



Distr.: General  
1 July 2011

Original: English

---

**Conference of the Parties to the Basel Convention  
on the Control of Transboundary Movements of  
Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal  
Tenth meeting**

Cartagena, Colombia, 17–21 October 2011  
Item 4 of the provisional agenda\*

**Enhancing cooperation and coordination among  
the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions**

**Enhancing cooperation and coordination among the Basel,  
Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions**

**Addendum**

**Review arrangements**

**Note by the Secretariat**

1. At their simultaneous extraordinary meetings, held from 22 to 24 February 2010 in Bali, Indonesia, the conferences of the parties to the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal, the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants adopted substantively identical omnibus decisions (BC.Ex-1/1, RC.Ex-1/1 and SC.Ex-1/1, respectively). Those decisions contain a section on review arrangements, in which the conferences of the parties decided to review at their respective meetings in 2013, and in accordance with the timetable contained in the annex to the omnibus decisions, how far the arrangements adopted pursuant to the synergies decisions,<sup>1</sup> in particular on joint activities, joint managerial functions and joint services, had contributed to achieving the following objectives:

- (a) Strengthening the implementation of the three conventions at the national, regional and global levels;
- (b) Promoting coherent policy guidance;
- (c) Reducing the administrative burden;
- (d) Maximizing the effective and efficient use of resources at all levels;

---

\* UNEP/CHW.10/1.

<sup>1</sup> Decision IX/10 of the Conference of the Parties to the Basel Convention, decision RC-4/11 of the Conference of the Parties to the Rotterdam Convention and decision SC-4/34 of the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention (the “synergies decisions”) are substantially identical decisions by which the conferences of the parties to the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions called for greater cooperation and coordination among the three conventions.

(e) Taking into account global concerns and the specific needs of developing countries and countries with economies in transition;

(f) Protecting human health and the environment for the promotion of sustainable development.

2. The omnibus decisions provide that the review will be undertaken on the basis of two reports, one prepared by the secretariats of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions and one by the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) in consultation with the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). The omnibus decisions also specify various steps to be taken in preparing the two reports.

3. Concerning the process for the preparation of the secretariats' report, the decisions specify that the secretariats are:

(a) To prepare, 90 days before the first meeting of a conference of the parties to be held in 2011, detailed terms of reference for the preparation of the secretariats' report for consideration by the conferences of the parties at their ordinary meetings in 2011;

(b) To develop a questionnaire, based on the terms of reference adopted by the conferences of the parties in 2011, for collecting information from parties;

(c) To prepare a joint secretariats' report, including recommendations, on the review containing information collected from parties through the questionnaire and their own views;

(d) To publish the secretariats' report on the conventions' websites 90 days before the first meeting of a conference of the parties in 2013.

4. As requested in the omnibus decisions, the secretariats have prepared detailed draft terms of reference for the preparation of their report. These terms of reference are set out in annex I to the present note.

5. Concerning the process for the review by the Executive Director of UNEP and the Director-General of FAO, the omnibus decisions invite the Executive Director, in consultation with the Director-General:

(a) To prepare, 90 days before the first meeting of a conference of the parties to be held in 2011, detailed terms of reference, including performance indicators, for the review called for in the decisions, for consideration by the conferences of the parties at their ordinary meetings in 2011;

(b) To prepare a report, including recommendations, on the review through a joint endeavour of their respective evaluation units, based on the input from parties and taking into account input from the three secretariats and other stakeholders;

(c) To publish the report on the conventions' websites 90 days before the first meeting of a conference of the parties in 2013.

6. As he was invited to do in the omnibus decisions, the Executive Director, in consultation with the Director-General, has prepared detailed terms of reference, including performance indicators, for the preparation of the report. The terms of reference are set out in annex II to the present note.

### **Possible action by the Conference of the Parties**

7. The Conference of the Parties may wish to include in its decision on enhancing cooperation and coordination among the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions the following operative paragraphs, with any amendments that it deems necessary:

#### **VI. Review arrangements**

1. *Adopts* the terms of reference for the reports pertaining to the review of arrangements;<sup>2</sup>

2. *Requests* the secretariats to continue to implement section VI of the omnibus decisions, on review arrangements, using the terms of reference referred to in paragraph 1 above;

3. *Invites* the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme, in consultation with the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, to continue to implement section VI of the omnibus decisions, on review arrangements, using the terms of reference referred to in paragraph 1 above.

---

2 UNEP/CHW.10/27/Add.6, annexes I and II.

## Annex I

### Detailed terms of reference for the preparation of the report by the secretariats of the three conventions

#### I. Purpose of the report

1. In line with the omnibus decisions, the purpose of the report by the secretariats is to review how far the arrangements adopted pursuant to the synergies decisions, in particular on joint activities, joint managerial functions and joint services, have contributed to achieving the following objectives (hereinafter referred to as “the six objectives”):

- (a) Strengthening the implementation of the three conventions at the national, regional and global levels;
- (b) Promoting coherent policy guidance;
- (c) Reducing the administrative burden;
- (d) Maximizing the effective and efficient use of resources at all levels;
- (e) Taking into account global concerns and the specific needs of developing countries and countries with economies in transition;
- (f) Protecting human health and the environment for the promotion of sustainable development.

#### II. Scope of the report

2. The material scope of the report will be based on the six objectives and how far the arrangements adopted pursuant to the synergies decisions, in particular on joint activities, joint managerial functions and joint services, have contributed to achieving them. The report will extend to other arrangements adopted pursuant to the synergies decisions, if and where appropriate, keeping in mind that the report is not intended to review parties’ activities.

3. The report covers the period from the adoption of the synergies decisions (May 2009) to May 2012.

#### III. Methodology

##### A. Questionnaire

4. A questionnaire to be sent to parties will be jointly prepared by the three secretariats. It will be made available in the six official languages of the United Nations. The questionnaire will be concise and consist of three parts:

- (a) Request for information on whether and how much the arrangements – joint activities, joint managerial functions, and joint services – have contributed to the six objectives. In addition, parties will have an opportunity to make specific comments and recommendations on whether and how the arrangements have contributed to each objective;
- (b) Request for information or comments on the challenges or obstacles experienced in the achievement of the six objectives;
- (c) Request for specific or general recommendations to parties, the secretariats, UNEP, FAO and other institutions and stakeholders as appropriate, on steps that could be taken to make the synergies arrangements, in particular on joint activities, joint managerial functions and joint services, better contribute to the six objectives.

5. The questionnaires will be sent to all parties and made available on the individual and on the synergies websites of the conventions. Completed questionnaires will also be made available on these websites.

**B. Report**

6. A report of no more than 20 pages in length will be jointly prepared by the three secretariats and will be based on the following outline:

- (a) Introduction;
- (b) Review of the responses from parties submitted via the questionnaire;
- (c) Views of the secretariats on the arrangements;
- (d) Conclusions and recommendations.

7. The completed questionnaires will also be made available to the conferences of the parties.

**IV. Working relationship with the joint evaluation units**

8. Although the two reports that will be prepared for the conferences of the parties will be independent of each other, the secretariats and the UNEP and FAO evaluation units will cooperate and exchange information on methodologies employed to avoid duplication and to gain from one another's efforts, where applicable.

**V. Timeline for the preparation of the report**

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Deadline</i>
Preparation and translation of the questionnaire	30 January 2012
Questionnaire sent out to all parties and posted on the websites of the conventions	15 February 2012
Collection of responses from parties	15 May 2012
Preparation of the secretariats' report	30 September 2012
Report published on the website of the conventions	Ninety days before the first meeting of a conference of the parties in 2013

## Annex II

### Terms of reference for the preparation of the report by the evaluation units of the United Nations Environment Programme and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

#### I. Objectives and scope of the review

##### A. Objectives

1. The purpose of the review is to assess progress made towards the implementation of the synergies decisions with the objective of establishing how the synergies process has contributed to enhancing cooperation and coordination at the national, regional and global levels. The review will take into account progress made by the parties, the secretariats, UNEP, FAO and other institutions mentioned in the synergies decisions towards the implementation of those decisions and other relevant decisions emerging from the extraordinary meetings of the conferences of the parties. The review will examine how actions taken have contributed to the achievement of the key overarching objectives of the synergies decisions:

(a) The extent to which the processes for enhancing cooperation and coordination took into account global concerns and responded to the specific needs of developing countries and countries with economies in transition;

(b) The extent to which actions taken to enhance coordination and cooperation helped to strengthen the implementation of the three conventions at the national, regional and global levels, helped to promote coherent policy guidance and enhanced efficiency in the provision of support to parties with a view to reducing their administrative burden and maximizing the effective and efficient use of resources at all levels;

(c) Whether the enhanced coordination and cooperation among the three conventions have contributed to the achievement of their ultimate common objectives: the protection of human health and the environment for the promotion of sustainable development.

2. The review would contain recommendations to parties, the secretariats, UNEP, FAO and other institutions and stakeholders, as appropriate. It would take into account assessments that may have been undertaken in response to decisions by the conferences of the parties at their meetings in 2011.

##### B. Scope

3. The review will be both retrospective and prospective. This involves taking stock of the past while looking into the future with regard to the role of the secretariats in enhancing cooperation and coordination and promoting enhanced policy guidance and efficiencies in their support for parties. While taking a longer-term perspective on the issue, the review will focus on the period since the synergies decisions came into effect. In doing so, the review will take account of the conditions prevailing before the synergies decisions were adopted.

4. This review will not assess, or seek to reach any definitive conclusions on, compliance with the provisions of the conventions. Instead, its focus will be on overall efforts by the respective organizations and the secretariats of the conventions to cooperate and coordinate their activities with the aim of promoting efficiencies in their support for parties. The review will identify key lessons learned or to be learned and make targeted recommendations for future improvement.

5. It will involve, among other things, a detailed analysis of actions initiated to enhance cooperation and coordination with a view to reducing the administrative burden of the conventions and maximizing the efficient use of the resources at all levels.

#### II. Review criteria and key questions

6. While always taking into account the standard internationally accepted evaluation criteria included under objectives-based evaluations (i.e., relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability), these review criteria are not exclusive. The review will be organized around a set of specific review questions. With such an approach, the criteria will be translated into specific questions, and each question may be aimed at eliciting information pertinent to one or more of the criteria. These questions are intended to give a more precise and accessible form to the review criteria and to

articulate the key issues of concern to stakeholders, thus optimizing the focus and usefulness of the review.

#### **A. Relevance**

7. The review will assess the overall relevance of the synergies decisions, asking whether they make sense in the broader global political, institutional and environmental context; whether they respond to the particular needs of all parties to the conventions, in particular developing countries and countries with economies in transition; and whether they are likely to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of the three conventions.

8. The review will further determine whether, in retrospect, the actions taken to enhance synergies among the conventions were consistent with the decisions adopted by the parties. It will ascertain the nature and significance of the contribution to the outcomes achieved to date, to the broader goal of reducing the administrative burden on the conventions and to maximizing the use of resources.

#### **B. Effectiveness and impact**

9. The review will evaluate how, and to what extent, the synergies decisions have strengthened the implementation of the three conventions at the national, regional and global levels and effectively promoted policy coherence between them. The assessment will take into account any achievement indicators that may have been stated in the decisions themselves.

10. The analysis of outcomes achieved should include an assessment of the extent to which the mechanisms established following the adoption of the omnibus decisions have directly or indirectly assisted in promoting and enhancing cooperation and coordination among the conventions. The review will seek to establish how these outcomes have contributed or will contribute to the achievement of the ultimate common objectives of the conventions: the protection of human health and the environment for the promotion of sustainable development.

#### **C. Efficiency**

11. Efficiency will be assessed at three levels. First, the review will consider whether the efforts and actions taken to forge synergies among the three conventions were cost-effective and undertaken in a timely manner.

12. Second, the review will evaluate whether the actions taken as a result of the synergies decisions have effectively reduced the administrative burden on the Convention secretariats, parties and other stakeholders, and have genuinely contributed to maximizing the efficient use of resources at all levels.

13. Third, the review will assess whether the synergies decisions have led to improved efficiency in the implementation of convention-related actions or activities at the national level.

#### **D. Sustainability**

14. Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term outcomes and impacts. The review will bring to light the factors that will determine the persistence of benefits derived from the efforts to foster synergies, such as enhanced effectiveness and efficiency of the conventions or improved coherence among them. Other factors might be stronger institutional capacity, better coordinated and informed decision-making or a positive perception by the parties of the outcomes of the synergies decisions themselves.

### **III. Methods**

15. This study will be conducted as an in-depth review using a participatory approach by the UNEP and FAO evaluation offices. The secretariats of the respective conventions, key representatives of parties and other relevant stakeholders will be kept informed and regularly consulted throughout the review. The independent reviewers commissioned to undertake the review will liaise with the evaluation offices on any logistical and methodological issues germane to the proper conduct of the review in a manner that is as independent as possible given the circumstances and the resources provided.

16. The review will comprise broad research, data collection and analysis, in addition to selected investigations through interviews, a questionnaire or questionnaires, global consultations, regional consultations and reviews of key documents and financial information. All these approaches will focus on the questions set out in the section above.

17. The synergies decisions and other related supporting documentation were used to derive preliminary outcome- and output-level performance indicators<sup>3</sup> for use in the review, which are listed in table 1.

Table 1

**Preliminary performance indicators for use in the review**

<i>Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
Joint implementation of <b>substantive activities</b> at the national, regional and global levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Number of joint initiatives under implementation (at each level) such as technical guidance and standards and capacity-building</li> <li>▪ Coordinated national reporting compliant with individual convention requirements</li> </ul>
Institutionalized <b>joint financial management and audit services</b> for the three conventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Satisfaction of stakeholders with arrangements for sharing audit reports</li> <li>▪ Cross-cutting Office of Internal Oversight Services audit report shared with the conferences of the parties at their meetings in 2011</li> <li>▪ Convention budget cycles remain synchronized with those of UNEP and FAO</li> <li>▪ Satisfaction of stakeholders and secretariats with financial and administrative support arrangements</li> </ul>
<b>Resource mobilization:</b> increased funding for the implementation of convention-related activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increase in secured funding for national, regional and global implementation per convention as reflected in the secretariats' budgets</li> <li>▪ Increase in expenditure on advocacy for resource mobilization per convention</li> </ul>
<b>Public information</b> products and outreach services jointly provided in relation to the three conventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Satisfaction of all stakeholders with public information products (such as websites) and outreach services provided</li> </ul>
<i>Outputs</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
Joint management processes and structures operational for the three conventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Formal joint management group established with defined terms of reference</li> <li>▪ Joint head of the three convention secretariats appointed</li> </ul>
Joint <b>resource mobilization</b> efforts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Preparation of a joint resource mobilization strategy</li> </ul>
Common <b>information technology</b> service provision for the three conventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Satisfaction of secretariat staff with information technology services provided</li> </ul>
Legal service for the three conventions operational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Satisfaction of secretariat staff and stakeholders with legal services provided</li> </ul>
Coordinated compliance mechanisms developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Draft mechanisms for cooperation on compliance at the national, regional and international levels</li> </ul>
Common information-sharing tools and mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Existence of tools, procedures and agreements for sharing legal, technical and scientific information</li> </ul>

18. The review will consist of three main phases in the course of which four methodological stages will be developed. The phases are listed in table 2.

Table 2

**Main phases of the review process**

<i>Three main phases of development</i>	<i>Four methodological stages</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inception</li> <li>• Implementation</li> <li>• Synthesis and reporting</li> </ul>	Structuring of the review Data collection Analysis Judgements on findings Recommendations

<sup>3</sup> Section VI of the synergies decisions, on review arrangements, specifies in paragraph 4 that the terms of reference for the review should include performance indicators.

## **A. Inception**

19. This phase will include the preparation of a review framework and data collection and analysis methods and tools. It will feature an extensive desk study and be concluded with the preparation of an inception report.

20. The review framework will provide details on the review questions, information sources, data collection and analysis tools, and performance indicators. The desk study will review decisions of the conferences of the parties, relevant documents prepared by the secretariats, documents and decisions of the Ad Hoc Joint Working Group on Enhancing Cooperation and Coordination among the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions, progress reports, minutes of meetings and relevant correspondence.

21. Preliminary interviews will be conducted with staff working on convention issues, the management teams of the secretariats and of the administering organizations (UNEP and, in the case of the Rotterdam Convention, with FAO), representatives of parties, non-governmental and civil society organizations, and other relevant stakeholders. Their views will be sought on the progress made by parties, the secretariats, UNEP, FAO and other institutions mentioned in the synergies decisions towards the implementation of those decisions and relevant decisions emerging from any extraordinary meetings of the conferences of the parties.

22. The inception report will present the context of the synergies decisions and the review framework. It will present the first findings derived from the desk study and include a list of issues requiring further investigation in the implementation phase of the review. The inception report will be shared with the advisory panel for the review (see below).

## **B. Implementation phase**

23. The main purpose of the implementation phase will be to complete and validate the information obtained during the inception phase. It will mainly consist of further document reviews and in-depth interviews with and surveys of key individuals in UNEP, FAO, the secretariats, party representatives and other key partner organizations.

24. Questionnaires could also be employed to gather data from a broad range of stakeholders. There are obvious potential synergies in this regard with the parallel review being led and undertaken by the secretariats. If feasible, and to avoid duplication of effort, the evaluators will engage with the secretariats to prepare a consolidated and comprehensive survey instrument that will meet the needs of both review efforts.

25. Analysis of the information collected will lead to an overall judgement on progress made towards the implementation of the synergies decisions and, ultimately, the degree to which implementation of the decisions has contributed to enhanced coordination and cooperation between the conventions and has made the use of their resources more efficient. Before the synthesis and reporting phase, the review team will present its emerging findings to the advisory panel for feedback.

## **C. Synthesis and reporting phase**

26. Based on the information collected and analysed during the previous phases, the review team will draft a review report. This report will build on relevant sections of the inception report and expand on the issues for further investigation previously identified therein. It will also present the lessons learned and recommendations of the review. The draft report will be reviewed by the advisory panel before it is finalized.

## **IV. Expected outputs**

27. The main output of the review will be a final report. The report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain the purpose of the review, exactly what was reviewed and the methods used. The report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should provide information on when the review took place, the places visited and who was involved and should be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. The report should include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the main report to facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons.

28. Evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete and balanced manner. The report must be written in English, be no longer than 50 pages (excluding annexes), use numbered paragraphs and include:

- (a) An **executive summary** (no more than three pages) providing a brief overview of the review's main conclusions and recommendations;
- (b) **Introduction and background** giving a brief overview of the synergies decisions under review in their broader context and of the origins of the review;
- (c) **Scope, objective and methods** presenting the review's purpose, the review criteria used and questions to be considered;
- (d) **Overall performance and impact** providing factual evidence relevant to the questions asked and interpretations of such evidence (the main substantive section of the report);
- (e) **Conclusions** presenting the review's concluding assessments against the given review criteria and standards of performance. The conclusions should provide answers to the key questions and determine whether the results achieved to date are considered positive or negative;
- (f) **Lessons learned** presenting general conclusions, based on established good practices that have the potential for wider application and use. Lessons may also be derived from problems and mistakes. The context in which lessons may be applied should be clearly specified, and lessons should always state or imply some prescriptive action. A lesson should be written such that experiences derived could be applied in other similar situations;
- (g) **Recommendations** suggesting actionable proposals for improvement. Prior to each recommendation, the issue or problem that the recommendation is meant to solve should be clearly stated. The recommendations should be relevant within the context of the conventions and organized by target groups. They should be prioritized according to their importance and urgency to the purpose of the review. Options for implementing the recommendations with an indication of their respective limits and possible risks should be presented. Recommendations will in all cases need to be cross-referenced to the corresponding findings or conclusions;<sup>4</sup>
- (h) **Annexes**, including terms of reference, a list of interviewees, documents reviewed and a brief summary of the expertise of the review team. Dissenting views or management responses to the review findings may later be annexed.

## V. Tasks and schedule

29. The review is expected to be implemented as set out in table 3.

Table 3

### Schedule for the review

<i>Deliverable/activity</i>	<i>Indicative time frame</i>
<i>Inception (November 2011–March 2012)</i>	
Inception – evaluation framework (following decision of the final meeting of a conference of the parties in 2011)	November 2011
Desk review	December 2011
Draft inception report	End of February 2012
Final inception report	End of March 2012
<i>Implementation (December 2011–15 May 2012)</i>	
Additional desk review	March–April 2012
Stakeholder interviews (including field missions)	April–May 2012
Data collation and analysis	May–June 2012
Debriefing on emerging findings	15 May 2012
<i>Reporting (15 May 2012–March 2013)</i>	
Submission of the first draft report to UNEP and FAO	30 June 2012
Presentation of the first draft report to the advisory panel	15 July 2012
Presentation of the second draft report to the advisory panel	7 September 2012
Distribution of the report by UNEP and FAO for comments by the parties	November 2012
Publishing of the final report on the websites	December 2012
Consideration of the review by the conferences of the parties and adoption of decisions by the conferences of the parties	After March 2013

<sup>4</sup> A high-quality recommendation is an actionable proposal that is: feasible to implement within the time frame and resources available; commensurate with the available capacities of implementation partners; specific in terms of who would do what and when; contains results-based language (i.e., a measurable performance target); and includes a trade-off analysis, when its implementation may require using significant resources that would otherwise be used for other purposes.

## **VI. Management arrangements**

30. The review will be jointly managed by the evaluation offices of UNEP and FAO, which will each appoint a task manager to manage the review process. The task managers will provide backstopping support and ensure coordination and liaison with all concerned units and other key agencies and stakeholders; they will determine the review team composition, provide overall guidance and ensure substantive supervision of all research. The UNEP Evaluation Office will, in consultation with its FAO counterpart, select and contract the international consultants to the review team.

31. The review team will be responsible for the development, research, drafting and finalization of the review in close consultation with the task managers and other relevant units of UNEP and FAO, in addition to the secretariats.

32. The evaluation offices will meet all costs related to conducting the review and will manage the review process, providing support and ensuring coordination and liaison with key agencies. They will be responsible for the final evaluation report and for its formal presentation to the conferences of the parties.

## **VII. Review team**

33. The review will be carried out by a team with advanced knowledge and experience in the following fields: chemicals and wastes; multilateral environmental agreements; international affairs and international development administration; institutional reform and business processes. The team must also possess an in-depth understanding of, and familiarity with, evaluation methods and techniques and documented experience in conducting evaluations and reviews. The team must be prepared to work in English, and possess excellent drafting skills.

34. The core review team will comprise two international consultants. One will be designated as the team leader and will provide intellectual leadership and direction for the review and be responsible for delivering the final product. The other will be a subject-matter specialist and have a good understanding of and expertise in multilateral and intergovernmental processes and in evaluation methods and processes. The team will be supported by designated staff from the UNEP and FAO evaluation offices. These task managers will provide overall guidance for the review and participate in the review as they deem appropriate.

35. The review team leader and all other members of the review team will be selected by the evaluation offices taking into account the technical qualifications of the consultants in the subject matter and in evaluation and review methods.

36. All team members will be responsible for drafting components of the report while the team leader will be responsible for drafting the integrated final report and executive summary with the support of the task managers.

## **VIII. Advisory panel**

37. As part of the consultative process in undertaking the review, an external advisory panel comprising six individuals from various member countries, including representatives of international agencies, will be set up by the evaluation offices. The members will be selected on the basis of their recognized stature in the fields of chemicals and wastes, multilateral environmental agreements and evaluations and reviews. The advisory panel will ensure quality control of the review. It will review and provide comments on the inception report, the draft report and the final review report. The evaluation offices will form part of the extended advisory panel, which will remain in existence until the completion, dissemination and final review of the report. Inputs from and comments of the advisory panel are expected to enrich the process and enhance broader understanding of the issues.

## **IX. Quality assurance team**

38. A joint internal quality assurance team comprising designated staff from the evaluation offices (but excluding task managers) will be set up to ensure adherence to the evaluation offices' quality standards pertaining to both the process and the review outputs or milestones.

## X. Review audience

39. The users of the review are the parties to the conventions, the UNEP and FAO management teams and the secretariats. Considerable interest is likely to be shown in the review by other stakeholders, including other convention parties and secretariats, various multinational organizations, the academic community, think tanks and many non-governmental and civil society organizations.

## XI. Follow-up, dissemination and learning

40. The review is expected to help the parties, the secretariats, UNEP and FAO to identify key lessons on strategic positioning that can provide a useful basis for strengthening cooperation and coordination among the conventions. It will present good practices and also draw lessons from unintended results.

41. The review and resulting recommendations will be shared with the parties to the conventions, the secretariats and other interested stakeholders. The review will be presented to the conferences of the parties and the secretariats, who will be responsible for preparing a management response to the findings and recommendations. Innovative ways of disseminating the review findings will be sought to reach as wide a range of stakeholders as possible.

## XII. Proposed timetable for reviewing the arrangements adopted pursuant to the synergies decisions

<i>Topic</i>	<i>Activity</i>	<i>Timing</i>
Preparation of the report	Development of initial report by UNEP and FAO	By 15 June 2012
Request comments from the parties	Distribution of the report by UNEP and FAO for comments by the parties	By November 2012
Publication of the final report	Publication of the final report on the website	By December 2012
Consideration of the review by the conferences of the parties	Adoption of decisions by the conferences of the parties	2013