

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3987	
GEF Agency project ID		606880	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		FAO	
Project name		Prevention and Disposal of POPs and Obsolete Pesticides	
Country/Countries		Eritrea	
Region		AFR	
Focal area		POPs	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		POPs SP-1; SP-2; SP-3	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Agriculture; Ministry of Land, Water and Environment; Ministry of Health	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Croplife International (co-financer)	
Private sector involvement		Not available	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		April 28, 2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		January 1, 2013	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		April 20, 2016	
Actual date of project completion		December 31, 2018	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.05	.05
	Co-financing	.87	UA
GEF Project Grant		2.15	1.94
Co-financing	IA own	.99	.65
	Government	.25	.14
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	1.59	1.59
	Private sector	.38	.09
	NGOs/CSOs		
	Other		
Total GEF funding		2.2	1.99
Total Co-financing		4.08	2.47
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		6.28	4.46
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		2019	
Author of TE		Boru Douthwaite and Zibusiso Sibanda	
TER completion date		1/29/2020	
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	--	S
M&E Implementation		MU	--	MU
Quality of Implementation		MU	--	MS
Quality of Execution		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 risks from POPs [Persistent Organic Pollutants] and obsolete pesticides in Eritrea through the use of sound environmental management methods to dispose of existing stocks and prevent further accumulation of POPs and obsolete pesticides" (TE pg. 21).

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Project Document did not include Development Objectives separate from the Global Environmental Objective, however the Project Document did indicate that the project will result in "the reduced exposure of farmers, consumers, and the public" (pg. 17).

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

There were no changes to the Global Environmental Objective or any project 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: <b>Satisfactory</b>
---------------	-----------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for project relevance. This TER, which uses a different scale, provides a rating of **Satisfactory**. The project outcomes are consistent with GEF-4 Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) Strategic Program 1: *Strengthening Capacities for NIP [National Implementation Plan] Implementation*; Strategic Program 2: *Partnering in Investments for NIP Implementation*; and Strategic Program 3: *Partnering in the Demonstration of Feasible, Innovative Technologies and Best Practices for POPs Reduction and Substitution*. The project outcomes are also consistent with Eritrea's commitments as a signatory to international conventions relating to POPs, including the Basel Convention, Rotterdam Convention, and the Stockholm Convention. Eritrea developed its NIP under the Stockholm Convention in 2011 with support from the GEF and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO). The TE notes that the project directly addressed the following priority issues identified in the NIP: (1) creating public awareness; (2) integrated approach on POPs issues; (3) identification and removal of stockpiles; (4) reducing the impacts of POPs on human health and environment; and (5) technical and financial assistance for POPs management (pg. 28).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
-------------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for project effectiveness, and this TER concurs. The project was designed to eliminate risks from POPs and obsolete pesticides through the use of sound environmental management methods to dispose of existing stocks and prevent further accumulation of and obsolete pesticides. By the time of the TE, the project had successfully safeguarded and disposed of 364 tonnes of obsolete pesticides. The TE also notes that national capacity for safeguarding and disposal was strengthened, as well as capacity for implementing Integrated Pest Management (IPM) and Farmer Field School (FFS) approaches. Additionally, significant progress was made in raising awareness of pesticide hazards and risk reduction strategies. The TE does indicate however, that the project fell short of achieving results in a number of key areas, including recycling of contaminated sprayers and containers; building a central store for pesticides; establishing a biological control for key citrus pests; establishing a laboratory for pesticide residues; institutionalizing the pesticide stock management system (PSMS); and finalizing legislation.

A summary of the project's achievements, by outcome, are provided below:

**Outcome 1: Eritrea's existing stocks of POPs and other obsolete pesticides safely destroyed and strategies for the remediation of contaminated materials, including soils, developed and demonstrated**

By the time of the TE, the project met its targets for safeguarding and disposing obsolete pesticides, while falling short of other key results, including building a central store for pesticides and recycling contaminated sprayers and containers (pgs. 28-30; 34). Specifically, the project safeguarded and disposed of 364 tonnes of obsolete pesticides, and 720 metal drums were safely stored in preparation for export for final disposal. The TE indicates that 6 tonnes of safeguarded obsolete pesticides and 24 tonnes of non-safeguarded pesticides had yet to be disposed of by the time of the TE. As expected, two stores were upgraded as intermediate collection centers, however the central store was not constructed. A risk reduction strategy for two contaminated sites was developed as expected, but it had not been implemented by the time of the TE.

### **Outcome 2: Strengthened capacity for pesticide life-cycle management**

The TE indicates that the project supported draft legislation addressing specific stages of pesticide management, however it had not been adopted by the time of the TE. As a result, no training on implementation and enforcement had taken place, as was anticipated in the project design (pg. 35). The TE indicates that the expected citrus biological control program was put on hold, as the project steering committee made the decision to shift the IPM program to tomatoes. The TE indicates that the project met its targets for building national capacity to safeguard obsolete pesticides, as well as implement IPM/FFS approaches. Additionally, training was provided in pesticide procurement, and stock and store management (TE pg. 31). The project fell short of implementing the PSMS, which was determined to be unviable, and an alternative system was not implemented (TE pg. 34). The TE also indicates that the empty container recycling scheme was not piloted in Zoba Maekel and the laboratory was not built, as expected in the project design.

### **Outcome 3: Raised awareness of pesticide hazards and risk reduction**

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) Communications strategy updated and an awareness campaign on pesticide hazards and risk reduction implemented; and (2) IPM promoted to policy makers. By the time of the TE, a communication strategy and awareness materials had been developed. However, the TE indicates that the project had yet to launch the awareness campaign (pg. 35). The TE does indicate that IPM had been successfully promoted to policymakers (pg. 33).

<b>4.3 Efficiency</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
-----------------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory** for project efficiency and this TER concurs. The project end date was extended more than two years, from April 2016 until December 2018, in order for the project to complete key activities. The TE indicates that delays in execution were primarily due to slow procurement decisions and high staff turnover in the Lead Technical Unit (LTU) (pg. 40). Key delays included: (1) delays recruiting the Technical Advisor at the beginning of the project; (2) delays procuring the communication campaign; and (3) delays contracting a consultant to design a landfill which led to delays remediating a critical site (pg. 41). Additionally, the TE indicates that the GEF budget for

Component 1 (Disposal of POPs and other obsolete pesticides) was overspent by \$287,000. At the same time, actual co-financing (\$2.47 million) was less than expected (\$3.21 million). As a result, activities under Component 2 (Pesticide life-cycle management) received less than half the planned budget, and key results were not achieved, including the establishment of a pesticide control laboratory, the establishment of a pesticide stock management system, and capacity building on implementing the new legislation (TE pg. 37).

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: <b>Moderately Likely</b>
--------------------	----------------------------------

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

#### Financial Resources

The TE assesses the sustainability of financial resources to be **Moderately Unlikely**. The TE indicates that no financial resources had been committed by the end of the project for the completion of key activities or the sustainability of project results. As the TE notes, “Future disposal activities through high temperature incineration would need substantial funding and it is not clear if or when that funding will be available again” (pg. 66). One aspect of the project, the Integrated Pest Management/Farmer Field Schools (IPM/FFS), is likely to receive future funding, as the government had committed to implementing the approach across the country (TE pgs. 48-49).

#### Sociopolitical

The TE assesses sociopolitical sustainability to be **Likely**. The TE indicates that country ownership was strong by the end of the project, particularly ownership by the Regulatory Services Department of the Ministry of Agriculture (RSD) (pg. 41). As noted above, the IPM/FFS approach in particular received significant political support, as evidenced by the government commitment to installing an FFS in every ward in the country (pg. 48). Additionally, the project significantly built the capacity of the project team and key stakeholders to safeguard and dispose of future stockpiles of obsolete pesticides (TE pg. 50).

#### Institutional Frameworks and Governance

The TE assesses the sustainability of institutional frameworks and governance to be **Moderately Likely**. The project supported draft legislation addressing specific stages of pesticide management, and it was expected that the legislation would be submitted to parliament for approval by March 2019 (TE pg. 34). The TE does indicate that there was conflict between the Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Land, Water and Environment, particularly prioritizing the disposal of the remaining contaminated soil, which could threaten institutional sustainability (TE pg. 66).

#### Environmental

The TE assesses environmental sustainability to be **Moderately Likely**. This TER did not find enough evidence to fully assess environmental sustainability. However, the TE does indicate that long-term strategies for environmental protection had not emerged by the end of the project, such as the construction of a landfill and central storage warehouse, as well as a strategy for the management of empty pesticide containers (pg. 66).

## 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?

Actual co-financing (\$2.47 million) was less than expected (\$3.21 million). The Government of Japan provided \$1.49 million through the Safeguarding Project. The TE indicates that three quarters of the Safeguarding Project budget went toward the safeguarding and disposal of obsolete pesticides and POPs (Component 1). The contribution from CropLife also went toward activities under Component 1 (TE pgs. 36-37). The TE indicates that the prioritization of disposal over Component 2 activities (Pesticide life-cycle management) meant that some key results were not achieved, such as the establishment of a pesticide control laboratory, the establishment of a pesticide stock management system, and capacity building on implementing the new legislation (TE pg. 37).

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 TE indicates that project implementation was affected by delays related to procurement issues and staff turnover in the Lead Technical Unit (LTU) (pg. 40). In particular, the TE notes that procurement issues affected the implementation of the communication campaign, which was delayed by 18 months, as well as the design of a landfill which led to delays remediating a critical site (Massawa Airport) (pg. 41).

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 Midterm Evaluation (MTE) indicated that there was a low level of ownership over the project due to the perception that the project was an "external activity" implemented by the FAO. However, the TE found that ownership over activities and outcomes, particularly by the Regulatory Services Department of the Ministry of Agriculture (RSD), was strong by project end. The TE notes that "One possible explanation for the change is that with the departure of the Technical Advisor, national project staff took more responsibility, and with it, ownership" (TE pg. 41). As a result, sociopolitical sustainability of the project was strong.

## 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: <b>Satisfactory</b>
-------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for M&E design at entry, and this TER concurs. The project's results framework is logical and hierarchical, and includes expected outputs, outcomes, and objectives. The indicators provided in the results framework are generally SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and timely), and are included for all levels of change. Additionally, baselines and targets are provided. The Project Document also includes a M&E plan, which details the planned M&E activities, responsible parties, timeframe, and budget. Overall, a budget of \$.15 million was allocated for the planned M&E system, which was appropriate given the project's size and scope (PD pg. 47). The TE does indicate that the level of reporting required in the M&E plan was "burdensome to comply with in full and, in the view of the evaluation team, not all necessary" (pg. 42).

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
------------------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory** for M&E implementation, and this TER concurs. The TE reports that the Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) were well-written and useful (pg. 43). This TER agrees in so far that the project reported on progress at the outcome and objective levels. The project did not report on progress at the output level, which would have strengthened the utility of the results framework as an M&E tool. The TE also notes that the M&E system "proved able to flag issues but less able to follow up on measures to deal with them" (pg. 43). The TE provides the example of the need to hire a consultant to design the landfill near Massawa airport, an issue that was flagged early by the Project Steering Committee (PSC) but not followed up on, resulting in multiple no-cost extensions to the project (pg.44). The TE also found that limited progress was made on recommendations provided by the Midterm Evaluation. In particular, the Midterm Evaluation noted that the PSC and Project Coordination Unit (PCU) "lacked budget information provided by project output to allow them to review work plans," and recommended budgets be prepared at least at the component level. The TE report indicates that this had not happened by the time of the terminal evaluation (pg. 43).

## 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: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
---------------------------------------	--

The TE assesses the quality of project implementation as **Moderately Unsatisfactory**, which this TER upgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The implementing agency for the project was the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Overall, the design of the project was relevant to the country context and the M&E Plan was appropriate for the project. As noted above however, the project experienced delays in procurement which significantly slowed down the implementation of key activities. The TE indicates that the main reason for these delays was FAO staff turnover at the senior level. The TE notes that the FAO-Representative changed four times over the life of the project; the Chief Technical Officer changed in 2016; and the Technical Advisor left the project in 2016 and was not replaced (pg. 41). Additionally, FAO transferred the Budget Holder position to the FAO Eritrea Country Office in 2015 and a number of issues emerged that they were not able to resolve, including providing relevant financial information to the Project Steering Committee (PSC) (TE pg. 40). Despite this, the TE indicates that the PSC's guidance and oversight over the day to day management of the project was satisfactory (pg. 41).

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
----------------------------------	--

The TE assesses the quality of project execution as **Moderately Satisfactory**, and this TER concurs. The Project Management Unit (PMU) was staffed by the Regulatory Services Department of the Ministry of Agriculture (RSD) and the Ministry of Land, Water and Environment (MoLWE), and overseen by a National Project Coordinator (NPC). Four task teams reported to the PMU: Disposal; Pesticide Management; Integrated Pest Management (IPM); and Information and Communication. The Midterm Evaluation in 2016 found that a PMU office had not been established and communication between the RSD and MoLWE staff was limited. The Midterm Evaluation recommended that a common PMU office

be established, however this recommendation was not adopted by the time of the TE (TE pg. 39). Additionally, the Midterm Evaluation found that too much emphasis was put on the disposal activities at the expense of other components of the project. The TE found that this shifted after the Midterm Evaluation, and other task teams received more resources and the project team was able to achieve key results in other areas, such as IPM (pg. 40). However, the TE also indicates that the GEF budget for disposal of POPs and other obsolete pesticides was overspent by \$287,000 (pg. 37).

## 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, 364 tonnes of obsolete pesticides had been safeguarded and disposed of. Additionally, 720 metal drums were safely stored in preparation for export for final disposal (TE pg. 28).

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 indicates that “The Project’s safeguarding and disposal work has likely reduced risk to human health from existing stocks of obsolete pesticides and related contaminated material,” however it does not provide specific evidence to support this claim (pg. 50).

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

The TE indicates that the project produced a national team competent in safeguarding and disposal work (pg. 50). Additionally, two stores were upgraded as intermediate collection centers and a risk reduction strategy for two contaminated sites was developed (TE pgs. 29-30). The TE also notes that a communication strategy and awareness materials had been developed by the time of the TE (pg. 35).

#### b) Governance

By the time of the TE, draft legislation addressing specific stages of pesticide management had been prepared, and it was expected that the legislation would be submitted to parliament for approval by March 2019 (TE pg. 34). Additionally, the government had stipulated that each ward in the country should have an IPM/FFS. The TE indicates that this should lead to a reduction in the use of pesticides, at least in the short term (pg. 50).

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 time of the TE.

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 were adopted at scale by the time of the TE.

## 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 TE team produced a “lessons learned” brief, however it was not included in the report.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE recommends the following (viii-ix):

1. The PSC should ensure that steps continue to be taken to reduce risk from existing stocks of obsolete pesticides and associated waste;

2. The PSC should continue to take steps to prevent further accumulation of obsolete pesticides and waste;
3. FAO and the PSC should help to ensure the success of nationwide roll-out of IPM/FFS in Eritrea;
4. The PSC, FAO and GEF should learn lessons to improve implementation, execution and gender equity in future projects to reduce risk from pesticides in Eritrea and globally;
5. The PSC and FAO should ensure gender is mainstreamed into plans to sustain and scale Project results. FAO and GEF should mainstream gender into projects whose preparation did not follow FAO's environmental and social standards; and
6. The PSC and FAO should take steps to ensure that reducing the risk from pesticides remains a priority for the government.

## 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" annex in the actual analysis, as it could not be accessed on FAO's website.	<b>MS</b>
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent and the evidence supporting the relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency ratings is convincing.	<b>S</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project	More evidence could have been provided to support sustainability ratings.	<b>MS</b>

sustainability and/or project exit strategy?		
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.	<b>U</b>
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Actual co-financing figures were provided. The report also includes project costs by component.	<b>S</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The assessment of the project's M&E systems was adequate, particularly for M&E implementation.	<b>S</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MS</b>

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