MOORE STEPHENS

UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

UNEP

A review of the proposals set out in the note by the Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions on the organization and operation of the part of the Rotterdam Convention Secretariat hosted by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations to enhance synergies arrangements

Final Report

Date: 13 October 2016

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

The Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions (BRS Conventions) were adopted in response to concerns over the dangers posed to human health and the environment from hazardous chemicals and waste. In addition to their distinct objectives, the Conventions all share this common objective relating to human health and the environment. This means that there are opportunities to strengthen implementation and increase efficiencies in the delivery to Parties through enhanced cooperation and coordination between the Conventions.

The synergies process was officially started in 2005, and the first synergy decisions were adopted during the 2008 / 2009 Conferences of the Parties (COPs).[1] The aim of these decisions was to achieve synergies through joint activities, joint managerial functions, joint services, synchronisation of budget cycles, and joint audit and review arrangements. Further decisions were adopted in 2011,[2] leading among other things to the establishment of the position of BRS Executive Secretary, who serves as joint head of the Secretariat for the three Conventions hosted by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), based in Geneva. The joint structure was further discussed and agreed at the second simultaneous extraordinary meetings of the three COPS held in May 2013.[3]

Part of the Secretariat of the Rotterdam Convention is hosted by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations, based in Rome. This part of the Secretariat is responsible for pesticides under the Convention, while staff in Geneva are responsible for industrial chemicals. The Rome-based staff are not included under the management of the joint Secretariat hosted by the UNEP in Geneva, but contribute to all operational areas of the Secretariat's work.

As background to discussions at the 2013 ExCOPs[4] concerning possible restructuring of Geneva-based staff, the Secretariat submitted a note on the organization and operation of the Rotterdam Convention Secretariat hosted by the FAO.[5] The note contains the following proposals[6] for leveraging the FAO's work on pesticides to realise further synergies:

17i. The development of technical and policy guidelines on aspects of pesticide management that reflect the requirements of the three Conventions;

17ii. Capacity development including training workshops at the national and regional levels on pesticide management including the identification of alternatives and the management and disposal of obsolete pesticides and POP containing wastes;

17iii. Improved communication and promotion of national synergies among key stakeholders in the implementation of the three Conventions;

18. Leveraging of the FAO's extensive programme and network of technical officers through the integration of the pesticide related capacity development activities across the three Conventions with FAO's Pesticide Programme;

19. Exchanging of staff whereby Secretariat staff in Geneva could be seconded to Rome to work on pesticide related topics, on a short- or long-term basis.

1.2 Scope of assignment

In the decisions on 'Enhancing cooperation and coordination among the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions' adopted during their 2015 meetings,[7] the COPs requested that the BRS Executive Secretary review the

---

[1] Decisions BC-IX/10 (June 2008), RC-4/11 (October 2008) and SC-4/34 (May 2009).

[2] Decisions BC-12/20, and RC-7/10 and SC-7/28 on enhancing cooperation and coordination among the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions.

[3] UNEP/FAO/CHW/RC/POPS/EXCOPS.2/2/Add.2

[4] The second simultaneous Extraordinary Meetings of the Conferences of the Parties.

[5] See document UNEP/FAO/CHW/RC/POPS/EXCOPS.2/INF/9.

[6] The numbering of the proposals begins at 17 rather than 1 because the original note also contained other items, not related to the current topic. We have retained the original numbering for ease of reference.

[7] BC-12/20, RC-7/10 and SC 7/28

proposals set out in the Secretariat's note, and submit a report thereon to the COPs in 2017. The BRS Executive Secretary appointed Moore Stephens LLP to carry out this review, which is aimed at enhancing cooperation and coordination among the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions.

1.3 Our approach

Our methodologies (which are set out in more detail in see **Annex 4**) focused on a number of key factors in order to assess the overall implications of the proposals for further synergies:

- The impact on coordination and communication amongst the joint UNEP-hosted BRS Secretariat, the FAO-hosted part of the Rotterdam Secretariat, and the FAO's Pesticides Programme;
- The feasibility of the proposals;
- The formulation of the proposals, in particular with respect to good practice models such as 'SMART';
- Any cost savings that might be realised and any impacts on resources committed to implementation; and
- Barriers to implementation of the proposals.

Our review first sets out a number of overarching observations applicable to all the proposals (**Section 2**). We then present specific observations and recommendations on the individual proposals (**Section 3**). In both cases we draw on findings from our fieldwork related to current arrangements, operations and views of staff at both the FAO and UNEP-hosted Secretariats.

We would like to thank the staff of the UNEP and FAO-hosted parts of the BRS Secretariat, external stakeholders for their assistance and co-operation throughout the course of the review.

Paul Stockton 13 October 2016

Partner

2 Overarching observations concerning further synergies

In this section we set out a number of overarching observations on issues relevant to the Secretariat's note. Detailed observations and recommendations on the individual proposals themselves are set out in **Section 3**.

2.1 Impact on coordination and communication

A key prerequisite for the successful introduction of further synergies arrangements between the UNEP-hosted Secretariat and the FAO-hosted part of the Secretariat is effective coordination and communication between the two. Problems in this area can lead to duplication of activities, inconsistencies in approach and ineffective operations overall – all of which are likely to undermine any attempts to introduce further synergies.

The evidence from our fieldwork, in particular our staff survey and interviews, suggests that coordination between the two parts of the Secretariat is relatively good. For example, only 2% of Geneva based staff felt that there was any duplication of documented responsibilities between the UNEP-hosted part of the Secretariat and the FAO-hosted part of the Secretariat.

Regarding *actual activities* (as opposed to documented responsibilities) the picture is slightly more nuanced. Seventy-three percent of total Secretariat staff agreed there was no unnecessary duplication of their actual activities with staff from FAO-hosted part of the Secretariat - an exception to this being respondents from the Technical Assistance Branch (TAB), where 33% suggested that there was some duplication. They suggested that this is caused either by staff members operating beyond their remit, or activities (such as workshops and drafting of guidance) not being specifically and definitively assigned to the FAO-hosted or UNEP-hosted part of the Secretariat. A member of the BRS Secretariat Executive Office in Geneva suggested that there was some duplication of actual activities. In the FAO-hosted part of the Secretariat, by contrast, no respondents were aware of any duplication of documented responsibilities or actual activities between themselves and Geneva-based staff. Again, these findings were broadly supported by our interviews with staff in both Rome and Geneva.

Results regarding the consistency of the advice, guidance and support given by FAO-hosted and UNEP-hosted parts of the Secretariat were less positive. 19% of staff disagreed mildly (and a further 4% strongly) that this advice, guidance and support is always consistent. Examples of this inconsistency included different approaches to national action plans and the listing of pesticides/industrial chemicals. However, given that 30% of respondents felt that such advice, guidance and support *is* consistent, this issue does not appear to be pervasive, and may well be remedied by implementing the proposals in the Secretariat's note.

One interesting nuance is that issues with communication and coordination appear to be felt more acutely by Rome based staff than by Geneva based staff. On a scale of 1 to 5, where '1' is 'very badly' and '5' is 'very well', four out of six Rome-based respondents (67%) rated the BRS Secretariat's[8] 'communication' and 'coordination' amongst branches/ as only a '1' or a '2', compared to 26% of Geneva-based staff (11 out of 42 respondents).

The communication and coordination issues detailed above must be overcome to ensure that the proposals are implemented as successfully as possible. **Section 3** contains a number of recommendations to support this aim.

2.2 Overall views on the feasibility of the proposals

Our survey of Secretariat staff suggests that there is considerable potential to realise the further synergies proposed. Over 50% of staff (of both the UNEP and FAO-hosted parts of the Secretariat) agreed that there is scope to realise further synergies between the UNEP-part of the BRS Secretariat and the FAO part of the Secretariat. Only one respondent disagreed.

Similarly, 19% of staff members agreed strongly, and 21% mildly, that synergies could potentially be realised through further integration of BRS-related activities with corresponding activities of the FAO's Pesticides Programme. Only 8% disagreed with this view.

Responses to our survey of the FAO country and regional offices also strongly indicate that the majority of the proposals are feasible. On a global scale, 100% of respondents feel that there is scope for greater use of

[8] Covers both UNEP- and FAO-hosted parts.

decentralised FAO offices to implement the BRS Conventions. Ninety percent of FAO country and regional office respondents feel that their particular office could contribute further to implementation in their country/region, and 90% agree that there is scope for further synergies with regards to proposals 17i,17ii and 17iii specifically. Overall, this suggests that staff realise and welcome the potential for further synergies.

2.3 Formulation of the proposals

Although the proposals are clearly drafted and include some details regarding implementation (for example Proposal 17ii includes actual topics for coordinated training workshops), without further development and clarification they are not specific enough to support effective planning, implementation and - particularly relevant for the current assignment - review/evaluation. For example, they do not include 'SMART'[9] criteria, nor metrics that would allow the Secretariat to set relevant targets, milestones or benchmarks, or measure and report progress with implementation.

We provide more detailed observations and recommendations on the formulation of each proposal in **Section 3**, based on best practice and the additional knowledge and insights acquired during our review.

2.4 Cost savings and impacts on resources committed to implementation

The note setting out the proposals does not attempt to estimate their financial and resourcing implications, instead focusing on how they might be implemented to achieve the best results. This means that a significant aspect of the proposals requires further development, since the financial implications of the proposals will be a key determinant as to their feasibility and net benefits.

> ***Recommendation***
>
> *1) Secretariat management should carry out more detailed analysis to estimate the financial implications of the proposals, and develop the proposals more fully to incorporate the results.*

Although detailed costing of the proposals is beyond the scope of our current assignment (and not supported by the routine data available to us), our review of the current financial benefits of synergies arrangements with the FAO suggests that cost savings would be likely were the proposals to be implemented. The note containing the proposals explains that the financial 'benefits in kind' of the current arrangements amount to circa $1 million, and are realised because the 'Rome (based Secretariat) make use of FAO's meeting facilities and its logistic, administrative and technical support without additional costs'.[10] Given these financial benefits, it is likely that further savings would be realised by achieving new synergies; however, further analysis would be required to quantify these more precisely. We provide some qualitative observations on the resource implications of each proposal in **Section 3.**

2.5 Overarching barriers to implementation

We used our staff survey and interviews to explore barriers to further synergies between the FAO-hosted and UNEP-hosted parts of the Secretariat. Notably, 53% of overall Secretariat staff stated that such barriers exist, with the most frequently cited examples being the separate locations of the Secretariats, and differences between institutional arrangements and working cultures. As with the concerns over communication and coordination outlined in **Section 2.2**, barriers to implementation are perceived as more of an issue by Rome based staff than by the rest of the Secretariat: 83% of respondents from Rome (5 respondents) stated that there were barriers to further synergies, compared to just 48% of the Geneva based Secretariat staff (18 respondents).

Notwithstanding these barriers to further synergies, it appears that even current arrangements could and should function more synergistically. The areas of concern that staff reported with respect to current arrangements include:

- Formerly there were quarterly joint management meetings between the two parts of the Secretariat – an approach which Secretariat staff tell us supported effective communication and coordination. More recently, these joint meetings have not been taking place, making it more difficult to realise synergies and organise complementary activities.

[9] Specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timebound.
[10] See document UNEP/FAO/CHW/RC/POPS/EXCOPS.2/INF/9, para 7. P. 3.

- Decision-making within the BRS Secretariat can be slow due to i) excessive high-level review of decisions that could potentially be delegated, and ii) lack of communication between branches.
- Decision-making within the FAO-hosted part of the Secretariat can be slow due to the hierarchical nature of the FAO, and differences in administrative rules between the FAO and UNEP (such as those governing financial management).
- Joint Secretariat meetings can be long and inefficient owing to a lack of defined meeting objectives and agreed outputs/outcomes. Moreover, some staff report that the UNEP-hosted Secretariat often attend these meetings without having reached an agreed-upon position beforehand. This means staff from the FAO-hosted part of the Secretariat effectively end up as observers whilst the UNEP-hosted branches discuss their own position amongst themselves.

All of the above have led to the two parts of the Secretariat working independently of each other at times, rather than cooperating as intended. In **Annex 1** we propose a number of additional actions, which – although not part of the Secretariat's Note on further synergies – could nonetheless support other potential synergies and benefits.

---

3 Review of the individual proposals

This section of the report sets out our detailed observations and recommendations on each of the Secretariat's proposals, which we have reviewed individually using the thematic framework outlined in **Section 1**.

3.1 Proposal 17i) Development of technical and policy guidelines on aspects of pesticide management that reflect the requirements of the three Conventions

Impact on coordination and communication

A consolidated, life-cycle approach to technical and policy guideline development would encourage strong coordination and communication between the UNEP-hosted Secretariat and the FAO-hosted part of the Secretariat, and help avoid duplication of work. This is because developing such guidelines would by necessity require coordination and communication in order to encompass the entire spectrum of knowledge of the three Conventions. Additionally, implementing this proposal would avoid any duplicate (or indeed contradictory) information being sent to Parties or other stakeholders by the UNEP-hosted and FAO-hosted parts of the Secretariat.

Feasibility

Developing such guidelines would appear to be very feasible. Indeed our discussions with Rome-based staff confirm that progress has already been made, and comprehensive guidance issued for some chemicals. Fifty-two percent of Secretariat staff agreed (31% strongly) that there is further scope to develop such guidelines; none disagreed.

Formulation of the proposal

Proposal 17i) is clearly drafted but lacks a number of key details to inform both implementation and review/evaluation.

Recommendation

2) The Secretariat should work with the Conferences of the Parties to reformulate and develop Proposal 17i) further as follows:

- *identify and prioritise specific aspects and issues suited to the development of coordinated technical and policy guidelines;*
- *rank these aspects and issues in order of priority so that concerted efforts can be made to address the most troublesome first, rather than disparate and ad-hoc efforts across a wide range of issues. This will enable organised and focused monitoring of progress against the prioritised list; and*
- *establish a date by which joint guidelines will be disseminated to Parties. Publishing this date could provide additional impetus for timely implementation.*

Cost savings and impacts on resources committed to implementation

Developing guidelines that reflect the requirements of the three Conventions is likely to reduce costs and maximise resources directed at implementation, since it would prevent the UNEP-hosted and FAO-hosted parts of the Secretariat from producing duplicative or contradictory guidelines. It would also reduce the burden of queries flowing inwards from Parties, since they would not need to make separate enquiries for each Convention, and could focus their queries on a single contact point (named within the guidance). This contact point would have a consolidated pool of information covering all relevant guidance.

Barriers to implementation

A number of Rome-based interviewees noted some difficulty in communicating and coordinating with the Technical Assistance Branch (TAB) of the BRS Secretariat. It was explained that the TAB are often unresponsive to communications such as questions and coordination/cooperation requests. In instances where responses are received these are often so slow that the FAO-hosted part of the Secretariat act without input from the TAB. This problem was also highlighted by interviewees from other branches of the UNEP-hosted part of the Secretariat, such as SSB and COB – where, for example, these challenges would have to be overcome to ensure that consolidated guidance is efficiently drafted and approved.

Recommendation

3) Secretariat management should include cooperation and communication between FAO-hosted and UNEP-hosted parts of the Secretariat as a criterion in the annual performance appraisal of all staff in each branch. A 360-degree evaluation model should be used to assess this aspect of performance, with feedback provided by colleagues from other branches and various levels of the hierarchy.

3.2 Proposal 17ii) Capacity development including training workshops at the national and regional levels on pesticide management including the identification of alternatives and the management and disposal of obsolete pesticides and POP containing wastes

Impact on coordination and communication

This proposal is likely to encourage improved coordination and communication, since these will be a prerequisite for delivering successfully through the staff, resources and networks of both parts of the Secretariat. For example, where a workshop is organised by the FAO-hosted part of the Secretariat, the UNEP-hosted part of the Secretariat would benefit from establishing contacts within the network of the local FAO country office (not to mention FAO country officers themselves).

Feasibility

Capacity development in this area appears highly feasible. The knowledge, skills and infrastructure/network exist within the FAO, and Parties expressed clear support for further cooperative capacity development at the national and regional levels. This view is supported by the results from our Secretariat survey, where 31% of staff agreed strongly, and 25% mildly, that there is scope to increase this type of activity. No respondents disagreed with this view.

Formulation of the proposal

Proposal 17ii) is clearly drafted but lacks a number of key details to inform both implementation and review/evaluation.

Recommendation

4) Secretariat management should reformulate and develop Proposal 17ii) further as follows:

- *Build on the needs assessment exercise already carried out by the Secretariat to identify training requirements and define the training workshops to be developed;*
- *identify capacity needs and how these should be met;*
- *where regional and national training requirements are identified, create suitable metrics to monitor progress of delivery against these;*
- *create suitable metrics to monitor progress with building capacity; and*
- *subject to availability of resources, propose actual dates for national and regional workshops, so that there is a hard deadline to focus attention on timely development of the workshops.*

Cost savings and impacts on resources committed to implementation

The integration of capacity-development activities offers scope for sizeable cost efficiencies and/or an increase in resources focused on implementation. Indeed some integrated activities are already taking place between the two parts of the Secretariat, and there is scope to enhance and expand such activities further. If one part of the Secretariat attends a workshop organised by the other, it can benefit from the latter's planning, organisation and monetary investment. Similarly, delivering training on a joint basis can reduce travel costs for Secretariat staff members. Moreover, if two Secretariat representatives attend (one from each part of the Secretariat), this can increase the range of knowledge and trainer resources available to delegates, particularly if the sessions are designed so as to make optimum use of both trainers' time.

Barriers to implementation

It is clear from our interviews and surveys that capacity-building needs and priorities can vary greatly from country to country and region to region. For example, some developing countries use cheaper and less sophisticated chemicals, and less technologically advanced distribution methods, such as manual spraying. The capacity-building priorities of these countries are clearly very different from those of European countries operating industrial-scale farming methods. It will therefore be important for the Secretariat to ensure that integrated capacity development activities such as joint training are tailored to the specific needs and priorities of Parties in different regions. It will also be important to identify training workshop leaders who are competent in the requirements of all three Conventions with regards to the various aspects of pesticides, industrial chemicals and POPs.

In the past, the FAO-hosted part of the Secretariat organised field workshops on pesticides and invited colleagues from the UNEP-hosted part of the Secretariat. Their attendance would have been an ideal example of a complementary / 'synergistic' activity, i.e. the Geneva-based team using a meeting planned by the Rome-based team meeting to communicate, coordinate and educate Parties/stakeholders on the ground. However, these colleagues did not attend – according to UNEP and FAO-hosted Secretariat staff due to budgetary and time constraints.

Recommendation

5) Rome-based staff responsible for organising field workshops should continue to invite colleagues from the other part of the Secretariat to attend. This initiative should be supported by Secretariat management, for example by covering travel expenses and per diems, and encouraging staff (for example through internal information campaigns) to both invite colleagues from the other Secretariat and attend relevant events themselves where possible.

3.3 Proposal 17iii) Improved communication and promotion of national synergies among key stakeholders in the implementation of the three Conventions

Impact on coordination and communication

Nearly all the staff members we interviewed reported that one of the greatest challenges to achieving the aims of the Conventions is the lack of a synergised approach at the national/Party level. A joint and improved strategy for

communicating and promoting the need for national-level synergies would undoubtedly be a highly complementary approach. Its implementation would require (and hence encourage) regular cooperation between the parts of the Secretariat. It would also allow the UNEP-hosted part of the Secretariat to benefit from the network of contacts and country office contacts of the FAO-hosted part of the Secretariat, and conversely the FAO-hosted team to benefit from improved access to the UNEP network.

Feasibility

Communication and promotion of national synergies is certainly feasible from a skills, knowledge and technological perspective. The staff of both the FAO-hosted and UNEP-hosted parts of the Secretariat are keen to encourage such synergies, and to share their knowledge via all possible means: email, the clearing house mechanism, webinars and face-to-face meetings of the Conventions.

In our interviews, both the Parties to the Conventions and Secretariat staff acknowledged that national-level relationships and joint working are something of a bottleneck in the synergies process. The lack of a united approach by the separate, respective National Delegated Authorities, Competent Authorities, and Official Contact Points at national level presents a roadblock to synergised activities such as, for example, lifecycle management of chemicals and consolidated public awareness campaigns. Both Parties and Secretariat staff expressed a strong desire to overcome this challenge. Again, this view is supported by the Secretariat staff survey. Thirty-three percent of respondents agreed strongly, and 21% mildly, that there is further scope to improve the communication and promotion of national synergies among key stakeholders of the Conventions. No respondents disagreed with this view.

Formulation of the proposal

Proposal 17iii) is clearly drafted but lacks a number of key details to inform both implementation and review/evaluation.

Recommendation

6) Secretariat management should reformulate and develop Proposal 17iii) further as follows:

- *Identify (in consultation with the COPs as appropriate) the types of channels that will be used for communication and promotion of national level synergies;*
- *Create a 'marketing campaign' consisting of elements that might be disseminated via suitable communication channels i.e. a case study of cost efficiencies of national level synergies via email. This could be done in a logical and chronological order, guiding National Delegated Authorities step by step towards a synergised national level approach;*
- *Establish metrics to monitor the success of any 'marketing campaign'. These might include the numbers of responses/click-through rate from 'marketing' emails, or numbers of countries notifying the BRS Secretariat of progress towards national-level synergies. An alternative metric might be the number of newly established partnerships between industry and/or NGOs and National Authorities specifically aimed at joint implementation of one or more of the Conventions;*
- *Establish milestones for any 'marketing campaign; and*
- *Include any applicable activities within the BRS Programme of Work and Budget to ensure that there is oversight / accountability, and encourage full and timely implementation.*

Cost savings and impacts on resources committed to implementation

Whilst national-level synergies would be likely to reduce costs and resources at the Party level, they would have a limited impact on costs at the level of the FAO-hosted and UNEP-hosted parts of the Secretariat. However, where a Party is better synergised, the BRS Secretariat will be able to more efficiently serve and support implementation of the Conventions in that country. For example, a synergised single point of contact within a country would make it much easier for the BRS Secretariat to coordinate workshops and deliver consolidated guidance to that country.

Barriers to implementation

Improvements are needed in the communication and coordination between the FAO-hosted and UNEP-hosted parts of the Secretariat so that they can work together effectively and efficiently to promote a united and comprehensive communication plan at the national level. We suggest a number of possible improvements as part of our note on other potential synergies/benefits in **Annex 1**.

3.4 Proposal 18. Leveraging of the FAO's extensive programme and network of technical officers through the integration of the pesticide-related capacity development activities across the three Conventions with FAO's pesticide programme

Impact on coordination and communication

Where workshops and capacity-development activities are organised by the FAO-hosted part of the Secretariat, the UNEP-hosted part of the Secretariat would benefit from establishing contacts within the network of FAO country offices, not to mention FAO country officers themselves. This approach would improve communication and coordination, as well as helping to avoid duplication of activities - since the Secretariat and the FAO would not waste time performing separate but similar workshops.

Feasibility

Whilst theoretically possible, and very efficient/synergistic from the BRS point of view, further utilisation of the FAO pesticides programme and its country offices might not be practically feasible. The main reasons for this are budgetary and resourcing constraints. The FAO's Pesticides Programme and FAO country offices have their own annual work programmes, and limited budgets with which to carry them out. Moreover, the Pesticides Programme is directly governed by the FAO, and hence FAO priorities are likely to take precedence over BRS activities should any spare resources become available – a notion supported by our interviews with staff members from both Secretariats. A key limiting factor is that most of the FAO-led field activities are supported by external donor funds rather than the BRS budget, and hence are linked to specific objectives, deliverables and timelines which may not be fully compatible with BRS priorities.

Nevertheless we note that members of both parts of the Secretariat have expressed interest in this proposal – 29% of Secretariat staff agreed strongly, and 23% mildly, that there is scope to develop this aspect further. Only 4% disagreed.

Formulation of the proposal

Proposal 18 is clearly drafted but lacks a number of key details to inform both implementation and review/evaluation.

Recommendation

7) Secretariat management should reformulate and develop Proposal 18 further as follows:

- *identify specific capacity-development activities/opportunities that have commonalities with the FAO Pesticide Programme work plan – for example, workshops or capacity-building partnerships;*
- *monitor the number of instances of integrated capacity-building activities; and*
- *establish a date for a joint meeting between the UNEP and FAO parts of the Secretariat and FAO Pesticides Programme staff.*

Cost savings and impacts on resources committed to implementation

Greater use of the FAO network of contacts, staff and programmes at zero cost to the BRS Secretariat would certainly mean a reduction in administrative costs relative to activity (assuming that there are no time-intensive and costly negotiations between the FAO and UNEP to agree changes to working arrangements).

Barriers to implementation

We note that the BRS Conventions already benefit from approximately $1million per annum in 'zero cost' resources (staff time, facilities and services) supplied by the FAO.[11] Greater integration of BRS activities with the FAO's pesticide programme may increase this resource requirement further. However, given other priorities and budgetary pressures there is no guarantee that the FAO will be able to meet this greater need on a 'pro bono' basis as it has done to date.

3.5 Proposal 19. Exchange of staff whereby Secretariat staff in Geneva could be seconded to Rome to work on pesticide-related topics, on a short- or long-term basis

Impact on coordination and communication

Staff-swapping would give staff members a stronger understanding of the activities of the other part of the Secretariat. Staff would be able to acquire both theoretical knowledge and practical skills, such as an awareness of the national and regional implementation networks of colleagues in the other Secretariat (e.g. Party contacts, NGOs, partners). Upon their return, staff could then share this information further with colleagues from their original Secretariat.

Feasibility

Temporary staff-swapping does appear feasible, albeit with some challenges to implementation (discussed below), and staff appear to be in favour of such a programme. Of those who responded to the staff survey, 27% agreed strongly, and 28% mildly, that there is scope for further synergies in this respect. Only 5% disagreed with this view.

Formulation of the proposal

Proposal 19 is clearly drafted but lacks a number of key details to inform both implementation and review/evaluation.

Recommendation

8) Secretariat management should reformulate and develop Proposal 19 further as follows:

- *identify those staff members who i) are open to an exchange (for example through an email campaign / electronic survey) and ii) would clearly contribute to developing a critical mass of expertise upon their return to their original Secretariat (for example through a 'skills audit' carried out either via HR database review or electronic survey); and*
- *indicate a suitable point at which any staff swap might be implemented. For example, the end of an annual work programme cycle, or a month that would be best suited to accommodate induction and training of swapped staff members.*

Cost savings and impacts on resources committed to implementation

A staff exchange mechanism is likely to increase administrative costs to cover the logistics of identifying and arranging appropriate exchanges. Moreover, whilst it would improve the knowledge base and networking potential within the Secretariats, it is unlikely to increase the level of resources dedicated to implementation. We were informed by staff at both Secretariats that there have previously been attempts at arranging staff exchanges, but that these have been unsuccessful due to cost constraints and difficulties in agreeing mutually suitable candidates. These unsuccessful attempts have increased administrative costs and reduced staff time available for actual implementation.

Barriers to implementation

Staff members in both parts of the Secretariat informed us that staff exchanges have been pursued in the past, but with little success due to a number of barriers. Firstly, staff exchanges incur significant additional costs, including, for example, flights, accommodation and allowances. Secondly, both parts of the Secretariat must be satisfied with the skillset, experience and ways of working of the staff members being exchanged. Finally, staff members themselves must be keen (or at least willing) to relocate for a sufficiently long time to make the arrangement worthwhile. By implementing Recommendation 8 above, the Secretariat should be able to explore the size and significance of some of these barriers, and further clarify the feasibility of this proposal and the optimum means of implementing it.

[11] See document UNEP/FAO/CHW/RC/POPS/EXCOPS.2/INF/9.

Annex 1 - Other potential synergies not covered in the note

In order to maximise the value added of our review, this Annex outlines a number of other possible synergies and improvements which – although not included in the current proposals - were either proposed by stakeholders or identified by us in the course of fieldwork.

i) Significant structural / strategic changes

Our interviews, surveys and document review identified a small number of potential changes at the structural or strategic level, which – subject to further research and validation of the underlying assumptions – might generate further synergies in addition to those proposed in the Secretariat's note. These are as follows:

Introduction of a unified BRS budget

Another potential synergy which could generate significant financial and operational impacts would be the introduction of a unified core budget across all three Conventions. This would go hand-in-hand with assessing the achievement of the requirements of the Conventions by monitoring the Secretariat's progress towards delivering the activities in its Programme of Work, rather than monitoring the utilisation of its budget.

Such an approach might simplify accounting and budgetary activities, but is likely to be difficult to achieve in practice because not all countries contributing to the budgets are Parties to all three Conventions. Furthermore, it is likely that Parties prefer the level of financial transparency provided by the current system of accounting, which records, monitors and reports utilisation of each Convention budget separately.

A full feasibility study would help the Secretariat to understand these challenges more thoroughly. This could include internal and external stakeholder consultations to explore the practical and administrative implications of a pooled budget arrangement – for example, whether there is scope to apportion / pro-rate countries' contributions and associated expenditure equitably based on which Conventions they are party to, or whether income and expenditure disclosures could be disaggregated sufficiently to address concerns over transparency.

Coordination of implementation with Minamata / SAICM

It may be possible to increase coordinated implementation at the national level between the FAO, the UNEP-hosted Secretariat and the UNEP Chemicals and Waste Branch Special Programme for the implementation of the BRS and Minamata Conventions and the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) to further the transition towards lifecycle management of chemicals; a common goal of these organisations.[12] This working arrangement might take the form of a partnership network with regular quarterly coordination meetings.

Joint training for Rome-based and Geneva-based BRS Secretariat staff

A key finding of our survey was that 52% of staff agreed that there was scope for synergies to be realised via joint BRS Convention-related training for Rome-based and Geneva-based Secretariat staff. Staff suggested that this might help the teams to work "as one team", in terms of both knowledge-sharing and 'softer' relationship-building. This approach would naturally complement the staff exchange arrangements outlined in Proposal 19, since staff who have taken part in exchanges would be particularly well placed to identify and convey technical touch points to other staff from the two Secretariats.

UNEP/FAO Shared Contacts Database

Management might consider a mechanism such as a shared contacts database including both UNEP and FAO country and regional offices.

[12] As stated by SAICM, see:
http://www.saicm.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=72&Itemid=474
and the BRS Secretariat, see:
http://www.brsmeas.org/Implementation/KnowledgeManagementandOutreach/PublicAwareness/Outreach/LifeCyclSolutionstoEwaste/tabid/2699/language/en-US/Default.aspx

ii) Other potential 'quick wins'

Our fieldwork also identified a number of relatively straightforward operational changes which are also not part of the current proposals, but which could nonetheless generate small but incremental improvements to working arrangements between the UNEP and FAO-hosted parts of the Secretariats. These are set out briefly below.

- Increased regularity of joint management meetings between senior Rome-based and Geneva-based staff, including the Executive Secretaries. This would ensure that potential areas for cooperation and coordination are identified at an early stage;
- Establishment of (and adherence to) best-practice models for holding meetings. The UNEP and FAO-hosted parts of the Secretariat should ensure that they agree their own position to a given topic amongst themselves prior to attending joint meetings with the other Secretariat. This would improve the efficiency of meetings by avoiding one Secretariat effectively being an observer to the internal deliberations of the other Secretariat as to its position on the topic being discussed. Moreover, all meetings should have a pre-prepared agenda and a list of intended outputs or outcomes;
- Commitment to timely decision-making by both parts of the Secretariat so that they can work in a rapid and coordinated manner, rather than one part of the Secretariat being delayed by the other (or moving ahead independently of the other);
- More regular bilateral updates on the work performed by each Secretariat, increasing transparency of activities and reducing potential duplication;
- Improved communication and coordination between TAB and the FAO-hosted part of the Secretariat to enable a joint approach to technical assistance such as workshops and capacity development activities;
- The BRS Secretariats could develop training or BRS-related guidance/materials that could be delivered to FAO country offices, so that they could identify opportunities for cooperation in implementing activities relevant to the Conventions.

Annex 2 – Note by the BRS Secretariat on opportunities for further synergies among the Conventions' Secretariats and the FAO's Pesticide Programme

Extract from *UNEP/FAO/CHW/RC/POPS/EXCOPS.2/INF/9*:

'IV OPPORTUNITIES FOR FURTHER SYNERGIES AMONG THE CONVENTIONS' SECRETARIATS AND THE FAO'S PESTICIDE PROGRAMME

14. The FAO part of the Rotterdam Convention Secretariat contributes to all of the functional areas set out in the matrix-based structure of the Secretariats (Annex I of UNEP/FAO/CHW/RC/POPS/EXCOPS.2/2ADD.2). Staff cooperate with the four branches in carrying out activities related to technical assistance, scientific support, meeting organization and managerial activities. Technical assistance activities include workshops to develop national action plans (NAPs), capacity building and training activities with a focus on pesticides and SHPFs and working with partners and in particular technical officers in the FAO Regional and Subregional Offices.

15. As per the MoU, the FAO part of the Rotterdam Convention Secretariat organizes every second meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP 2, COP 4) and the Chemical Review Committee (CRC1, 3, 5, and 7). Meetings convened in Rome make use of FAO's meeting facilities and its logistic, administrative and technical support without additional costs.

16. The work of the Rotterdam Convention Secretariat is fully integrated with FAO's Pesticide Management Programme. The synergy process offers opportunities to consider closer technical cooperation or synergies between the technical activities of the Secretariats of the Basel and Stockholm Conventions with FAO's Pesticide Management Programme. FAO's expertise and on-going cooperation with countries is directly relevant to the identification of safer alternatives including pesticides and pest management practices, phasing out the use of POPs pesticides, and the management of hazardous pesticide wastes.

17. The opportunity to leverage FAO's work on pesticides in support of the technical synergies between FAO's work in lifecycle management of pesticides and the Secretariats of the Basel and Stockholm Conventions could include:

i) development of technical and policy guidelines on aspects of pesticide management that reflect the requirements of the three Conventions;

ii) capacity development including training workshops at the national and regional levels on pesticide management including the identification of alternatives and the management and disposal of obsolete pesticides and POP containing wastes;

iii) improved communication and promotion of national synergies among key stakeholders in the implementation of the three Conventions.

18. Integration of the pesticide related capacity development activities across the three Conventions with FAO's pesticide programme would be a cost effective and efficient mechanism to create further synergies among the Secretariats and at the national level and regional levels within and among member countries through leveraging of FAO's extensive programme and network of technical officers in the implementation of the three Conventions. Such integration would also demonstrate greater compliance with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.

19. Secretariat staff in Geneva are presently working across the three Conventions, and consideration should be given to the feasibility and possible advantages of integrating the work of the Basel and Stockholm Conventions with FAO's Pesticide Management Programme. A first step could be to develop a process to facilitate the exchange of staff whereby Secretariat staff in Geneva could be seconded to Rome to work on pesticide related topics, on a short or long term basis. This would allow for the development of a critical mass of expertise in industrial chemicals management in Geneva in cooperation with UNEP Chemicals and build on the pesticides expertise and technical programme that exists in Rome. Differences in staff costs between Rome and Geneva may also be a factor to consider.'

Annex 3 – Summary of review methodology

We designed this methodology to review the proposals set out in the note by the Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions on the organization and operation of the part of the Rotterdam Convention Secretariat hosted by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations to enhance synergies arrangements, and to advise the COPs of any follow-up action necessary at their meetings in 2017. The main strands of our methodology are set out below.

Surveys of key stakeholders

In order to gather key qualitative data on the operation and impact of the synergy arrangements, we conducted electronic surveys of key stakeholders at the central, regional and national level. To obtain sufficient coverage of key stakeholders (supplemented by interviews of representatives from other groups), we surveyed staff of both the UNEP-hosted BRS Secretariat and the FAO-hosted part of the Rotterdam Secretariat; FAO Regional/Country Offices; Parties to the Conventions; Partners, and Regional Centres.

The surveys were carried out using the BRS Secretariat's *Feedback Server 5* survey tool. Survey design, coding and analysis was performed by the Moore Stephens team.

The dates and response rates for each survey were as follows:

Survey	Dates	Number of responses	Response rate
Parties	8 June - 5 August 2016	Basel: 59 (58 Parties)	32%
		Rotterdam: 48 (46 Parties)	31%
		Stockholm: 64 (62 Parties)	36%
Secretariat	15 June - 22 July 2016	48	81%
Partners	15 June - 22 July 2016	14	<1%
FAO Regional/Country offices	15 June - 22 July 2016	11	69%
Regional Centres	15 June - 22 July 2016	10	44%

Semi-structured interviews

To explore qualitatively the relevant review themes, we carried out semi-structured interviews with key members of BRS Secretariat staff from the different branches (Executive Office, Conventions Operations, Technical Assistance, Scientific Support), as well as a sample of other stakeholders from Parties/Convention Bodies, Regional Centres and Partner organisations.

These interviews took place at the BRS Secretariat Head Office in Geneva, Switzerland; the FAO Head Office in Rome, Italy; during the tenth meeting of the Basel Convention Open-Ended Working Group in Nairobi, Kenya (which took place from 30 May to 2 June 2016); and by telephone and video conference.

The interviews followed prescribed topic guides tailored to the key themes of the review, supplemented by additional ad hoc questions. This allowed the review team to gather qualitative and contextual information in addition to the formal standardised data collected through of the electronic surveys.

In total we interviewed 93 people, with each interview lasting approximately 1 hour. **Annex 4** provides a full list of these interviewees.

Annex 4 – List of stakeholders interviewed

UNEP-part of the BRS Secretariat

Name	Position
Charles Avis	Public Information Officer, Conventions Operations Branch
Marylene Beau	Programme Officer, Conventions Operations Branch
Stephanie Cadet	Meeting Services Assistant, Conventions Operations Branch
Maria Cristina Cárdenas Fischer	Chief, Technical Assistance Branch
Francesca Cenni	Programme Officer, Technical Assistance Branch
Yvonne Ewang	Legal Officer, Conventions Operation Branch
Julien Hortoneda	Information Systems Officer, Conventions Operations Branch
Matthias Kern	Senior Programme Officer, Technical Assistance Branch
Andrea Lechner	Programme Officer, Conventions Operations Branch
Melisa Lim	Programme Officer, Scientific Support Branch
Alexander Mangwiro	Programme Officer, Technical Assistance Branch
Gamini Manuweera	Programme Officer, Scientific Support Branch
Laura Meszaros	Programme Officer, Office of the Executive Secretary
Frank Moser	Programme Officer, Office of the Executive Secretary
Bruce Noronha	Administrative Officer, Office of the Executive Secretary
David Ogden	Chief, Conventions Operations Branch
Kei Ohno Woodall	Programme Officer, Scientific Support Branch
Satu Ojaluoma	Administrative Officer, Office of the Executive Secretary
Abiola Olanipekun	Chief, Scientific Support Branch
Rolph Payet	Executive Secretary, BRS Conventions
Osmany Pereira Gonzalez	Information and Conference Services Manager, Conventions Operations Branch
Ana Priceputu	Programme Officer, Scientific Support Branch
Suman Sharma	Programme Officer, Technical Assistance Branch
Kerstin Stendahl	Deputy Executive Secretary, BRS Conventions
Amélie Taoufiq-Cailliau	Legal Officer, Conventions Operations Branch
Tatiana Terekhova	Programme Officer, Technical Assistance Branch
Carla Valle-Klann	Programme Officer, Scientific Support Branch
Juliette Voinov Kohler	Policy and Legal Advisor, Conventions Operations Branch

Name	Position
Susan Wingfield	Programme Officer, Conventions Operations Branch

FAO part of the Rotterdam Secretariat and FAO Pesticides Programme

Name	Position
Christine Fuell	Senior Technical Officer
Bill Murray	Deputy Director, Plant Production and Protection Division / Executive Secretary for the FAO part of the Rotterdam Convention
Francesca Mancini	Operations Officer / Sustainable Agriculture Expert
Aleksandar Mihajlovski	Agriculture Officer
Inma Roda Martin	Co-ordinator
Elisabetta Tagliati	Programme Officer
Richard Thompson	Agricultural Officer
Gerold Wyrwal	Agricultural Officer
Yun Zhou	Technical Officer

UNEP

Name	Position
Abdouraman Bary	Regional Sub-programme Coordinator for Chemicals and Wastes, UNEP Regional Office for Africa
Jacob Duer	Coordinator MInamata Convention
Achim Halpaap	Head, Chemicals and Waste Branch, Division of Technology, Industry and Economics
Maarten Kappelle	Coordinator, Sub-Programme on Chemicals & Waste
Tim Kasten	Deputy Director, Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (DTIE)
Elizabeth Mrema	Director, Division of Environmental Law and Conventions (DELC)
Kakuko Nagatani	Regional Sub-programme Coordinator for Chemicals and Waste, UNEP Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
Jordi Pon	Regional Sub-programme Coordinator for Chemicals and Waste, UNEP Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean

Parties

Name	Position	Country
Azhari Omer Abdelbagi	Undersecretary, Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research	Sudan
Sam Adu-Kumi	President of Stockholm Convention Bureau	Ghana
Ali Abdullah Al-Dobhani	Former Vice President of Stockholm Convention Bureau	Yemen

Name	Position	Country
Hala Sultan Said Al Easa	Government Representative	Qatar
Nguyen Anh-Tuan	Vice President of Stockholm Convention Bureau	Vietnam
Dragan Asanovic	Vice President of Basel Convention Bureau	Montenegro
Jahisiah Benoit	Senator, Environmental Coordinating Unit	Dominica
Ana Berejiani	Vice President of Stockholm Convention Bureau	Georgia
Cristina Andrea Briel	Encargada de la Sección Economía y Comercio, Señora Primera Secretaria	Argentina
Kyunghee Choi	Director General, Environmental Health Research Department / National Institute of Environmental Research, Ministry of Environment	Republic of Korea
Anne Daniel	General Counsel, Constitutional, Administrative and International Law Section, Justice Canada	Canada
Trecia David	Vice President of Rotterdam Convention Bureau	Guyana
Magda Frydrych	Chief Specialist, Department of Risk Assessment Bureau for Chemical Substances	Poland
Floyd George	Open-Ended Working Group Co-Chair (Technical)	Dominica
Ana García González	Head of Service, Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environmental Affairs	Spain
Floria Roa-Gutierrez	Professor, Institute of Technology (ITCR)	Costa Rica
Juergen Helbig	Chair of the Chemical Review Committee, Ex-officio Member of Rotterdam Convention Bureau, European Union	European Commission
Reginald Hernaus	Vice President of Stockholm Convention Bureau	Netherlands
Silvija Nora Kalnins	Vice President of Rotterdam Convention Bureau	Latvia
David Kapindula	Principal Inspector, Environmental Management Agency	Zambia
Paul Philip Kesby	Director, Hazardous Waste, Environment Standards Division, Department of Environment	Australia
Prakash Kowlesser	Director, Solid Waste Management Division. Ministry of Local Government and Outer Islands	Mauritius
Abderrazak Marzouki	Vice President of Basel Convention Bureau	Tunisia
Andrew McNee	Vice President of Stockholm Convention Bureau	Australia
Estefania Morerira	Chair of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee, Ex-officio Member of Stockholm Convention Bureau	Brazil
Marcus Natta	Vice President of Stockholm Convention Bureau	St Kitts
Francis Kihumba Njuguna	Assistant Director of Environment, National Environment Management Authority, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	Kenya

Name	Position	Country
Daiana Ozola	Vice President of Stockholm Convention Bureau	Latvia
Jorge Peydro-Aznar	Policy Officer, DG Environment	European Commission
Agustina Camilli Prado	Deputy Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Eastern Republic of Uruguay to the UN Office and other international organizations in Geneva	Uruguay
Hassan Rahimi Majd	Former Vice President of Rotterdam Convention Bureau	Iran
Geri-Geronimo Romero Sañez	Section Chief, Hazardous Waste Management Section, Environmental Management Bureau	Philippines
Lone Schou	Senior Advisor on International Issues, Chemicals Department, Danish Environmental Protection Agency	Denmark
Santiago Dávila Sena	Open-Ended Working Group Co-Chair (Legal)	Spain
Timo Seppälä	Senior Adviser, Centre for Sustainable Consumption and Production / Contaminants Unit, Finnish Environment Institute	Finland
Petronella Shoko	Director, Environmental Management Agency	Zimbabwe
Juan Simonelli	Chair of the Implementation and Compliance Committee, Ex-officio Member of Basel Convention Bureau	Argentina
Jane Stratford	Team Leader, Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs	UK
Caroline Theka	Vice President of Rotterdam Convention Bureau	Malawi
Els Van de Velde	Vice President of Basel Convention Bureau	Belgium
Luis Ignacio Vayas Valdivieso	Vice President of Stockholm Convention Bureau	Ecuador
Gordana Vesligaj	Senior Expert Advisor, Ministry of Environmental and Nature Protection, Sector for sustainable waste management, plans, programmes and information system	Croatia
Franz Xaver Perrez	President of Rotterdam Convention Bureau	Switzerland

FAO Regional/Country Offices

Name	Position
Shoki Al Dobai	Regional Plant Protection Officer, FAO Regional Office for the Near East, Egypt
Joyce Mulila Mitti	Plant Production and Protection Officer, FAO sub-Regional Office for Southern Africa, Zimbabwe

Regional Centres

Name	Position
Leila Devia	Director, Basel Convention Regional Centre for the South American Region in Argentina
Jinhui Li	Director, Basel Convention Regional Centre for the Asia and Pacific Region in China

Partners

Name	Position
Ross Bartley	Environmental and Technical Director, Bureau of International Recycling
Gina Killikelly	Back Compliance Consultant, Dell
Naoko Ishii	CEO and Chairperson, Global Environment Facility
Meriel Watts	Coordinator, PAN Asia and the Pacific
Tadesse Omera	Coordinator, PAN Ethiopia
James Puckett	Executive Director, Basel Action Network (BAN)
Paul Quickert	Environmental Program Manager, Cisco Services
Alan David Watson	Senior Scientist, Public Interest Consultant, International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN)
Sheila Willis	Head of International Programmes, PAN UK

Annex 5 – Survey of Secretariat staff: Summary of questions and results

Efficiency

These questions relate to the efficiency of staffing structures within the Secretariat's matrix management structure. We define efficiency here as 'fulfilling all necessary tasks without wasting time or resources'.

3. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

a. My role and responsibilities within the structure of the BRS Secretariat are clearly defined.

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	6%	6%	6%	17%	67%	0%	100%
Executive Office	0%	14%	0%	29%	57%	0%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	0%	17%	33%	33%	17%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	13%	13%	0%	75%	0%	100%
Technical Assistance	22%	0%	0%	44%	33%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**6%**	**6%**	**6%**	**23%**	**56%**	**2%**	**100%**

b. My role and responsibilities within the structure of the BRS Secretariat are clearly defined in relation to the roles and responsibilities of other staff members in the Geneva Secretariat.

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	6%	6%	6%	44%	39%	0%	100%
Executive Office	0%	14%	0%	29%	57%	0%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	0%	33%	33%	17%	17%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	13%	13%	0%	63%	13%	100%
Technical Assistance	22%	11%	11%	22%	33%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**6%**	**8%**	**10%**	**29%**	**42%**	**4%**	**100%**

c. My role and responsibilities within the structure of the BRS Secretariat are clearly defined in relation to the roles and responsibilities of other staff members in the Rome Secretariat.

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	0%	0%	11%	44%	39%	6%	100%
Executive Office	0%	14%	0%	43%	14%	29%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	0%	0%	17%	50%	33%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	0%	0%	0%	63%	38%	100%
Technical Assistance	22%	22%	11%	22%	22%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**4%**	**6%**	**6%**	**29%**	**38%**	**17%**	**100%**

d. My role and responsibilities within the structure of the BRS Secretariat are clearly defined in relation to roles and responsibilities of staff members in other organizations (e.g. UNEP, FAO)

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	6%	6%	11%	22%	44%	11%	100%
Executive Office	0%	0%	14%	57%	14%	14%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	0%	33%	17%	33%	17%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	0%	0%	0%	88%	13%	100%
Technical Assistance	11%	0%	22%	11%	44%	11%	100%
Grand Total	**4%**	**2%**	**15%**	**21%**	**46%**	**13%**	**100%**

e. My actual activity corresponds to my official role and responsibilities within the structure of the BRS Secretariat.

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	11%	0%	0%	28%	56%	6%	100%
Executive Office	0%	0%	0%	57%	43%	0%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	0%	17%	50%	17%	17%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	0%	13%	25%	63%	0%	100%
Technical Assistance	11%	22%	0%	22%	44%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**6%**	**4%**	**4%**	**33%**	**48%**	**4%**	**100%**

f. As far as I know, there is no unnecessary duplication of responsibilities between my documented job role/description and the roles of other staff within the Geneva Secretariat.

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	6%	0%	6%	22%	61%	6%	100%
Executive Office	0%	14%	0%	14%	71%	0%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	0%	33%	17%	33%	17%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	13%	13%	0%	75%	0%	100%
Technical Assistance	22%	11%	11%	22%	33%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**6%**	**6%**	**10%**	**17%**	**56%**	**4%**	**100%**

g. As far as I know, there is no unnecessary duplication of my actual activities and the actual activities of other staff within the Geneva Secretariat.

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	6%	0%	0%	33%	56%	6%	100%
Executive Office	0%	0%	0%	29%	71%	0%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	0%	33%	17%	33%	17%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	13%	13%	0%	75%	0%	100%
Technical Assistance	22%	11%	11%	22%	33%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**6%**	**4%**	**8%**	**23%**	**54%**	**4%**	**100%**

h. As far as I know, there is no unnecessary duplication of responsibilities between my documented job role/description and the roles of other staff within the Rome Secretariat.

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	0%	0%	6%	22%	61%	11%	100%
Executive Office	0%	14%	0%	14%	43%	29%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	0%	0%	17%	67%	17%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	0%	13%	0%	50%	38%	100%
Technical Assistance	11%	11%	11%	22%	33%	11%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**4%**	**6%**	**17%**	**52%**	**19%**	**100%**

i. As far as I know, there is no unnecessary duplication of actual activities between my role and the roles of other staff within the Rome Secretariat.

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	0%	0%	6%	22%	56%	17%	100%
Executive Office	0%	14%	0%	14%	57%	14%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	0%	0%	17%	67%	17%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	0%	13%	0%	50%	38%	100%
Technical Assistance	22%	11%	11%	22%	22%	11%	100%
Grand Total	**4%**	**4%**	**6%**	**17%**	**50%**	**19%**	**100%**

5. On a scale of 1 to 5 (where '1' is 'very inefficient' and '5' is 'very efficient'), in your opinion how efficient are the following?

a. My branch of the BRS Secretariat

	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	6%	0%	11%	28%	56%	0%	100%
Executive Office	0%	0%	43%	57%	0%	0%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	0%	17%	67%	0%	17%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	0%	25%	38%	38%	0%	100%
Technical Assistance	22%	11%	33%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**6%**	**2%**	**23%**	**40%**	**27%**	**2%**	**100%**

b. The BRS Secretariat overall

	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	6%	0%	50%	33%	11%	0%	100%
Executive Office	0%	14%	29%	57%	0%	0%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	17%	83%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	13%	38%	38%	0%	13%	100%
Technical Assistance	0%	56%	11%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**17%**	**42%**	**33%**	**4%**	**2%**	**100%**

7. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

a. The implementation of the matrix structure within the BRS Secretariat has made the way I perform my work more efficient.

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	17%	17%	22%	28%	11%	6%	100%
Executive Office	14%	14%	14%	29%	14%	14%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	50%	17%	0%	0%	33%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	38%	38%	0%	25%	0%	100%
Technical Assistance	11%	0%	44%	0%	22%	22%	100%
Grand Total	**10%**	**21%**	**27%**	**15%**	**15%**	**13%**	**100%**

b. Overall, the BRS Secretariat is more efficient now than before the matrix structure was implemented.

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	6%	17%	28%	28%	11%	11%	100%
Executive Office	14%	0%	14%	14%	29%	29%	100%
Rome Secretariat	17%	50%	17%	0%	0%	17%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	38%	38%	0%	13%	13%	100%
Technical Assistance	11%	11%	22%	0%	33%	22%	100%
Grand Total	**8%**	**21%**	**25%**	**13%**	**17%**	**17%**	**100%**

Effectiveness

These questions are about the effectiveness with which the Secretariat matrix management structure operates. We define effectiveness here as 'achieving desired results or impacts'.

9. On a scale of 1 to 5 (where '1' is 'very ineffective' and '5' is 'very effective'), in your opinion how effective are the following in supporting BRS implementation?

a. My branch of the BRS Secretariat

	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	0%	0%	17%	33%	44%	6%	100%
Executive Office	14%	0%	43%	29%	14%	0%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	0%	17%	50%	0%	33%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	0%	25%	38%	38%	0%	100%
Technical Assistance	22%	11%	44%	22%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**6%**	**2%**	**27%**	**33%**	**25%**	**6%**	**100%**

b. The BRS Secretariat overall

	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	6%	0%	11%	33%	33%	17%	100%
Executive Office	14%	14%	43%	29%	0%	0%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	0%	17%	50%	0%	33%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	0%	13%	75%	13%	0%	100%
Technical Assistance	22%	33%	22%	22%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**8%**	**8%**	**19%**	**40%**	**15%**	**10%**	**100%**

c. The level of authority delegated to me in order to perform my own role and responsibilities

	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	0%	0%	17%	33%	44%	6%	100%
Executive Office	14%	0%	43%	29%	14%	0%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	0%	17%	50%	0%	33%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	0%	25%	38%	38%	0%	100%
Technical Assistance	22%	11%	44%	22%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**6%**	**2%**	**27%**	**33%**	**25%**	**6%**	**100%**

11. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

a. I find that I am more effective now at supporting implementation of the Conventions than before the matrix structure was implemented.

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	6%	11%	28%	22%	22%	11%	100%
Executive Office	14%	0%	14%	14%	14%	43%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	17%	50%	0%	0%	33%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	25%	38%	13%	13%	13%	100%
Technical Assistance	0%	22%	33%	11%	11%	22%	100%
Grand Total	**4%**	**15%**	**31%**	**15%**	**15%**	**21%**	**100%**

b. Overall, the BRS Secretariat is more effective now at supporting implementation of the Conventions than before the matrix structure was implemented.

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	6%	6%	39%	17%	22%	11%	100%
Executive Office	14%	0%	0%	14%	29%	43%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	33%	33%	0%	0%	33%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	38%	38%	0%	13%	13%	100%
Technical Assistance	11%	11%	22%	11%	22%	22%	100%
Grand Total	**6%**	**15%**	**29%**	**10%**	**19%**	**21%**	**100%**

13. How would you rate the following activities of the Secretariat?

a. Ability to stick to deadlines set internally by Secretariat management

	Very poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	0%	6%	28%	50%	11%	6%	100%
Executive Office	0%	14%	29%	29%	14%	14%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	0%	17%	50%	0%	33%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	0%	25%	75%	0%	0%	100%
Technical Assistance	11%	0%	44%	44%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**4%**	**29%**	**50%**	**6%**	**8%**	**100%**

b. Ability to stick to deadlines set externally, for example by CoPs, parties, partners, etc.

	Very poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	-	0%	22%	39%	33%	6%	100%
Executive Office	-	14%	14%	14%	29%	29%	100%
Rome Secretariat	-	0%	17%	33%	33%	17%	100%
Scientific Support	-	0%	0%	63%	38%	0%	100%
Technical Assistance	-	22%	11%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**6%**	**15%**	**38%**	**33%**	**8%**	**100%**

c. Quality of your team/department outputs

	Very poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	-	0%	0%	22%	44%	6%	100%
Executive Office	-	0%	14%	43%	14%	0%	100%
Rome Secretariat	-	0%	0%	17%	33%	17%	100%
Scientific Support	-	0%	0%	63%	38%	0%	100%
Technical Assistance	-	11%	22%	33%	22%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**2%**	**6%**	**33%**	**33%**	**4%**	**100%**

d. Quality of the Secretariat outputs overall

	Very poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	-	6%	28%	50%	11%	6%	100%
Executive Office	-	0%	29%	57%	14%	0%	100%
Rome Secretariat	-	17%	33%	33%	0%	17%	100%
Scientific Support	-	0%	0%	75%	13%	13%	100%
Technical Assistance	-	11%	22%	33%	22%	11%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**6%**	**23%**	**50%**	**13%**	**8%**	**100%**

e. Communication and coordination between the branches (including Executive Office) of the Secretariat

	Very poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	11%	17%	44%	17%	6%	6%	100%
Executive Office	0%	0%	43%	43%	0%	14%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	33%	50%	0%	0%	17%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	38%	25%	38%	0%	0%	100%
Technical Assistance	11%	67%	11%	11%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**6%**	**29%**	**35%**	**21%**	**2%**	**6%**	**100%**

f. Decision-making within your branch (Chief of Branch being highest level of management in this instance)

	Very poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	6%	0%	28%	11%	44%	11%	100%
Executive Office	0%	0%	14%	57%	0%	29%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	33%	33%	17%	0%	17%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	0%	50%	38%	13%	0%	100%
Technical Assistance	22%	33%	22%	11%	11%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**6%**	**10%**	**29%**	**23%**	**21%**	**10%**	**100%**

g. Decision-making within the Secretariat overall (Executive Director being the highest level of management in this instance)

	Very poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	6%	6%	33%	39%	6%	11%	100%
Executive Office	0%	0%	29%	43%	14%	14%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	33%	50%	0%	0%	17%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	13%	38%	38%	0%	13%	100%
Technical Assistance	11%	0%	44%	22%	11%	11%	100%
Grand Total	**4%**	**8%**	**38%**	**31%**	**6%**	**13%**	**100%**

h. Use of UNEP network, knowledge and resources for the purposes of achieving/furthering the aims of BRS

	Very poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	0%	11%	39%	28%	6%	17%	100%
Executive Office	0%	29%	14%	43%	0%	14%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	0%	17%	0%	0%	83%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	0%	63%	38%	0%	0%	100%
Technical Assistance	11%	11%	44%	22%	0%	11%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**10%**	**38%**	**27%**	**2%**	**21%**	**100%**

i. Use of FAO network, knowledge and resources for the purposes of achieving/furthering the aims of BRS

	Very poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	0%	22%	28%	22%	6%	22%	100%
Executive Office	0%	29%	14%	0%	0%	57%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	0%	17%	33%	33%	17%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	0%	25%	25%	0%	50%	100%
Technical Assistance	22%	11%	33%	0%	0%	33%	100%
Grand Total	**4%**	**15%**	**25%**	**17%**	**6%**	**33%**	**100%**

J. Effectiveness of Secretariat meetings in producing actionable outputs or achieving the aims of the meeting (Secretariat meetings are those within and across branches, teams and management levels (excluding COPs, Working Groups))

	Very poor	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	0%	6%	39%	44%	6%	6%	100%
Executive Office	0%	0%	14%	43%	14%	29%	100%
Rome Secretariat	17%	0%	17%	50%	0%	17%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	13%	38%	25%	13%	13%	100%
Technical Assistance	11%	11%	11%	44%	11%	11%	100%
Grand Total	**4%**	**6%**	**27%**	**42%**	**8%**	**13%**	**100%**

Section 2 – Questions to inform the review of proposals on the organization and operation of the part of the Rotterdam Convention Secretariat hosted by the Food and Agriculture Organization

These questions relate to proposals by the BRS Secretariat on the organization and operation of the part of the Rotterdam Convention Secretariat hosted by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. The aim of this review is to enhance cooperation and coordination among the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions.

14. To what extent do you agree that there is scope to realise further synergies between the activities of the UNEP-part of the BRS Secretariat and the FAO part of the BRS Secretariat in the following areas?

a. Capacity development including training workshops at the national and regional levels on pesticide management including the identification of alternatives and the management and disposal of obsolete pesticides and POP containing wastes

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	0%	-	11%	22%	28%	39%	100%
Executive Office	0%	-	0%	14%	43%	43%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	-	33%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	-	13%	25%	13%	50%	100%
Technical Assistance	11%	-	33%	11%	44%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**-**	**17%**	**21%**	**31%**	**29%**	**100%**

b. Development of technical and policy guidelines on aspects of pesticide management that reflect the requirements of the three Conventions

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	-	-	17%	17%	28%	39%	100%
Executive Office	-	-	0%	14%	43%	43%	100%
Rome Secretariat	-	-	0%	50%	50%	0%	100%
Scientific Support	-	-	13%	25%	13%	50%	100%
Technical Assistance	-	-	33%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**-**	**15%**	**25%**	**31%**	**29%**	**100%**

c. Communication and promotion of national synergies among key stakeholders in the implementation of the three Conventions, including National Delegated Authorities

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	-	-	22%	22%	28%	28%	100%
Executive Office	-	-	0%	0%	57%	43%	100%
Rome Secretariat	-	-	33%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Scientific Support	-	-	13%	25%	13%	50%	100%
Technical Assistance	-	-	22%	22%	44%	11%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**-**	**19%**	**21%**	**33%**	**27%**	**100%**

d. Increased use of the FAO network of country offices and other contacts

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	0%	6%	17%	22%	33%	22%	100%
Executive Office	0%	0%	0%	0%	57%	43%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	0%	13%	25%	0%	63%	100%
Technical Assistance	11%	0%	33%	33%	22%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**2%**	**19%**	**23%**	**29%**	**25%**	**100%**

e. Further integration with the FAO's pesticide programme

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	-	11%	22%	17%	17%	33%	100%
Executive Office	-	14%	0%	14%	29%	43%	100%
Rome Secretariat	-	0%	50%	33%	17%	0%	100%
Scientific Support	-	0%	13%	25%	0%	63%	100%
Technical Assistance	-	11%	22%	22%	33%	11%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**8%**	**21%**	**21%**	**19%**	**31%**	**100%**

f. Short-term or long-term staff exchange secondments between Rome and Geneva (both directions)

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	0%	6%	28%	17%	28%	22%	100%
Executive Office	0%	0%	0%	29%	29%	43%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	17%	17%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Scientific Support	13%	0%	13%	25%	0%	50%	100%
Technical Assistance	0%	0%	11%	44%	44%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**4%**	**17%**	**27%**	**27%**	**23%**	**100%**

g. Joint internal training including both Rome based and Geneva based Secretariat staff

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	0%	6%	22%	11%	33%	28%	100%
Executive Office	0%	0%	14%	14%	29%	43%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	0%	17%	50%	33%	0%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	0%	25%	13%	13%	50%	100%
Technical Assistance	11%	0%	11%	33%	44%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**2%**	**19%**	**21%**	**31%**	**25%**	**100%**

15. Do you think there are barriers to realising further synergies between the activities of the UNEP Secretariat and the FAO Rome Secretariat?

	No	Yes
Conventions Operations	65%	35%
Executive Office	33%	67%
Rome Secretariat	17%	83%
Scientific Support	67%	33%
Technical Assistance	25%	75%
Grand Total	**47%**	**53%**

17. To what extent do you agree with the following statement?

a. The advice, guidance and support provided to Parties and other stakeholders by the Geneva Secretariat is always consistent with the advice and guidance provided to them by the Rome Secretariat.

	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	6%	17%	11%	28%	11%	28%	100%
Executive Office	0%	29%	14%	0%	14%	43%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	33%	33%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	0%	25%	13%	25%	38%	100%
Technical Assistance	11%	22%	22%	11%	0%	33%	100%
Grand Total	**4%**	**19%**	**19%**	**19%**	**10%**	**29%**	**100%**

Section 3 – Questions to inform the overall review of synergy arrangements

These questions relate to your views on the Secretariat's contribution to overall synergies arrangements.

19. On a scale of 1 to 5 (where '1' is 'very badly' and '5' is 'very well'), how well do you think the BRS Secretariat currently exercises its functions with respect to:

a. the Basel Convention

	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	0%	0%	22%	50%	22%	6%	100%
Executive Office	0%	0%	0%	43%	14%	43%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	0%	0%	17%	0%	83%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	0%	13%	63%	25%	0%	100%
Technical Assistance	11%	11%	33%	44%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**2%**	**17%**	**46%**	**15%**	**19%**	**100%**

b. the Rotterdam Convention

	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	-	6%	28%	44%	17%	6%	100%
Executive Office	-	0%	29%	14%	14%	43%	100%
Rome Secretariat	-	17%	50%	17%	0%	17%	100%
Scientific Support	-	0%	13%	50%	13%	25%	100%
Technical Assistance	-	22%	22%	44%	0%	11%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**8%**	**27%**	**38%**	**10%**	**17%**	**100%**

c. the Stockholm Convention

	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	-	-	17%	50%	28%	6%	100%
Executive Office	-	-	0%	43%	14%	43%	100%
Rome Secretariat	-	-	17%	0%	0%	83%	100%
Scientific Support	-	-	13%	75%	13%	0%	100%
Technical Assistance	-	-	44%	44%	11%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**-**	**19%**	**46%**	**17%**	**19%**	**100%**

d. synergies decisions

	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	-	-	22%	56%	17%	6%	100%
Executive Office	-	-	14%	29%	14%	43%	100%
Rome Secretariat	-	-	33%	17%	0%	50%	100%
Scientific Support	-	-	13%	63%	25%	0%	100%
Technical Assistance	-	-	33%	44%	22%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**-**	**23%**	**46%**	**17%**	**15%**	**100%**

e. internal management decisions (highest authority being Executive Director)

	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	6%	11%	39%	28%	0%	17%	100%
Executive Office	0%	0%	14%	43%	14%	29%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	0%	33%	17%	0%	50%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	0%	25%	38%	13%	25%	100%
Technical Assistance	11%	0%	44%	22%	22%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**4%**	**4%**	**33%**	**29%**	**8%**	**21%**	**100%**

f. ensuring communication amongst branches and locations of the BRS Secretariat (Rome and Geneva)

	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	6%	28%	39%	17%	6%	6%	100%
Executive Office	0%	14%	14%	29%	0%	43%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	67%	0%	17%	0%	17%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	0%	50%	38%	0%	13%	100%
Technical Assistance	11%	33%	44%	11%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**4%**	**27%**	**33%**	**21%**	**2%**	**13%**	**100%**

g. ensuring coordination amongst branches and locations of the BRS Secretariat (Rome and Geneva)

	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Conventions Operations	0%	33%	39%	17%	6%	6%	100%
Executive Office	14%	0%	14%	29%	0%	43%	100%
Rome Secretariat	0%	67%	0%	17%	0%	17%	100%
Scientific Support	0%	0%	50%	38%	0%	13%	100%
Technical Assistance	11%	22%	56%	11%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**4%**	**25%**	**35%**	**21%**	**2%**	**13%**	**100%**

Annex 6 – Survey of Parties to the BRS Conventions – Summary of questions and results

1. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

a. Capacity building (policy)

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	7%	7%	30%	30%	4%	22%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	42%	33%	25%	0%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	33%	44%	6%	17%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	10%	28%	17%	45%	100%
Middle East	0%	9%	18%	9%	36%	27%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**3%**	**24%**	**30%**	**14%**	**27%**	**100%**

b. Capacity building (legal and institutional frameworks)

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	7%	4%	41%	26%	7%	15%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	42%	42%	8%	8%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	28%	44%	6%	22%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	10%	31%	14%	45%	100%
Middle East	0%	0%	27%	18%	36%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**1%**	**28%**	**32%**	**12%**	**26%**	**100%**

c. Capacity building (scientific and technical)

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	11%	4%	30%	33%	11%	15%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	42%	50%	8%	0%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	33%	28%	22%	17%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	17%	24%	14%	45%	100%
Middle East	0%	9%	18%	18%	36%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**3%**	**1%**	**27%**	**30%**	**16%**	**23%**	**100%**

d. Training via face-to-face workshops and projects

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	7%	33%	22%	26%	7%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	25%	58%	8%	8%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	28%	33%	22%	17%	100%
Europe	0%	7%	21%	17%	14%	41%	100%
Middle East	9%	9%	9%	18%	36%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**5%**	**24%**	**27%**	**20%**	**21%**	**100%**

e. Training via webinars and online sessions

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	0%	19%	37%	37%	4%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	42%	33%	25%	0%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	6%	28%	61%	6%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	7%	28%	21%	45%	100%
Middle East	9%	0%	18%	18%	36%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**0%**	**15%**	**30%**	**35%**	**18%**	**100%**

f. Needs assessment

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	7%	4%	33%	30%	11%	15%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	50%	33%	17%	0%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	22%	17%	33%	28%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	24%	17%	17%	41%	100%
Middle East	9%	9%	18%	18%	36%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**2%**	**29%**	**22%**	**20%**	**24%**	**100%**

g. Development of tools

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	11%	0%	30%	11%	33%	15%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	50%	33%	17%	0%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	17%	33%	33%	17%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	17%	24%	17%	41%	100%
Middle East	9%	9%	18%	27%	27%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**3%**	**1%**	**24%**	**23%**	**26%**	**22%**	**100%**

3. In the following areas, how does the quantity of Technical Assistance you now receive compare with what you received before the implementation of synergies arrangements in 2011?

a. Capacity building (policy)

Region	Much less now	Slightly less now	It is the same now	Slightly more now	Much more now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	7%	7%	33%	19%	11%	22%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	33%	42%	8%	17%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	56%	22%	6%	17%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	14%	24%	17%	45%	100%
Middle East	9%	9%	27%	9%	36%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**3%**	**31%**	**22%**	**14%**	**28%**	**100%**

b. Capacity building (legal and institutional frameworks)

Region	Much less now	Slightly less now	It is the same now	Slightly more now	Much more now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	7%	4%	37%	26%	7%	19%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	42%	33%	8%	17%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	44%	28%	6%	22%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	10%	28%	17%	45%	100%
Middle East	9%	0%	36%	18%	27%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**1%**	**31%**	**27%**	**12%**	**28%**	**100%**

c. Capacity building (scientific and technical)

Region	Much less now	Slightly less now	It is the same now	Slightly more now	Much more now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	7%	4%	22%	22%	26%	19%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	33%	50%	8%	8%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	39%	33%	6%	22%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	14%	24%	17%	45%	100%
Middle East	9%	9%	27%	9%	36%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**2%**	**24%**	**27%**	**18%**	**27%**	**100%**

d. Training via face-to-face workshops and projects

Region	Much less now	Slightly less now	It is the same now	Slightly more now	Much more now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	7%	15%	26%	26%	19%	15%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	33%	42%	17%	8%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	56%	22%	6%	17%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	14%	31%	14%	41%	100%
Middle East	9%	9%	18%	9%	36%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**1%**	**5%**	**28%**	**27%**	**16%**	**23%**	**100%**

e. Training via webinars and online sessions

Region	Much less now	Slightly less now	It is the same now	Slightly more now	Much more now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	26%	30%	33%	11%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	33%	42%	17%	8%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	17%	22%	56%	6%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	7%	31%	17%	45%	100%
Middle East	9%	0%	9%	27%	36%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**1%**	**0%**	**17%**	**30%**	**31%**	**21%**	**100%**

f. Needs assessment

Region	Much less now	Slightly less now	It is the same now	Slightly more now	Much more now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	7%	44%	15%	11%	19%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	42%	33%	17%	8%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	39%	28%	11%	22%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	24%	21%	14%	41%	100%
Middle East	0%	9%	27%	9%	36%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**1%**	**3%**	**35%**	**20%**	**15%**	**26%**	**100%**

g. Development of tools

Region	Much less now	Slightly less now	It is the same now	Slightly more now	Much more now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	4%	30%	19%	26%	19%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	42%	33%	17%	8%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	33%	28%	17%	22%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	14%	28%	17%	41%	100%
Middle East	0%	9%	27%	18%	27%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**1%**	**2%**	**27%**	**24%**	**20%**	**26%**	**100%**

5. On a scale of 1 to 5 (where '1' is 'not at all well' and '5' is 'very well'), how well does the BRS Secretariat meet your needs through the following activities:

a. Capacity building (policy)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	15%	4%	26%	30%	11%	15%	100%
Asia	0%	8%	42%	33%	8%	8%	100%
Central & South America	6%	6%	39%	39%	6%	6%	100%
Europe	0%	7%	7%	38%	21%	28%	100%
Middle East	9%	9%	27%	18%	18%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**6%**	**6%**	**24%**	**33%**	**13%**	**17%**	**100%**

b. Capacity building (legal and institutional frameworks)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	15%	7%	30%	26%	11%	11%	100%
Asia	8%	0%	42%	17%	17%	17%	100%
Central & South America	6%	6%	44%	22%	11%	11%	100%
Europe	0%	7%	10%	28%	28%	28%	100%
Middle East	9%	9%	27%	18%	18%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**7%**	**6%**	**28%**	**23%**	**17%**	**18%**	**100%**

c. Capacity building (scientific and technical)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	15%	7%	11%	41%	15%	11%	100%
Asia	8%	0%	33%	42%	8%	8%	100%
Central & South America	0%	6%	33%	50%	0%	11%	100%
Europe	0%	3%	14%	28%	28%	28%	100%
Middle East	18%	0%	27%	27%	18%	9%	100%
Grand Total	**7%**	**4%**	**20%**	**37%**	**15%**	**16%**	**100%**

d. Training via face-to-face workshops and projects

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	15%	4%	30%	26%	19%	7%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	42%	42%	8%	8%	100%
Central & South America	0%	17%	22%	50%	11%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	7%	21%	24%	17%	31%	100%
Middle East	18%	9%	18%	18%	27%	9%	100%
Grand Total	**6%**	**7%**	**26%**	**31%**	**16%**	**14%**	**100%**

e. Training via webinars and online sessions

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	7%	11%	37%	37%	4%	100%
Asia	0%	17%	25%	33%	17%	8%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	17%	61%	22%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	3%	10%	24%	38%	24%	100%
Middle East	18%	9%	27%	36%	18%	9%	100%
Grand Total	**1%**	**6%**	**15%**	**38%**	**30%**	**10%**	**100%**

f. Needs assessment

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	11%	11%	37%	19%	7%	15%	100%
Asia	0%	17%	33%	25%	8%	17%	100%
Central & South America	0%	11%	39%	39%	0%	11%	100%
Europe	0%	10%	3%	31%	21%	34%	100%
Middle East	18%	9%	27%	9%	27%	9%	100%
Grand Total	**5%**	**11%**	**26%**	**26%**	**12%**	**20%**	**100%**

g. Development of tools

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	11%	15%	22%	19%	22%	11%	100%
Asia	0%	8%	25%	33%	17%	17%	100%
Central & South America	0%	6%	39%	39%	6%	11%	100%
Europe	0%	3%	10%	24%	28%	34%	100%
Middle East	9%	18%	27%	18%	18%	9%	100%
Grand Total	**4%**	**9%**	**22%**	**27%**	**19%**	**18%**	**100%**

6. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

a. When organising Technical Assistance, the BRS Secretariat encourage appropriate communication and cooperation between the entities involved with the implementation of each Convention in my country (assuming they are not the same organisation)

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	N/A	Grand Total
Africa	7%	7%	7%	26%	37%	15%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	8%	75%	17%	0%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	28%	44%	22%	6%	100%
Europe	3%	0%	7%	17%	31%	41%	100%
Middle East	9%	9%	0%	36%	36%	9%	100%
Grand Total	**4%**	**3%**	**11%**	**34%**	**30%**	**18%**	**100%**

b. Where there are issues relevant to two or more Conventions, BRS Technical Assistance is delivered in a synergized manner

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	4%	7%	37%	33%	15%	100%
Asia	8%	0%	8%	58%	25%	0%	100%
Central & South America	0%	6%	17%	39%	39%	0%	
Europe	3%	3%	7%	14%	34%	38%	100%
Middle East	9%	9%	0%	36%	36%	9%	
Grand Total	**4%**	**4%**	**8%**	**34%**	**34%**	**16%**	**100%**

8. On a scale of 1 to 5 (where '1' is 'very ineffective' and '5' is 'very effective'), how effective do you think the BRS Secretariat has been at delivering technical assistance in cooperation with the following partnerships of other organizations?

a. UNEP (outside of the BRS Secretariat, for example: Chemicals and Waste Branch, PCB Elimination Network, DDT Alliance, Mercury Partnership, Global Partnership on Waste Management)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	0%	19%	26%	44%	7%	100%
Asia	0%	17%	25%	42%	17%	0%	100%
Central & South America	0%	6%	28%	61%	6%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	4%	32%	39%	25%	100%
Middle East	9%	0%	18%	36%	27%	9%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**3%**	**16%**	**37%**	**30%**	**11%**	**100%**

b. FAO Secretariat including FAO country offices (outside of the Rome-based Rotterdam Secretariat)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	7%	37%	7%	19%	26%	100%
Asia	8%	8%	25%	42%	8%	8%	100%
Central & South America	0%	17%	17%	22%	17%	28%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	4%	25%	21%	50%	100%
Middle East	10%	30%	20%	0%	20%	20%	100%
Grand Total	**3%**	**9%**	**20%**	**19%**	**18%**	**31%**	**100%**

c. Multilateral Environmental Agreements & their bodies (for example: Minamata, Vienna Convention, UNFCCC, CITES)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	4%	33%	26%	15%	19%	100%
Asia	0%	17%	17%	50%	17%	0%	100%
Central & South America	0%	11%	28%	44%	11%	6%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	7%	32%	25%	36%	100%
Middle East	9%	9%	27%	9%	27%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**6%**	**22%**	**32%**	**19%**	**20%**	**100%**

d. International Organizations and networks (for example: Partnership on Measuring ICT for Development, Green Customs Initiative, Interpol, WHO, World Customs, Solving the E-waste Problem Initiative)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	11%	22%	15%	15%	37%	100%
Asia	0%	17%	25%	42%	0%	17%	100%
Central & South America	6%	22%	28%	33%	0%	11%	100%
Europe	0%	4%	7%	22%	15%	52%	100%
Middle East	9%	9%	36%	9%	18%	27%	100%
Grand Total	**1%**	**11%**	**21%**	**23%**	**10%**	**33%**	**100%**

e. Business and Industry

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	7%	30%	7%	22%	33%	100%
Asia	17%	17%	8%	25%	0%	33%	100%
Central & South America	6%	17%	33%	6%	0%	39%	100%
Europe	0%	4%	18%	21%	14%	43%	100%
Middle East	9%	9%	9%	18%	0%	55%	100%
Grand Total	**4%**	**9%**	**22%**	**14%**	**10%**	**40%**	**100%**

f. NGOs

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	11%	26%	11%	11%	41%	100%
Asia	8%	17%	17%	42%	0%	17%	100%
Central & South America	0%	12%	29%	12%	0%	47%	100%
Europe	0%	4%	11%	29%	18%	39%	100%
Middle East	9%	9%	9%	18%	9%	45%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**9%**	**19%**	**21%**	**9%**	**40%**	**100%**

g. Academia and Research

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	11%	22%	19%	7%	41%	100%
Asia	8%	17%	33%	33%	8%	17%	100%
Central & South America	6%	11%	28%	6%	0%	47%	100%
Europe	0%	4%	11%	25%	11%	39%	100%
Middle East	0%	18%	9%	9%	9%	45%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**10%**	**20%**	**19%**	**7%**	**42%**	**100%**

10. On a scale of 1 to 5 (where '1' is 'very ineffective' and '5' is 'very effective'), how effective do you think the BRS Secretariat has been at delivering Technical Assistance through the following partnerships?

a. Partnership for Action on Computing Equipment (PACE)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	4%	11%	15%	15%	56%	100%
Asia	8%	8%	17%	25%	8%	33%	100%
Central & South America	0%	17%	33%	11%	6%	33%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	0%	14%	29%	57%	100%
Middle East	9%	9%	27%	27%	9%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**6%**	**14%**	**16%**	**16%**	**44%**	**100%**

b. Environmental Network for Optimizing Regulatory Compliance on Illegal Traffic (ENFORCE)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	4%	7%	15%	19%	56%	100%
Asia	8%	8%	25%	33%	8%	17%	100%
Central & South America	0%	22%	28%	17%	6%	28%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	7%	4%	32%	57%	100%
Middle East	9%	0%	27%	27%	18%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**6%**	**15%**	**15%**	**19%**	**42%**	**100%**

c. Informal Group on Household Waste Partnership

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	7%	7%	19%	11%	56%	100%
Asia	8%	8%	33%	17%	0%	33%	100%
Central & South America	0%	17%	6%	22%	0%	56%	100%
Europe	0%	4%	0%	11%	21%	64%	100%
Middle East	9%	0%	36%	0%	18%	36%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**7%**	**11%**	**14%**	**11%**	**54%**	**100%**

d. Other partnerships (please give details below)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	10%	0%	5%	86%	100%
Asia	0%	9%	9%	0%	0%	82%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	13%	13%	0%	73%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	0%	4%	4%	91%	100%
Middle East	0%	0%	22%	11%	0%	67%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**1%**	**9%**	**5%**	**3%**	**83%**	**100%**

12. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

a. BRS scientific and technical activities have helped to engage Parties and other stakeholders in more informed dialogue about science in BRS implementation

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	0%	11%	48%	33%	4%	100%
Asia	0%	8%	8%	58%	8%	17%	100%
Central & South America	0%	6%	17%	50%	22%	6%	
Europe	3%	0%	10%	41%	38%	10%	100%
Middle East	9%	9%	27%	36%	27%	0%	
Grand Total	**1%**	**3%**	**13%**	**46%**	**30%**	**7%**	**100%**

b. BRS scientific and technical activities have increased our understanding of scientific considerations relating to decision-making under the three Conventions

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	4%	41%	52%	4%	100%
Asia	0%	8%	0%	75%	0%	17%	100%
Central & South America		6%	28%	17%	44%	6%	
Europe	0%	0%	10%	48%	31%	10%	100%
Middle East		9%	0%	55%	36%	0%	
Grand Total	**0%**	**3%**	**9%**	**44%**	**37%**	**7%**	**100%**

c. BRS scientific and technical activities have helped us consider a lifecycle approach for the sound management of hazardous chemicals and wastes

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	0%	7%	37%	44%	7%	100%
Asia	0%	8%	0%	67%	8%	17%	100%
Central & South America		6%	17%	22%	50%	6%	
Europe	0%	0%	7%	45%	38%	10%	100%
Middle East		9%	9%	27%	45%	9%	
Grand Total	**1%**	**3%**	**8%**	**39%**	**40%**	**9%**	**100%**

14. On a scale of 1 to 5 (where '1' is 'very badly' and '5' is 'very well'), how well does your Basel Convention Regional Centre support you via the following activities?

a. Providing technical assistance

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	15%	22%	4%	11%	44%	100%
Asia	8%	8%	25%	33%	8%	17%	100%
Central & South America	11%	6%	22%	33%	17%	11%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	10%	3%	10%	76%	100%
Middle East	18%	36%	18%	0%	9%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**6%**	**10%**	**18%**	**12%**	**11%**	**42%**	**100%**

b. Capacity building

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	15%	15%	7%	15%	44%	100%
Asia	8%	17%	17%	33%	8%	17%	100%
Central & South America	11%	6%	44%	6%	17%	17%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	7%	10%	10%	72%	100%
Middle East	18%	36%	18%	0%	9%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**6%**	**11%**	**18%**	**10%**	**12%**	**42%**	**100%**

c. Promoting the transfer of technology

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	7%	15%	19%	4%	15%	41%	100%
Asia	25%	8%	17%	17%	0%	33%	100%
Central & South America	11%	17%	28%	17%	11%	17%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	10%	3%	7%	79%	100%
Middle East	18%	27%	27%	0%	9%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**9%**	**11%**	**18%**	**7%**	**9%**	**45%**	**100%**

15. On a scale of 1 to 5 (where '1' is 'very badly' and '5' is 'very well'), how well does your Stockholm Convention Regional Centre support you via the following activities?

a. Providing technical assistance

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	11%	26%	11%	7%	41%	100%
Asia	0%	8%	25%	25%	17%	25%	100%
Central & South America	6%	11%	22%	28%	22%	11%	100%
Europe	0%	10%	10%	17%	7%	55%	100%
Middle East	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%	55%	100%
Grand Total	**3%**	**10%**	**18%**	**17%**	**11%**	**40%**	**100%**

b. Capacity building

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	15%	26%	7%	7%	41%	100%
Asia	0%	17%	17%	17%	25%	25%	100%
Central & South America	6%	6%	33%	17%	28%	11%	100%
Europe	0%	10%	3%	21%	7%	59%	100%
Middle East	9%	9%	18%	0%	9%	55%	100%
Grand Total	**3%**	**11%**	**18%**	**13%**	**13%**	**41%**	**100%**

c. Promoting the transfer of technology

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	11%	11%	33%	0%	7%	37%	100%
Asia	0%	17%	25%	8%	8%	42%	100%
Central & South America	6%	11%	33%	11%	22%	17%	100%
Europe	0%	10%	10%	14%	3%	62%	100%
Middle East	9%	9%	18%	0%	9%	55%	100%
Grand Total	**5%**	**11%**	**23%**	**7%**	**9%**	**44%**	**100%**

16. On a scale of 1 to 5 (where '1' is 'very badly' and '5' is 'very well'), how well does your *Rotterdam Convention* FAO / UNEP Regional and/or Country Office support you via the following activities?

a. Providing technical assistance

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	15%	11%	7%	11%	56%	100%
Asia	8%	0%	17%	25%	0%	50%	100%
Central & South America	0%	17%	17%	22%	17%	28%	100%
Europe	0%	3%	10%	10%	3%	72%	100%
Middle East	0%	9%	9%	0%	18%	64%	100%
Grand Total	**1%**	**9%**	**12%**	**12%**	**9%**	**56%**	**100%**

b. Capacity building

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	11%	15%	7%	11%	56%	100%
Asia	8%	8%	17%	17%	0%	50%	100%
Central & South America	0%	28%	17%	6%	22%	28%	100%
Europe	0%	3%	7%	17%	0%	72%	100%
Middle East	0%	9%	9%	0%	18%	64%	100%
Grand Total	**1%**	**11%**	**12%**	**10%**	**9%**	**56%**	**100%**

c. Promoting the transfer of technology

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	15%	11%	7%	11%	56%	100%
Asia	8%	8%	25%	8%	0%	50%	100%
Central & South America	0%	28%	6%	17%	22%	28%	100%
Europe	0%	3%	14%	7%	0%	76%	100%
Middle East	0%	9%	9%	0%	18%	64%	100%
Grand Total	**1%**	**12%**	**12%**	**8%**	**9%**	**57%**	**100%**

18. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

a. There is no unnecessary duplication of activities between the BRS Secretariat and the Regional Centres.

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	4%	0%	33%	41%	19%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	17%	50%	17%	17%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	17%	22%	61%	0%	
Europe	0%	3%	3%	24%	34%	34%	100%
Middle East	0%	0%	18%	64%	18%	0%	
Grand Total	**1%**	**2%**	**9%**	**34%**	**37%**	**17%**	**100%**

b. There is no unnecessary duplication of activities between Basel Convention Regional Centres, Rotterdam Convention FAO / UNEP Regional and Country offices, and/or Stockholm Convention Regional Centres.

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	7%	7%	30%	30%	26%	100%
Asia	-	0%	25%	42%	17%	17%	100%
Central & South America	-	11%	6%	50%	33%	0%	
Europe	-	3%	7%	21%	31%	38%	100%
Middle East	-	9%	9%	64%	18%	0%	
Grand Total	**-**	**7%**	**9%**	**36%**	**28%**	**20%**	**100%**

c. There is no contradiction between the information provided by the BRS Secretariat and that provided by the Regional Centres and FAO/UNEP Regional or Country offices.

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	4%	7%	22%	30%	37%	100%
Asia	-	0%	25%	50%	8%	17%	100%
Central & South America	-	6%	6%	28%	61%	0%	
Europe	-	0%	0%	17%	38%	45%	100%
Middle East	-	0%	18%	45%	18%	18%	
Grand Total	**-**	**2%**	**8%**	**22%**	**34%**	**29%**	**100%**

d. There is no contradiction between the information provided by your Basel Convention Regional Centre, Rotterdam Convention FAO / UNEP Regional or Country office, and/or Stockholm Convention Regional Centre.

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	0%	4%	4%	26%	37%	100%
Asia	-	8%	25%	0%	0%	17%	100%
Central & South America	-	6%	11%	6%	50%	6%	
Europe	-	0%	3%	0%	34%	45%	100%
Middle East	-	9%	27%	0%	18%	0%	
Grand Total	**-**	**3%**	**10%**	**2%**	**29%**	**28%**	**100%**

Clearing House Mechanism

These questions are about the 'Clearing House' mechanism set up and operated by the BRS Secretariat to facilitate information sharing.

20. On a scale of 1 to 5 (where '1' is 'very ineffective' and '5' is 'very effective'), how effective do you think the Clearing House mechanism has been at:

a. providing one entry point to a wide range of relevant information on chemicals and waste management?

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	7%	19%	22%	22%	26%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	33%	42%	8%	17%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	56%	17%	6%	22%	100%
Europe	0%	3%	10%	41%	24%	21%	100%
Middle East	0%	0%	27%	36%	18%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**1%**	**3%**	**26%**	**31%**	**18%**	**21%**	**100%**

b. facilitating the sharing of information on good practice and implementation models?

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	7%	7%	19%	26%	19%	22%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	33%	33%	17%	17%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	39%	33%	6%	22%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	24%	34%	21%	21%	100%
Middle East	0%	0%	45%	27%	18%	9%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**2%**	**29%**	**31%**	**17%**	**19%**	**100%**

c. facilitating the transfer of expertise and know-how between stakeholders?

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	7%	7%	19%	26%	19%	22%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	58%	25%	0%	17%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	56%	22%	0%	22%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	31%	24%	17%	28%	100%
Middle East	0%	9%	45%	18%	18%	9%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**3%**	**37%**	**24%**	**12%**	**21%**	**100%**

d. helping make better use of available resources across the three Conventions?

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	7%	7%	19%	26%	19%	22%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	42%	42%	8%	8%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	50%	28%	0%	22%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	17%	21%	41%	21%	100%
Middle East	0%	0%	27%	27%	36%	9%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**2%**	**28%**	**27%**	**23%**	**18%**	**100%**

e. keeping you informed regarding Convention issues, meetings and programmes?

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	7%	15%	26%	30%	19%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	17%	67%	8%	8%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	22%	44%	22%	11%	100%
Europe	0%	3%	7%	24%	48%	17%	100%
Middle East	0%	0%	27%	18%	36%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**1%**	**3%**	**15%**	**34%**	**32%**	**15%**	**100%**

Public awareness, outreach and publications

These questions are about the synergies activities aimed at raising popular and stakeholder awareness and understanding of the Conventions, and strengthening responsibility towards chemicals and waste.

22. In your opinion, how have the following aspects of BRS implementation changed as a result of synergy arrangements?

a. Co-ordination of public awareness activities between the Conventions

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	0%	19%	48%	26%	4%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	25%	50%	17%	8%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	28%	33%	33%	6%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	7%	38%	38%	17%	100%
Middle East	0%	0%	9%	64%	18%	9%	100%
Grand Total	**1%**	**0%**	**16%**	**44%**	**30%**	**9%**	**100%**

b. Co-ordination of outreach activities between the Conventions

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	0%	11%	52%	30%	4%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	33%	42%	17%	8%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	28%	28%	44%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	10%	31%	41%	17%	100%
Middle East	0%	0%	18%	36%	36%	9%	100%
Grand Total	**1%**	**0%**	**17%**	**39%**	**35%**	**8%**	**100%**

c. Co-ordination of publication activities between the Conventions

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	0%	19%	48%	26%	4%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	33%	42%	17%	8%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	22%	33%	44%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	7%	41%	41%	10%	100%
Middle East	0%	0%	18%	36%	36%	9%	100%
Grand Total	**1%**	**0%**	**18%**	**41%**	**34%**	**6%**	**100%**

24. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

a. The BRS Secretariat successfully strengthens delivery of the Conventions' key messages in my country through its communication and outreach services.

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	7%	15%	30%	41%	4%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	17%	42%	42%	0%	100%
Central & South America	0%	6%	33%	33%	17%	11%	
Europe	3%	7%	10%	48%	31%	0%	100%
Middle East	0%	9%	18%	45%	27%	0%	
Grand Total	**2%**	**6%**	**18%**	**39%**	**32%**	**3%**	**100%**

b. The synergies programme of public awareness and outreach has increased the support we receive from the public and other stakeholders.

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	7%	15%	48%	22%	4%	100%
Asia	0%	8%	25%	50%	8%	8%	100%
Central & South America	0%	11%	39%	22%	6%	22%	
Europe	3%	10%	21%	24%	17%	24%	100%
Middle East	0%	18%	9%	45%	18%	9%	
Grand Total	**2%**	**10%**	**22%**	**36%**	**15%**	**14%**	**100%**

Reporting

This section is about the impact of synergies arrangements on Parties' reporting under the Conventions.

26. In your estimation how have the following changed in your organisation since the introduction of synergies arrangements?

a. Management time required for reporting under the Basel Convention

Region	Decreased significantly	Decreased slightly	No change	Increased slightly	Increased significantly	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	7%	0%	30%	11%	7%	44%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	50%	25%	8%	17%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	50%	22%	11%	17%	100%
Europe	0%	17%	21%	14%	3%	45%	100%
Middle East	0%	0%	20%	40%	30%	10%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**5%**	**33%**	**19%**	**9%**	**32%**	**100%**

b. Management time required for reporting under the Stockholm Convention

Region	Decreased significantly	Decreased slightly	No change	Increased slightly	Increased significantly	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	7%	0%	22%	22%	7%	41%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	33%	42%	8%	17%	100%
Central & South America	0%	6%	41%	24%	18%	12%	100%
Europe	0%	17%	31%	21%	3%	28%	100%
Middle East	0%	0%	0%	30%	20%	50%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**6%**	**28%**	**25%**	**9%**	**29%**	**100%**

c. Staff time required for reporting under the Basel Convention

Region	Decreased significantly	Decreased slightly	No change	Increased slightly	Increased significantly	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	7%	4%	26%	11%	11%	41%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	42%	25%	8%	25%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	44%	22%	11%	22%	100%
Europe	0%	14%	28%	10%	3%	45%	100%
Middle East	0%	0%	20%	40%	30%	10%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**5%**	**32%**	**18%**	**10%**	**33%**	**100%**

d. Staff time required for reporting under the Stockholm Convention

Region	Decreased significantly	Decreased slightly	No change	Increased slightly	Increased significantly	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	8%	4%	19%	27%	4%	38%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	33%	33%	8%	25%	100%
Central & South America	0%	6%	44%	19%	19%	13%	100%
Europe	0%	14%	41%	14%	3%	28%	100%
Middle East	0%	0%	0%	30%	20%	50%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**6%**	**31%**	**22%**	**9%**	**30%**	**100%**

e. Other resources required for reporting under the Basel Convention (please provide details below)

Region	Decreased significantly	Decreased slightly	No change	Increased slightly	Increased significantly	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	4%	27%	8%	15%	42%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	45%	36%	0%	18%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	12%	18%	18%	53%	100%
Europe	0%	7%	34%	7%	3%	48%	100%
Middle East	0%	0%	38%	13%	13%	38%	100%
Grand Total	**1%**	**3%**	**30%**	**13%**	**10%**	**42%**	**100%**

f. Other resources required for reporting under the Stockholm Convention (please provide details below)

Region	Decreased significantly	Decreased slightly	No change	Increased slightly	Increased significantly	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	8%	4%	23%	15%	4%	46%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	36%	45%	0%	18%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	20%	13%	13%	53%	100%
Europe	0%	7%	39%	7%	4%	43%	100%
Middle East	0%	0%	13%	13%	13%	63%	100%
Grand Total	**2%**	**3%**	**29%**	**16%**	**6%**	**44%**	**100%**

28. Thinking now about the PIC notification procedures under the Rotterdam Convention, in your estimation how have the following changed in your organisation since the introduction of synergies arrangements?

a. Management time required for the PIC notification procedures

Region	Decreased significantly	Decreased slightly	No change	Increased slightly	Increased significantly	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	0%	33%	13%	0%	50%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	30%	20%	0%	50%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	75%	0%	6%	19%	100%
Europe	0%	10%	31%	7%	0%	52%	100%
Middle East	0%	0%	0%	22%	22%	56%	100%
Grand Total	**1%**	**3%**	**37%**	**10%**	**3%**	**45%**	**100%**

b. Staff time required for the PIC notification procedures

Region	Decreased significantly	Decreased slightly	No change	Increased slightly	Increased significantly	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	4%	30%	13%	0%	48%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	30%	20%	0%	50%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	75%	0%	6%	19%	100%
Europe	0%	11%	32%	4%	0%	54%	100%
Middle East	0%	0%	11%	11%	22%	56%	100%
Grand Total	**1%**	**5%**	**38%**	**8%**	**3%**	**45%**	**100%**

c. Other resources required for the PIC notification procedures

Region	Decreased significantly	Decreased slightly	No change	Increased slightly	Increased significantly	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	0%	33%	8%	0%	54%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	30%	10%	0%	60%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	56%	0%	6%	38%	100%
Europe	0%	7%	38%	3%	0%	52%	100%
Middle East	0%	0%	25%	0%	13%	63%	100%
Grand Total	**1%**	**2%**	**39%**	**5%**	**2%**	**51%**	**100%**

30. With regards to systems used for reporting:

Does your country use the Electronic Reporting System (ERS) for reporting against the Basel Convention?

Row Labels	Don't know / N/A	No	Yes
Africa	41%	11%	48%
Asia	20%	40%	40%
Central & South America	18%	6%	76%
Europe	41%	3%	55%
Middle East	10%	30%	60%
Grand Total	31%	13%	56%

Does your country use the Electronic Reporting System (ERS) for reporting against the Stockholm Convention?

Row Labels	Don't know / N/A	No	Yes
Africa	48%	4%	48%
Asia	30%	20%	50%
Central & South America	17%	11%	72%
Europe	28%	0%	72%
Middle East	50%	20%	30%
Grand Total	33%	8%	59%

If your country uses the ERS's for both Conventions, has the similarity between the reporting systems and the user interface resulted in efficiency savings in your organisation?

Row Labels	Don't know / N/A	No	Yes
Africa	58%	13%	29%
Asia	60%	30%	10%
Central & South America	56%	0%	44%
Europe	59%	10%	31%
Middle East	44%	11%	44%
Grand Total	56%	12%	32%

Joint managerial functions

This section is about the implementation and impact of joint managerial functions for the BRS Conventions.

32. For the following activities of the BRS Secretariat, how does the support you now receive with respect to the *Basel Convention* compare with the support you received prior to the introduction of synergies arrangements in 2011? (if you are not involved with the Basel Convention, please tick 'N/A')

a. Management / organisation of meetings of the Convention bodies including the Conferences of the Parties and subsidiary bodies

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	0%	7%	22%	19%	52%	100%
Asia	-	8%	8%	33%	8%	42%	100%
Central & South America	-	6%	0%	39%	39%	17%	100%
Europe	-	0%	3%	21%	24%	52%	100%
Middle East	-	9%	9%	0%	36%	45%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**3%**	**6%**	**23%**	**24%**	**43%**	**100%**

b. Management / organisation of other meetings

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	4%	15%	19%	7%	56%	100%
Asia	-	8%	17%	25%	8%	42%	100%
Central & South America	-	0%	17%	22%	33%	28%	100%
Europe	-	0%	7%	17%	24%	52%	100%
Middle East	-	0%	0%	9%	36%	55%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**2%**	**12%**	**18%**	**20%**	**47%**	**100%**

c. Provision of legal and policy advice

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	7%	26%	11%	56%	100%
Asia	-	-	33%	25%	0%	42%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	28%	22%	22%	28%	100%
Europe	-	-	7%	24%	17%	52%	100%
Middle East	-	-	9%	9%	27%	55%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**-**	**15%**	**22%**	**15%**	**47%**	**100%**

d. Resource Mobilisation

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	4%	30%	11%	56%	100%
Asia	-	-	25%	25%	0%	50%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	39%	17%	22%	22%	100%
Europe	-	-	7%	17%	17%	59%	100%
Middle East	-	-	9%	18%	27%	45%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**-**	**15%**	**21%**	**15%**	**48%**	**100%**

e. Joint international cooperation and coordination activities

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	4%	11%	15%	15%	56%	100%
Asia	-	0%	17%	33%	17%	33%	100%
Central & South America	-	0%	11%	44%	22%	22%	100%
Europe	-	0%	7%	17%	21%	55%	100%
Middle East	-	0%	9%	9%	36%	45%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**1%**	**10%**	**23%**	**20%**	**45%**	**100%**

33. For the following activities of the BRS Secretariat, how does the support you now receive with respect to the *Rotterdam Convention* compare with the support you received prior to the introduction of synergies arrangements in 2011? (if you are not involved with the Rotterdam Convention, please tick 'N/A')

a. Management / organisation of meetings of the Convention bodies including the Conferences of the Parties and subsidiary bodies

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	7%	7%	11%	7%	67%	100%
Asia	-	8%	0%	25%	17%	50%	100%
Central & South America	-	11%	17%	22%	22%	28%	100%
Europe	-	3%	0%	17%	31%	48%	100%
Middle East	-	0%	0%	9%	27%	64%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**6%**	**6%**	**16%**	**20%**	**51%**	**100%**

b. Management / organisation of other meetings

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	7%	7%	15%	4%	67%	100%
Asia	-	8%	0%	25%	8%	58%	100%
Central & South America	-	6%	28%	17%	17%	33%	100%
Europe	-	3%	0%	21%	28%	48%	100%
Middle East	-	0%	0%	9%	27%	64%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**5%**	**8%**	**17%**	**16%**	**53%**	**100%**

c. Provision of legal and policy advice

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	7%	7%	11%	7%	67%	100%
Asia	-	0%	17%	17%	0%	67%	100%
Central & South America	-	6%	33%	11%	11%	39%	100%
Europe	-	0%	3%	28%	21%	48%	100%
Middle East	-	0%	0%	18%	9%	73%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**3%**	**12%**	**17%**	**11%**	**56%**	**100%**

d. Resource Mobilisation

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	7%	7%	11%	4%	70%	100%
Asia	-	0%	17%	17%	0%	67%	100%
Central & South America	-	6%	33%	6%	17%	39%	100%
Europe	-	3%	7%	10%	17%	62%	100%
Middle East	-	0%	0%	18%	9%	73%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**4%**	**13%**	**11%**	**10%**	**61%**	**100%**

e. Joint international cooperation and coordination activities

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	7%	7%	11%	7%	67%	100%
Asia	-	0%	8%	25%	0%	67%	100%
Central & South America	-	6%	22%	17%	28%	28%	100%
Europe	-	3%	7%	14%	24%	52%	100%
Middle East	-	0%	0%	9%	27%	64%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**4%**	**10%**	**14%**	**17%**	**54%**	**100%**

34. For the following activities of the BRS Secretariat, how does the support you now receive with respect to the *Stockholm Convention* compare with the support you received prior to the introduction of synergies arrangements in 2011? (if you are not involved with the Stockholm Convention, please tick 'N/A')

a. Management / organisation of meetings of the Convention bodies including the Conferences of the Parties and subsidiary bodies

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	0%	7%	30%	11%	52%	100%
Asia	-	8%	8%	25%	25%	33%	100%
Central & South America	-	6%	0%	44%	28%	22%	100%
Europe	-	3%	0%	28%	38%	31%	100%
Middle East	-	0%	0%	18%	27%	55%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**3%**	**4%**	**30%**	**26%**	**38%**	**100%**

b. Management / organisation of other meetings

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	0%	11%	26%	11%	52%	100%
Asia	-	8%	8%	25%	17%	42%	100%
Central & South America	-	0%	22%	28%	17%	33%	100%
Europe	-	3%	0%	28%	38%	31%	100%
Middle East	-	0%	0%	18%	27%	55%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**2%**	**9%**	**26%**	**22%**	**41%**	**100%**

c. Provision of legal and policy advice

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	7%	22%	11%	59%	100%
Asia	-	-	25%	25%	8%	42%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	39%	11%	11%	39%	100%
Europe	-	-	7%	38%	24%	31%	100%
Middle East	-	-	9%	9%	27%	55%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**-**	**16%**	**23%**	**16%**	**44%**	**100%**

d. Resource Mobilisation

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	0%	7%	22%	11%	59%	100%
Asia	-	0%	17%	25%	8%	50%	100%
Central & South America	-	0%	33%	17%	17%	33%	100%
Europe	-	3%	3%	34%	21%	38%	100%
Middle East	-	0%	9%	18%	18%	55%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**1%**	**13%**	**24%**	**15%**	**46%**	**100%**

e. Joint international cooperation and coordination activities

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	0%	15%	22%	11%	52%	100%
Asia	-	0%	17%	25%	8%	50%	100%
Central & South America	-	0%	17%	33%	28%	22%	100%
Europe	-	3%	3%	28%	31%	34%	100%
Middle East	-	0%	9%	9%	27%	55%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**1%**	**12%**	**24%**	**21%**	**41%**	**100%**

Overall impacts of synergies arrangements

This section deals with the extent to which the overall intended impacts of synergies arrangements have been realised.

36. In your opinion, how have the following aspects of BRS implementation changed as a result of synergy arrangements (i.e. from 2011 onwards)?

a. Co-operation between relevant agencies internationally

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	15%	48%	19%	19%	100%
Asia	-	-	25%	42%	17%	17%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	11%	44%	22%	22%	100%
Europe	-	-	3%	59%	24%	14%	100%
Middle East	-	-	9%	18%	45%	27%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**-**	**11%**	**47%**	**23%**	**18%**	**100%**

b. Co-operation between relevant agencies nationally

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	4%	37%	44%	11%	4%	100%
Asia	-	0%	25%	50%	17%	8%	100%
Central & South America	-	0%	17%	56%	17%	11%	100%
Europe	-	0%	24%	52%	14%	10%	100%
Middle East	-	0%	9%	36%	36%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**1%**	**24%**	**48%**	**17%**	**9%**	**100%**

c. Political visibility of the Basel Convention

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	15%	26%	7%	52%	100%
Asia	-	-	17%	42%	8%	33%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	33%	22%	33%	11%	100%
Europe	-	-	3%	31%	14%	52%	100%
Middle East	-	-	0%	36%	27%	36%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**-**	**14%**	**30%**	**16%**	**40%**	**100%**

d. Political visibility of the Rotterdam Convention

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	30%	19%	11%	41%	100%
Asia	-	-	17%	33%	8%	42%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	50%	6%	17%	28%	100%
Europe	-	-	3%	38%	17%	41%	100%
Middle East	-	-	0%	27%	36%	36%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**-**	**21%**	**24%**	**16%**	**38%**	**100%**

e. Political visibility of the Stockholm Convention

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	22%	30%	11%	37%	100%
Asia	-	-	25%	33%	8%	33%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	33%	22%	22%	22%	100%
Europe	-	-	7%	48%	17%	28%	100%
Middle East	-	-	9%	36%	36%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**-**	**19%**	**35%**	**17%**	**29%**	**100%**

f. Effectiveness of financing for the implementation of the Conventions

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	4%	0%	26%	48%	15%	7%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	42%	42%	8%	8%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	33%	39%	6%	22%	100%
Europe	0%	3%	14%	41%	21%	21%	100%
Middle East	0%	0%	18%	27%	36%	18%	100%
Grand Total	**1%**	**1%**	**26%**	**41%**	**16%**	**15%**	**100%**

g. Policy coherence between the Conventions

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	15%	41%	30%	15%	100%
Asia	-	-	25%	42%	17%	17%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	6%	78%	11%	6%	100%
Europe	-	-	3%	52%	28%	17%	100%
Middle East	-	-	0%	55%	36%	9%	100%
Grand Total	**-**	**-**	**9%**	**53%**	**24%**	**13%**	**100%**

38. In your estimation, how have the following changed in your organisation since the introduction of synergies arrangements (i.e. from 2011 onwards)?

a. Staff costs of implementing the Conventions

Region	Decreased significantly	Decreased slightly	No change	Increased slightly	Increased significantly	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	11%	7%	56%	7%	0%	19%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	58%	25%	0%	17%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	83%	6%	11%	0%	100%
Europe	3%	14%	76%	3%	0%	3%	100%
Middle East	9%	0%	9%	27%	9%	45%	100%
Grand Total	**5%**	**6%**	**62%**	**10%**	**3%**	**13%**	**100%**

b. Travel costs of implementing the Conventions

Region	Decreased significantly	Decreased slightly	No change	Increased slightly	Increased significantly	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	15%	15%	52%	4%	0%	15%	100%
Asia	8%	0%	33%	42%	0%	17%	100%
Central & South America	0%	11%	61%	22%	0%	6%	100%
Europe	7%	21%	62%	7%	0%	3%	100%
Middle East	9%	9%	9%	18%	27%	27%	100%
Grand Total	**8%**	**13%**	**50%**	**14%**	**3%**	**11%**	**100%**

c. Other costs of implementing the Conventions

Region	Decreased significantly	Decreased slightly	No change	Increased slightly	Increased significantly	Don't know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	16%	4%	40%	8%	8%	24%	100%
Asia	0%	8%	25%	25%	8%	33%	100%
Central & South America	0%	6%	44%	19%	0%	31%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	59%	0%	0%	41%	100%
Middle East	10%	0%	20%	20%	10%	40%	100%
Grand Total	**5%**	**3%**	**43%**	**11%**	**4%**	**33%**	**100%**

Annex 7 – Survey of Regional Centres - Summary of questions and results

Technical Assistance

These questions are about Regional Centres' role in the Technical Assistance provided to Parties to assist them in fulfilling their obligations under the BRS Conventions.

1. In your opinion, what has been the impact of synergies arrangements on the following?

a. The quality of Technical Assistance activities provided by Regional Centres

Row Labels	It has decreased greatly	It has decreased slightly	It is unchanged	It has increased slightly	It has increased greatly	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	100%	0%	100%
Asia	-	-	50%	50%	0%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	33%	33%	33%	100%
Europe	-	-	0%	100%	0%	100%

b. The amount of Technical Assistance provided by Regional Centres

Row Labels	It has decreased greatly	It has decreased slightly	It is unchanged	It has increased slightly	It has increased greatly	Grand Total
Africa	-	0%	-	50%	50%	100%
Asia	-	50%	-	0%	50%	100%
Central & South America	-	0%	-	33%	67%	100%
Europe	-	0%	-	50%	50%	100%

c. The relevance of Technical Assistance provided by Regional Centres

Row Labels	It has decreased greatly	It has decreased slightly	It is unchanged	It has increased slightly	It has increased greatly	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	100%	0%	100%
Asia	-	-	50%	0%	50%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	0%	0%	100%	100%
Europe	-	-	0%	50%	50%	100%

d. The ease with which Parties and other stakeholders can access Technical Assistance

Row Labels	It has decreased greatly	It has decreased slightly	It is unchanged	It has increased slightly	It has increased greatly	Grand Total
Africa	-	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Asia	-	50%	0%	50%	0%	100%
Central & South America	-	0%	33%	0%	67%	100%
Europe	-	0%	0%	50%	50%	100%

3. To what extent do you agree with the following statements

a. Parties and other stakeholders are promoting full and coordinated use of Regional Centres to strengthen the regional delivery of Technical Assistance under all three Conventions.

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	-	0%	100%	0%	-	100%
Asia	0%	-	50%	50%	0%	-	100%
Central & South America	33%	-	0%	0%	67%	-	100%
Europe	0%	-	0%	0%	100%	-	100%

b. Your Regional Centre always agrees its business plans and/or workplans with the countries concerned prior to finalising them.

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	-	-	100%	0%	-	100%
Asia	0%	-	-	50%	50%	-	100%
Central & South America	33%	-	-	33%	33%	-	100%
Europe	50%	-	-	0%	50%	-	100%

5. On a scale of 1 to 5 (where '1' is 'very badly' and '5' is 'very well'), how well do you think your Regional Centre supports Basel Convention implementation via the following activities? If your centre is not involved in Basel Convention implementation, please tick 'N/A'

a. Capacity building (policy)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	100%
Asia	-	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	100%
Central & South America	-	0%	33%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Europe	-	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	100%

b. Capacity building (legal and institutional frameworks)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Asia	-	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	100%
Central & South America	-	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	100%
Europe	-	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	100%

c. Capacity building (scientific and technical)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	50%	0%	50%	0%	100%
Asia	-	-	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	0%	33%	67%	0%	100%
Europe	-	-	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%

d. Training via face-to-face workshops and projects

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Asia	-	-	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	0%	67%	33%	0%	100%
Europe	-	-	50%	0%	50%	0%	100%

e. Training via webinars and online sessions

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%

f. Needs assessment

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	0%	50%	50%	100%
Asia	-	-	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	33%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Europe	-	-	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%

g. Development of tools

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	100%
Asia	-	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	100%
Central & South America	-	0%	33%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Europe	-	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%

6. On a scale of 1 to 5 (where '1' is 'very badly' and '5' is 'very well'), how well do you think your Regional Centre supports Rotterdam Convention implementation via the following activities? If your centre is not involved in Rotterdam Convention implementation, please tick 'N/A'.

a. Capacity building (policy)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	-	0%	0%	100%	100%
Asia	-	-	-	0%	0%	100%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	-	67%	0%	33%	100%
Europe	-	-	-	0%	50%	50%	100%

b. Capacity building (legal and institutional frameworks)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
Asia	-	-	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	33%	67%	0%	0%	100%
Europe	-	-	50%	0%	50%	0%	100%

c. Capacity building (scientific and technical)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	-	0%	0%	100%	100%
Asia	-	-	-	50%	0%	50%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	-	67%	33%	0%	100%
Europe	-	-	-	50%	0%	50%	100%

d. Training via face-to-face workshops and projects

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
Asia	-	-	0%	50%	0%	50%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	67%	0%	33%	0%	100%
Europe	-	-	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%

e. Training via webinars and online sessions

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	-	0%	100%	100%
Asia	-	-	0%	-	0%	100%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	33%	-	67%	0%	100%
Europe	-	-	0%	-	0%	100%	100%

f. Needs assessment

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	0%	-	100%	100%
Asia	-	-	0%	0%	-	100%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	33%	67%	-	0%	100%
Europe	-	-	50%	0%	-	50%	100%

g. Development of tools

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
Asia	-	-	0%	0%	50%	50%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	33%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Europe	-	-	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%

7. On a scale of 1 to 5 (where '1' is 'very badly' and '5' is 'very well'), how well do you think your Regional Centre supports Stockholm Convention implementation via the following activities? If your centre is not involved in Stockholm Convention implementation, please tick 'N/A'.

a. Capacity building (policy)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	-	100%
Asia	0%	50%	50%	50%	0%	-	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	-	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	-	100%

b. Capacity building (legal and institutional frameworks)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	-	0%	100%	0%	-	100%
Asia	0%	-	50%	50%	0%	-	100%
Central & South America	0%	-	0%	0%	100%	-	100%
Europe	0%	-	50%	0%	50%	-	100%

c. Capacity building (scientific and technical)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	50%	50%	0%	100%
Asia	-	-	50%	0%	50%	0%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Europe	-	-	0%	0%	50%	50%	100%

d. Training via face-to-face workshops and projects

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	50%	50%	-	100%
Asia	-	-	50%	0%	50%	-	100%
Central & South America	-	-	0%	67%	33%	-	100%
Europe	-	-	50%	0%	50%	-	100%

e. Training via webinars and online sessions

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	50%	-	0%	0%	50%	100%
Asia	0%	50%	-	50%	0%	0%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	-	33%	67%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	-	0%	50%	50%	100%

f. Needs assessment

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	-	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	-	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
Central & South America	0%	-	0%	67%	33%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	-	0%	0%	50%	50%	100%

g. Development of tools

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	-	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	-	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
Central & South America	0%	-	0%	67%	33%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	-	0%	0%	50%	50%	100%

9. On a scale of 1 to 5 (where '1' is 'very ineffective' and '5' is 'very effective'), how effective do you think cooperation has been with the following partnerships of other organizations in delivering Technical Assistance in your region?

a. UNEP (outside of the BRS Secretariat, for example: Chemicals and Waste Branch, PCB Elimination Network, DDT Alliance, Mercury Partnership, Global Partnership on Waste Management)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%		0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Asia	0%		50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
Central & South America	33%		0%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Europe	0%		50%	0%	50%	0%	100%

b. FAO Secretariat including FAO country offices (outside of the Rome-based Rotterdam Secretariat)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	50%	0%	-	-	50%	100%
Asia	0%	50%	0%	-	-	50%	100%
Central & South America	33%	33%	33%	-	-	0%	100%
Europe	0%	50%	0%	-	-	50%	100%

c. Multilateral Environmental Agreements & their bodies (for example: Minamata, Vienna Convention, UNFCCC, CITES)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	100%
Central & South America	0%	33%	0%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	100%

d. International Organizations and networks (for example: Partnership on Measuring ICT for Development, Green Customs Initiative, Interpol, WHO, World Customs, Solving the E-waste Problem Initiative)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
Central & South America	33%	33%	0%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%

e. Business and Industry

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	0%	0%	-	50%	50%	100%
Asia	-	50%	50%	-	0%	0%	100%
Central & South America	-	67%	33%	-	0%	0%	100%
Europe	-	100%	0%	-	0%	0%	100%

f. Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	0%	50%	0%	50%	-	100%
Asia	-	50%	50%	0%	0%	-	100%
Central & South America	-	67%	0%	33%	0%	-	100%
Europe	-	50%	0%	50%	0%	-	100%

g. Academia and Research

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	100%
Asia	-	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Central & South America	-	33%	0%	67%	0%	0%	100%
Europe	-	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%

11. On a scale of 1 to 5 (where '1' is 'very ineffective' and '5' is 'very effective'), how effective do you think the delivery of Technical Assistance has been through the following partnerships?

a. Partnership for Action on Computing Equipment (PACE)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	-	0%	50%	50%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	-	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
Central & South America	33%	-	33%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	-	0%	0%	50%	50%	100%

b. Environmental Network for Optimizing Regulatory Compliance on Illegal Traffic (ENFORCE)

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	0%	100%	-	0%	100%
Asia	0%	50%	0%	0%	-	50%	100%
Central & South America	0%	33%	33%	0%	-	33%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	0%	50%	-	50%	100%

c. Informal Group on Household Waste Partnership

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	100%
Asia	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Central & South America	33%	0%	0%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%

13. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

a. BRS scientific and technical activities have helped to engage Parties and other stakeholders in more informed dialogue about science in BRS implementation in our region.

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	-	50%	50%	-	100%
Asia	-	-	-	50%	50%	-	100%
Central & South America	-	-	-	33%	67%	-	100%
Europe	-	-	-	50%	50%	-	100%

b. BRS scientific and technical activities have increased Parties' understanding of scientific considerations relating to decision-making under the three Conventions in our region.

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	0%	-	50%	0%	-	100%
Asia	-	0%	-	50%	0%	-	100%
Central & South America	-	33%	-	33%	33%	-	100%
Europe	-	0%	-	50%	0%	-	100%

c. BRS scientific and technical activities have helped Parties consider a lifecycle approach for the sound management of hazardous chemicals and wastes in our region.

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	0%	-	50%	50%	0%	100%
Asia	-	0%	-	100%	0%	0%	100%
Central & South America	-	33%	-	33%	33%	0%	100%
Europe	-	0%	-	0%	50%	50%	100%

14. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

a. Our Regional Centre is helping to generate synergies with Regional Centres for the other Conventions.

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	50%	50%	50%	-	100%
Asia	-	-	50%	50%	0%	-	100%
Central & South America	-	-	33%	33%	67%	-	100%
Europe	-	-	0%	0%	50%	-	100%

b. The role of our Regional Centre within the overall structure of BRS implementation is clearly defined.

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	0%	-	50%	0%	-	100%
Asia	-	0%	-	50%	0%	-	100%
Central & South America	-	33%	-	0%	33%	-	100%
Europe	-	0%	-	0%	0%	-	100%

c. The role of our Regional Centre within the overall structure of BRS implementation is clearly understood by all stakeholders.

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	-	100%
Asia	0%	50%	50%	0%	50%	-	100%
Central & South America	33%	0%	0%	67%	0%	-	100%
Europe	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	-	100%

d. There is no unnecessary duplication of activities between the BRS Secretariat and the Regional Centres.

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	-	-	50%	50%	-	100%
Asia	0%	-	-	100%	0%	-	100%
Central & South America	0%	-	-	33%	67%	-	100%
Europe	50%	-	-	0%	50%	-	100%

e. There is no unnecessary duplication of activities between Basel Convention Regional Centres, Rotterdam Convention FAO / UNEP regional offices, and/or Stockholm Convention Regional Centres.

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	-	50%	0%	-	100%
Asia	0%	0%	-	100%	0%	-	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	-	67%	0%	-	100%
Europe	50%	50%	-	0%	50%	-	100%

f. There is no contradiction between the information and advice provided to Parties by the BRS Secretariat and the advice provided to Parties by Regional Centres.

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	-	50%	50%	-	100%
Asia	-	-	-	100%	0%	-	100%
Central & South America	-	-	-	33%	67%	-	100%
Europe	-	-	-	0%	100%	-	100%

g. There is no contradiction between the information and advice provided by Basel Convention Regional Centres, Rotterdam Convention FAO / UNEP regional offices, and Stockholm Convention Regional Centres.

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	-	50%	50%	0%	100%
Asia	-	-	-	100%	0%	0%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	-	0%	67%	33%	100%
Europe	-	-	-	0%	50%	50%	100%

Clearing House Mechanism

These questions are about the 'Clearing House' Mechanism set up and operated by the BRS Secretariat to facilitate information sharing.

15. On a scale of 1 to 5 (where '1' is 'very ineffective' and '5' is 'very effective'), how effective do you think the Clearing House mechanism has been at:

a. providing one entry point to a wide range of relevant information on chemicals and waste management?

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	100%	0%	-	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	0%	100%	-	0%	100%
Central & South America	0%	33%	0%	67%	-	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	0%	0%	-	100%	100%

b. facilitating the sharing of information on good practice and implementation models?

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
Central & South America	0%	33%	0%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	100%

c. facilitating the transfer of expertise and know-how between stakeholders?

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	100%
Central & South America	0%	33%	33%	0%	33%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%

d. helping make better use of available resources across the three Conventions?

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	100%
Central & South America	0%	33%	33%	33%	0%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%

e. keeping you informed regarding Convention issues, meetings and programmes?

Region	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	100%
Central & South America	0%	33%	0%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%

Public awareness, outreach and publications

These questions cover your regional perspective on the synergies activities aimed at raising popular and stakeholder awareness and understanding of the Conventions and strengthening responsibility towards chemicals and waste.

16. In your opinion, how have the following aspects of BRS implementation changed as a result of synergy arrangements?

a. Co-ordination of public awareness activities between the Conventions

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	100%	0%	-	100%
Asia	-	-	50%	50%	0%	-	100%
Central & South America	-	-	33%	67%	0%	-	100%
Europe	-	-	0%	50%	50%	-	100%

b. Co-ordination of outreach activities between the Conventions

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Asia	-	-	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	33%	0%	67%	0%	100%
Europe	-	-	0%	50%	0%	50%	100%

c. Co-ordination of publication activities between the Conventions

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	100%	0%	-	100%
Asia	-	-	50%	50%	0%	-	100%
Central & South America	-	-	0%	67%	33%	-	100%
Europe	-	-	0%	50%	50%	-	100%

18. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

a. The BRS Secretariat successfully strengthens delivery of the Conventions' key messages in my region through its communication and outreach services

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	50%	50%	0%	100%
Asia	-	-	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	0%	33%	67%	0%	100%
Europe	-	-	0%	50%	0%	50%	100%

b. The synergies programme of public awareness and outreach has increased the support we receive from the public and other stakeholders

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	50%	0%	50%	100%
Asia	-	-	50%	50%	50%	0%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	0%	67%	0%	0%	100%
Europe	-	-	0%	50%	0%	50%	100%

Joint managerial functions

This section is about the implementation and impact of joint managerial functions for the BRS Conventions, as seen from the Regional Centre perspective.

20. For the following activities of the BRS Secretariat, how does the support provided to implementation in your region compare with the support provided prior to 2011?

a. Management / organisation of meetings of the Convention bodies including the Conferences of the Parties and subsidiary bodies

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	50%	50%	-	100%
Asia	-	-	50%	50%	0%	-	100%
Central & South America	-	-	0%	33%	67%	-	100%
Europe	-	-	50%	0%	50%	-	100%

b. Management / organisation of other meetings

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	0%	0%	50%	50%	-	100%
Asia	-	50%	0%	50%	0%	-	100%
Central & South America	-	0%	0%	33%	67%	-	100%
Europe	-	0%	50%	0%	50%	-	100%

c. Provision of legal and policy advice

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	100%
Asia	-	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	100%
Central & South America	-	0%	33%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Europe	-	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	100%

d. Resource mobilisation

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	0%	50%	50%	100%
Asia	-	-	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Europe	-	-	50%	0%	50%	0%	100%

e. Joint international cooperation and coordination activities

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	50%	50%	-	100%
Asia	-	-	50%	50%	0%	-	100%
Central & South America	-	-	0%	100%	0%	-	100%
Europe	-	-	50%	50%	0%	-	100%

Overall impacts of synergies arrangements

This section deals with the extent to which the overall intended impacts of synergies arrangements, including those relevant to Regional Centres, have been realised.

22. In your opinion, how have the following changed as a result of synergy arrangements?

a. Co-operation between relevant agencies nationally

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	50%	0%	50%	100%
Asia	-	-	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	0%	67%	33%	0%	100%
Europe	-	-	0%	50%	50%	0%	100%

b. Co-operation between relevant agencies internationally

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	50%	0%	50%	100%
Asia	-	-	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	0%	67%	33%	0%	100%
Europe	-	-	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%

c. Political visibility of the Basel Convention

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Asia	-	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
Central & South America	-	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	100%
Europe	-	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	100%

d. Political visibility of the Rotterdam Convention

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	100%
Asia	-	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
Central & South America	-	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	100%
Europe	-	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	100%

e. Political visibility of the Stockholm Convention

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	0%	0%	100%	0%	-	100%
Asia	-	0%	50%	50%	0%	-	100%
Central & South America	-	0%	0%	67%	33%	-	100%
Europe	-	50%	0%	50%	0%	-	100%

f. Effectiveness of financing for the implementation of the Conventions

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	0%	50%	-	50%	100%
Asia	0%	50%	50%	0%	-	0%	100%
Central & South America	0%	0%	0%	100%	-	0%	100%
Europe	0%	50%	0%	50%	-	0%	100%

g. Policy coherence between the Conventions

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	100%	0%	-	100%
Asia	-	-	50%	50%	0%	-	100%
Central & South America	-	-	0%	33%	67%	-	100%
Europe	-	-	0%	0%	100%	-	100%

h. Your engagement with stakeholder organisations in your region

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	100%	0%	-	100%
Asia	-	-	50%	50%	0%	-	100%
Central & South America	-	-	67%	33%	0%	-	100%
Europe	-	-	50%	0%	50%	-	100%

i. Your engagement with other Regional Centres in other regions

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Asia	-	-	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	33%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Europe	-	-	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%

j. Your engagement with Parties in your region

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	50%	50%	-	100%
Asia	-	-	0%	100%	0%	-	100%
Central & South America	-	-	0%	100%	0%	-	100%
Europe	-	-	50%	0%	50%	-	100%

Section 2 - Questions to inform the review of the matrix-based management approach and organization of the Secretariats

This section covers your experience of dealing with the BRS Secretariat and matrix-based management approach.

24. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

a. We have a clear contact point for communication with the BRS Secretariat.

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	-	0%	100%	-	100%
Asia	-	-	-	100%	0%	-	100%
Central & South America	-	-	-	0%	100%	-	100%
Europe	-	-	-	0%	100%	-	100%

b. The information provided to us by the Geneva Secretariat is always consistent with the information provided by the Rome Secretariat.

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	-	0%	100%	100%
Asia	-	-	50%	-	0%	50%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	33%	-	33%	33%	100%
Europe	-	-	0%	-	0%	100%	100%

c. The BRS Secretariat co-operate effectively with us to support implementation of the Basel, Rotterdam and/or Stockholm Conventions.

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	50%	50%	-	100%
Asia	-	-	50%	0%	50%	-	100%
Central & South America	-	-	0%	33%	67%	-	100%
Europe	-	-	0%	0%	100%	-	100%

d. The BRS Secretariat co-operate more effectively with us to support implementation now than the previous Secretariat(s) did prior to 2011.

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	-	-	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Asia	-	-	50%	0%	50%	0%	100%
Central & South America	-	-	0%	33%	0%	33%	100%
Europe	-	-	0%	0%	0%	50%	100%

Annex 8 – Survey of Partners - Summary of questions and results

1. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

a. Synergies arrangements have had a positive impact on cooperation and coordination of your activities under the Basel Convention

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	17%	0%	50%	33%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	0%	60%	40%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
North America	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**7%**	**14%**	**43%**	**29%**	**7%**	**100%**

b. Synergies arrangements have had a positive impact on cooperation and coordination of your activities under the Rotterdam Convention

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	17%	17%	50%	17%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	0%	20%	60%	20%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
North America	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**7%**	**21%**	**36%**	**29%**	**7%**	**100%**

c. Synergies arrangements have had a positive impact on cooperation and coordination of your activities under the Stockholm Convention

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	17%	17%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	0%	20%	80%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
North America	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**7%**	**21%**	**29%**	**43%**	**0%**	**100%**

d. As far as I am aware, there is no unnecessary duplication in the partnership activities carried out under the three Conventions

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	40%	20%	40%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	100%
North America	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**7%**	**36%**	**21%**	**29%**	**7%**	**100%**

3. How do you think the following cooperation and coordination-related aspects of Basel Convention implementation have changed as a result of synergies arrangements?

a. Delivering technical assistance to the Parties

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	17%	17%	50%	0%	17%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	0%	40%	40%	20%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
North America	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**7%**	**7%**	**43%**	**14%**	**29%**	**100%**

b. Securing sustainable funding for the Convention

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	17%	0%	33%	33%	0%	17%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	0%	40%	20%	40%	100%
Europe	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	100%
North America	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**7%**	**7%**	**21%**	**29%**	**7%**	**29%**	**100%**

c. Developing and updating technical guidelines

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	0%	67%	17%	17%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	0%	60%	20%	20%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
North America	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**0%**	**7%**	**50%**	**14%**	**29%**	**100%**

d. Developing and implementing tools to assist implementation

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	0%	67%	17%	17%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	0%	60%	20%	20%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
North America	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**57%**	**14%**	**29%**	**100%**

e. Exchanging information between relevant stakeholders

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	33%	33%	17%	17%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	0%	40%	40%	20%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	100%
North America	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**0%**	**14%**	**43%**	**21%**	**21%**	**100%**

f. Raising the public profile of the Convention

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	50%	33%	0%	17%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	0%	40%	40%	20%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
North America	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**0%**	**36%**	**29%**	**14%**	**21%**	**100%**

g. Raising the political profile of the Convention

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	50%	33%	0%	17%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	0%	40%	40%	20%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
North America	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**0%**	**36%**	**29%**	**14%**	**21%**	**100%**

h. Preventing and combating illegal activity related to the Convention

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	17%	50%	17%	0%	17%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	40%	0%	20%	40%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
North America	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**7%**	**43%**	**7%**	**7%**	**36%**	**100%**

i. Resolving trade-related issues and disputes

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	17%	33%	33%	0%	17%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	40%	0%	20%	40%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
North America	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**7%**	**36%**	**14%**	**7%**	**36%**	**100%**

j. Monitoring of Convention implementation

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	17%	33%	17%	17%	17%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	20%	20%	20%	40%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
North America	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**7%**	**29%**	**14%**	**14%**	**36%**	**100%**

5. How do you think the following cooperation and coordination-related aspects of Rotterdam Convention implementation have changed as a result of synergies arrangements?

a. Delivering technical assistance to the Parties

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	17%	33%	17%	33%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	0%	80%	20%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
North America	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**0%**	**7%**	**50%**	**14%**	**29%**	**100%**

b. Securing sustainable funding for the Convention

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	17%	0%	50%	0%	33%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	20%	40%	20%	20%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
North America	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**7%**	**21%**	**36%**	**7%**	**29%**	**100%**

c. Developing and updating technical guidelines

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	17%	0%	33%	17%	33%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	40%	20%	40%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
North America	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**7%**	**21%**	**29%**	**21%**	**21%**	**100%**

d. Developing and implementing tools to assist implementation

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	17%	0%	50%	0%	33%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	20%	20%	40%	20%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
North America	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**7%**	**14%**	**36%**	**14%**	**29%**	**100%**

e. Exchanging information between relevant stakeholders

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	17%	0%	33%	17%	33%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	0%	60%	40%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
North America	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**7%**	**7%**	**50%**	**21%**	**14%**	**100%**

f. Raising the public profile of the Convention

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	0%	67%	0%	33%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	0%	60%	40%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
North America	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**0%**	**14%**	**57%**	**14%**	**14%**	**100%**

g. Raising the political profile of the Convention

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	0%	50%	17%	33%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
North America	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**0%**	**21%**	**36%**	**21%**	**21%**	**100%**

h. Preventing and combating illegal activity related to the Convention

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	17%	33%	17%	33%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	40%	20%	20%	20%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
North America	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**0%**	**36%**	**21%**	**14%**	**29%**	**100%**

i. Resolving trade-related issues and disputes

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	17%	0%	33%	17%	33%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	60%	0%	20%	20%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
North America	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**7%**	**36%**	**14%**	**14%**	**29%**	**100%**

j. Monitoring of Convention implementation

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	17%	0%	33%	17%	33%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	40%	0%	40%	20%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
North America	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**7%**	**29%**	**14%**	**21%**	**29%**	**100%**

7. How do you think the following cooperation and coordination-related aspects of Stockholm Convention implementation have changed as a result of synergies arrangements?

a. Delivering technical assistance to the Parties

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	33%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	0%	80%	20%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
North America	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**0%**	**14%**	**50%**	**21%**	**14%**	**100%**

b. Securing sustainable funding for the Convention

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	17%	17%	67%	0%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	20%	20%	20%	40%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
North America	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**7%**	**29%**	**36%**	**7%**	**21%**	**100%**

c. Developing and updating technical guidelines

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	17%	33%	0%	50%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	20%	60%	20%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
North America	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**7%**	**29%**	**29%**	**29%**	**7%**	**100%**

d. Developing and implementing tools to assist implementation

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	17%	33%	17%	33%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	20%	40%	20%	20%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
North America	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**7%**	**29%**	**29%**	**21%**	**14%**	**100%**

e. Exchanging information between relevant stakeholders

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	17%	17%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
North America	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**7%**	**21%**	**43%**	**29%**	**0%**	**100%**

f. Raising the public profile of the Convention

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	17%	33%	33%	17%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	40%	20%	40%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	100%
North America	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**7%**	**43%**	**29%**	**21%**	**0%**	**100%**

g. Raising the political profile of the Convention

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	33%	17%	17%	33%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	40%	20%	40%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
North America	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**14%**	**36%**	**14%**	**29%**	**7%**	**100%**

h. Preventing and combating illegal activity related to the Convention

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	33%	17%	17%	33%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	20%	40%	20%	20%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
North America	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**14%**	**21%**	**29%**	**21%**	**14%**	**100%**

i. Resolving trade-related issues and disputes

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	17%	33%	33%	17%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	40%	20%	20%	20%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
North America	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**7%**	**43%**	**21%**	**14%**	**14%**	**100%**

j. Monitoring of Convention implementation

Region	It is much worse now	It is slightly worse now	It is the same now	It is slightly better now	It is much better now	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	17%	17%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	20%	20%	40%	20%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
North America	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**7%**	**29%**	**21%**	**29%**	**14%**	**100%**

9. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

a. We have a clear contact point for communication with the BRS Secretariat

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	17%	33%	50%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	20%	40%	40%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	100%
North America	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**0%**	**14%**	**36%**	**43%**	**7%**	**100%**

b. The information provided to us by the Geneva Secretariat is always consistent with the information provided by the Rome Secretariat

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	0%	33%	33%	17%	17%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	40%	0%	40%	20%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	100%
North America	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**0%**	**36%**	**14%**	**29%**	**21%**	**100%**

c. The BRS Secretariat co-operate effectively with us to support implementation of the Basel, Rotterdam and/or Stockholm Conventions

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	Don't Know / N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	17%	17%	33%	33%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	0%	100%
Europe	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	100%
North America	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**15%**	**15%**	**38%**	**31%**	**0%**	**100%**

d. The BRS Secretariat co-operate more effectively with us to support implementation now than the previous Secretariat(s) did prior to 2011

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	17%	17%	67%	0%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	0%	40%	40%	20%	100%
Europe	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	100%
North America	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**14%**	**14%**	**43%**	**14%**	**14%**	**100%**

e. The BRS Secretariat are proactive in seeking to cooperate and coordinate with us in order to implement the Basel, Rotterdam or Stockholm Convention

Region	Strongly disagree	Mildly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mildly agree	Strongly agree	N/A	Grand Total
Africa	0%	17%	17%	50%	17%	0%	100%
Asia	0%	0%	0%	40%	40%	20%	100%
Europe	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	100%
North America	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Grand Total	**0%**	**14%**	**7%**	**36%**	**29%**	**14%**	**100%**

Annex 9 – Glossary of terms and abbreviations

BRS	Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions
CA	Competent Authority
CHM	Clearing House Mechanism
COB	Conventions Operations Branch
COPs	Conferences of the Parties
DNA	Delegated National Authority
ED	Executive Director of UNEP
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organisation [of the United Nations]
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreement
OCP	Official Contact Point
PIC	Prior Informed Consent
SOPs	Standard Operating Procedures
SSB	Scientific Support Branch
TA	Technical Assistance
TAB	Technical Assistance Branch
UN	United Nations
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme

Annex 10 – A-Z list of countries which responded to our Survey of Parties, including their regional classification for the purposes of our analysis

Country	Region for purposes of our analysis
Afghanistan	Asia
Antigua and Barbuda	Central & South America
Azerbaijan	Asia
Bahrain	Middle East
Belgium	Europe
Belize	Central & South America
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Europe
Bulgaria	Europe
Burundi	Africa
Canada	North America
Central African Republic	Africa
Chad	Africa
China	Asia
Colombia	Central & South America
Comoros	Africa
Congo	Africa
Costa Rica	Central & South America
Cuba	Central & South America
Dominican Republic	Central & South America
Ecuador	Central & South America
Egypt	Africa
El Salvador	Central & South America
European Union	Europe
Finland	Europe
Germany	Europe
Greece	Europe
Guyana	Central & South America
Honduras	Central & South America
Hungary	Europe
India	Asia
Iraq	Middle East
Japan	Asia
Jordan	Middle East
Lao	Asia
Lebanon	Middle East
Lesotho	Africa
Liberia	Africa
Macedonia	Europe
Madagascar	Africa
Maldives	Africa
Mali	Africa
Morocco	Africa
Mauritius	Africa
México	Central & South America

Country	Region for purposes of our analysis
Monaco	Europe
Montenegro	Europe
Mozambique	Africa
Nepal	Asia
Netherlands	Europe
Nicaragua	Central & South America
Norway	Europe
Oman	Middle East
Panama	Central & South America
Paraguay	Central & South America
Peru	Central & South America
Poland	Europe
Qatar	Middle East
Republic Marshall Islands	Asia
Republic of Guinea	Africa
Republic of Kazakhstan	Asia
Republic of Serbia	Europe
Republic of Yemen	Middle East
Romania	Europe
Romania	Europe
Senegal	Africa
Senegal	Africa
Seychelles	Africa
Slovakia	Europe
St. Kitts and Nevis	Central & South America
State of Palestine	Middle East
Swaziland	Africa
Swaziland	Africa
Sweden	Europe
Switzerland	Europe
Tanzania	Africa
Turkey	Europe
United Kingdom	Europe
United Republic of Tanzania	Africa
Uruguay	Central & South America
Vietnam	Asia

Annex 11 – Regional classifications used in our analysis, with countries who responded to our Survey of Parties

Africa

Burundi
Central African Republic
Chad
Comoros
Congo
Egypt
Guinea
Lesotho
Liberia
Madagascar
Maldives
Mali
Morocco
Mauritius
Mozambique
Senegal
Senegal
Seychelles
Swaziland
Swaziland
Tanzania
United Republic of Tanzania

Asia

Afghanistan
Azerbaijan
China
India
Japan
Lao
Nepal
Republic Marshall Islands
Republic of Kazakhstan
Vietnam

Central & South America

Antigua and Barbuda
Belize
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
El Salvador
Guyana
Honduras
México
Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
St. Kitts and Nevis
Uruguay

Europe

Belgium
Belgium
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Bulgaria
European Union
Finland
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Macedonia
Monaco
Montenegro
Netherlands
Norway
Poland
Republic of Serbia
Romania
Romania
Slovakia
Sweden
Switzerland
Turkey
United Kingdom

Middle East

Bahrain
Iraq
Jordan
Lebanon
Oman
Qatar
Republic of Yemen
State of Palestine

North America

Canada

Annex 12 – Countries who responded to our survey of Parties for each of the three Conventions

Basel Survey Responses: 59 responses from 58 Parties

Afghanistan	India	Qatar
Antigua and Barbuda	Iraq	Republic Marshall Islands
Azerbaijan	Japan	Republic of Kazakhstan
Bahrain	Jordan	Republic of Serbia
Belgium	Lao	Republic of Yemen
Belize	Lebanon	Romania
Bulgaria	Liberia	Senegal
Burundi	Madagascar	Seychelles
Canada	Maldives	Slovakia
China	Morocco	State of Palestine
Colombia	México	Swaziland
Congo	Montenegro	Sweden
Costa Rica	Mozambique	Switzerland
Cuba	Nepal	The Netherlands
Dominican Republic	Nicaragua	Turkey
Ecuador	Norway	United Kingdom
Egypt	Oman	United Republic of Tanzania
El Salvador	Panama	Uruguay
European Union	Paraguay	
Honduras	Peru	

Rotterdam Survey Responses: 48 responses from 46 Parties

Antigua and Barbuda	Cuba	Jordan
Belgium	Dominican Republic	Lao
Belize	Ecuador	Lebanon
Bulgaria	European Union	Lesotho
Burundi	Greece	Macedonia
Canada	Guyana	Maldives
Chad	Honduras	Mauritius
China	Iraq	México
Colombia	Japan	Morocco

Nepal
Norway
Peru
Qatar
Republic Marshall Islands
Republic of Kazakhstan
Republic of Serbia
Republic of Yemen
St. Kitts and Nevis
Swaziland
Sweden
Switzerland
Tanzania
The Netherlands
Turkey
United Kingdom
United Republic of Tanzania
Uruguay
Vietnam

Stockholm Survey Responses: 64 responses from 62 Parties

Antigua and Barbuda
Azerbaijan
Bahrain
Belgium
Belize
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Bulgaria
Canada
Central African Republic
China
Colombia
Comoros
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
El Salvador
EU
Finland
Germany
Guyana
Honduras
Hungary
India
Iraq
Japan
Jordan
Lao
Lebanon
Liberia
Madagascar
Maldives
Mali
Morocco
Mauritius
México
Monaco
Montenegro
Nepal
Norway
Peru
Poland
Qatar
Republic Marshall Islands
Republic of Kazakhstan
Republic of Macedonia
Republic of Serbia
Republic of Yemen
Republic of Guinea
Romania
Senegal
Seychelles
Slovakia
Swaziland
Sweden
Switzerland
The Netherlands
Turkey
United Kingdom
United Republic of Tanzania
Uruguay