura no solo paso numerosos filtros en la aprobación del proyecto, incluidos en la Sede, sino que, además, fue revisada para añadir recursos en su extensión sin realizar comentarios adicionales. Esto ha de matizarse notablemente.	La frase no se refiere al proyecto (a la estructura u objetivos del proyecto) sino al marco de resultados del proyecto, que son dos elementos diferentes. Como se indica, el marco de resultados del proyecto se analiza con mayor detalle en la sección 4.3.2, e indicador por indicador en el anexo 7. La frase en ese párrafo es una conclusión del análisis realizado en esos apartados. Para modificarla, habría que argumentar qué indicadores específicos deben ser analizados de otra manera.
22 pág 18	Al menos yo no evalué satisfactoriamente un curso si no aprendo algo. Cuál es la razón entonces de evaluarlo satisfactoriamente, los cafés. Participar en un curso tiene coste de oportunidad y si no te es útil no lo evalúas bien.	Se puede deducir, como se arguye, que la satisfacción con un curso está relacionada con un aprendizaje. Ese impacto no es no obstante necesario. Desde un punto de vista de M&E, la pregunta debería ser directa.
19 pág 25	Si bien esto es de diseño el comentario puede afectar la percepción de logro y efectividad del punto.	<p>Entiendo que este comentario se refiere al párrafo 25 en la página 19, y no al párrafo 19 en la página 25, que no existe. En cualquier caso, el comentario invita a una consideración general.</p> <p>Es importante aclarar cómo se lleva a cabo el análisis de los resultados de un proyecto en una evaluación de medio término o final. Esta se suele hacer en dos planos. Por un lado, se evalúan los resultados usando el marco de resultados del proyecto, esto es, sus indicadores, metas y métodos y fuentes de verificación. Esto corresponde a la sección 4.2.1 del informe de evaluación. A menudo, esa aproximación no brinda una imagen fiel o adecuada de los resultados de un proyecto, porque el marco de resultados no es apropiado. Por ejemplo, puede haber inconsistencias entre indicadores y metas, los métodos y fuentes de verificación pueden ser inadecuados, o simplemente las metas pueden ser poco ambiciosas o demasiado ambiciosas. Por ello el análisis de los resultados del proyecto con respecto a su marco de resultados se complementa con un análisis de los resultados del proyecto a partir de unos criterios definidos por el evaluador o el equipo de evaluación que permita analizar los resultados de manera más robusta. Esto corresponde a la sección 4.2.2 del informe de evaluación.</p> <p>Es crucial subrayar que el análisis del marco de resultados es una parte sustancial de una evaluación, y que el análisis de los resultados del proyecto de acuerdo con su marco de resultados (sección 4.2.1) no puede obviar las deficiencias de ese marco. Esto no significa que una evaluación infravalore los</p>

		resultados de un proyecto. En cualquier caso, ese análisis se completa con la sección 4.2.2 que analiza de manera más directa (y sin esos matices) los resultados del proyecto. Esta es la práctica (y la estructura) habitual en evaluaciones de proyectos internacionales, siguiendo lineamientos internacionales de evaluación.
19 pág 25	Por tanto el comentario sobre que el indicador es vago es una percepción subjetiva, dado que los gobiernos sí han realizado compromisos en esa línea.	El análisis indica que el indicador es vago en el sentido de que no se especifica qué es un compromiso, cuál es su grado de firmeza (por ejemplo, ¿se puede considerar una carta de agradecimiento como un compromiso?). Esto hace difícil medir si se han realizado o no compromisos. En cualquier caso, los resultados se analizan de manera explícita en esa sección y, como se anota, el análisis se expande en la secciones 4.2.2 y 4.4.
19 pág 25	¿O sea si no fuera vago el indicador este punto no se habría cumplido? Hay decretos ejecutivos emitidos por el gobierno del Perú utilizando la evaluación. Eso no es vago. Y los productos tangibles están disponibles. No se puede decir que se ha cumplido por que el indicador es vago.	Hay dos países. En el caso del Perú el compromiso es firme: un decreto ejecutivo es un compromiso manifiesto. Hay consenso en eso. La evaluación del compromiso de Chile es más compleja. En mi opinión (hay algunos aspectos subjetivos en una evaluación, y puede haber discrepancias), una carta de agradecimiento no es un compromiso suficientemente firme. En el caso de Chile si la matriz de resultados usase otro método y fuente de verificación (por ejemplo, la existencia de un decreto, una ley o un plan), la meta no se habría cumplido. El análisis refleja eso.
36 pág 21	A mí me parece que ese uso "informal" es fundamental, dado que sin esa información no se contaría con el argumento que logra la acción política	De acuerdo. Se ha ajustado, señalando que aunque canales más formales podrían tener mayor impacto, estos canales informales son fundamentales y han tenido gran impacto.
39 pág 21	Esto no es preciso. Para la EPR de Chile, al igual que la de Perú, se realizó el levantamiento de datos, misión de evaluación, escritura de capítulos, revisión del texto completo, revisión y participación en el examen final en el working party.	Esa es la información que se obtuvo en las entrevistas. En cualquier caso, se ha ajustado.
52 pág 24	the first environmental regional treaty	It has been added.
54 pág 25	Chile has not signed, Perú did it. In Perú the ratification (second step) is pending.	It has been adjusted.
55 págg 25	"...not approved the signature of the agreement,..." ratificación.	It has been adjusted.
55 pág 25	"...a draft law on the protection of human rights defenders, including environmental defenders, is being discussed in Parliament..." it is a decree (DS No004-2021-JUS) , and has already been issued.	It has been adjusted.
56 pág 25	"Ecuador signed the agreement..." ratified.	It has been adjusted.
58 pág 26	"...promoting the agenda of the agreement." No tengo claridad si estos países se eligieron por poner ejemplos, dado que el Acuerdo de Escazú ha sido firmado por 24 países y ya ratificado por 12.	Se ha agregado una nota a pie de página explicando que el acuerdo fue firmado por 24 países y ratificado por 12, y que los países que se mencionan abajo constituyen la muestra seleccionada para esta evaluación. El párrafo 61 que se centra en el nivel regional indica explícitamente que el acuerdo ha sido firmado por 24 países y ratificado por 12.
61 pág 26	"The agreement will enter into force in April 2021..." entered	Se ha ajustado.
85 pág 31	Sobre estos porcentajes no tengo claridad de que sean correctos por 2 razones: 1) debiera tomar el presupuesto original aprobado al inicio	El análisis se basa en la información financiera entrega al evaluador el 12 de abril de 2021. Se ha agregado una nota a pie de página especificándolo.

	del proyecto. Dado que posteriormente se traspasaron recursos a grants y contribuciones 2) Considerar que hubo que recordar que unos 40.000 dólares, que se gastaron en contractual services pues en vez de pagar viáticos se contrataron hoteles.	
86 pág 31	El gasto fue menor, y básicamente a servicios de interpretación/conferencias, que entraban en ocasiones en esta línea.	
86 pág 31	<b>“As noted, expenditure on travel of staff was lower than planned.”</b> No lo creo.	
89 pág 32	Asignar esa cantidad de recursos para ello es sencillamente descabellado. Sería convertir el medio en fin.	Es debatible si es descabellado. Depende de la profundidad del análisis, en términos del número de evaluadores, entrevistas realizadas, análisis en profundidad de países, misiones a terreno... Esas son en cualquier caso las cifras usuales.
89 pág 32	<b>“This compromises the independent nature of evaluation and could become a challenge for monitoring when staff already has significant non-project related work.”</b>  Todo este apartado no tiene que ver con el proyecto, es un tema genérico de los DA. No me queda claro por qué hay que ponerlo aquí.	Se pone porque claramente tiene que ver con el proyecto, ya que los recursos disponibles para su evaluación son una parte del proyecto. Es cierto que trascienden el proyecto, pero eso no significa que no sean un elemento constitutivo del proyecto.
90 pág 32	<b>“The approach to indicators is adequate and consistent in EA1 and EA3, but it is not adequate in EA2, where changes in capacities of civil servants are not directly measured. All the indicators are targets rather than indicators. An indicator would be formulated as “number of or percentage of”, while a target would be formulated as “X number of or Y percentage of”, in both cases with a time reference.”</b>  La mayoría de los comentarios menos positivos se basan en este punto. Creo que hay que tomarlo como aprendizaje pero creo que lo destaca demasiado.	La segunda parte se ha eliminado, teniendo en cuenta una explicación de la PPOD sobre su inoportunidad para un proyecto DA. La primera parte es relevante en una evaluación. Entre otros aspectos, siguiendo los lineamientos internacionales, las evaluaciones tienen que analizar el sistema de M&E.
90 pág 32	<b>“Annex 7 provides detailed comments.”</b> Este anexo es muy detallado. Tengo muchos comentarios ahí.	El análisis del marco de resultados tiene que ser detallado.
96 pág 34	<b>“...(for instance in Chile the EDA in English had already been completed).”</b> No es exacto, se estaba trabajando.	Se ha eliminado la referencia.
104 pág 36	<b>“Is it however unclear which aspects are a good practice, which ones an innovative approach and which ones a lessons learned, and whether the lessons learned were identified in other projects and used in this project or learned in this project. It is worth noting that lessons learned comprise more than success stories, being critical to document what works well, what works less well and what does not work. Moreover, lessons have to be documented and shared with a wide range of stakeholders, not only internally at ECLAC.”</b> Es interesante lo que plantea pero no sé bien cómo podríamos abordar este tema.	La sección 6, que identifica lecciones aprendidas, puede dar pistas sobre ello. La recomendación número 1 también apunta en esa línea.
110 pág 38	Tal vez pueda incluirse que los expertos enviados por la Convención de Aarhus y su staff fue cofinanciado. No obstante no tenemos acceso a cuanto desembolso UNECE por los viajes/viáticos.	Se ha agregado en la tabla 4. Se han introducido referencias en el párrafo 107.

121 pág 41	<p><b>“For instance, one of the EPR recommendations is the restriction or prohibition of import of inputs for illegal mining. However, Peru advocates for commercial openness, which makes it unlikely to implement that particular EPR recommendation.”</b> No me queda muy claro este ejemplo.</p> <p>Hay que precisar que uno de los principales insumos de la minería ilegal en el Perú es el mercurio y el país ratificó el convenio de Minamata.</p>	Se ha eliminado esa referencia.
129 pág 43	<p><b>“The recent development of the structure and functions of the Committee to Support Implementation and Compliance could help mobilize resources for the implementation of the agreement.”</b> Eliminar “recent”. El comité está creado pero su estructura es materia de la futura primera COP.</p>	Se ha eliminado.
136 y 137 pág 44	Con EPR y GPA si se puede argumentar que con esto se busca el derecho vivir en un ambiente sano, lo que se relaciona con el derecho a la vida por lo que parece muy tajante al mencionar que no tienen que ver con Derechos humanos.	El texto no decía que GPA no contribuye, sino que no contribuye de manera significativa, que es distinto. Se ha agregado la información provista y se ha matizado más, indicando una relación indirecta.
137 pág 44	Las EPRs tiene un capítulo completo sobre aspectos sociales y medio ambiente, donde se incluyen el análisis sobre grupos vulnerables y derechos humanos específicos, particularmente los derechos de acceso.	Se ha ajustado.
108 pág 46	Me parecen comentarios burocráticos, que van en la línea de convertir los proyectos en fines en sí mismos en vez de instrumentos para la acción y el apoyo a los países	Los proyectos no son fines en sí mismos, pero deben ser formulados de manera robusta, incluyendo un plan de M&E robusto, comprendiendo un marco de resultados sólido. No creo que esto sea incompatible con que un proyecto sea un instrumento para la acción y el apoyo a los países. Al contrario, un plan de M&E robusto contribuye a mejorar la acción y así a lograr los resultados previstos, es decir, a brindar un mejor apoyo a los países.
117 pág 48	<p><b>“The work on the assessments of environmental costs and expenditures did not contribute in a significant way to advance human rights and gender equality. The EPR work contributed to a certain extent in terms of the process, but not in the content of the reports.”</b> Este argumento es muy tajante. Ambas líneas (GPA y EPR) buscan reforzar el derecho a vivir en un ambiente sano y este se vincula con el derecho a la vida.</p>	Ver arriba. La contribución del GPA es más bien indirecta. El análisis del EPR se ha ajustado.
118 pág 49	<b>“...such as the OECD.”</b> ECLAC and the OCDE	Se ha agregado.
118 pág 49	<b>“...and there is visible social opposition”</b> No es social.	Se ha eliminado.
ANNEX 6 pág 72	<b>“Although there are important shortcomings in the indicator and reporting, ...”</b> Revisar esto. Me parece que tiene que ver más con el diseño del indicador, pero no tiene que ver con el cumplimiento del objetivo buscado en el proyecto. Este argumento tiende a minimizar lo hecho.	La parte subrayada tiene ciertamente que ver con el diseño del sistema del indicador. También con el modo de reportar el logro. Esto afecta el análisis del cumplimiento del objetivo buscado en el proyecto. El análisis no minimiza lo hecho, sino que indica las condiciones en las que se puede realizar el análisis, para que este sea riguroso.
ANNEX 6 pág 72	<b>“Given the vagueness of the indicator,”</b> Revisar esto. Me parece que tiene que ver más con el diseño del indicador, pero no tiene que ver con el cumplimiento del objetivo buscado en el proyecto. Este argumento tiende a minimizar lo hecho.	Como se explica arriba, es importante distinguir entre la sección 4.2.1, que examina los resultados de acuerdo con el marco de resultados, y la sección 4.2.2, que analiza los resultados de manera más robusta, sin tener que usar el marco de resultados ni estar por tanto el análisis lastrado por las deficiencias de ese marco.

ANNEX 7 pág 75	<p>“... IDB workshop, probably in the US, which does not seem relevant.” La participación en el workshop fue en Chile con representantes de la región.</p>	Se ha eliminado
ANNEX 7 pág 75	<p>“The indicator and reporting are not fully consistent. The indicator refers to the result (assessments developed) and reporting to the activity (carrying out advisory services), but it is unclear whether the activity resulted in the expected result” Me parece que enfocarse tanto en el diseño indicador quita merito a los logros obtenidos.</p>	<p>Como se señala arriba, el análisis del marco de resultados y el análisis de los resultados del proyecto son dos ejercicios necesarios. Una evaluación de un proyecto internacional debe analizar los dos aspectos (no puede obviar el primero).</p> <p>Estos ejercicios son distintos: el análisis del marco lógico no cambia los resultados obtenidos, ni quita ni concede mérito a los resultados obtenidos. Como se explica arriba, los resultados obtenidos se analizan en dos planos. Por un lado, en la sección 4.2.1, se usa el marco de resultados del proyecto. En este análisis, para ser rigurosos, hay que tener en cuenta la calidad del marco de resultados. Por otro lado, en la sección 4.2.2, se analizan los resultados de manera más robusta.</p>
ANNEX 7 pág 75	<p>“The indicator system for this EA is not fully relevant, in the sense that it does not measure changes in capacity of civil servants to assess environmental performance. It is surprising that the indicator system for EA2 is different to the indicator system of EA1 and EA3.” Me parece que enfocarse tanto en el diseño indicador quita merito a los logros obtenidos.</p>	Igual que arriba.
ANNEX 7 pág 75	<p>“The indicator is not specific. The term commitment is very vague and can mean very different things. Indicating means and sources of verification would be particularly important here.” Me parece que enfocarse tanto en el diseño indicador quita merito a los logros obtenidos.</p>	Igual que arriba.
ANNEX 7 pág 75	<p>“Reporting reflects this shortcoming. In Peru a strong proof of commitment is mentioned. In Chile references are vague (a thank you letter) or very vague (a statement in a launch event), and partial in terms of sectoral scope (solid waste management) and type of action (household survey).” En el caso de Chile el proceso de elaboración de la EDA incluyó una amplia participación del gobierno de Chile que se reflejan en un agradecimiento formal por parte del gobierno. No queda claro por qué se menciona que las referencias presentadas son vagas.</p>	Ver también arriba. Se ha ajustado para aclararlo. En mi opinión (y podemos disentir en este punto), una carta de agradecimiento y un discurso en un evento de lanzamiento no son una evidencia sólida de un compromiso firme de usar los EPR en el diseño de políticas. En contraste, un decreto, como en Perú, es una evidencia sólida. Como se indica, es por ello muy importante que el marco de resultados establezca métodos y fuentes de verificación específicos relevantes.

## Evaluation Report Feedback Form: PPOD

SPECIFIC COMMENTS		
PARAGRAPH NUMBER	COMMENT	EVALUATOR'S RESPONSE
1	Please include a sub heading for evaluation objective and evaluation scope.	The first heading has been adjusted and is now called <i>Evaluation objective and scope</i> as its content explained specifically this.
3. Methodology	Under methodology, please include a mention and justification of the chosen evaluation questions, criteria, performance standards or other criteria. This can make reference to the evaluation matrix in the annex.	A paragraph explaining this has been moved down from the introduction to a new section in the methodology section.
21, 23, 24, 25, 118	En la sección sobre la relevancia del proyecto, en varios párrafos (21, 23, 24, 25, 118) se pone mucho foco en la instrumentalidad de los EPR para facilitar (aunque no sea requisito obligatorio) el proceso de admisión en la OCDE-OECD. Este “extra” aparece mencionado en el documento de proyecto únicamente para el caso de Costa Rica. En el draft del informe de evaluación para el caso de Perú se dice “In Peru EPR has informed policy dialogue to a great extent, regardless of the priority governments in office have given to accessing the OECD”. Justamente, dado que los proyectos son “demand-driven” y el objetivo último es el fortalecimiento de capacidades nacionales, la insistencia en colocar el tema de la admisión a la OECD (que se basa en otros múltiples criterios) puede desvirtuar la percepción del proyecto haciéndolo ver como algo instrumental a cuestiones diferentes del fortalecimiento de capacidades y de guiar el policy-making con evidencias.	Es importante distinguir entre esos cinco párrafos (21, 23, 24, 25 y 118) en relación con la referencia a la OCDE. Mi intención al leer el comentario fue eliminar lo máximo posible las referencias a la instrumentalidad de los EPR para facilitar el acceso a la OCDE. Sin embargo, al leer detenidamente de nuevo los cinco párrafos, solo el 25 y el 118 hacen referencia específica a ello y el 118 hace parte de las conclusiones. El párrafo 21 hace referencia a obligaciones internacionales de países, y no al acceso a la OCDE. El párrafo 23 se enfoca en la credibilidad del EPR y sus implicaciones. Y el párrafo 25 indica las necesidades en esa materia. La información recolectada demuestra claramente que los procesos EPR están relacionados con procesos OECD. Las entrevistas muestran un consenso en ese punto, con el matiz que se hace en el texto. Se han hecho ajustes para acentuar más si cabe la contribución al fortalecimiento de capacidades e informar el policy-making con evidencia (esto se trata con más detalle en la sección de impacto). La relación es compleja, pero que tenga múltiples funciones no significa que una función desvirtúe la otra.
22	It is not very clear if this paragraph refers to the situation prior to the project, after project intervention, or both.	Temporal references have been added to clarify it.
22-23	In the subheading, please spell out EPR.	It has been spelled out.
4.1.1 and 4.1.2	Not clear what the difference is between the heading of those 2 sections (priorities of targeted countries vs priorities of LAC countries).	These questions were defined in the inception phase. As explained in section 2.1 on the general information about the project and more specifically table 1 in page 4, activities 1 and 2 had a clear focus on a few countries – they did not target all LAC countries. Section 4.1.1 focuses on the relevance of project activities for those specific countries, while section 4.1.2 focuses on the relevance of project activities for the whole LAC region, beyond those few target countries. Footnotes have been added to clarify this.
20 (page 18)	Please replace “impact indicators” by “indicators” or “indicators of achievement” according to the Prodoc.	It has been adjusted.
37	This is the first reference to components of the project, as opposed to work streams. Please use consistent terminology throughout to help the reader follow along.	References to work streams have been deleted. “Component” has been used throughout.
86	Please note that the project budget reflects the structure and line items of the development account. DA projects are supposed to complement	This information has been added and the paragraph significantly adjusted.

	activities of the programme of work, and entities are supposed to use their existing personnel, which is why they do not have staff costs, besides GTA which is meant to be temporary.	
87	Please clarify what is meant by General Secretariat (is it within ECLAC the Office of the Executive Secretary at ECLAC/ the Office of the Secretary of the Commission? Or the UN Secretariat?)	The reference is to the Secretariat within ECLAC. I am not clear whether the Office of the Executive Secretary at ECLAC and the Office of the Secretary of the Commission are the same. A reference to the latter has been added.
89	Please note that budget allocation for the evaluation was indicative, in line with DA requirements at the time, and the project was given the flexibility to increase that amount in the end, especially considering that the overall budget of the project was increased.	It has been added and the paragraph nuanced.
89	Unclear what is meant by “according to UMOJA’s philosophy additional resources should not be allocated for M&E”. This might be more related to DA project structure, not UMOJA per se.	It has been deleted.
90 y 108	se dice que el marco lógico tiene déficits y se ejemplifica con el indicador del EA2, “changes in capacities of civil servants are not directly measured”. The indicator for EA2, goes in fact further than the usual acknowledgment of the trained civil servants about their own increased skills, and point at actual use of those skills (IA.2.1 Environmental performance and sustainability assessments developed in two target countries por tanto va más allá de un aumento percibido de las capacidades de los servidores públicos para hacer EPR, sino que muestra que han puesto dichas capacidades en práctica con éxito). El uso de este tipo de indicadores más fuertes, para mostrar aumento de capacidades es impulsado – cuando no directamente solicitado- por el Management Team del Development Account en la sede durante el proceso de diseño del proyecto (ver instrucciones sobre la formulación en la página 5 del template adjunto para el diseno de la nota conceptual del proyecto).	<p>Un indicador sobre la aplicación de un conocimiento adquirido o una capacidad reforzada es mejor (más fuerte) que un indicador de percepción sobre el aumento de la capacidad. Es bueno en ese sentido que el Management Team del DA solicite este tipo de indicador.</p> <p>Sin embargo, la pertinencia de un indicador referido a la producción de un reporte como proxy a un aumento de capacidad sigue siendo limitada, por dos motivos:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) los EPR no los hacen solo los beneficiarios de las capacitaciones. Entiendo que la propia CEPAL juega un papel decisivo en desarrollar los análisis y escribir el reporte, que no es un trabajo exclusivo de los funcionarios capacitados. El indicador sería apropiado si los funcionarios capacitados hicieran solos el producto.</li> <li>ii) los reportes se hicieron en 2017, esto es, poco después de las capacitaciones, por lo que los reportes no son un buen indicador del aumento de las capacidades en el medio plazo. Para ello habría que medir la capacidad de las personas capacitadas para llevar a cabo esos análisis más tarde, digamos en 2019 o 2020. Que existan capacidades para hacer reportes en 2017 no significa que esa capacidad se mantenga después de hacerlos, y lo interesante sería que esa capacidad se mantuviese un tiempo después.</li> </ul> <p>En cuanto a la diferencia del EA1 y el EA2 esa explicación no lo justifica. Si un indicador de percepción no es válido para el EA2 no debería serlo tampoco para el EA1 y el EA3; si un indicar relativo a la producción de informes fuera suficiente para el EA2 debería serlo también para el EA1 y el EA3 (el EA1 incluye un indicador de percepción y uno de producción de informes, asumiendo que el segundo no es suficiente).</p> <p>Se ha agregado una breve explicación en el párrafo 90 y se han incluido los detalles de estas consideraciones en el anexo 7.</p>

<b>90 y 108</b>	se dice "All the indicators are targets rather than indicators. An indicator would be formulated as "number of or percentage of", while a target would be formulated as "X number of or Y percentage of". Si bien es cierto que es muy extendida la separación entre metas e indicadores en la aplicación de la metodología RBM (esta es la fórmula usual en muchas entidades del sistema de fondos y programas del sistema de Naciones Unidas, y de muchos actores de la cooperación internacional), el formato en el que se diseñan los proyectos de la Cuenta del Desarrollo exige el uso de "indicators of achievements", una fórmula que aúna lo que en otros sistemas es el indicador y el target por separado. Esta formulación, no es exclusiva de los proyectos de la Cuenta del Desarrollo, sino que es común también en los marcos lógicos de la programación de recursos regulares de las entidades del Secretariado de Naciones Unidas. ver instrucciones sobre la formulación en la página 5 del template adjunto para el diseño de la nota conceptual del proyecto). En esta línea, la recomendación de revisar los diseños de los proyectos no procede en cuanto ECLAC tiene que enviar los proyectos del Development Account de acuerdo al formato e instrucciones enviadas por la sede.	Gracias por la aclaración. Se ha eliminado la referencia de los párrafos 90 y 108, y se ha agregado esta explicación en el anexo 7.
<b>91</b>	As noted above for paragraph 86, personnel costs are not included in DA projects.	The whole section has been deleted, because it seems it is not relevant.
<b>94</b>	se refiere a un reporte inconsistente en cuanto el progreso no se hace hacia el target. Nuevamente aquí el reporte se hace de acuerdo al template y cumpliendo los requerimientos de la sede para los proyectos de la Cuenta del Desarrollo, en función del "indicator of achievement" que aúna lo que en otros sistemas sería target e indicador por separado.	Se ha eliminado la referencia en el texto principal y el anexo 7.
<b>135-137</b>	We suggest merging the 2 recommendations (1 and 2) having to do with lessons learned, to be more concise.	They have been merged.





Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)  
Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe (CEPAL)  
[www.eclac.org](http://www.eclac.org)