

Terminal Evaluation Validation form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		5407	
GEF Agency project ID		623106	
GEF Replenishment Phase		5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		FAO	
Project name		Disposal of Obsolete Pesticides including POPs, Promotion of Alternatives and Strengthening Pesticides Management in the Caribbean	
Country/Countries		Recipient Countries (11): Antigua and Barbuda (ANT); Barbados (BAR); Dominica (DMI); Dominican Republic (DOM); Guyana (GUY); Jamaica (JAM); Saint Kitts and Nevis (STK); Saint Lucia (STL); Saint Vincent and The Grenadines (STV); Suriname (SUR); Trinidad and Tobago (TRI)	
Region		Caribbean	
Focal area		Chemicals (Persistent Organic Pollutants – POPS)	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		GEF Strategic Objectives: CHEM-1 Outcome 1.4 POPs waste prevented, managed and disposed of, and POPs contaminated sites managed in an environmentally sound manner	
Stand alone or under a programmatic framework		SA	
If applicable, parent program name and GEF ID		-	
Executing agencies involved		Coordinating Group of Pesticide Control Boards of the Caribbean (CGPC)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		NGO secondary executing agency;	
Private sector involvement (including micro, small and medium enterprises) ¹		Private sector as beneficiary and sub-contractor	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) / Approval (MSP) date		02 March 2014	
Effectiveness date / project start date		01 November 2015	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		31 December 2019	
Actual date of project completion		31 December 2021	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.150	0.150
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		4.358	4.358
Co-financing	IA own	5.191	3.085
	Government	17.936	26.644
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		

¹ Defined as all micro, small, and medium-scale profit-oriented entities, including individuals and informal entities, that earn income through the sale of goods and services rather than a salary. ([GEF IEO 2022](#))

	Private sector		
	NGOs/CBOs		0.021
	Other	3.241	3.527
Total GEF funding		4.508	4.508
Total Co-financing		26.369	33.277
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		30.876	37.634
Terminal evaluation validation information			
TE completion date		30.08.2021	
Author of TE		Mr. Hubert Paulmer and a subject matter specialist Dr. Teresita Romero Torres.	
TER completion date		Nov 14 th 2022	
TER prepared by		Ines Freier	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Neeraj Negi	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review ²	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	MU	MU	MU
Sustainability of Outcomes		U	U	ML
M&E Design		MS	MS	MS
M&E Implementation		MU	MU	MU
Quality of Implementation		MU	MU	MU
Quality of Execution		MU	MU	MU
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report			—	S

3. Project Objectives and theory of change

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The global environmental objective of the project is to "promote the sound management of pesticides in the Caribbean throughout their life-cycle in ways that lead to the minimization of significant adverse effects on human health and the global environment." (TE p. 24)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project documents do not list development objectives separately. .

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or project activities during implementation? What are the reasons given for the change(s)?

No change.

3.4 Briefly summarize project's theory of change – describe the inputs and causal relationships through which the project will achieve its long-term impacts, key links, and key assumptions.

The theory of change is based on the following assumptions:

- There is the active participation of key stakeholders to support the implementation of project activities;
- Training provided to targeted project beneficiaries meets the necessary capacity needs across all countries;
- Regional bodies foster collaboration among national focal points;
- Sufficient resources are available and provided to support all project activities;
- The CGPC is capable of coordinating regional registration and enables collaboration on the project, and there are enough and robust expertise and technical skills in the region to handle and analyze soil samples and carry out site remediation;
- There is an equitable representation of all relevant actors in the project; and

² The terminal evaluation was commissioned by the Office of Evaluation of the FAO. Therefore, the ratings in the terminal evaluation and by the Office are identical.

- There is a political willingness to adopt the model regulations to harmonize pesticide registration and control at the regional level.

The project produces the following outputs:

1. The pilot studies develop and demonstrate best practices to remediate contaminated sites and promote effective highly hazardous pesticides (HHP) alternatives;
2. Physical Removal of POPs from the countries is undertaken,
3. 3. Support for Harmonization of legislation for POP.

These outputs are expected to change the behavior of actors at all levels. The relevant actors are able soundly manage use of PoPs and maintain its inventory. These outcomes are expected to lead to the long-term impact

Long-term environmental impact: removal of harmful effects POPs from the region and sound management of POPS in the region producing the GEB “positive impact on health” which is the aim of the implementation of the International Conventions.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

The outcome ratings (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and overall outcome rating) are on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory. The sustainability rating is on a four point scale: Likely to Unlikely.

Please justify the ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance and Coherence	Rating: S
------------------------------------	-----------

The project aligns with global / GEF and national priorities and tries to meet respective needs of beneficiaries. The project contributes to the Reduction of POP which aligns with the GEF’s role as a financing mechanism for the Rotterdam Convention and Stockholm Convention. The project was aligned and contributed to the implementation of GEF 5 Chemical Strategy (CHEM1) of preventing, managing, and disposing POPs waste; environmentally sound management of sites contaminated by POPs, and development of country capacity to phase out and reduce releases of POPs. (TE p31)

The project is relevant at the regional level as the consideration of model draft pesticide legislation bill by COTED and CARICOM for adoption and the move to have CAHFS45 as the Secretariat for CGPC in 2019 show (TE p31)

The project addressed the needs of the national governments to strengthen the regulatory authorities (Pesticides and Toxic Chemicals Boards or Pesticide Control Boards) and update legislations that were 10 to 30 years old. (TE p31).

The project is relevant to the mandate of FAO, which includes prevention and management of agricultural pests; safe distribution and use of pesticides, including disposal (TE p31)

The project is not coherent with other interventions in the region covering similar issues due to lack of co-ordination and knowledge exchange. The project document envisaged the collaboration with the BCRC/UNIDO (GEF 5558) project to dispose of PCBs. While activities took place on the ground (in the country), there was a lack of direct and effective communication between the project team and the BCRC team (TE p9)

The project design is adequate like regional approach and pilot sites in some countries. Project activities and theory of change are aligned only implementation capacity is lacking.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: MU
--------------------------	------------

Overall, the outcome achievements were substantially below expected results because of which outcome effectiveness is assessed to be moderately unsatisfactory. Although results related to shipping and disposal of pesticides were met, legislation to regulate import and use has not passed. Pilot projects like the remediation of one contaminated site and creating a district level container management network in Suriname have been implemented but experience has not been widely shared or scaled up.

The project fully delivered one component pertaining to shipping and disposal of pesticides. The other components such as technology transfer of methodologies for identification and remediation of contaminated sites, development of systems for the management of empty containers, strengthening the regulatory framework and institutional capacity for sound management of pesticides, promotion of alternatives to chemical pesticides, were not fully delivered. (TE p 34-41)

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: MU
-----------------------	------------

Outcome efficiency is assessed to be moderately unsatisfactory because of delays due to inadequate project management resources. The project start was delayed by 6 months, the project structure was not adequately staffed to deal with requirements of a complex project: it had only a coordinator and an assistant to deal with project's implementation in 11 participating countries. The participating countries demonstrated low levels of interest in supporting implementation.

4.4 Outcome	Rating: MU
--------------------	------------

The outcomes could not be achieved as several major outputs were not delivered or fully delivered.

4.5 Sustainability	Rating: ML
---------------------------	------------

Achievement of long-term objectives related to removal of PCB is moderately likely because despite of moderate financial and political risks, the institutional framework and governance mechanism allow the passing of the relevant legislation in future. The TE argues that activities for the sound management of chemicals like an import ban are not applied but this was not a planned result of the project . (TE p 45-50).

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, 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?

Co-financing of national governments was essential to achieve the outcome because the project volume was enough to carry out pilot activities like shipping out PCB for safe disposal but many activities like training relied on co-financing from national governments. The co-financing from the governments was in-kind and it was in form of support for use of training facilities, transport arrangements, staff time to attend trainings and to support pilot projects. The international agricultural research institutions which were supposed to co-finance the pilots did not bring in resources so that governments and university / NGO substituted the co-financing. (TE p 56)

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?

Delays were due to complicated processes for shipping out PCB, complicated legislative processes for legislation on POP and insufficient implementation capacity of Caribbean States at national level.. The delays affected the aspired project outcomes like adoption of legislation.

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

Stakeholder ownership has affected project outcomes in the following way:

Stakeholder engagement was strong at the regional level (through CARICOM) but was inadequate at the national level (including the private sector and farmers/community organizations). The terminal evaluation indicates that stakeholders such as the private sector importers and farmers are willing to contribute to the project activities however because of low capacities of the executing agency, their engagement was low. (TE p 7)

The project faced challenges in working with an implementation partner for field tests. The partnership with the original partner, CARDI (Caribbean Agriculture and Development Institute), to implement field tests on alternatives to POP did not work out due to the change of key personnel (in CARDI) and lack of

agreement with CARDI on financial terms. Therefore, the project worked with the University of West Indies instead.

The national governments as stakeholders preferred national processes over a regional harmonized registration process for POP so that the outcome a regional registration mechanism was not achieved.

In some countries, the interest waned after the obsolete pesticide disposal activity was completed (e.g., Dominican Republic), as there was no other project activity in the country. Additionally, engagement and interaction were primarily with technical stakeholders, who had high workloads and limited availability, and not with policymakers at the national level.

At the national level, the project depended on the NPC's time and commitment. The hierarchy (level) of the NPC also determined the ability to interact formally/engage with stakeholders in other ministries and with decision-makers within the country. Private sector engagement was primarily at the CGPC level and was not involved as required at the ground level. (TE p 57)

5.4 Other factors: In case the terminal evaluation discusses other key factors that affected project outcomes, discuss those factors and outline how they affected outcomes, whether positively or negatively.

Terminal evaluation reports, consistent with the observations of this terminal evaluation reviewer, that working in the Caribbean is generally challenging due to the low implementation capacity of island states with different legal systems and languages. Processes through CARICOM take time but are in general successful. Implementing technical solutions in the field is challenging due to remoteness of some locations and high costs. Technical processes like shipping out pesticides for disposal take time and are costly due to the available infrastructure.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six-point scale: Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: MS
-------------------------	------------

The designed monitoring system met minimum requirements of GEF. It had a budgeted M&E plan and included delivery of reports to FAO & GEF. It also had a provisional work plan by outputs and related activities. (TE p 51)

The TE found inconsistencies between outputs and indicators and between baseline or intermediate and final targets, some indicators were not appropriate for tracking the planned outputs and outcomes. Further, there were no indicators for planned impacts like economic and health benefits. (TE p 52)

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: MU
-----------------------------------	------------

The TE found that M&E activities were “informal,” inadequate and not systematic. (TE p 53) This is why M&E implementation is rated moderately unsatisfactory.

The results matrix was not updated during implementation. Budget was allocated for M&E, but there was no system or mechanism to systematically follow-up and monitor activities. In addition, the project structure lacked human resources to ensure appropriate and adequate M&E. For monitoring, the project was dependent on the field officers, who managed a portfolio of projects and the general monitoring system of FAO which largely tracked budget utilization and not progress on project results. (TE p 54) An additional person to support project management, follow-up/monitoring of activities and consultant deliverables would have helped, given the slow implementation throughout the project.

The project had specific environment-related indicators and tracked them. The project used the POPs tracking tools (TT) to report on results related to the disposal of obsolete pesticides, including POPs in an environmentally sound manner (TE p 52).

PIRs and six-monthly reports were reviewed before being sent to GEF. Nevertheless, it was noted that there is a need to improve the rigor of self-evaluation in PIRs. The monitoring of the risks identified in the project document was carried out through the PIRs and six-monthly reports. The risk rating was updated based on the situations presented in the reporting year and after the mid-term review. Two new risks were identified during project implementation related to insufficient action and support from national pesticide regulatory authorities for project implementation and delays in project implementation associated with the COVID-19 pandemic. (TE p 54)

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation rating is based on the assessment of the performance of GEF Agency(s). Quality of Execution rating is based on performance of the executing agency(s). 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: MU
--	------------

FAO was both implementing and executing agency. However, the project document lists the Coordinating Group of Pesticide Control Boards of the Caribbean (CGPC) as the executing agency. The TE found that FAO undertook all functions of the executing agency.

The implementation of the project is rated as moderately unsatisfactory due to the shortcomings in the project preparation, delivery of outputs, the delays and shortcomings in project supervision.

FAO was responsible for the appropriate use of funds, procurement and contracting for the project. There was an adequate separation between FAO's execution and implementing functions. Procurement of goods/services and recruitment of consultants were handled through HQ FAO processes. (TE p 54)

Oversight of project implementation took place overseeing budget spending. Corrections were not taken after MTR according to the TE (TE p 55).

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating:MU
----------------------------------	-----------

The project structure was not strategically and appropriately envisioned and therefore not staffed adequately to implement a complex project covering 11 countries. Quality of project execution is, therefore, rated moderately unsatisfactory.

This affected project management, monitoring, timely completion of activities, knowledge products, communication, and budget utilization. It was ambitious to expect a two-person team (Project Coordinator and a Project Assistant) to manage a complex project with six components, 14 outputs, and multiple activities covering 11 project countries. This was reflected in the delay in completion of activities and about 20 percent of funding unspent. It also affected various aspects of the project, such as monitoring and communication. (TE p. 15)

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 stressors and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project.

Removal of pesticides for disposal from the region: the disposal of 319 tonnes of obsolete pesticides (target 300 tonnes.)

Imports still occur because they are allowed. Safe storage and handling of pesticides is still not adequate. (TE p 34)

Reducing contamination levels, especially of Endrin, Endrine-Ketone and Dieldrin, at a contaminated site in Suriname also contributes to GEBs by reducing releases of hazardous products into the land, air and water. Through the collection of 12 tonnes of empty pesticide containers and the triple rinse awareness campaign in Suriname, achieved by the formation of a network of farmers, government and private sector, the risks of surface and groundwater contamination and soil degradation in the area covered by the network have been

mitigated. The biopesticides tested in the field trials, which showed promising results in replacing the use of highly hazardous pesticides, are also expected to reduce environmental pollution. (TE p 43)

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community cohesion, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project.

It is likely that the project contributed to health and economic changes, but these are not reported in the terminal evaluation.

8.3 Enabling conditions. Describe notable achievements in the following areas: Policy, Legal & Institutional Development; Individual & Institutional Capacity-Building; Knowledge Exchange & Learning; and, Multistakeholder Interactions. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these achievements, as well as how contextual factors have influenced progress.

National legislation on PCB was in the process of approval in all countries passing through CARICOM, however a regional harmonized system for approval of PCB was not implemented (TE p 34-36)

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects.

Not observed by TE

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, practices, approaches, or any of the enabling conditions identified above) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end.

Not observed by TE

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report, including how they could have application for other GEF projects. Lessons must be based on project experience.

Key lessons:

- complex projects must have an adequate number of staff for project management,
- Continued support is necessary after the first project on this specific subject in the region.
- Removal of chemicals for disposal is a first step to managing chemicals but not enough. Training countries only in the disposal of existing stockpiles without training them in preventing future accumulation, and disposal of obsolete pesticide and not creating national systems and structures for safe storage and disposal of obsolete pesticides has led to accumulation in many countries (TE p 69)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

To GEF project formulators and FAO:

- In project design and implementation of regional projects in the Caribbean, differences in contextual realities and capacities/resources among larger islands, land-based countries and smaller islands should be considered in the project strategy to ensure inclusivity, knowledge exchange and co-operation between countries is important
- Regional project design/implementation should ensure the engagement of diverse national stakeholders in (beyond participating in events) and not only NPCs. Should use existing national structures (e.g., pesticide control boards, committees, etc.) to engage, inform national stakeholders, and enable collaborations. Identify and communicate the benefits from the regional project for each country.
- Exist strategy for the project with proposals for national government for pending activities
- Adapt results matrix after project start or MTR if necessary
- Follow up for on-going legislative processes
- Future projects supporting national governments, creating sub-regional mechanisms in group of similar countries
- Private sector engagement should be a priority, specifically in the empty pesticide container management and promote alternatives to pesticides. (TE 65-67)

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/indicators of terminal evaluation quality	GEF IEO COMMENTS	Rating
1. Timeliness: terminal evaluation report was carried out and submitted on time?	yes	S
2. General information: Provides general information on the project and evaluation as per the requirement?	yes	S
3. Stakeholder involvement: the report was prepared in consultation with – and with feedback from - key stakeholders?	yes	S
4. Theory of change: provides solid account of the project's theory of change?	Repeats theory of change from MTR	MS
5. Methodology: Provides an informative and transparent account of the methodology?	Fulfills all criteria for developing an adequate methodology and implementation of methods for data gathering	S
6. Outcome: Provides a clear and candid account of the achievement of project outcomes?	The results matrix is checked whether outputs have been delivered and outcomes have been achieved	S
7. Sustainability: Presents realistic assessment of sustainability?	As Results are limited their sustainability is also limited	S
8. M&E: Presents sound assessment of the quality of the M&E system?	All weaknesses of the M+E system are listed and explained	S
9. Finance: Reports on utilization of GEF funding and materialization of co-financing?	Full list of co-funding, reports on spending of GEF funds	S

10. Implementation: Presents a candid account of project implementation and Agency performance?	Explains very well the role of FAO as executing and implementing agency	S
11. Safeguards: Provides information on application of environmental and social safeguards, and conduct and use of gender analysis?	Information is available in the respective section of the report	S
12. Lessons and recommendations are supported by the project experience and are relevant to future programming?	Lessons and 8 detailed recommendations relevant to the project	S
13. Ratings: Ratings are well-substantiated by evidence, realistic and convincing?	Ratings are realistic and adequate given the context of the Caribbean and GEF	MS
14. Report presentation: The report was well-written, logically organized, and consistent?	Meets all expectations	S
Overall quality of the report		S

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

No publication of project available because communication strategy was missing