

## SC-6/16: Regional and subregional centres for capacity-building and the transfer of technology

### *The Conference of the Parties*

1. *Takes note* of the information provided by the Secretariat on regional centres;<sup>1</sup>
2. *Also takes note* of the workplans for the biennium 2012–2013 and activity reports for the period 2011–2012<sup>2</sup> submitted by the Stockholm Convention regional and subregional centres and the nominated Stockholm Convention centre;
3. *Requests* the Stockholm Convention regional and subregional centres to submit to the Secretariat their workplans for the biennium 2014–2015 by 30 September 2013;
4. *Also requests* the Stockholm Convention regional and subregional centres to submit to the Secretariat their activity reports for the period January 2013–December 2014 by 31 December 2014 for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its seventh meeting;
5. *Adopts* the methodology for evaluating the regional centres, set out in annex III to the present decision, which includes a quantitative analysis to be used in the evaluation of the performance and sustainability of each centre to be undertaken every four years, and which is based on the criteria set out in annex II to decision SC-2/9;
6. *Notes* that it has evaluated, in accordance with the criteria set out in annex II to decision SC-2/9, the performance and sustainability of the Stockholm Convention regional and subregional centres endorsed by decision SC-4/23;
7. *Endorses* for a second period of two years the Stockholm Convention regional and subregional centres for capacity-building and the transfer of technology listed in annex I to the present decision and decides to reconsider, pursuant to decision SC-3/12, their status as regional or subregional centres under the Convention at its seventh meeting;
8. *Also endorses* the nominated Stockholm Convention centre listed in annex II to the present decision as a Stockholm Convention regional or subregional centre for capacity-building and the transfer of technology, in accordance with decision SC-3/12, for a period of two years;
9. *Decides* to evaluate, in accordance with the criteria set out in annex II to decision SC-2/9, the performance and sustainability of the centre listed in annex II to the present decision and to reconsider its status as a Stockholm Convention regional and subregional centre for capacity-building and the transfer of technology at its seventh meeting;
10. *Requests* the Secretariat to prepare a draft evaluation report on the regional centres listed in annexes I and II to the present decision and in annex I to decision SC-5/21, based on the methodology mentioned in paragraph 5 above, for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its seventh meeting;
11. *Invites* parties, observers and financial institutions in a position to do so to provide financial support to enable regional centres to implement their workplans aimed at supporting parties in implementing their obligations under the Convention;
12. *Takes note* of the challenges faced by some regional centres and invites parties, as well as other regional centres, in a position to do so, to cooperate with and support those regional centres through the exchange of best practices as well as through facilitating means of implementation;
13. *Requests* the Secretariat to prepare a report on the activities of the Stockholm Convention regional and subregional centres and the nominated Stockholm Convention centre for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its seventh meeting.

---

<sup>1</sup> UNEP/POPS/COP.6/19; also available on the Convention website

<sup>2</sup> UNEP/POPS/COP.6/INF/19; also available on the Convention website.

## **Annex I to decision SC-6/16**

### **Stockholm Convention regional and subregional centres for capacity-building and the transfer of technology endorsed by the Conference of the Parties at its sixth meeting for a second period of two years**

<b>Region</b>	<b>Institution</b>	<b>Location</b>
<b>Asia and the Pacific</b>	Stockholm Convention Regional Centre for Capacity-building and the Transfer of Technology in China	Beijing, China
	Stockholm Convention Regional Centre for Capacity-building and the Transfer of Technology in Kuwait	Kuwait City, Kuwait
<b>Central and Eastern Europe</b>	Stockholm Convention Regional Centre for Capacity-building and the Transfer of Technology in the Czech Republic	Brno, Czech Republic
<b>Latin America and the Caribbean</b>	Stockholm Convention Regional Centre for Capacity-building and the Transfer of Technology in Brazil	São Paulo, Brazil
	Stockholm Convention Regional Centre for Capacity-building and the Transfer of Technology in Mexico	Mexico City, Mexico
	Stockholm Convention Regional Centre for Capacity-building and the Transfer of Technology in Panama	Panama City, Panama
	Stockholm Convention Regional Centre for Capacity-building and the Transfer of Technology in Uruguay	Montevideo, Uruguay
<b>Western Europe and others</b>	Stockholm Convention Regional Centre for Capacity-building and the Transfer of Technology in Spain	Barcelona, Spain

## Annex II to decision SC-6/16

### Stockholm Convention regional and subregional centre endorsed by the Conference of the Parties at its sixth meeting for an initial period of two years

Region	Institution	Location
Asia and the Pacific	Basel Convention Regional Centre for South-East Asia (BCRC-SEA)	Jakarta, Indonesia

## Annex III to decision SC-6/16

### Methodology for evaluating the regional centres

**Table 1: Methodology for evaluating the performance and sustainability of the regional and subregional centres based on the criteria<sup>3</sup> for evaluating the performance of the regional centres**

<i>Criteria<sup>4</sup></i>	<i>Instructions</i>	<i>Indicators and rankings</i>	<i>Sources of information</i>	<i>Evaluator's summary comments<sup>5</sup></i>	<i>Total score (Maximum possible score 33)</i>
(a) The centre demonstrates the capacity to identify, document and implement project activities aimed at assisting parties in the implementation of their obligations under the Stockholm Convention.	Based on factual evidence, the evaluator should search for examples that demonstrate that the centre has the capacity to:  (a) Identify;  (b) Document; and  (c) Implement projects/activities.	Number of examples for which the centre has identified, documented and implemented project activities:  0: No example found in any of the three areas; 1: At least one example observed in one of the three areas; 2: At least one example in two of the three areas; 4: At least one example in all three areas.	– Activity reports for relevant years  – Workplans for relevant years  – Other relevant information sources (e.g., feedback from parties)		(Maximum possible score: 4)
(b) Achieves concrete and/or measurable results in terms of capacity-building in its technical assistance and technology transfer activities.	Based on factual evidence, the evaluator should look into the number of completed capacity-building activities or projects relevant to the implementation of the Convention undertaken by the centre and the number of parties that benefited from such activities or projects.	Number of capacity-building activities implemented by the centre:  0: No proven example; 1: 1–5 examples; 2: 6–10 examples; 4: 11–15 examples; 8: 16 or more examples;  Number of parties that benefited from these activities:  1: Up to 5 parties; 2: More than 5 parties.	– Activity reports for relevant years		(Maximum possible score: 10)

<sup>3</sup> Annex II to decision SC-2/9 on the criteria for evaluating the performance of regional or subregional centres for capacity-building and technology transfer.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Lists references of the sources and the information and data collected that provide evidence for the score given.

<i>Criteria<sup>4</sup></i>	<i>Instructions</i>	<i>Indicators and rankings</i>	<i>Sources of information</i>	<i>Evaluator's summary comments<sup>5</sup></i>	<i>Total score (Maximum possible score 33)</i>
(c) Identifies, undertakes and promotes cooperation, collaboration and synergies in efforts to assist parties in meeting Convention obligations.	Based on factual evidence, the evaluator should look for proven examples of coordination and collaboration with other relevant partners (such as other regional centres, the Secretariat, UNEP, FAO and other United Nations organizations) to assist parties in meeting Convention obligations.	Number of coordination and collaborative activities undertaken by the centre with other relevant partners: 0: No proven example; 1: At least one example; 2: More than one example.	– Activity reports for relevant years  – Other information provided by parties or observers		(Maximum possible score: 2)
(d) Identifies additional financial resources and other donors to fund activities to assist parties in meeting Convention obligations.	Based on factual evidence, the evaluator should look into a number of examples of donors or funds mobilized to implement the centre's activities or what proportion of its workplan has been implemented (funding for the day-to-day operation of the centre shall not be counted).	Number of donors or funding sources mobilized or percentage of the workplan implemented: 0: No example of additional funding mobilized to implement any of the activities of the workplan; 1: One or two examples of additional donors or funding sources mobilized to implement workplan activities, or up to 25 per cent of the workplan implemented; 2: Three or four examples of additional donors or funding sources mobilized to implement workplan activities, or up to 50 per cent of the workplan implemented; 4: Five to seven examples of additional donors or funding sources mobilized to implement workplan activities, or up to 75 per cent of the workplan implemented; 8: Eight or more examples of additional donors or funding sources mobilized to implement workplan activities, or more than 75 per cent of the workplan implemented.	– Activity reports for relevant years  – Workplan for relevant years		(Maximum possible score: 8)
(e) Manages and conducts all activities efficiently, effectively and transparently.	Based on factual evidence, the evaluator should search for proven examples that demonstrate that the centre conducts its activities:	Number of examples for which the centre has conducted its activities: (a) Efficiently; (b) Effectively; (c) Transparently: 0: No example found in any	– Activity reports for relevant years  – Workplans for relevant years  – Other relevant		(Maximum possible score: 8)

<i>Criteria<sup>4</sup></i>	<i>Instructions</i>	<i>Indicators and rankings</i>	<i>Sources of information</i>	<i>Evaluator's summary comments<sup>5</sup></i>	<i>Total score (Maximum possible score 33)</i>
	(a) Efficiently; (b) Effectively; (c) Transparently; and has submitted the required workplans and activity reports within the given deadlines.	of the three areas; 1: At least one example observed in one of the three areas; 2: At least one example observed in two of the three areas; 4: At least one example observed in each of three areas.  Number of workplans or activity reports submitted within the deadline: 0: none of the workplans and activity reports submitted within the given deadlines; 1: Up to two out of four documents (workplans and activity reports) submitted within the given deadlines; 2: Three out of four documents submitted within given deadlines; 4: All four documents submitted within the given deadlines.	information sources (e.g., feedback from parties or information available on the centre's website)		
(f) Demonstrates the capacity to meet the various language requirements of the region or subregion and conduct business in English as required	Based on factual evidence, the evaluator should search for proven examples which demonstrate that the centre does have such capacity.	Number of examples showing that the centre meets the language requirements of the region:  0: No example; 1: One or more examples showing that such capacity exists.	– Activity reports for relevant years  – Other relevant information sources (e.g., feedback from parties)		(Maximum possible score: 1)
<b>Total scores</b>					

## Summary of performance evaluation

The performance evaluation exercise can be summarized as follows:

### Summary of points scored against evaluation criteria for the centre being evaluated

Total score (TS) (maximum possible: 33)	Assessment percentage TS x 100/33	<b>Performance level</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Excellent (&gt;90%)</li> <li>○ Good (75–89%)</li> <li>○ Acceptable (60–74%)</li> <li>○ Unsatisfactory (&lt;60%)</li> </ul>
--	--------------------------------------	--

**Table 2: Meeting the terms of reference for regional centres under the Stockholm Convention set out in annex I to decision SC-2/9**

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Status at the time of endorsement (yes or no)</i>	<i>Status at the time of evaluation (yes or no)</i>
(a) Takes into account the work done under other MEAs, the Basel Convention and UNEP/UNIDO cleaner production centres		
(b) Expertise of centre meets TA requirement of the region		
(c) Location of the institution provides easy access to parties		
(d) Eligible to receive financial support from financial mechanism		
(e) Highly qualified technical personnel with recognized competence in technical assistance and technology transfer		
(f) Equipped with :		
(i) Adequate number of PCs with up-to-date software		
(ii) Good communication facilities with telephone and fax		
(iii) Reliable internet connection		
(iv) Adequate meeting facilities or access thereto		
(g) Serve a definite group of parties in the region or subregion		
(h) Possibility to serve beyond the region		
(i) The working language of the centre has been defined		
(j) Legal status: it is an independent legal entity operating as a separate legal entity		
(k) Existence of a liaison staff member designated to communicate with the Secretariat as contact person		
(l) Coordinator of the centre has:		
(i) A technical background		
(ii) Project management competency		
(iii) Experience in technical assistance and capacity-building		
<b>Observations</b>		