

**Project Evaluation Series**

**Terminal evaluation of the project  
“Disposal of obsolete pesticides including  
persistent organic pollutants, promotion  
of alternatives and strengthening  
pesticides management in the Caribbean”**

**Project code: GCP/SLC/204/GFF  
GEF ID: 5407**

**Annex 1. Evaluation matrix**

Criteria	Questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Methods	Source of information
<b>Relevance</b> (rating required)	Were the project outcomes aligned with the GEF focal areas/operational programme strategies, country priorities and FAO Country Programming Framework?	Are the project outcomes aligned with the GEF Chemicals focal area of the GEF-5 period?	Level of alignment (e.g., low, medium, high) of project outcomes with GEF-5 Chemicals focal area priorities.	Desk review, survey and key informant interviews.	Country and Regional development plans, strategies or programs; FAO Country Program Framework of the participating countries; FAO regional priorities; GEF-5 strategy; project documentation, including progress reports; survey and interviews.
		Are the project outcomes aligned with current country and regional priorities?	Level of congruence (e.g., low, medium, high) of project outcomes with current country and regional priorities.		
		Are the project outcomes aligned with FAO Country Program Framework of the participating countries and with FAO regional priorities?	Level of congruence (e.g., low, medium, high) of project outcomes with FAO Country Program Framework of the participating countries and with FAO regional priorities.		
	Was the project design appropriate for delivering the expected outcomes?		Level of alignment (e.g., low, medium, high) between project activities and expected outcomes.	Desk review and key informant interviews; Project Theory of Change.	
	Has there been any change in the relevance of the project since its design, such as new national policies, plans or programmes that affect the relevance of the project objectives and goals?	Have there been any new regional/national policies, plans or programs related to pesticide management, plant health or agriculture?	Number of new regional/national policies, plans or programs related to pesticide management, plant health or agriculture.	Desk review and key informant interviews.	
	If yes, how have these new regional/national policies, plans or programs affected (favorably or unfavorably) the project relevance?	Magnitude of the effect (e.g., low, medium, high and negative or positive) of new regional/national policies, plans or programs on project relevance.			

Criteria	Questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Methods	Source of information
<b>Effectiveness</b> (rating required)	To what extent have project objectives been achieved, and were there any unintended results?	To what extent have project objectives been achieved?	Level of achievement of project objectives (e.g., low, medium, high).	Desk review, key informant interviews and regional survey of institutional engagement and capacity development.	Project documentation, including progress reports, GEF tracking tools and final products; interviews and survey.
		Has there been any unexpected results (positive or negative)?	Number of unexpected results (positive or negative) Magnitude of the effect of unexpected results (positive or negative).		
	To what extent did the project actual outcome commensurate with the expected outcomes?	What is the level of achievement and quality of the project outputs and outcomes?	Percentage of achievement of outputs. Percentage of achievement of outcomes. Level of quality of outputs and outcomes.		
		Are the project outcomes contributing to achieve national and/or regional goals?	Number of outcomes that are contributing to achieve national and/or regional goals.		
	To what extent can the attainment of results be attributed to the GEF-funded component?	What activities have been funded by the GEF-funded component?	Level of contribution of outputs (e.g., low, medium, high) funded by GEF to the project results; level of plausibility of theory of change.		
		What are the outputs of these activities?			
How have these outputs contributed to the project results?					
<b>Efficiency</b> (rating required)	(implementation) To what extent did FAO deliver on project identification, concept preparation, appraisal, preparation, approval and start-	To what extent did FAO deliver on project identification, concept preparation, appraisal, preparation, approval and start-up, oversight and supervision?	Perception of project partners and beneficiaries on FAO performance (e.g., satisfactory, moderately satisfactory, moderately	Desk review and key informant interviews.	Project documentation, including financial and co-financing reports, progress

Criteria	Questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Methods	Source of information
	up, oversight and supervision? How well risks were identified and managed?		unsatisfactory or unsatisfactory).  Level of FAO performance based on project results and impact as assessed by the evaluation team (e.g., satisfactory, moderately satisfactory, moderately unsatisfactory or unsatisfactory).		reports, GEF tracking tools, minutes of the meetings of the Steering Committee and other bodies, interviews and survey.
		How well risks were identified during the project design?	Level of performance (e.g., low, medium, high) of FAO and the Steering Committee to identify and manage risks		
		How well risks were managed during project implementation?			
		How well new risks were identified during project implementation?			
(execution) To what extent did the executing agency effectively discharge its role and responsibilities related to the management and administration of the project?	To what extent has the Coordinating Group of Pesticide Control Boards of the Caribbean (CGPC) discharged effectively its role and responsibilities as the executing partner?	Perception of project partners and beneficiaries on the performance of the CGPC (e.g., satisfactory, moderately satisfactory, moderately unsatisfactory or unsatisfactory).  Level of CGPC performance based on the findings of the evaluation team (e.g., satisfactory, moderately satisfactory, moderately unsatisfactory or unsatisfactory).			

Criteria	Questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Methods	Source of information
	To what extent has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and management been able to adapt to any changing conditions to improve the efficiency of project implementation?	Have the results been obtained in a timely manner?	Number of project activities carried out according to project schedule.		
		Is the budget executed congruent with the results obtained?	Level of congruence (e.g., high, medium or low) of the activities carried out with the budget executed.		
		Has the project been implemented in a cost-effective manner?	Level of congruence (e.g., high, medium or low) of project cost with the results obtained.		
		To what extent has the project been able to adapt to any changing conditions to improve the efficiency of project implementation?	Number of adaptive measures implemented in response to changes not foreseen in the project.		
<b>Sustainability</b> (rating required)	What is the likelihood that the project results will continue to be useful or will remain even after the end of the project?	What is the likelihood of social sustainability of the project results?	Level of ownership of the project achievements by the beneficiaries.	Desk review, key informant interviews and regional survey of institutional engagement and capacity development, among others. If required, country case studies.	Interviews, survey and project documentation, including progress reports, training materials and final products.
		What is the likelihood of environmental sustainability of the project results?	Capacities developed for the sound management of pesticides in the region (e.g., high, medium, low). Number of effective and available alternatives to Highly Hazardous Pesticides in the region.		
		What is the likelihood of financial sustainability of the project results?	Number/type and robustness of financial mechanisms that could support the continuity		

Criteria	Questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Methods	Source of information
			of project activities after project completion.		
		What is the likelihood of institutional sustainability of the project results?	<p>Level of reinforcement (e.g., high, medium, low) of the regulatory framework.</p> <p>Number of countries that have adopted the model pesticide legislation.</p> <p>Number of countries that are participating in the regional pesticide registration mechanism.</p> <p>Number of countries that have adopted the common system for inspection and control of imported pesticides.</p>		
	What are the key risks which may affect the sustainability of the project benefits?		<p>Number of risks that may affect the sustainability of the project benefits.</p> <p>Magnitude of risks (e.g., high, medium, low) that may affect the sustainability of the project benefits</p>		
<b>Factors affecting performance</b>	Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E design) Was the M&E plan practical and sufficient?		Level of practicality and adequacy (e.g., high, medium, low) of the M&E plan.	Desk review and key informant interviews.	M&E system, project documentation, including GEF tracking tools, Back to Office Reports, Mid-

Criteria	Questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Methods	Source of information
(rating required)	Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E implementation) Did the M&E system operate as per the M&E plan? Was information gathered in a systematic manner, using appropriate methodologies?	Is there a M&E system in place? Does M&E contain tracking tools?	M&E system in place and operational.		Term Evaluation Report, progress reports and minutes of the meetings of the Steering Committee and other bodies; survey and interviews.
		If yes, is the M&E system operating according to the M&E plan?			
		Has Information been gathered in a systematic manner, using appropriate methodologies?	Number of methodologies or mechanisms applied to systematically gather information.		
	Was the information from the M&E system appropriately used to make timely decisions and foster learning during project implementation?	If there is a M&E system, has its information been appropriately used to make timely decisions and foster learning during project implementation?	Level of use (e.g., high, medium, low) of the M&E system to make timely decisions and foster learning during project implementation.		
	Stakeholder engagement Were other actors, such as civil society, indigenous population or private sector involved in project design or implementation, and what was the effect on the project results?	Were all the relevant stakeholders identified during the project design? If not, what were the reasons?	Number and type of stakeholders identified during project design and participating in the project.	Survey of institutional engagement and capacity development, among others; key informant interviews and desk review.	
		What mechanisms have been implemented to involve relevant actors? Have these mechanisms been effective?	Number and type of mechanisms implemented to involve relevant actors.  Level of effectiveness of the mechanisms.		

Criteria	Questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Methods	Source of information
		Have there been new actors participating in the project?	Number and type of new actors participating in the project.		
		What effect has the participation of these actors had on the project results?	Effect of the participation of the actors on project results.		
<b>Environmental and social safeguards</b>	To what extent were environmental and social concerns taken into consideration in the design and implementation of the project?	Has the project risk category changed during project implementation?	Number of mitigation measures included in the environmental and social management plan implemented.	Desk review and key informant interviews.	Project documentation, including progress reports and the environmental and social management plan, and interviews.
		Has there been any negative impact generated by the project?			
		To what extent have the mitigation measures included in the environmental and social management plan been implemented?			
<b>Gender</b>	To what extent were gender considerations taken into account in designing and implementing the project? Was the project implemented in a manner that ensures gender equitable participation and benefits?	After the Mid-Term Evaluation, has a gender mainstreaming strategy implemented?	Gender mainstreaming strategy in place.	Desk review, key informant interviews and survey of institutional engagement and capacity development, among others.	Interviews, survey and project documentation.
		If yes, what activities were carried out to mainstream the gender perspective into the project?	Number and type of activities carried out to integrate the gender perspective into the project.		
		Has the project ensured gender equitable participation and benefits?	Number and type of benefits received by men and women.		
<b>Co-financing</b>	To what extent did the expected co-financing materialize, and how short fall in co-financing, or	How have the challenges encountered in estimating co-financing been overcome?	Percentage of co-financing materialized.	Desk review and key informant interviews.	Project documentation, including co-



Criteria	Questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Methods	Source of information
	materialization of greater than expected co-financing affected project results?	What percentage of the committed co-financing has materialized?			financing reports, progress reports, GEF tracking tools, minutes of the meetings of the Steering Committee and other bodies, and interviews.
		What effect has the percentage of materialized co-financing had on project results?	Magnitude of the effect of the co-financing materialized on project results.		
<b>Progress to Impact</b>	To what extent may the progress towards long-term impact be attributed to the project?	To what extent have the conditions or outputs and outcomes set out in the project's Theory of Change been met?	Probability of reaching the expected impact due to the results obtained in the project.	Desk review, key informant interviews and survey of institutional engagement and capacity development, among others. If required, country case studies.	Project documentation, including GEF tracking tools and final products; survey and interviews.
		To what extent this achievement lead to the expected long-term impacts of the project?			
	Was there any evidence of environmental stress reduction and environmental status change, or any change in policy/legal/regulatory framework?	Quantity of obsolete pesticides eliminated in the region.  Percentage of remediation of pesticide contaminated sites selected by the project.			
	Are there any barriers or other risks that may prevent future progress towards long-term impact?	Number and type of potential risks or barriers that may prevent future progress towards long-term impact.			
<b>Knowledge management</b>	How is the project assessing, documenting and sharing its results, lessons learned and experiences?	What information/knowledge has the project generated?	List and description of the information/knowledge generated by the project.	Desk review, key informant interviews and survey of institutional engagement and capacity	Survey, interviews and project documentation, including publications, web platforms and reports
		How has the project documented the information/knowledge generated?	Number of technical documents, manuals and		

Criteria	Questions	Sub-questions	Indicators	Methods	Source of information
		How has the project disseminated and shared this information/knowledge and all the results, lessons learned and experiences gained?	methodologies published by the project.	development, among others.	of information exchange.
	To what extent are communication products and activities likely to support the sustainability and scaling-up of project results?	To what extent have the communication products and activities contributed to develop capacities among actors participating in the project?	Capacities developed that support the sustainability and scaling-up of project results.		
		To what extent will the developed capacities support the sustainability and scaling-up of project results?			

Office of Evaluation  
evaluation@fao.org  
www.fao.org/evaluation

**Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations**  
Rome, Italy



Some rights reserved. This work is available  
under a CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO licence.