

**Project Evaluation Series
01/2020**

**Final Evaluation of “Demonstration project for the
Decontamination of Persistent Organic
Pesticides Contaminated Soils using Non-thermal
Treatment Methods”**

Project code: GCP/BOT/011/GFF
GEF ID: 3958

**Terminal Evaluation of “Prevention and Disposal of
Persistent Organic Pollutants and Obsolete Pesticides
in Eritrea”
Phase II**

Project code: GCP/ERI/014/GFF
GEF ID: 3987

**Final evaluation of “Disposal of persistent organic
pollutants and obsolete pesticides in Mozambique”**

Project code: GCP/MOZ/100/GFF
GEF ID: 3986

Annex 2. Inception report

POPs Evaluation Cluster

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
Rome, 2020**

1. Background

1. The evaluation will use a **cluster approach**. This means that this Project, together with two other Persistent Organic Pollutants – related projects in Eritrea and Botswana that are due for final evaluations, will have a common evaluation management and evaluation team. This approach will decrease the overall cost and will enrich the analyses of the evaluation. Each project within the cluster will have a separate Terms of Reference and a Final Evaluation Report. The cluster approach will also produce a **lessons learned document** in addition to individual evaluation reports, to take stock on implementation of Persistent Organic Pollutants projects in East and Southern Africa, building from similar lessons learned document from West Africa.
2. **Botswana.** The Project's overall objective is *"Reduction of risk to public health and environment from pesticides through the detailed characterization, selection of treatment option, and decontamination of approx. 18.000 tonnes of POPs and pesticide-contaminated soil at the Sebele Farm site and associated sites in Botswana"*.
3. The Project has 13 sub - outcomes:
 - Outcome 1.1 Characterization of level and type of contamination at contaminated sites
 - Outcome 1.2 Commercially available non-thermal treatment options assessed
 - Outcome 1.3 Existing obsolete stocks and stockpiles of contaminated containers safeguarded and disposed of
 - Outcome 2.1 Revised pesticide and waste management legislation in place
 - Outcome 2.2 Systems supporting life-cycle management of pesticides instituted
 - Outcome 2.3 Review of pest control strategies and promotion of less toxic alternatives to pesticides
 - Outcome 2.4 Communications and awareness programme in place
 - Outcome 3.1 Soil Treatment option selected.
 - Outcome 3.2 Contaminated soil treated.
 - Outcome 4.1. M&E systems in place
 - Outcome 4.2 Project components implemented effectively and efficiently
 - Outcome 5.1 Institutional arrangements in place
 - Outcome 5.2 Planning and management effectively executed
4. **Eritrea.** The Project's overall objective is *"To eliminate risks from POPs and other obsolete pesticides in Eritrea through the use of sound environmental management methods to dispose of existing stocks and prevent further accumulation of POPs and obsolete pesticides. This will result in the reduced exposure of farmers, consumers and the public"*.
5. The Project has 3 Outcomes:
 - Outcome 1. Eritrea's existing stocks of POPs and other obsolete pesticides safely destroyed and strategies for the remediation of contaminated materials, including soils developed and demonstrated
 - Outcome 2. Strengthened capacity for pesticide life-cycle management
 - Outcome 3. Raised awareness of pesticide hazards and risk reduction
 - Outcome 4. Project monitored and evaluated effectively

6. **Mozambique.** The Project's overall objective is *"to reduce the risks posed by POPs and pesticides wastes in Mozambique through the development of a national risk profile of contaminated sites and other POPs/pesticide contaminated materials. The project will result in the development of detailed site-specific waste management plans followed by the development and implementation of a national strategy for effective POPs waste management for existing and potential future wastes"*.
7. The Project has six sub-outcomes:
 - Outcome 1.1 The containment and removal of buried pesticides at prioritized high-risk locations thus preventing continuing environmental contamination and public health risks
 - Outcome 1.2 Removal and safe treatment of all old pesticide containers produced as a result of the implementation of past projects
 - Outcome 2.1 The development of a sustainable system for container management in collaboration with the pesticide industry
 - Outcome 2.2: Institutional capacity developed and national pesticide management policy strengthened to ensure the risk to the environmental and public health from obsolete pesticides and associated wastes is minimized in the future
 - Outcome 2.3: Improved management of pesticides imported into Mozambique for agricultural and public health uses through all stages of the pesticide life-cycle and institutionalization of the Pesticide Safe Management Strategy (PSMS).
 - Outcome 3.1: Monitoring and evaluation systems will be put in place to ensure the project components are implemented effectively and efficiently.
 - Outcome 3.2: Project personnel from line ministries will be trained in the principles of project management which apply to a wide range of future challenges

2. Stakeholder analysis

8. A comprehensive list of key people, groups, and institutions that were involved in the project was compiled with the assistance of National Project Coordinators and the Chief Technical Advisor.
9. Based on the nature and extent of their involvement and their availability, stakeholders will be identified for participation in the inception workshop, face to face interviews, focal group discussions or interviews via Skype. Care will be taken to ensure that all groups are represented including project staff, GEF and FAO representatives, representatives from governments and donor agencies, private sector, NGOs with interest in the project and communities around project sites. The inception workshop is designed to provide an early opportunity for stakeholders to raise issues to be considered during the evaluation, as well as to identify key people to talk to not on the initial list.

3. Evaluation approach and methodology

3.1. Evaluation Approach

10. The evaluation takes a 'cluster' approach in which the same evaluation team evaluate three similar projects back to back over 30 days and then produce three evaluation reports and one synthesis publication. The approach is chosen to save money and maximize insight and learning. The three projects are:
 - "Demonstration project for decontamination of POPs contaminated soils using non-thermal treatment methods" GCP/BOT/011/GFF in Botswana.
 - "Prevention and Disposal of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and Obsolete Pesticides in Eritrea Phase II Prevention and Disposal of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and Obsolete Pesticides in Eritrea Phase II" GCP/ERI/014/GFF in Eritrea
 - "Disposal of Persistent Organic Pesticides (POPs) and Obsolete Pesticides in Mozambique" GCP /MOZ/100/GFF in Mozambique
11. The evaluation is informed by the value for money framework¹ as well as United Nations Evaluation Group UNEG Norms & Standards² and will be in line with the OED Manual and methodological guidelines and practices. This is reflected in the five areas chosen for inquiry relating to relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, equity and sustainability, and impact.
 1. How relevant was the project to global and national efforts for reducing and eliminating risks due to obsolete pesticides, including POPs?
 2. How satisfactory was the project in implementation and execution in achieving outputs? How satisfactory was M&E?

¹ See [here](#)

² <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21>

3. How effective has the project been in delivering outcomes (both expected and unexpected)?
 4. To what extent and how did the project include social issues, including gender, in project design and implementation?
 5. To what extent and how can project outcomes be sustained and scaled to achieve broader impact?
12. A number of sub-questions further elaborates the evaluation questions. The sub-questions are based on an exhaustive reading of the project document and mid-term evaluation report and are fine-tuned during the inception workshop. The sub-questions are also chosen and worded such that answering them will provide a basis for the evaluators to rate project performance as per GEF requirements for Terminal evaluations. Judgment criteria for answering the sub-questions as well as sources of data and methods of analysis are shown in an evaluation matrix (Appendix 2).

3.2. Evaluation Tools

13. **Theory of Change (ToC)** will be one of the main methods to be used in the evaluation process. All the three projects do not have a Theory of Change; rather they have a log frame that describes the results logic. Common to all three projects is that the definition of outputs and outcomes are often used interchangeably. The Theory of Change exercise will build a logical progression, interlinkages, and feedbacks loops of outcomes. A draft TOC will be formulated by the Evaluation Team and validated by the participants in the workshop. Based on the TOC, the assumptions will be formulated and tested with various tools within the evaluation.
- a. Develop the TOC of the project through review of documents and initial discussions. Nuance the TOC to differentiate output level results and outcome level results. Validate the Theory of Change drafted before the workshop.
 - b. Conduct a formulation of Timeline of the Project and an After-Action-Review around the Outcomes of as stated in the TOC. This reinforces the validation process, nuances and enriches the TOC (refer to the workshop methodology in section).
 - c. Draft related assumption related to the TOC.
 - d. Test the assumptions to see if: (a) the precondition for the outcome is met or (b) the outcomes are met.
 - e. Collate the information in the Evaluation Matrix.
 - f. Use the information/findings/evidence from this exercise for triangulation and present in the (a) Final Evaluation Report and (b) as a separate report in the Annex.
14. The **Evaluation Matrix** will be one of the main methods in the evaluation process. The evaluation questions will be the backbone of the matrix. Judgment criteria will be developed with the project team and various stakeholders. Information and triangulation will come from various tools of data collection such as Systematic Desk Review, Key Informant Interviews, Focus Group Discussion, Field Validation Visits/Direct Observations
15. **Systematic Desk Review**

- a. Review the log frame and collect information on the targets, baseline, and the Source of Verification.
- b. Build a library of information, conduct a systematic analysis.
- c. Use the information/findings/evidence from this exercise for triangulation and present in the (a) Evaluation Matrix (b) Final Evaluation Report and (c) a separate table of output level achievements will be developed as an Annex.

16. Key Informant Interviews (KI)/Focus Group Discussion (FGD)

- a. Request information from the PMU on important stakeholders to engage for KI and FGD (most FGDs would be related to Field Validation Visits).
- b. Conduct a parallel stakeholder analysis through desk review and scoping interviews with the project team.
- c. Conduct KIs and FGDs.
- d. Use the information/findings/evidence from this exercise for triangulation in the Evaluation Matrix and present in the Final Evaluation Report.

17. Field Validation Visits/Direct Observations

- a. Request information from the PMU on essential results that can be seen in the field. It is important to see sites where the project did well, where the project did not do well, and where the project did not do any change.
- b. Conduct a parallel analysis of possible field validation visits through desk review and initial scoping with the project team.
- c. Conduct field visits.
- d. Use the information/findings/evidence from this exercise for triangulation in the Evaluation Matrix and present in the Final Evaluation Report

3.3. Evaluation Workshop

18. A vital part of the approach is to hold an inception workshop at the start of the evaluation team's visit to each of the three countries. The purpose is to build participants understanding and ownership of the evaluation process and results as well as to inform the evaluation. The decision to start with a workshop is the recognition that the project staff and implementers are in the best position to identify the most relevant results of the project. Based on various evaluation experiences³, evaluations that include those involved are more likely to produce that are accepted as useful and used. In addition, when people participate in evaluations, they are more likely to see it as an opportunity for learning, reflection, and improvement and are more able to be self-critical.

³ Paz-Ybarnegaray, Rodrigo, and Boru Douthwaite. "Outcome evidencing: A method for enabling and evaluating program intervention in complex systems." *American Journal of Evaluation* 38, no. 2 (2017): 275-293.

19. In this respect, this workshop will nuance results, gather evidence, and understand how results came to be. Participants will be encouraged to help build an understanding of how to best sustain and scale achievements. The workshop will be of value to the participants by allowing them to reflect together on what went well, not so well and what lessons they can learn for the future. Participants will have an opportunity to suggest recommendations the evaluation might make to reduce the risk from POPS and obsolete pesticides in the country.
20. Through close coordination with the project team, about 15-25 project staff and key stakeholders will be identified to attend the workshop. This would include FAO Project Staff, SC members, National Program Officer, Project Field Managers, representatives from the Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Environment Focal Point, etc.
21. Through a participatory process, the Evaluation Team will facilitate participants to meet the following objectives:
- To identify the Project's most significant achievements, both expected and unexpected, descriptions of how they were achieved and ways to validate causal claims relating to those achievements;
 - To develop a project theory of change based on outcomes achieved⁴;
 - To identify key challenges and if and how they were overcome;
 - To identify key insight and lessons learned (if you were to do it again, what would you do differently);
 - To seek inputs from project staff and stakeholders on the evaluation questions and judgment criteria;
22. The workshop will produce the following outputs:
- A listing of what project staff and stakeholders consider to be the project's most significant achievements together with documents and names of people that can validate causal claims relating to those achievements
 - A project Theory of Change
 - A listing of key challenges and description of how they were overcome
 - A listing of key insights and lessons learned by project staff and stakeholders
 - Changes to the evaluation questions that make the answers more relevant to project staff and stakeholders
23. The workshop will follow the following format:
- Timeline.
 - After-Action-Review.
 - Discussion on the way forward
 - Review of the TOC.
 - Review of the Evaluation Question.

⁴ The three projects do not have a theory of change

24. Agenda Overview of the workshop.

Day 1: Identifying key project outputs, outcomes, challenges, insight and learning[Evaluators refine the draft project theory of change based on inputs from the workshop and modify evaluation matrix based on output from Day 1]:

- Opening, introductions, expectations
- Introduction to key concepts and ideas
- Identification of significant project outputs and outcomes at different steps of the pesticide management life-cycle and for project management and M&E
- Identifying causal links between outputs and outcomes
- Identify key challenges and how they were overcome

Day 2: Input into project theory of change and evaluation questions

- Discussion and participant recommendations for modification of project theory of change
- Discussion and participant recommendations for modification of evaluation questions and refinement of judgment criteria

25. **Participants.** Through close coordination with the project team, about 15-25 project staff and key stakeholders will be identified to attend the workshop. This would include FAO Project Staff, SC members, National Program Officer, Project Field Managers, representatives from the Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Environment Focal Point, etc.

4. Site mapping and sampling

26. The evaluation team will visit each of the three evaluation countries for nine days, two days of which will be taken up in the inception workshop. The team will then split with one evaluator visiting remediation sites that are possible to reach within the time available. The decision was made to be more efficient in covering field mission and important interviews in and around the capital. During the field visits, key informant interviews will be held with project counterparts at the provincial level in the collaborating line ministries (agriculture, environment, health) as well as the private sector and community representatives close to contaminated sites. About 40 key partners and beneficiaries will be engaged during each visit. Special effort will be made to engage women and youth during community visits.

27. The field visits are described in the timeline below.

5. Limitations and risks

28. The **cluster approach** was applied to these three projects because of technical and administrative reasons. Technically, these projects almost have the same modus operandi, which makes sense to have a common umbrella of a “cluster evaluation” for lessons learning and comparability. Administratively, the projects in Botswana and Eritrea are subsidizing the project in Mozambique, which has a limited evaluation budget provision. The Mozambique project will benefit from an international and regional consultant, which it could not afford if it were a stand-alone evaluation.

In this respect, the missions needed to be one-after-the-other for budget and financial administration reasons. Besides, the projects in Botswana and Eritrea are ending in December. Hence there is an urgency that the missions need to proceed so that the Mozambique evaluation can take advantage of the clustering approach. The evaluation visits have been planned back to back, meaning the team go straight from Mozambique to Botswana and then on to Eritrea over 32 days. The main limitation to each of the three evaluations is the time that the evaluation team has to prepare for and then consolidate findings after the evaluation visits.

29. The team will do what is possible in the time available, but the expectation should be that the length and depth of three evaluations on a tight timeline will inevitably be less deep and thorough than three individual evaluations. On the other hand, the team will be able to produce a cross-case learning report that should be of real value in guiding future work to dispose of obsolete POPs. The cluster evaluation trades some depth for higher synthesis, and this should be recognized.
30. There was an urgency to complete terms of reference (only for Mozambique) at the same time as that fieldwork has started. The inception report is relatively on time, as stated in the OED guidelines that it should be submitted 1 week after the start of the main mission. However, the risks that some feedback may not be fully taken into account as the team's flexibility to make changes is reduced once country visits start.
31. Finally, the three projects began before the requirement to include gender mainstreaming during implementation and before the requirement to develop and work with a theory of change. The team expects that the usefulness of GEF and FAO guidelines for evaluating gender mainstreaming and for evaluating monitoring and evaluation will be limited.

6. Timeline and deliverables

Date	Day	Activity
MOZAMBIQUE		
17-Nov-18	Saturday	Travel
18-Nov-18	Sunday	Evaluation Team Meeting
19-Nov-18	Monday	Mozambique / day -1 Debriefing with FAOR/ De Briefing with Project Team/ Briefing by UNDSS
20-Nov-18	Tuesday	Mozambique / Workshop-day 2
21-Nov-18	Wednesday	Mozambique /Field Mission-day 3 (2 teams, one for Moziva and one for Motola-Maputo)
22-Nov-18	Thursday	Mozambique /Field Mission-day 4 (2 teams, one for Moziva and one for Motola-Maputo)
23-Nov-18	Friday	Mozambique /Field Mission-day 5 (2 teams, one for Moziva and one for Motola-Maputo)
24-Nov-18	Saturday	Mozambique /Field Mission- day 6 (2 teams, one for Moziva and one for Motola-Maputo)
25-Nov-18	Sunday	Mozambique /Field Mission-day 7 (2 team s meet in Maputo)
26-Nov-18	Monday	Mozambique /Field Mission-day 8 (Maputo Meetings)
27-Nov-18	Tuesday	Mozambique /day -9 De Briefing with Project Team /Debriefing with FAOR/Travel to Botswana
BOTSWANA		
28-Nov-18	Wednesday	Botswana /Briefing with Country Office and Project team (AM) / Workshop-day 1-Half day (PM)

29-Nov-18	Thursday	Botswana / Workshop-day2
30-Nov-18	Friday	Botswana / Workshop-day 3
1-Dec-18	Saturday	Botswana
2-Dec-18	Sunday	Travel to field
3-Dec-18	Monday	Botswana /Field Mission-day 4
4-Dec-18	Tuesday	Botswana /Field Mission-day 5
5-Dec-18	Wednesday	Botswana /Field Mission-day 6
6-Dec-18	Thursday	Botswana /Field Mission- day 7
7-Dec-18	Friday	Botswana /Field Mission-day 8/ De Briefing with FAOR
ERITREA		
8-Dec-18	Saturday	Travel to Eritrea
9-Dec-18	Sunday	Rest
10-Dec-18	Monday	Eritrea /day -1 day -1 Debriefing with FAOR/De Briefing with Project Team/Briefing by UNDSS
11-Dec-18	Tuesday	Eritrea / Workshop-day 2
12-Dec-18	Wednesday	Eritrea / Workshop-day 3
13-Dec-18	Thursday	Eritrea /Field Mission-day 4 or Interviews in Asmara
14-Dec-18	Friday	Eritrea /Field Mission-day 5 or Interviews in Asmara
15-Dec-18	Saturday	Eritrea /Field Mission-day 6 or Interviews in Asmara
16-Dec-18	Sunday	Eritrea
17-Dec-18	Monday	Eritrea /Field Mission-day 8 or Interviews in Asmara
18-Dec-18	Tuesday	Eritrea / De Briefing with Project Team /Debriefing with FAOR/Travel to duty stations

7. Stakeholders involved in the three POPs projects part of the Cluster Evaluation

Potential participation in the evaluation	Name	Role	Institution
BOTSWANA			
Interview in Gaborone	Motshwari Obopile	SC member/National MTE Consultant	Botswana College of Agriculture (BCA)
Interview in Gaborone	B. Lechina	Research Officer	DCP
Interview in Gaborone	K. Moasi	SC member	DCP
Interview in Gaborone	Loitseng Sebetwane	Registrar of Pesticides/ 1st NPC	DCP – Registrar of Pesticides
Interview in Gaborone	Mr Majaule	SC member	Department of Agricultural Research
Interview in Gaborone	H. Modiakgotla	Chief - Head of Plant Protection	Department of Crop Protection (DCP)
Interview in Gaborone	K. Sebua	Research Officer	Department of Crop Protection (DCP)
Interview in Gaborone	L. Kanelo	Research Officer	Department of Crop Protection (DCP)
Interview in Gaborone	Tshepo Mosedame	Research Officer	Department of Crop Protection (DCP)
Interview in Gaborone	C.Mbereki (NPC)	Research Officer	Department of Crop Protection (DCP)
Interview in Gaborone	G. Maseelane	SC member	Department of Public Health

Interview in Gaborone	S. Motladiile	SC member	Dept of Waste Management and Pollution Control (DWMPC)
Interview in Gaborone	Keletso Segokgo	Office Assistant	FAO Botswana
Interview in Gaborone	Molathlegi Modise	National Project Coordinator (full time and employed by project)	FAO Botswana
Interview in Gaborone	Rene Czudek	FAO Representative	FAO Botswana
Interview in Gaborone	Balasang J. Mmusi	Communications Officer	Min of Agriculture
Interview in Gaborone	Galeitsiwe Ramokapane	Director of Crops and Chairman of Steering Committee	Min of Agriculture
Interview in Gaborone	Tirelo Ditshipi	Communications Officer	Min of Agriculture
Interview in Gaborone	Hillary Masundire	National HHP/KAP Survey Consultant	Uni. Of Botswana
Interview in Gaborone	G. Bojase		University of Botswana
Interview in Gaborone	V. Obuseng	SC member	University of Botswana
Interview in Gaborone	Tshiamo Rantao	National Legal Consultant	
Interview in Project Site 1		Fábrica de Óleos	Private Sector Beneficiary
Interview in Project Site 1	Carla Albino	DPA	Provincial Government Min. Agriculture Focal Point
Skype interview	Baogen Gu	Budget Holder	FAO AGPMC
Skype interview	Elisabetta Tagliati	Lead Technical Officer	FAO AGPMC
Skype interview	Francesca Mancini	Lead Technical Officer	FAO AGPMC
Skype interview	Ivy Saunyama	Chief Technical Advisor	FAO AGPMC
Skype interview	Mark Davis	Budget Holder	FAO AGPMC
Skype interview	Richard Thompson	Lead Technical Officer	FAO AGPMC
Skype interview	Russell Cobann	LTO/Remediation Consultant	FAO AGPMC
Skype interview	Lalaina Ravelomanansto	FAO Legal Officer	LEGN
Skype interview	Andrea Rother	Pesticide Risk Reduction Consultant (HHP)	
Skype interview	Carlo Lupi	Mid Term Evaluation Consultant	
Skype interview	Colin Lang	Remediation Consultant	
Skype interview	Detlef Döhnert	Empty Pesticide Container Management Expert	
Skype interview	Harold van der Valk	Pest and Pesticide Management Consultant	
Skype interview	Joost Vlaming	Registration Toolkit Expert	
Skype interview	Livia LoyDona	Pesticide Risk Reduction Communication/Survey Consultant	
Skype interview	Roma Gwynn	IPM Consultant	
Skype interview	Vito Buonsante	International Legal Consultant	
ERITREA			
Interview in Asmara	Kuena Morebotsane	Project Liaison Officer	FAO CBC
Interview in Asmara	Alganesh Ghebrekristos Berhe	Project Officer	FAO ERITREA
Interview in Asmara	Asghedom Teklemariam	Assistant FAOR Programmes	FAO ERITREA
Interview in Asmara	Berhan Araya	Project Assistant/Communications Officer	FAO ERITREA
Interview in Asmara	Elsa Tekle	Procurement Officer	FAO ERITREA

Interview in Asmara	Ghenet Tefzazion	Assistant FAO R Administration	FAO ERITREA
Interview in Asmara	Mehreteab Gherewoldi	Driver	FAO ERITREA
Interview in Asmara	Paulos Andemariam	Programme Coordinator	FAO ERITREA
Interview in Asmara	Ousmane Guindo	Budget Holder (FAOR)	FAO ERITREA (FAOR)
Interview in Asmara	Aduigna Haile	National IPM Consultant	Hamelmalo Agricultural College
Interview in Asmara	Tekle Berhan	SC Member	Ministry of Health (malaria Control)
Interview in Asmara	Mr Ghebrezgiher Hailemichael	SC Member	Ministry of Education (MoE)
Interview in Asmara	Aman Saleh	SC Member	Ministry of Health Malaria Control
Interview in Asmara	Kaleab Haile Mokonnen	National Project Coordinator	Regulatory Services Department
Interview in Asmara	TekleabMesghena	Chairman PSC/Project Director	Regulatory Services Department
Interview in Asmara	Leith Watson	Disposal Contractor	Veolia
Interview in Asmara	Tony Richards	Disposal Contractor	Veolia
Interview in Asmara	Adel Osman	Safeguarding team (paraquat)	
Interview in Asmara	Isaac Giorgis	Safeguarding team (paraquat)	
Interview in Asmara	Kibrom Asmerom	MoLWE	
Interview in Asmara	Kidane Yohanes	Safeguarding team (paraquat)	
Interview in Asmara	Michael Yacob	NARI (IPM TT)	
Interview in Asmara	Misghina Okbasiassie	PSD (M+E)	
Interview in Asmara	Shidan Tekley	MoA-RSD (Pesticide TT)	
Interview in Asmara	Tedros Seium AED	Communication TT	
Interview in Asmara	Teklit Andom	Safeguarding team (paraquat)	
Skype interview	Leula Mekonnen	SC Member	Eritrean and Crops and Livestock Corporation (ECLC)
Skype interview	Elisabetta Tagliati	Lead Technical Officer	FAO AGPMC
Skype interview	Isabelle Pierrard	Communications Expert	FAO AGPMC
Skype interview	Ivy Saunyama	International Consultant IPM FFS/ Lead Technical Officer/CTA	FAO AGPMC
Skype interview	Mark Davis	Budget Holder	FAO AGPMC
Skype interview	Michael Hansen	Chief Technical Adviser	FAO AGPMC
Skype interview	Mr. Alfredo Impiglia	IPM FFS International Consultant	FAO AGPMC
Skype interview	Richard Thompson	Lead Technical Officer	FAO AGPMC
Skype interview	Russell Cobban	International Consultant/Officer	FAO AGPMC
Skype interview	Bui Thi Lan	Budget Holder	FAO ERITREA (FAOR)
Skype interview	Wouter Pronk	Landfill Expert	Greencross Switzerland
Skype interview	Brigitte Nyambo	IPM FFS International Consultant	
Skype interview	Carlo Lupi	Mid Term Evaluation Consultant	
Skype interview	David Laycock	Pesticide Store/Stock Management Consultant	
Skype interview	Kiran Virpathi	PSMS Internatioal Consultant	
Skype interview	Luciano Rovesti	IPM FFS International Consultant	
Skype interview	Mr. Ashraf Al Hawamdeh	IPM FFS International Consultant	
MOZAMBIQUE			
Briefing and De Briefing in Maputo	Olman Serrano	FAO Representant	FAO MOZAMBIQUE
Evaluation Workshop Participant	Lizi Mabote	SC Member	Agrifocus - Private company

Evaluation Workshop Participant	Carla Cuambe	Program Officer	FAO MOZAMBIQUE
Evaluation Workshop Participant	Khalid Cassam	National Project Coordinator	FAO MOZAMBIQUE
Evaluation Workshop Participant	Mauricio Sulila	SC Member	LIVANINGO?
Evaluation Workshop Participant	Luciano Gonçalves	Project Field Manager - Min Agric Technician	Min Agrc
Evaluation Workshop Participant	Egídio Bacalhau	Project Field Manager - Min Environment Technician	Min Environ
Evaluation Workshop Participant	Samson Cuamba	Project Focal Point at Min Environment	Min Environ
Evaluation Workshop Participant	Sidonio Cottage	Min Environment Officer	Min Environ (the focal point of Stockholm convention)
Evaluation Workshop Participant	Rosalia Naife	National Directorate for Environment	National Directorate for Environment
Evaluation Workshop Participant	Lucas Umusse	New Head of pest registration center	pest registration center
Evaluation Workshop Participant	Domingos Cugala		UEM/FAEF
Evaluation Workshop Participant	Anastacio Luis	Former Head of pest registration center	
Interview in Maputo	Claudia Pereira	FAO Representant Assistant - Program	FAO MOZAMBIQUE
Interview in Maputo	Júlio de Castro	FAO Representant	FAO MOZAMBIQUE
Interview in Maputo	Balbina FN Muller	Donor	Japan embassy
Interview in Maputo	Yuka Iwanami	SC Member	Japan embassy
Interview in Maputo	Mahomed Rafik Vala	National Director of Agriculture	Min Agriculture
Interview in Maputo	Pedro Dzucula	National Director of Agriculture	Min Agriculture
Interview in Maputo	Serafina Mangana	Plant Protection Head of Department	Min Agriculture
Interview in Maputo	Ana Cardoso	SC Member	Min Health
Interview in Maputo	Francisco Chuquela Langa	SC Member	Min Industry and Trade
Interview in Maputo	Momade Nemané	GEF Focal Point	Mozambique GEF Focal Person
Interview in Maputo		Jutiça Ambietal	NGO
Interview in Maputo	Buque / Fagildo	TECAP	Private Sector
Interview in Maputo	Muhamad Carolia	ABBA	Private Sector
Interview in Maputo	Osvaldo / Rohit	OLAM	Private Sector
Interview in Maputo	Sandra Chemane	SC Member	University
Interview in Maputo	Paula Pimentel		USAID
no action needed	Olga Silvia	Operation Officer	FAO MOZAMBIQUE
no action needed	Sandra Gomes	Operation Officer	FAO MOZAMBIQUE
no action needed	Silvia Cuambe	Operation Officer	FAO MOZAMBIQUE
no action needed	Abel Omar	Project Field Worker	
no action needed	Carlos Amilton	Project Field Worker	
no action needed	Elton Onesio Bacalhau	Project Field Worker	
no action needed	Francisco Banze	Project Field Worker	
no action needed	Hamiltom Mambo	Project Field Worker	
no action needed	João José Calimbo	Project Field Worker	
no action needed	Silvio Gove	Project Field Worker	
no action needed	Swidique Abdul Omar	Project Field Worker	
no action needed	Virgilio Vasco Cumbe	Project Field Worker	
Skype interview	Baogen Gu	Budget Holder	FAO AGPMC

Skype interview	Elisabetta Tagliati	Lead Technical Officer	FAO AGPMC
Skype interview	Francesca Mancini	Lead Technical Officer	FAO AGPMC
Skype interview	Ivy Saunyama	Chief Technical Advisor	FAO AGPMC
Skype interview	Kevin Helps	LTO	FAO AGPMC
Skype interview	Mark Davis	Budget Holder	FAO AGPMC
Skype interview	Richard Thompson	Lead Technical Officer	FAO AGPMC
Skype interview	Russell Cobann	LTO/Remediation Consultant	FAO AGPMC
Skype interview	Lalaina Ravelomananstoa	FAO Legal Officer	LEGN
Skype interview	Andrea Rother	Pesticide Risk Reduction Consultant (HHP)	
Skype interview	Carlo Lupi	Mid Term Evaluation Consultant	
Skype interview	Eloise Touni	Consultant M & E	
Skype interview	Harold van der Valk	Pest and Pesticide Management Consultant	
Skype interview	Livia LoyDona	Pesticide Risk Reduction Communication/Survey Consultant	

32. Also, in each of the field visits the following stakeholder will be targeted for interviews. Farmer or Farmer's group around the contaminated aream, Provincial Government; Private Sector, Provincial Government Min. Agriculture Focal Point, Provincial Government Min. Health Focal Point, Provincial Government Min. Environmental/Water Focal Point; Provincial Government Min. Industry and Trade Focal Point, Environmental NGO

8. Evaluation Matrix

Sub-questions	Judgment criteria	Sources of data and methods of analysis
1. Relevance		
<i>Evaluation question 1: "How relevant was the project to national and regional efforts for reducing, eliminating the production, management of POPs?"</i>		
To what extent and how was the project relevant to Mozambique's commitment to internationally ratified plans and conventions relating to POPs?	The project was relevant to GEF-4 POPs strategic objectives of reducing and elimination production, use and release of POPs	
To what extent was the project relevant to Mozambique's national policies relating to POPs?		
2. Efficiency		
<i>Evaluation question 2: How satisfactory was project implementation and execution in achieving outputs? (e.g., contaminated sites cleaned)</i>		
To what extent did the project's implementation and institutional arrangements support the achievement of project outputs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The hosting arrangements provided by MINAG have been satisfactory - The Project Management Unit (PMU) has received useful and timely guidance and leadership from the Project Steering Committee (SC) - The subcomponents were well managed 	

	- Expected outputs were delivered on-time	
To what extent has the project contained and removed buried pesticides at high-risk locations?		
To what extent has the project prevented continuing environmental contamination and public health?		
To what extent has the project removed and safely treated all old pesticide containers from past projects?		
To what extent has the project adopted and used the same operational standards as the GEF-supported Africa Stockpiles Programme?		
To what extent did the M&E system meet planning, accountability, and learning requirements?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The M&E system was usefully able to track project implementation against work plans - Realistic goals and time frames were set for implementation - The M&E system allowed for learning and supported adaptive programming, where appropriate 	
3. Effectiveness		
<i>Evaluation Question 3: How effective has the project been in delivering outcomes (both expected and unexpected)?</i>		
To what extent was the project designed and implemented to achieve outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project coordination function and institutional arrangements, including joint project steering committees, were designed and functioned, in part, to promote and maintain ownership and healthy and active partnership 	
To what extent and how has the project developed a sustainable system for container management with the pesticide industry?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A system for managing containers has been developed in partnership with the pesticide industry - The system is being used 	
To what extent and how has the project developed institutional capacity to reduce the risk from pesticides and associated wastes?		Use of OED guidance on evaluating CAPDEV
To what extent has the project strengthened national pest management policy to reduce risk from pesticides and associated wastes?		
To what extent has the project improved management of pesticides imported into Mozambique for agricultural and public health purposes through all stages of the pesticide life cycle?		
To what extent has the project generated unexpected outcomes?		
To what extent is the PSMS functioning?		
4. Normative values and social inclusion (equity)		

<i>To what extent and how did the project include social issues, including gender, in project design and implementation?</i>		
Same as above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A gender analysis was conducted at project design. - The project design includes specific gender indicators/targets or activities (at country or project/ regional level). - Gender was mainstreamed throughout the design. - Equal and active participation of women in project activities - Social safeguards were clarified and rigorously enforced 	
5. Sustainability and scaling		
<i>Evaluation question 5. What are the strategies and impact pathways by which early project outcomes can be sustained and scaled to achieve wider impact? How can the strategies and pathways be supported after the end of the project?</i>		
What are the risks to sustaining project outcomes, and are they likely to be mitigated or avoided?	- The risk	
To what extent can the project outcomes be up-scaled, replicated, or serve as a catalyst for future interventions?		