

PROJECT EVALUATION

**Terms of Reference for the Final
Evaluation of the Project
“Disposal of Persistent Organic
Pesticides (POPs) and Obsolete
Pesticides in Mozambique”**

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
OFFICE OF EVALUATION
November 2018**

Contents

| | |
|--|------------|
| Acronyms and abbreviations..... | iii |
| Introduction | 1 |
| 1 Background and Context of the Project..... | 1 |
| 2 Evaluation purpose | 2 |
| 3 Evaluation scope..... | 2 |
| 4 Evaluation objectives and Evaluation questions | 4 |
| 5 Methodology | 6 |
| 6 Roles and responsibilities..... | 8 |
| 7 Evaluation team composition and profile..... | 10 |
| 8 Evaluation products deliverables | 10 |
| 9 Evaluation timeframe | 10 |
| Appendix 1. FAO - GEF Evaluation Criteria Rating Table and Rating Scheme..... | 12 |
| Appendix 2: Project Co-financing Table | 15 |

Acronyms and abbreviations

| | |
|------|---|
| BH | Budget holder |
| CD | Capacity Development |
| EM | Evaluation Manager |
| ET | Evaluation team |
| ETL | Evaluation team leader |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations |
| GEF | Global Environmental Facility |
| NGO | Non-governmental organization |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MR | Management Response |
| MTE | Mid-term evaluation |
| OED | FAO Office of Evaluation |
| PMT | Project Management Team |
| POPs | Persistent Organic Pesticides |
| ToC | Theory of Change |
| ToR | Terms of Reference |

Introduction

1. This document presents the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the final evaluation of the Project entitled “Disposal of Persistent Organic Pesticides (POPs) and Obsolete Pesticides in Mozambique” (refer to Table 1 for a summary of the Project’s information).
2. The ToR represent a guiding document for the Evaluation Team (ET) and the project’s main stakeholders. The ToR briefly describes the Project and its key areas of work. The ToR sets out the purpose and scope of the evaluation, and presents a proposed evaluation work plan. This document has been shared with and commented upon by the Project Task Force, Project Management Unit and peer reviewed by the Office of Evaluation.

Table 1. Basic Project Information.

| | |
|--|---|
| Region: | Africa |
| Country: | Mozambique |
| Project Title: | Disposal of Persistent Organic Pesticides (POPs) and Obsolete Pesticides in Mozambique |
| FAO Project Symbol: | GCP/MOZ/100/GFF |
| GEF ID: | 3986 |
| Focal Area: | Persistent Organic Pollutants |
| Strategic Priority: | POPs SP-1, Strengthening Capacities for NIP Implementation POPs-SP-3, Partnering in the demonstration of feasible, innovative technologies and best practice in POPs reduction Sound Chemicals Management |
| Project Executing Partners: | Ministry of Agriculture (MINAG), Ministry for Coordination of Environmental Affairs (MICOA) |
| Project Size (FSP/MSP): | FSP |
| Project Duration: | 36 months |
| Date of Entry into Work Programme: | June 2009 |
| CEO Endorsement Date: | 23 December 2010 |
| Project Start Date (effectiveness): | 01 July 2011 |
| Actual/Expected Closing Date (operational): | 31 December 2018 |
| PPG/PDF Funding (if any) (USDm) | USD 50,000 |
| Total Project Cost: | USD 6,204,836 |
| GEF Grant (USD): | USD 1,950,000 |
| Proposed Co-financing: | USD 4 254 836 |

1 Background and Context of the Project

1.1 Background

3. The Government of Mozambique, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) recognized the importance of tackling issues on pesticide life cycle management. This Project was formulated to respond to the GEF's Global Environmental Objective which is the elimination of risks from POPs and pesticide residues in Mozambique through the use of environmentally sound management methods, and to prevent the creation of additional POPs or other environmental contaminants.
4. This Project hopes eliminate the risks from the waste remaining from prior cleanup and disposal efforts and develop a local strategy for addressing pesticide life-cycle management in the future. Moreover, the Project aims to strengthen the legislative framework for hazardous waste management of unwanted pesticides and associated wastes in Mozambique.
5. 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"*.
6. 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 implementation of past projects
 - Outcome 2.1 The development of a sustainable system for container management in the future in collaboration with 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 PSMS.
7. The Project is implemented at two levels, at the National Level, the Project focuses on pesticide policy and strategy formulation, harmonization of regulations and institutional reforms. At the provincial level, the Project has field implementation for the disposal of pesticide containers and treatment of contaminated soil.

2 Evaluation purpose

8. This Final Evaluation is a requirement of the donor. It is being conducted for both accountability and learning purposes of FAO, the project team and project partners participating institutions and national governments. The Final Evaluation and a synthesis of lessons learned document¹ will serve as an input to improve future project formulation and implementation of similar projects.
9. The main audience and intended users of the evaluation are:
 - **Primary audience and users are:**
 - The FAO Country Office, Project Management Team, members of Project Task Force in the FAO Headquarters and regional offices who will use the findings and lessons identified in the evaluation to finalize project activities; plan for sustainability of results achieved; improve formulation and implementation of similar projects;
 - The Donors who will use the findings to inform strategic investment decisions in the future; and
 - The National Government counterparts who will use the evaluation findings and conclusions for future planning.
 - **Secondary audience and users**
 - Other donors and organizations interested in supporting similar projects;
 - FAO Regional and Sub-regional offices, and other FAO technical departments who are interested on the lessons learned identified by the evaluation;
 - Other national governments who might be interested in similar approaches to pesticide life cycle management.

3 Evaluation scope

10. The Final Evaluation will assess the results achieved by the project throughout its implementation period from July 2011 to November 2018, covering all activities that have been implemented. The Evaluation will assess the pre-conditions and arrangements that are in place to adequately implement the planned activities. In addition, the Evaluation will also assess the effectiveness of the project's governance mechanism along with the linkages and/or partnerships between the project and other major country initiatives.

¹ This evaluation is part of a clustered evaluation approach of three POPs related project from GCP /BOT/011/GFF (Botswana), GCP /ERI/014/GFF (Eritrea) and GCP /MOZ/100/GFF (Mozambique) which will produce a synthesis of lessons learned document from the three final evaluations.

11. 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. 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 a similar lessons learned document from West Africa.

4 Evaluation objectives and Evaluation questions

12. The Final Evaluation has the following objectives:

- Assess relevance of the project strategy, and quality² of project design and implementation arrangements;
- Assess results (including intermediate outcome, long term outcomes and pathways of outcome to impact); gaps and challenges in achieving its intended results; and opportunities or risks to sustainability;
- Identify lessons from project implementation.
- Rate the project according to the prescribed GEF rating scheme

4.1 Evaluation questions

13. The evaluation will be results-based and its main purpose is to assess the progress in the implementation and achievements of the project, and identify strengths, weaknesses, gaps/challenges, opportunities and lessons learned. The Evaluation Questions will be the main tool to analyze the project's performance, synthesize conclusions and produce recommendations to improve on the remaining implementation of the project and strengthen sustainability of positive results and learn from project results.

14. The Evaluation Questions will be cross-cutting in nature. The Evaluation Questions described below will focus on results, and will be used to guide the overall assessment. Sub-questions will be further elaborated in an Evaluation Matrix to answer the main Evaluation Questions in a comprehensive manner.

Evaluation Question 1: To what extent did the project design and implementation aligned to the strategic objectives of reducing, eliminating production, management of POPs by FAO, GEF, and the National Government?

15. *Evaluation Question 1 will focus on the relevance and ownership of the project.*

Evaluation Question 2: How successful has the project been in delivering expected outputs and outcomes (both quantitative and qualitative) aimed at reducing the risk to public health and the environment posed by poor pesticide management and obsolete pesticide waste?

16. *Evaluation Question 2 will look into effectiveness and impact.*

² Under the assessment of quality the following aspects will be looked at: project's theory of change and impact pathway, including the assumptions; the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation arrangements.

Evaluation Question 3: How efficient was the project design, management and implementation in meeting objectives and achieving expected outputs and outcomes? And what role did Monitoring and Evaluation play in improving project management and overall efficiency?

17. *Evaluation Question 3 will focus on efficiency, relevance, project design, preparation, readiness of partners to engage with the project, project management and oversight, budget and financial management, M&E and communication.*

Evaluation Question 4: What impact did the project have on the development or promotion of partnerships? How has stakeholder involvement affected the achievement of project objectives?

18. *Evaluation Question 4 will be centered on the results and challenges related to efficiency and partnerships.*

Evaluation Question 5: To what extent can the project's current and potential results be up-scaled, replicated or serve as a catalyst for future interventions?

Evaluation Question 6: To what extent did the project planned for sustainability and considered cross cutting issues such as gender, governance and social inclusion?

5 Methodology

19. The evaluation will adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group UNEG Norms & Standards³ and will be in line with the OED Manual and methodological guidelines and practices. It will follow a participatory process and adapt a consultative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders throughout the evaluation process, ensuring consultations are carried out with a wide range of stakeholders.
20. The evaluation will be results-focused. It will develop and use a Theory of Change of the project to inform the analysis of the contributions made by the project to the expected project results.
21. In general, the following qualitative and quantitative evaluation tools will be used to collect primary and secondary data and evidence and answer the main evaluation questions:
 - evaluation workshop to reconstruct the theory of change and to build ownership of the evaluation process.
 - desk-review of existing project documents and reports, to better understand the context and structure of the project and identify the project milestones.
 - semi-structured interviews with key informants, stakeholders and project participants and government authorities. Face to face interviews, phone or skype interviews will be carried as needed. Interviews will be supported by the evaluation matrix.
 - focus group discussions with beneficiaries at provincial level.
 - surveys and/or questionnaires through email to all relevant stakeholders with whom face-to-face interviews and/or skype calls or phone interviews cannot be conducted.
22. The selection for field visits was based on consultations with the project team, using the below criteria.
 - Level of results in the implementation of project activities ensuring representation of localities where activities are more advanced and countries with a slower progress;
 - Feasibility of travel.
23. Information related to the assessment of the project's **Relevance** will be collected through desk review of relevant pesticide related policies and strategies, FAO country programme frameworks, regional and national initiatives, among others. In addition,

³ <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21>

interviews with national project stakeholders and other stakeholders will be conducted.

24. For evaluation questions related to **Effectiveness**, multiple tools will be combined to answer the different sub questions. Including documentation review and interviews with the main partners, national participating organizations /associations and stakeholders and an exhaustive desk review of existing project documentation (e.g. baseline and end line surveys). The evaluation will examine the appropriateness of the plans and arrangements set up to implement the related activities. For each of the assessed results, the evaluation will seek to identify the factors both positive and negative that have influenced the results and provide specific recommendations to further improve project performance, sustainability or future design. If possible, counterfactuals and attribution of initial results will be sought.
25. For evaluation questions related to **Efficiency** review of documentation (including M&E data, annual reports, etc.) and interviews with the project management, implementing partners and stakeholders will be the main tools. The evaluation will assess FAO's role as a GEF Implementing and Executing Agency. In addition, the evaluation will assess the added value of the Project's Co-financing.
26. Relevant information to answer questions under **Partnerships** will be collected through focus group discussions and interviews with project partners. A desk review of secondary information such as Letter of Agreements will feed into this assessment. The analysis of the project's effectiveness will also serve as inputs to answer this question.
27. In gauging **Sustainability**, evidences will be gathered to analyze and identify routes to impact. In addition, risks to Financial, Social-political, Institutional and environment, will be assessed.
28. Information related to **Gender, Governance** and **Social Inclusion** will be gathered through a desk review of project documents and interviews with project stakeholders, to understand what type of gender sensitive and equity focused activities the project has implemented. Particular attention will devoted to ensure that women and other under-privileged groups are consulted during the evaluation process.
29. **Capacity Development** as a way to deliver results will be assessed by looking into three dimensions, individual, organizational and enabling environment levels.
30. Triangulation of evidence will be critical in the analysis and will support conclusions and recommendations. Debriefing sessions at country level will be carried out at the end of the field visits, to validate preliminary findings.
31. The TOR of the evaluation and the first draft report will go through an internal OED peer review process to ensure quality prior to circulation with the project team. The conclusions and recommendations will be shared in the first draft of the report for feedback and comments by Project Management and main stakeholders. The report will be finalized after the comments are received. Suggestions will be incorporated as considered appropriate by OED and the Evaluation Team.

6 Roles and responsibilities

32. The **Office of Evaluation OED**, Evaluation Manager (EM) will the support of the Evaluation Team (ET) is responsible for the finalization of the ToR with inputs from the Project Management Team.
33. The EM is responsible for the identification of the evaluation team members. EM will brief the project team on the evaluation process and will engage with them throughout the evaluation process. Moreover, the EM will brief the evaluation team on the evaluation methodology and process and will review the final draft report for Quality Assurance purposes in terms of presentation, compliance with the ToR and timely delivery, quality, clarity and soundness of evidence provided and of the analysis supporting conclusions and recommendations in the evaluation report.
34. OED also has a responsibility in following up with the Budget Holder (BH), and the Project Management Team for the timely preparation of the Management Response and the follow-up to the review.
35. The **Project Management Team (PMT)**, in consultation with the FAO representative, is responsible for initiating the evaluation process, providing inputs to the first version of the ToR, especially the description of the background and context chapter, and supporting the evaluation team during its work, including the organization of the evaluation missions. The PMT is required to participate in meetings with the evaluation team, make available information and documentation as necessary, and comment on the terms of reference and report. The BH, PMT and full project team can also contribute in the identification of the consultants for the evaluation team. The Project Management Team, on behalf of the BH, is also responsible for leading and coordinating the preparation of the Project Management Response and the Follow-up Report to the evaluation. OED guidelines for the Management Response and the Follow-up Report provide guidelines on this process. Involvement of different members of the project team will depend on respective roles and participation in the project.
36. The **Evaluation Team (ET)** is responsible for further developing and applying the evaluation methodology, for conducting the evaluation, and for producing the evaluation report. All team members, including the Evaluation Team Leader (ETL), will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings, discussions, field visits, and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs for the final draft and final report. The ET will also be free to expand the scope, criteria, questions and issues listed above, as well as develop its own evaluation tools and framework, within time and resources available and based on discussions with the EM, consult with the BH and PMT where necessary. The ET is fully responsible for its report which may not reflect the views of the Governments or FAO. An evaluation report is not subject to technical clearance by FAO although OED is responsible for Quality Assurance of all evaluation reports.
37. The ET will maintain close liaison with the FAO Office of Evaluation and the Project Management Team. Although the mission is free to discuss with the authorities concerned anything relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment on behalf of the Government, the donor or FAO.

38. The ETL is responsible for guiding and coordinating the ET members in their specific work, discussing their findings, conclusions and recommendations and preparing the final draft and the final report, consolidating the inputs from the team members with his/her own. In collaboration with the EM, the ETL will finalize the report and ensure the received comments are incorporated, as deemed necessary.

7 Evaluation team composition and profile

39. The evaluation team will comprise the best available mix of skills that are required to assess the project, and as a whole, will have expertise in all the following subject matters:

- Agriculture
- Project Evaluations
- Pesticide Management
- Soil Science

40. The evaluation team will have had no previous involvement in the formulation, implementation or backstopping of the project. All will sign the Declaration of Interest form of the FAO OED. To the extent possible, the evaluation team will be balanced in terms of geographical and gender representation to ensure diversity and complementarity of perspectives.

8 Evaluation products deliverables

41. The evaluation will produce the following deliverables:

- Evaluation Matrix - to be produced before the main mission scheduled on November 2018.
- Theory of Change of the project, after consultation and validation with project stakeholders.
- Draft evaluation report - OED will review the zero draft of the evaluation report submitted by the evaluation team to ensure it meets OED's quality standards and criteria. The draft evaluation report will then be circulated to the PTF and stakeholders, for comments before finalization by OED; suggestions will be incorporated as deemed appropriate by the evaluation team.
- Final evaluation report – will illustrate the evidence found that responds to the evaluation questions listed in the ToR. The report will be prepared in English, and will follow the OED template for GEF evaluation report template. Supporting data and analysis will be annexed. Translations in other languages of the Organization, if required, will be FAO's responsibility.
- Aide memoires and debriefing presentation of preliminary findings.

9 Evaluation timeframe

42. The evaluation's timeframe and responsibilities are presented below.

| Task | Estimated Dates | Duration | Responsibility |
|--|------------------------|-----------------|--|
| PLANNING PHASE | | | |
| ToR finalization | November 2018 | | EM & ETL with BH and PMT |
| Team identification and recruitment | November 2017 | 3 weeks | EM with BH and PMT |
| Mission organization and travel arrangements | November 2018 | 4 weeks | EM & ETL with BH and PMT |
| DATA COLLECTION PHASE | | | |
| Reading background documentation | November 2018 | ~1 week | ET for ToR development, preparation of the evaluation matrix |
| Briefing of the evaluation team ET by OED via skype | November 2018 | | EM, when necessary supported by PMT |
| Field mission, in country interviews, de briefing | November-December 2018 | 1-2 weeks | ET supported by PMT |
| REPORT WRITING - DISSEMINATION PHASE | | | |
| Drafting report / Zero draft for review by OED | January-February 2019 | 4 weeks | ET |
| Review by OED before circulation | February 2019 | 1 week | EM and ET to respond to comments |
| Internal OED quality assurance before circulation; Review report as per OED and peer review comments | February 2019 | 1 week | OED peer reviewer |
| First draft for circulation and comments | February 2019 | 2 weeks | PMT and other stakeholders |
| Revision of comments, review report and comments matrix | February 2019 | 1 week | ET and EM |
| Final draft and comments matrix for circulation | March 2019 | | ET and EM |
| Editing and layout | March 2019 | | OED |
| Final Report | April 2019 | | OED |

Appendix 1. FAO - GEF Evaluation Criteria Rating Table and Rating Scheme

FAO-GEF Evaluation Criteria Rating Table

Each criterion receives a rating derived from the evaluative assessment in the main document.

| GEF - FAO criteria/sub criteria | Rating ⁴ | Summary Comments ⁵ |
|---|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| A. ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT RESULTS | | |
| 1. Overall quality of project outcomes ⁶ | | |
| 1.1. Relevance | | |
| 1.2. Effectiveness | | |
| 1.3. Efficiency | | |
| B. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND EXECUTION RATING | | |
| 2. Quality of project implementation | | |
| 3. Quality of project execution | | |
| C. MONITORING AND EVALUATION (M&E) RATING | | |
| 4. Overall quality of M&E | | |
| 4.1. M&E Design | | |
| 4.2. M&E Plan Implementation | | |
| D. SUSTAINABILITY OF PROJECT OUTCOMES | | |
| 5. Overall likelihood of risks to sustainability | | |
| 5.1. Financial risk | | |
| 5.2. Socio-political risk | | |
| 5.3. Institutional risk | | |
| 5.4. Environmental risk | | |

⁴ See rating scheme at the end of the document.

⁵ Include reference to the relevant sections in the report.

⁶Assessment and ratings by outcome may be undertaken if there is added value. A composite scoring of all outcome ratings, however, is not advised.

Rating Scheme

A. Overall Outcome ratings⁷

Terminal evaluations take into account the project's results, logical framework, ToC and work plan. Mid-term evaluations can base outcome ratings on work plans and mid-term targets (if available).

| Rating | Description |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | "Level of outcomes achieved clearly exceeds expectations and/or there were no short comings." |
| Satisfactory (S) | "Level of outcomes achieved was as expected and/or there were no or minor short comings." |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | "Level of outcomes achieved more or less as expected and/or there were moderate short comings." |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | "Level of outcomes achieved somewhat lower than expected and/or there were significant shortcomings." |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | "Level of outcomes achieved substantially lower than expected and/or there were major short comings." |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | "Only a negligible level of outcomes achieved and/or there were severe short comings." |
| Unable to Assess (UA) | The available information does not allow an assessment of the level of outcome achievements. |

B. Project Implementation ratings (Assess Implementation and Execution separately)

| Rating | Description |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | There were no shortcomings and quality of implementation / execution exceeded expectations. |
| Satisfactory (S) | There were no or minor shortcomings and quality of implementation / execution meets expectations. |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | There were some shortcomings and quality of implementation / execution more or less meets expectations. |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | There were significant shortcomings and quality of implementation / execution somewhat lower than expected. |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | There were major shortcomings and quality of implementation substantially lower than expected. |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | There were severe shortcomings in quality of implementation / execution . |
| Unable to Assess (UA) | The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of implementation / execution . |

⁷ See instructions provided in annex 2: Rating Scales in the "Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations for Full-sized Project", April 2017.

C. Monitoring and Evaluation Design or Implementation Ratings (Overall M&E design, Assess Design and Implementation separately)

| Rating | Description |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | There were no shortcomings and quality of M&E design / M&E implementation exceeded expectations. |
| Satisfactory (S) | There were no or minor shortcomings and quality of M&E design / M&E implementation meets expectations. |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | There were some shortcomings and quality of M&E design / M&E implementation more or less meets expectations. |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | There were significant shortcomings and quality of M&E design / M&E implementation somewhat lower than expected. |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | There were major shortcomings and quality of M&E design / M&E implementation substantially lower than expected. |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | There were severe short comings in M&E design or M&E implementation . |
| Unable to Assess (UA) | The available information does not allow an assessment of the quality of M&E design / M&E implementation |

D. Sustainability

| Rating | Description |
|--------------------------|---|
| Likely (L) | There is little or no risk to sustainability. |
| Moderately Likely (ML) | There are moderate risks to sustainability. |
| Moderately Unlikely (MU) | There are significant risks to sustainability. |
| Unlikely (U) | There are severe risks to sustainability. |
| Unable to Assess (UA) | Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability. |

Appendix 2: Project Co-financing Table

| Name of the Co-financer | Co-financer type ⁸ | Type of co-financing ⁹ | Co-financing at project start (Amount confirmed at GEF CEO endorsement/approval) (in USD) | | | Materialized Co-financing at project mid-term (confirmed by the evaluation Team) (in USD) | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|------|-------|---|------|-------|
| | | | In-kind | Cash | Total | In-kind | Cash | Total |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Grand Total (in USD) | | | | | | | | |

⁸ Examples of categories include: local, provincial or national government; semi-government autonomous institutions; private sector; multilateral or bilateral organizations; educational and research institutions; Non-Profit organizations; Civil Society Organizations; foundations; beneficiaries; GEF agencies; and others (please explain).

⁹ Grants; loans; equity participation by beneficiaries (individuals) in form of cash; guarantees; in-kind or material contributions; and others (please explain).