1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3985	
GEF Agency project ID		607573	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		FAO	
Project name		Demonstration Project for Decontamination of POPs Contaminated Soils Using Non-Thermal Treatment Methods	
Country/Countries		Botswana	
Region		AFR	
Focal area		POPs	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		POPs SP-1; SP-2; and SP-3	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Agriculture; Ministry of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Not available	
Private sector involvement		Not available	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		October 17, 2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		February 1, 2012	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		January 30, 2016	
Actual date of project completion		December 31, 2018	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing	1.3	Not available
GEF Project Grant		1.36	1.09
Co-financing	IA own	.43	.48
	Government	.81	.68
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	1.1	.3
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
	Other		
Total GEF funding		1.36	1.09
Total Co-financing		3.64	1.46
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		5	2.55
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		2019	
Author of TE		Boru Douthwaite and Zibusiso Sibanda	
TER completion date		2/3/2020	
TER prepared by		Laura Nissley	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Sohn	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	MS	MS	--	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML	--	ML
M&E Design		S	--	MS
M&E Implementation		MU	--	MU
Quality of Implementation		MU/MS	--	MU
Quality of Execution		MU/MS	--	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		--	--	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's Global Environmental Objective was to "Eliminate risk from POPs [Persistent Organic Pollutants] and obsolete pesticides in Botswana through the use of sound environmental management methods to dispose of contaminated soil and pesticide waste and prevent further accumulation of POPs, obsolete pesticides and pesticide waste" (TE pg. 21).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project was to "Reduce the risk to public health and the environment through the characterization, treatment and decontamination of POPs and POPs contaminated soil" (PD pg. 3).

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

There were no changes to the project's objectives or activities during implementation.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 **Relevance**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project relevance, and this TER concurs. The project's outcomes are consistent with GEF-4 Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) Strategic Program 1: *Strengthening Capacities for National Implementation Plan (NIP) Implementation*; Strategic Program 2: *Partnering in Investments for NIP Implementation*; and Strategic Program 3: *Partnering in the Demonstration of Feasible, Innovation Technologies and Best Practices for POPs Reduction and Substitution*. As a signatory to the Basel, Stockholm, and Rotterdam Conventions, Botswana committed to managing POPs using acceptable international standards, as well as reducing risks caused by these substances. Under the Stockholm Convention in particular, Botswana was required to develop a NIP detailing how it plans to manage POPs (TE pg. 26). Botswana submitted its NIP to the Stockholm Secretariat on July 6, 2011, before the effectiveness date of the project. Additionally, the project's outcomes are consistent with Botswana's national policies related to POPs and the protection of the environment, included the National Waste Strategy (1998); the Agrochemicals Act (1999); and the Environmental Impact Assessment Act (2005) (TE pg. 27).

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for project effectiveness, and this TER concurs. The project was designed to dispose of contaminated soil and pesticide waste and prevent further accumulation of POPs, obsolete pesticides and pesticide waste. The Sebele Warehouse in Gaborone was selected as the remediation site, however in 2016 the Warehouse accidentally burned down, along with safeguarded pesticides, unidentified pesticides, and contaminated plastic containers that were awaiting disposal. This created an additional contaminated site that needed to be remediated, which had yet to be completed by project end (TE pg. 58). Overall however, 63.8 tonnes of obsolete pesticides and contaminated containers were disposed of, meeting the targets set by the project (TE pg. 71). Some progress was also made in strengthening pesticide life-cycle management, however the project fell short of piloting a model for the sustainable management of Empty Pesticide Containers (EPCs), as well as operationalizing the Pesticide Stock Management System (PSMS). Additionally, the revised legislation on pesticide and waste management had yet to be submitted to parliament by project end, and the awareness campaign was not fully implemented.

A summary of the project's achievements, by component and outcome, is provided below:

Component 1: Contaminated Sites Characterization and Disposal Option Assessment

Outcome 1.1: Characterization of level and type of contamination at contaminated sites
Expected results under this outcome include: (1) Sites surveyed and ranked in terms of risk to public health and the environment; (2) Inventory of existing stocks; and (3) Inventory of contaminated containers. By project end, an inventory of obsolete pesticides stocks and containers was completed. The Sebele warehouse was selected for remediation, as it was the only site with heavily contaminated soil (TE pg. 28-29).

Outcome 1.2: Commercially available non-thermal treatment options assessed
Expected results under this outcome include: (1) Environmental assessment complete for all pesticide wastes; (2) Environmental management plan (EMP) completed for obsolete stocks and containers; and (3) EMP completed for all contaminated sites. By project end, two environmental assessments were carried out to determine the extent of contamination at the Sebele site, and detailed EMPs were developed (TE pg. 29).

Outcome 1.3: Existing obsolete stocks and stockpiled containers disposed of
Expected results under this outcome include: (1) Obsolete stocks safeguarded; (2) Contaminated containers collected and inspected; and (3) Obsolete stocks and contaminated containers sent for disposal/recycling. By project end, 28.8 tonnes of obsolete pesticide stocks and contaminated containers were exported for disposal by high temperature incineration. Additionally, 35 tonnes of contaminated seed was incorporated into the bioremediation process (TE pg. 28). The TE also indicates that 4.5 tonnes of safeguarded obsolete pesticides and 2-3 tonnes of unidentified pesticides, as well as 10 tonnes of contaminated containers that were awaiting export for disposal, burned down with the Sebele warehouse, which needed to be remediated in 2017 (pg. 29).

Component 2: Strengthening of the Regulatory Sector for Pesticide Management

Outcome 2.1: Revised pesticide and waste management legislation in place
Expected results under this outcome include: (1) Legislation for future management of pesticides/POPs waste reviewed and amended; (2) Review and assessment of local disposal options for treatment of pesticide and POPs waste; and (3) 2 officers from Plant Protection Service complete the FAO course on pesticide risk management. In 2015, consultants were hired to review legislation and address existing gaps. The Attorney General Chambers, along with the Ministry of Agriculture, drafted a Pesticides Amendment Bill which had yet to be submitted to parliament by project end (TE pg. 38). Additionally, the project developed a model for the local treatment of EPCs, although it had yet to be piloted (TE pg. 36). Lastly, 2 government staff completed the course on pesticide risk management (TE pg. 40).

Outcome 2.2: Systems supporting life-cycle management of pesticides instituted
Expected results under this outcome include: (1) Pesticide life-cycle gap analysis completed; (2) PSMS installed and operational; (3) Training course developed for all pesticide and customs inspectors. The TE does not indicate whether or not a gap analysis was completed, however the PSMS was installed and staff were trained in 2012. Unfortunately, inadequate internet access prevented the system from being used (TE pg.35). 25 personnel from the Plant Protection Division and Agrochemicals Committee received training on the FAO Pesticides Registration Toolkit, meeting the project's target (TE pg. 40).

Outcome 2.3: Less toxic alternatives to pesticides promoted
Expected results under this outcome include: (1) Current pest management strategies assessed and reviewed; and (2) Revision of existing policy to reduce use of highly toxic materials. The TE indicates that opportunities for integrated pest management (IPM) were not assessed by project end. However, the TE does indicate that the project's initial plan to reduce access to Class 1A pesticide products was expanded

to include the identification of Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs) and the development of a mitigation plan, including the promotion of biopesticdes and other less toxic alternatives (pg. 33).

Outcome 2.4: Communication and awareness campaign in place
Expected results under this outcome include: (1) Comprehensive communications and awareness strategy developed; (2) Communications and awareness materials developed; and (3) Communications and awareness materials delivered. By project end, a communications strategy was developed, along with awareness materials on pesticide risk and how to reduce it. The TE indicates that the awareness campaign was developed but not fully implemented by project end (pgs. 40-41).

Component 3: Treatment of Contaminated Sites

Outcome 3.1: Treatment option selected
Expected results under this outcome include: (1) Trial and pilot of selected soil treatment options; (2) EMP updated on the basis of trial and pilot results. A Rapid Environmental Assessment (REA) was done to determine the level of contaminated soil at Sebele. Samples were also collected from an area contaminated with Clordane. Bioremediation through land farming was selected as the means for disposal and commenced in February 2017. The TE indicates that it possible the contamination found will require methods other than bioremediation, however this had not been determined by project end (TE pgs. 29-30).

Outcome 3.2: Contaminated materials treated
Expected results under this outcome include: (1) Issue of tender for remediation contractor; and (2) Implementation of remediation strategy. The TE indicates that the remediation of the Sebele contaminated site was initiated, but not completed by project end (pg. 71). However, the TE indicates that "results from final soil sampling indicated that the bioremediation process had successfully reduced pesticide contamination to levels that did not pose a significant health risk to human health or the environment" (pg. 30).

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory** for project efficiency, and this TER concurs. The project end date was extended three years, from January 2016 until December 2018, in order for the project to complete key activities. The TE indicates that the project experienced a number of delays which affected the delivery of results (pg. 71). The project experienced delays in hiring senior staff, including the National Project Coordinator (TE pg. 42). In the case of disposal activities, the project experienced delays procuring the necessary equipment, as well as renewing the contracts of national staff, who were employed on short six-month contracts (pg. 29). Additionally, theft and vandalism at the Sebele Warehouse site caused delays in processing the Empty Pesticide Containers (EPCs), and as a result only 2 out of the expected 10 tons were exported for disposal. These delays were compounded by

a fire, which burned down the warehouse and stocks of POPs and non-POPs pesticides. As a result, the government had to pay to clear up hundreds of tons of contaminated rubble (TE pg. 48). The TE also notes that activities under Component 2 (Strengthening of the Regulatory Sector for Pesticide Management) were delayed because the government's co-financing did not materialize until October 2014, one year and eight months from the project's completion date (pg. 40).

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Moderately Likely**

The TE assesses the overall sustainability of project benefits to be **Moderately Likely**, and this TER concurs.

Financial Resources

The TE assesses the sustainability of financial resources as **Moderately Likely**. The TE indicates that the Government of Botswana has committed an additional $.5 million to complete project activities, although no formal plan was in place by project end (pg. 56). On the other hand, the TE notes that the private sector is "unlikely to invest resources at this stage since the EPC [empty pesticide containers) business model that was meant to facilitate involvement of the sector was not fully developed or initiated [Outcome 2.1]" (pg. 72).

Sociopolitical

The TE assesses sociopolitical sustainability as **Likely**. The TE indicates that while government ownership over the project was weak in the beginning (as evidenced by an ineffective Project Steering Committee), this did improve over the life of the project (pg. 49). Additionally, the project did invest in an awareness raising campaign, which was launched in 2018 by the Ministry of Agriculture Campaigns Unit and was still ongoing after project end. The campaign intended to target different stakeholders, including farmers, policy makers, funding bodies, general population, and the commercial sector, which should strengthen sociopolitical sustainability (TE pg. 41).

Institutional Frameworks and Governance

The TE assesses the sustainability of institutional frameworks and governance as **Moderately Likely**. The project supported a number of initiatives to strengthen the regulations for pesticide management and promote less toxic alternatives to pesticides. The Attorney General Chambers, along with the Ministry of Agriculture, drafted a Pesticides Amendment Bill, which covers the management of EPCs, the replacement of Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs) with safer alternatives, and the banning of temporary import permits (TIPs) for pesticides (TE pg. 38). However, the Bill had yet to approved by project end. The TE also notes that other institutional initiatives, such as a national pesticide stock management system (PSMS), will require a coordinated effort involving different government ministries. As the TE indicates, this had not been achieved by project end (pg. 56).

Environmental

The TE assesses environmental sustainability as **Moderately Unlikely**. The TE notes that "practices that pollute the environment such as burning/burying of EPCs and poor stock management will likely continue leading to further environmental contamination," however the report does not provide evidence to support this assertion (pg. 72).

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Overall, it appears that actual co-financing ($1.46 million) was less than expected ($2.34 million) when excluding expected project preparation grant co-financing. However, the TE did not have access to reliable information regarding co-financing. The TE notes that the team "found information on co-financing in the Project Implementation Reports, but it was not clear how the in-kind contributions were calculated, nor how the contributions were allocated…Ultimately this made it impossible to know how much had been spent overall and how much had been spent on each of the components" (pg. 15).

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project received three no-cost extensions due to various delays in implementation. The TE indicates the following reasons for delays: (1) hiring senior staff, including the National Project Coordinator (pg. 42); (2) procuring the equipment for disposal and remediation; (3) renewing the contracts of national staff (pg. 29); (4) security concerns at Sebele Warehouse (pg. 48) and (4) disbursement of co-financing (pg. 40). Taken together, the TE indicates that these delays affected the delivery of results, including the safe container disposal and the establishment of a working pesticide stock management system (PSMS) (pg. 58).

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The TE indicates that country ownership over the project was initially weak. The Project Steering Committee (PSC) met infrequently in the beginning of the project. The TE indicates that there were "too many changes in members attending to develop much understanding and ownership of the project" (pg. 41). Additionally, stakeholders from the private sector and NGOs, did not participate in the PSC. The TE

does indicate that ownership improved over the life of the project, which the TE attributes to the hiring of a well-connected, full-time National Project Coordinator (pg. 48).

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 **M&E Design at entry**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for M&E design at entry, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The project's results framework is logical and hierarchical; however, the project's outputs and indicators are interchangeable. For example, the three outputs included under Outcome 2.2 (Pesticide life-cycle gap analysis completed; PSMS installed and operational and all registered pesticides loaded into the system; and Training course developed for all pesticide and customs inspectors) are identical to the indicators provided for Outcome 2.2. As a result, the results framework is a less effective M&E tool for tracking and measuring progress at the output and outcome levels. At the objective level, however, the indicators provided are SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and timely). Additionally, the Project Document provides a detailed M&E plan, including M&E activities, responsible parties, timeframe, and associated budget. The TE does indicate, however, that the overall budget for M&E ($.15 million or 4% of the project budget) is unrealistic given the "burdensome" level of reporting outlined in the Project Document (pg. 49).

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory** for M&E Implementation, and this TER concurs. The TE indicates that the M&E system operated inconsistently and proved able to "flag issues but less able to follow up on measures to deal with them" (pg. 50). The Midterm Review also notes that project monitoring was particularly weak in the beginning, although the TE indicates that this improved over the life of the project (TE pg. 50-51). The quality of the annual project implementation reports (PIRs) was limited by a weak results framework that lacked SMART indicators at the output and outcome levels. Other types of reports outlined in the project's M&E plan were not produced, including quarterly reports and reports on co-financing expenditure (TE pg. 50). The TE also indicates that the Project Steering Committee (PSC) "did not fulfill its monitoring role of reviewing work plans and budget,

because neither were properly presented or discussed" (pg. 51). The TE also notes that the budget for M&E remained inappropriate given the size and scope of the project (pg. 50).

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 **Quality of Project Implementation**	Rating: **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory/Moderately Satisfactory** for quality of project implementation, while this TER provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. The implementing agency for the project was the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). The Midterm Evaluation found that while the FAO was effective at providing technical support to the project, "an overload of work of the LTU [Lead Technical Unit] prevented it from supervising some key project activities such as safeguarding and shipment of pesticide waste at Sebele" (TE pg. 44). The project was also managed from the FAO Subregional Office for Southern Africa, as there was no FAO county representative in Botswana until 2018, and which presented a challenge for project oversight. Additionally, the TE indicates that frequent turnover in key staff positions, such as the Lead Technical Officer and the National Project Coordinator (NPC), resulted in a loss of institutional memory and project momentum (pg. 71). The Project Steering Committee also did not provide effective oversight over the project, as evidenced by poor attendance, changes in membership, and difficulties setting dates for meetings (TE pg. 48).

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory/Moderately Satisfactory** for quality of project execution, while this TER provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory**. Execution of project activities was the responsibility of the FAO Budget Holder (FAO-AGP) and the Project Management Unit (PMU), which was based out of the Plant Protection Division (PPD) of the Ministry of Agriculture. The TE

indicates that project activities were slow to start due to delays in appointing a part-time National Project Coordinator (NPC) and a Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), as well as security issues at the Sebele warehouse and slow dispersal of co-financing from the Government of Botswana (pg. 46). The project cycled through four NPCs throughout the life of the project, which affected the momentum of the project. However, the TE indicates that project execution improved after the appointment of a fourth, well-connected, full-time NPC at the beginning of 2017 (pg. 60). The project was ultimately able to complete key activities, including the disposal of obsolete pesticides and contaminated containers.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

> By project end, 63.8 tonnes of obsolete pesticides and contaminated containers were disposed of (TE pg. 71). The TE also indicates that 4.5 tonnes of safeguarded obsolete pesticides and 2-3 tonnes of unidentified pesticides, as well as 10 tonnes of contaminated containers that were awaiting export for disposal, burned down with the Sebele warehouse, which had to be remediated (pg. 29).

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

> The TE doesn't explicitly indicate any socioeconomic changes that occurred by project end; however it does note that the fire at the Sebele Warehouse created a "large and expensive health hazard" (pg. 29).

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project

activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

By project end, a national team had been trained on safety, bioremediation, and risk assessment. The TE indicates that the team had the capacity to independently duplicate bioremediation activities in other locations (pg. 30). Additionally, the project trained over 200 farmers and extension staff in risks associated with pesticides and empty containers, and how to manage them (TE pg. 31). 25 government staff were also trained on the FAO Pesticide Registration Toolkit, and two staff completed the course on pesticide risk management (TE pg. 32). In addition to training, the project developed a model for the local treatment of EPCs, although it had yet to be piloted (TE pg. 36). A communications strategy was also developed, along with awareness materials on pesticide risk and how to reduce it (TE pg. 40).

b) Governance

The project supported the drafting of the Pesticides Amendment Bill, which covers the management of EPCs, the replacement of Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs) with safer alternatives, and the banning of temporary import permits (TIPs) for pesticides (TE pg. 38). However, the Bill had not been approved by parliament by project end.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

The TE does not indicate any unintended impacts that occurred by the end of the project.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The TE does not indicate any GEF initiatives that had been adopted at scale by project end.

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The lessons learned brief was not included with the report and could not be accessed through FAO's website.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE included the following recommendations (pg. viiI):

1. FAO should continue to highlight and advise the government to keep the issue of risk from pesticides as a priority. FAO should continue to empower the members of the PSC to lobby for continued efforts to reduce risk from pesticides in Botswana;

2. FAO and the PSC should continue to work on the issues of (i) Bioremediation, (ii) Implementation of a sustainable Empty Pesticide Container management strategy, (iii) Establishing a national stock management system, (iv) Enacting the revised pesticides legislation, and (v) Communication campaign for pesticide management;

3. FAO and the PSC could lobby for strengthening the office of the pesticide registrar;

4. FAO should ensure gender mainstreaming and inclusion of social and environmental safeguards in future projects.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report included an adequate assessment of project outcomes and impacts; however, it would have been helpful to include the analysis of project outputs in the actual report.	**MS**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report was consistent, and the ratings were generally well substantiated.	**MS**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	More evidence could have been provided to support sustainability ratings.	**MS**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The report does not include the lessons learned brief which was generated by the evaluation team.	**U**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE presents actual costs and co-financing realized, however it indicates that the co-financing information was unreliable, and that this was a limitation of the evaluation.	**S**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	A more thorough assessment of the results framework was needed. Otherwise, the report's evaluation of the M&E system was adequate.	**MS**
Overall TE Rating		**MS**

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).