

**Project Evaluation Series**

**Terminal evaluation of the project  
“Disposal of persistent organic pollutants  
and obsolete pesticides and implementation  
of sound pesticides management in Benin”**

**GCP/BEN/056/GFF**

**GEF ID: 4756**

**Annex 4. Project evaluation matrix**

Evaluation criterion	Evaluation question	Evaluation sub-questions	Indicator	Data source/collection method
<b>Relevance</b>	<b>1. To what extent is the project relevant and consistent with the Government of Benin's strategic priorities for sustainable agricultural development and environmental conservation and with FAO and GEF strategic objectives?</b>	1.1. To what extent do the project design and intended outcomes address the needs and priorities of Benin and its population with respect to agricultural development, safe pesticide management, and reduction of pesticide exposure?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evaluation of the extent to which the project objectives and design are consistent with the needs, policies, and priorities of the Government of Benin, FAO, and agricultural stakeholders, and remain relevant in a changing context</li> <li>- Alignment with national objectives, policies, plans, and programs for sustainable development, agricultural development, and food security</li> <li>- Alignment with the country's international environmental commitments (Stockholm, Rotterdam and Basel Conventions)</li> <li>- Alignment with the priorities of the national strategies and programmes for environmental management and the fight against pollution, nuisances and degradation</li> </ul>	<p><i>Literature review:</i> Development policy and strategy documents; sectoral programs, plans and policies; country program framework and its results framework; FAO and GEF strategic objectives</p> <p><i>Analysis:</i> Logical framework, reconstructed theory of change, management and implementation arrangements and mechanisms (including adequacy of human resources and expertise planned and mobilized), institutional arrangements and partnerships, arrangements for implementing activities (research, training, extension etc.)</p> <p><i>Interviews:</i> Project supervision team (LTO, FLO); PMU: NPC, senior technical advisor, expert consultants; central-level implementing partners, including co-financing partner projects; local-level implementing partners; farmers (direct beneficiaries)</p>
		1.2. To what extent is the project consistent with other interventions carried out by the Government and its partners, including FAO and GEF, in the agriculture and environment sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extent to which the project is complementary with other interventions in the agricultural sector and in the management of pests, pesticides and alternative products</li> </ul>	

Evaluation criterion	Evaluation question	Evaluation sub-questions	Indicator	Data source/collection method
		(pesticide and pesticide waste management, research and promotion of alternative solutions)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extent to which harmonization and coordination with other stakeholders and projects have provided added value while avoiding duplication of activities</li> </ul>	
		1.3. To what extent is the project design, and in particular its approach to action and capacity building, as well as its activities appropriate to achieve the intended outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Validity of the strategy for building the capacity of government decision-makers and stakeholders involved in pest, pesticide, and waste management on the one hand, and the suggestion of alternatives on the other</li> </ul>	
		1.4. Are the results framework and theory of change logical, coherent, and realistic for achieving the overall project objective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Level of consideration of the real needs of the beneficiaries and the specific needs of women, children as well as vulnerable and disadvantaged groups</li> <li>- Validity of the chosen activities; coherence between needs and targeted outcomes</li> <li>- Quality of the targeted results</li> <li>- Feasibility, consistency and coherence of activities</li> <li>- Level of operational realism (methods and processes deployed)</li> <li>- Quality and realism of indicators (SMART) and targets</li> <li>- Revision of some indicators and targets</li> <li>- Quality of semi-annual reports and Project Implementation Report</li> <li>- Provision of a mechanism to adapt to changes that may occur during implementation</li> <li>- Analysis of risks, threats and changes that may affect the implementation of the project</li> </ul>	

Evaluation criterion	Evaluation question	Evaluation sub-questions	Indicator	Data source/collection method
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quality and feasibility of proposed mechanisms and measures</li> </ul>	
		<p>1.5. To what extent does the project contribute to FAO strategic objectives and country programming framework in Benin?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consistency with the CPF</li> <li>- Alignment with FAO Strategic Priorities</li> <li>- Alignment and coherence with FAO's capacity building strategy</li> <li>- Alignment and coherence with FAO's gender strategy</li> </ul>	
		<p>1.6. To what extent does the project contribute to the GEF strategic objectives and results framework, including CHEM-1 Outcome 1.4 POPs wastes avoided, managed and disposed of, and POPs contaminated sites managed in an environmentally friendly manner?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Alignment with GEF guidelines and operational policy and guidance requirements<sup>1</sup></li> <li>- Contribution to GEF Results Framework</li> <li>- Extent to which the guidelines and requirements for co-financing, public participation, stakeholder engagement, monitoring and evaluation, application of the incremental cost principle, gender equality, and GEF environmental and social safeguards are considered.</li> </ul>	

<sup>1</sup> GEF/C.31/12 14 May 2007.

Evaluation criterion	Evaluation question	Evaluation sub-questions	Indicator	Data source/collection method
Effectiveness	2. To what extent are the intended objectives of the project being achieved and what is the level of progress towards impact?	2.1. To what extent has the project contributed to eliminating risks associated with existing obsolete pesticide stockpiles and reduction of risks from sites heavily contaminated with pesticides (Outcome 1)?	<p>Level of achievement of indicator targets for Outcome 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Destruction of some 200 tons of POPs and other obsolete pesticides in an environmentally friendly manner</li> <li>- Reduction of the risk of exposure/level of contamination of at least two contaminated sites (50% reduction)</li> </ul> <p>Level of achievement of outputs for Outcome 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Targets vs. outputs</li> </ul> <p>Changes or effects generated under Outcome 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Intended effects</li> <li>- Unintended effects</li> </ul> <p>Factors that contributed to or limited the achievement of Outcome 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Positive factors</li> <li>- Negative factors</li> </ul>	<p><i>Review of reports and tools:</i> Project Implementation Report, mid-term evaluation report; GEF monitoring tools, semi-annual reports; partner activity reports; etc.</p> <p><i>Interviews with resource persons from the following entities:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PMU and Technical Experts;</li> <li>- Project supervisory bodies: Government (Project Steering Committee); FAO (GEF Coordination Unit, Plant Production and Protection Division)</li> <li>- Central level implementing partners</li> <li>- Local level implementing partners:</li> <li>- Co-financing projects/partners;</li> <li>- Local stakeholders and providers</li> <li>- Final beneficiaries: Agricultural communities, local communities, farmers' groups</li> </ul>
		2.2. To what extent has the project contributed to reducing risks to the environment and human health caused by the use of empty pesticide containers in cotton production (Outcome 2)?	<p>Level of achievement of targets for Outcome 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 75,000 empty containers rinsed three times, collected and stored until they are recycled in the third year; 150,000 planned for the fourth year</li> </ul> <p>Level of achievement of outputs for Outcome 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Container management plan review document and stakeholder approval report</li> <li>- Implementation of a pilot plan for the management of empty</li> </ul>	

Evaluation criterion	Evaluation question	Evaluation sub-questions	Indicator	Data source/collection method
			<p>pesticide containers in the regions of Alibori and Borgou (Number of containers used in Borgou and Alibori, including: rinsed; collected; safely stored; recycled/disposed of)</p> <p>Changes or effects generated under Outcome 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Intended effects</li> <li>- Unintended effects.</li> </ul> <p>Factors that contributed to or limited the achievement of Outcome 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Positive factors</li> <li>- Negative factors</li> </ul>	
		<p>2.3. To what extent has the project eased the strengthening of the regulatory framework and institutional capacity for the sound management of pesticides throughout their life cycle (Outcome 3)?</p>	<p>Level of achievement of targets for Outcome 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revision of national legislation in accordance with international and regional obligations adopted by the fourth year of the project</li> <li>- The National Pesticide Management Committee and Pesticide Inspection and Quality Control System in place and operational by the third year of the project</li> </ul> <p>Level of achievement of outputs for Outcome 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National legislation enabling harmonized regional pesticide regulations in accordance with international and regional instruments</li> <li>- Development of a National Strategy/Action Plan and a</li> </ul>	

Evaluation criterion	Evaluation question	Evaluation sub-questions	Indicator	Data source/collection method
			<p>budget for pesticide inspection and quality control (sub-indicator 1: Publication of the national strategy for pesticide inspection and quality control; sub-indicator 2: Resources allocated to the implementation and monitoring of the national strategy)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased national capacity for post-registration inspection and control (sub-indicator 1: Number of inspectors designated and trained; sub-indicator 2: number, target and cost of quality control analyses)</li> </ul> <p>Changes or effects generated under Outcome 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Intended effects</li> <li>- Unintended effects</li> </ul> <p>Factors that contributed to or limited the achievement of Outcome 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Positive factors</li> <li>- Negative factors</li> </ul>	
		<p>2.4 To what extent has the project contributed to the successful promotion of integrated management techniques as alternatives to conventional pesticides, and to reducing the use of chemical and extremely dangerous pesticides (Outcome 4)?</p>	<p>Level of achievement of indicator targets for Outcome 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Many farmers trained in integrated management alternatives through Farmer Field Schools (FFS)</li> <li>- Percentage reduction in the use of pesticides on cotton and other crops among trained farmers (Objectives to be determined for the years 1 and 2)</li> </ul> <p>Level of achievement of outputs for Outcome 4</p>	

Evaluation criterion	Evaluation question	Evaluation sub-questions	Indicator	Data source/collection method
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identification of potential alternatives to endosulfan, POPs and other obsolete pesticides and approval of an action plan for field testing, registration and promotion (Number of good practices identified; the extent of use or testing of the selected practices will be known after the publication of the first year's data for the relevant typology)</li> <li>- Identified alternatives to Endosulfan, POPs and other obsolete pesticides are tested to ensure their technical and economic feasibility at the farm level (Number of plant protection products tested in the field)</li> <li>- Promotion of viable alternatives to Endosulfan, POPs and other obsolete pesticides (sub-indicator: Number of farmers trained in Farmer Field Schools)</li> </ul> <p>Changes or effects generated under Outcome 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Intended effects</li> <li>- Unintended effects</li> </ul> <p>Factors that contributed to or limited the achievement of Outcome 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Positive factors</li> <li>- Negative factors</li> </ul>	
		2.5 To what extent is the project progressing towards impact?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Impacts generated or being generated on sustainable pest and pesticide management, sustainable</li> </ul>	



Evaluation criterion	Evaluation question	Evaluation sub-questions	Indicator	Data source/collection method
			reduction of contamination and risks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extent to which outcomes have contributed (or are contributing) to the generation of impacts in the agriculture and livestock sectors in general and among beneficiary communities in particular</li> <li>- Constraints or risks that may hinder progress toward achieving long-term impacts</li> <li>- Measures to prevent or manage these risks</li> <li>- Likelihood and quality of impact</li> </ul>	
<b>Efficiency and factors affecting performance</b>	<b>3. Was the project efficient and effective in the deployment of management mechanisms, including activity planning, financing and co-financing, monitoring and evaluation, stakeholder participation, and internal and external communication?</b>	3.1. How effective were the project implementation mechanisms?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Functioning and effectiveness of the implementing bodies               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steering Committee</li> <li>• Project Management Unit</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<i>Review of reports and tools:</i> Project Implementation Report, mid-term evaluation report; semi-annual reports; etc. <i>Interviews:</i> Project Management Unit: Lead Technical Advisor, Monitoring and Evaluation and Technical Experts; Project Steering Committee; central level implementing partners; co-financing partner projects; FAO HQ project supervision: Lead Technical Officer (LTO)/ Plant Production and Protection Division; Funding Liaison Officer (FLO)/GEF Coordination Unit (GCU)
		3.2. To what extent has the project received adequate, timely and quality technical assistance from FAO in relation to the needs and intended outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Effectiveness, quality and timeliness of the GEF Coordination Unit's support to the project               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timeliness and effectiveness of annual supervision missions</li> <li>• Frequency of participation in the project steering committee</li> <li>• Contribution to the development of preventive and corrective actions to address risks and problems affecting project implementation</li> <li>• Timeliness in the transfer of project funds to address semi-annual financial needs</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Quality and effectiveness of the Lead Technical Officer (LTO) under the supervision of the Plant Production and Protection Division</li> </ul>	

Evaluation criterion	Evaluation question	Evaluation sub-questions	Indicator	Data source/collection method
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effectiveness of coordination and mobilisation of the project support expert team (technical officers, operational officers)</li> <li>• Quality of assistance in the recruitment of human resources and service providers</li> <li>• Quality and timeliness of approval of terms of reference, memoranda of understanding and contracts by the appropriate FAO technical officers</li> <li>• Quality and timeliness of review and approval of technical reports, publications, documents, training materials and manuals etc.</li> <li>• Quality of technical implementation monitoring in accordance with the project results framework</li> <li>• Quality of PPR review and quality of Project Implementation Review development</li> <li>- Major risks or problems prevented/resolved through project supervision</li> </ul>	
		3.3. To what extent has the planning of activities affected project effectiveness?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Status, quality and effectiveness of planning processes</li> <li>- Extent to which the results framework/project logical framework is used as a management tool</li> <li>- Evolution of the results framework</li> </ul>	
		3.4. How effective was financial planning?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Functioning of the financial control system</li> <li>- Ease of budgetary decision making</li> </ul>	

Evaluation criterion	Evaluation question	Evaluation sub-questions	Indicator	Data source/collection method
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Difference between planned and actual expenditures</li> <li>- Frequency and effectiveness of audits (annual, biannual)</li> <li>- Case of changes in allocation of funds</li> </ul>	
		3.5. What is the status and effectiveness of co-financing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Status of planned and actual co-financing pledges.</li> <li>- For each co-financing, provide: i) Sources of co-financing; ii) Number of funding partners; iii) Type of co-financing; iv) Amount confirmed at the time of CEO approval (USD); v) Actual amount received at the time of mid-term evaluation (USD); vi) Actual percentage of expected amount</li> </ul>	
		3.6. To what extent have the monitoring and evaluation tools been used adequately?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extent to which the systematic field data collection system is used to monitor project outcome indicators (operation and efficiency)</li> <li>- Quality and effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation tools</li> <li>- Was the information from the M&amp;E system used appropriately to make immediate decisions during project implementation?</li> <li>- To what extent were the recommendations from the mid-term evaluation considered and managed?</li> <li>- Effectiveness of achievement analysis? (e.g., Project Implementation Report)</li> </ul>	

Evaluation criterion	Evaluation question	Evaluation sub-questions	Indicator	Data source/collection method
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Level of integration of gender and vulnerable populations concerns in the tools</li> <li>- Level of consideration and management of environmental and social risks</li> </ul>	
		3.7. To what extent have stakeholders been effectively involved in project management?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quality and timeliness in establishing and executing partnerships and contracts (e.g., pesticide disposal company and other implementing partners)</li> <li>- Extent to which the project has established partnerships (e.g., between government, civil society, and the project team): complementarity and synergy with project interventions (quality of partnerships; level of involvement and support of government stakeholders at central, decentralized, and local levels; interest and involvement of stakeholders in project success)</li> <li>- Consequent effect of stakeholder participation on project outcomes</li> </ul>	
		3.8. To what extent is data reported and used?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How does the project evaluate, document and share its results, lessons learned and experiences?</li> <li>- To what extent has the project disseminated "best practices" and "lessons learned" from the project for enhanced adaptation to climate risk in the agricultural sector?</li> <li>- To what extent are communication products and activities likely to</li> </ul>	

Evaluation criterion	Evaluation question	Evaluation sub-questions	Indicator	Data source/collection method
			support the sustainability and scaling up of project outcomes? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Level of compliance with GEF data reporting requirements</li> <li>- Mode and process of communicating good practices</li> <li>- Quality of internal and external project communication</li> </ul>	
<b>Sustainability<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>4. Are the project outcomes sustainable and what conditions are in place to strengthen sustainability and reduce the risks that may affect it?</b>	4.1. Has the project put in place appropriate sustainability mechanisms or an exit strategy for the end of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What sustainability conditions and mechanisms are in place?</li> <li>- Has an exit strategy been implemented?</li> <li>- Is this strategy relevant and realistic?</li> </ul>	<i>Project documentation (see details in previous evaluation questions)</i> <i>Interviews with stakeholders (see details in previous evaluation questions)</i>
		4.2. Are the financial risks to sustainability considered and managed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How likely will the financial and economic resources be available after the end of the project?</li> <li>- Financial and economic instruments and mechanisms in place to ensure that project benefits continue after GEF support</li> <li>- Factors necessary to create an enabling environment for sustainability of funding</li> </ul>	
		4.3. Are socio-economic and environmental risks to sustainability considered and managed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Social, political risks that could threaten the sustainability of project achievements?</li> <li>- Environmental risks that could threaten or undermine project achievements and outcomes, including risks identified by project stakeholders</li> <li>- Risks of low stakeholder ownership</li> </ul>	

<sup>2</sup> Overall sustainability is assessed using a four-level scale: Likely (L), Moderately likely (ML), Moderately Unlikely (MU), and Unlikely (U)

Evaluation criterion	Evaluation question	Evaluation sub-questions	Indicator	Data source/collection method
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Level of public/stakeholder awareness</li> <li>- Quality of project communication</li> </ul>	
		4.4. To what extent are risks related to the institutional framework and governance for sustainability identified and addressed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Risks associated with legal and policy frameworks, governance structures, and processes related to the sustainability of project benefits</li> <li>- Factors/frameworks that can ensure or support self-sustainability after project closure</li> <li>- Ability of project managers to adapt to institutional and governance changes</li> </ul>	
		4.5. How likely will the project outcomes remain useful or sustainable after the project is completed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assessment based on answers to previous sub-questions on sustainability</li> </ul>	
		4.6 What are the barriers or other risks to progress towards long-term impacts?		
<b>Cross-cutting themes</b>	<b>5. Have issues related to gender, vulnerable or disadvantaged groups, and environmental protection been integrated into the project and adequately addressed during implementation?</b>	5.1. Were gender concerns addressed during project implementation and management? (To what extent have women, indigenous peoples, and vulnerable and marginalized groups been involved in the project?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Gender mainstreaming plan (planned? implemented? why? what effect?)</li> <li>- Number, intensity and extent of activities targeting women</li> <li>- Number of women/number of men who benefited from the project</li> </ul>	<p><i>Literature review:</i> Project document, GEF gender policy, framework developed by the FAO Evaluation Office for gender analysis; mid-term review report; activity report</p> <p><i>Interviews:</i> Communities; NGOs; civil society associations, implementing stakeholders; GEF focal point, public, private and civil society stakeholders; farmers; communities</p>
		5.2. To what extent have civil society, native peoples, and vulnerable and marginalised groups been involved in the project and to what extent have their needs been	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Level of engagement per type of stakeholder and gender.</li> <li>- Implementation status of GEF guidelines on the inclusion of indigenous peoples</li> </ul>	

Evaluation criterion	Evaluation question	Evaluation sub-questions	Indicator	Data source/collection method
		considered in the design and implementation of the program at different levels?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- List of disadvantaged groups' concerns addressed by the project</li> <li>- Action plan (existing, level of implementation and completion)</li> <li>- Number, intensity and extent of activities targeting women</li> </ul>	
		5.3. To what extent have environmental safeguards and social issues been considered in the project design and implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Have risks been identified during implementation?</li> <li>- What are the plan and measures to control and manage the significant risks identified?</li> </ul>	

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.