



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the United  
Nations

## Office of Evaluation

---

### Capacity Building on Obsolete and POPs Pesticides in Eastern European Caucasus and Central Asian (EECCA) countries (GCP /INT/o62/GFF)

*Annexes to the final report*

## Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

### Office of Evaluation (OED)

This report is available in electronic format at: <http://www.fao.org/evaluation>

*The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.*

*The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.*

© FAO 2013

*FAO encourages the use, reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Except where otherwise indicated, material may be copied, downloaded and printed for private study, research and teaching purposes, or for use in non-commercial products or services, provided that appropriate acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright holder is given and that FAO's endorsement of users' views, products or services is not implied in any way.*

*All requests for translation and adaptation rights, and for resale and other commercial use rights should be made via [www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request](http://www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request) or addressed to [copyright@fao.org](mailto:copyright@fao.org).*

For further information on this report, please contact:

Director, OED  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 1, 00153  
Rome, Italy  
Email: [evaluation@fao.org](mailto:evaluation@fao.org)

## Table of Contents

<b>Annex 1.</b>	<b>Terms of References.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Annex 2.</b>	<b>List of institutions and stakeholders met during the evaluation process... </b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Annex 3.</b>	<b>List of documents consulted .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Annex 4.</b>	<b>Evaluation Questionnaire .....</b>	<b>27</b>

## **Annex 1. Terms of References**

### **1. Background of the Initiative**

#### ***1.1 Project overview***

1. Mismanagement and accumulation of obsolete pesticides and POPs pose a threat to health and the environment locally, regionally and globally. In response to this threat, Article 6 of the Stockholm Convention requires countries to take measures to eliminate or reduce the release of POPs into the environment.

2. In order to effectively implement Article 6 of the Stockholm Convention, it is necessary for countries to carry out a comprehensive and detailed inventory of POPs stockpiles. Although most countries, including those participating in this project, have completed an indicative inventory of POPs within the framework of their National Implementation Plan (NIP), these inventories do not provide sufficient details in order to allow a detailed management or elimination plan to be developed. Neither would an indicative inventory suffice for wastes to be transported across international boundaries or by sea and treated or destroyed in an appropriate facility in compliance with relevant national and international legislation.

3. The practicalities of identifying stockpiles and wastes that contain or are contaminated by POPs, managing and taking action to eliminate the stockpiles and wastes in compliance with the requirements of the Convention are complex and beyond the capacity of most developing countries and countries with economies in transition.

4. In addition, elimination of POPs stockpiles or stockpiles that are contaminated by POPs is also technically complex and requires understanding of the specific hazards that POPs present. Many, or most stockpiles and wastes that contain, or are contaminated by, POPs are old and in poor condition. Containers holding POPs chemicals may be deteriorated and chemicals are likely to have leaked into the environment. The management of such stockpiles requires specialist knowledge, trained personnel and adequate protection for people and the environment to ensure that the requirements of the Convention are adequately met and that health and the environment are adequately protected. The capacity for elimination of POPs is non-existent or very limited at best in the countries participating in this project.

5. At the time of project formulation some of the Central European and EECCA countries had been aware of the problems with large stocks of obsolete pesticides, associated wastes and contamination of soil and ground water for many years and had been looking for solutions. In some cases, countries had taken action on their own or with external assistance to address the situation. On the whole however, the problems were not being addressed adequately either in terms of scope or in terms of standards applied to remediation activities.

6. Many of the countries in the EECCA region lack the financial or technical capacity to address their stockpiles which are among the largest in the world. The differential between the countries of the region that were addressing their POPs and obsolete pesticides and those that were not was one of the main justifications for this project which aimed to bring about an exchange of experience and knowledge.

## ***1.2 Institutional Arrangements***

7. FAO was the GEF agency for the project and as such provided overall project management and technical guidance. Administration of the grant was in compliance with the rules and procedures of FAO, and in accordance with the agreements between FAO and GEF.

8. As the GEF agency for the project, FAO undertook to:

- Manage and disburse funds from GEF and other co-financiers of the project in accordance with the rules and procedures of FAO;
- Enter into agreements with participating country governments, Green Cross Switzerland, IHPA and Milieukontakt International for the provision of goods and services to or from the project;
- Oversee project implementation in accordance with the project document, work-plans, budgets, agreements with co-financiers and the rules and procedures of FAO;
- Oversee the execution of the project to ensure that appropriate technical standards are applied to all activities concerned with pesticide management and handling.

9. A Letter of Agreement was made between FAO and Green Cross Switzerland for the provision of a project secretariat and for the execution of project activities. The GEF contribution to the project was disbursed by means of the agreement between FAO and Green Cross. The management of this agreement was to be the responsibility of the FAO Project Coordinator. It should be noted that this was the first time such an operational modality had been adopted by FAO and so the lesson learnt from this project will be a valuable source of reference data when deciding if FAO operates in this way in the future.

## ***1.3 Project Impact and Objectives***

10. The impact of this project was defined as “to contribute to reduced adverse impacts on health and environment from excessive and poorly controlled pesticide use”.

11. The primary objective of the project was the reduction of pesticide releases into the environment and elimination of human health and environmental threat they pose in EECCA countries. As such the project aimed to facilitate viable and environmentally sound measures for the identification, handling and disposal of pesticides stockpiles and wastes, and incorporation of strategies for prevention and management of obsolete pesticides into national policies with a strong emphasis of regional and sub-regional approaches.

12. The project aimed to provide both technical and policy solutions. Technical solutions were to include removal of major known sources of contamination such as obsolete pesticide stocks and capacity building to strengthen pesticide import controls and product quality control. Policy solutions were to include strengthening pesticide legislation and training for government staff so that they are better able to identify and address weaknesses in the system.

## ***1.4 Project Outcomes***

13. The project outcomes were set to allow contribution to realisation of the expected results through implementation of activities designed to raise awareness, build capacity of obsolete pesticide management, disposal and prevention, provide for better information exchange among participating countries and involving a wide range of stakeholders.

14. The expected project outcomes and associated outputs/activities were:

- **Outcome 1:** Enhanced awareness among participating countries on prevention and disposal of POPs and obsolete pesticides.
- **Outcome 2:** Strengthened Capacity for POPs and obsolete pesticide prevention and disposal
- **Outcome 3:** Framework for exchange of information and experience among countries on the prevention and disposal of obsolete pesticides;
- **Outcome 4:** Greater stakeholder involvement in prevention and elimination of POPs and obsolete pesticides

## 2. Purpose of the Evaluation

15. In accordance with the Project Document, an independent Terminal Evaluation will be undertaken at the end of the project implementation. The Terminal Evaluation will determine progress being made towards achievement of outcomes and will assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the institutional arrangements on project implementation and the net benefit or negative impact of this on the recipients. It will, inter alia:

- review the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation through the LOA;
- analyse effectiveness of implementation and partnership arrangements;
- identify lessons learned about project design, implementation arrangements and management;
- highlight technical achievements and lessons learned;
- assess and levels of project accomplishment; and
- synthesize lessons that may help improve the selection, design, and implementation of future GEF activities.

16. The Terms of Reference for this Terminal Evaluation were prepared in close consultation with FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) and the FAO GEF Coordination Unit within FAO in accordance with the evaluation policies and procedures of FAO and the GEF

17. The Terminal Evaluation is planned to take place in the period from 25 September to mid-October 2012 (with a write-up period in October/November 2012); this will allow the evaluation to benefit from the planned lessons learnt workshop to be held in Moldova September 26 where direct access to country representatives will be possible.

## 3. Scope of the Evaluation

18. The evaluation will critically assess the programme through internationally accepted evaluation criteria, i.e. relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. In addition, mainstreaming of gender issues will also be a criterion for assessment. Within these criteria, the evaluation will analyse the following features of the programme, as appropriate.

- A. Relevance of the initiative to: the International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides; the GEF IV-POPs Strategy under which the project was approved; EECCA countries development priorities and needs for to the sustainable management of the pesticides; FAO Global Goals, Strategic Objective A Sustainable Crop Production Intensification and Organizational Result A3 and Core Functions<sup>1</sup>;
- B. Effectiveness and efficiency of the project implementation arrangements through the LOA with Green Cross Switzerland with particular emphasis on savings in terms of costs and time. The assessment should also consider the costs for management of the relationship by FAO and the visibility of FAO under the project. Finally this element of the evaluation should look at linkages with existing FAO structures and role of local FAO offices and REU.
- C. Robustness and realism of the theory of change underpinning the project/programme, including logic of causal relationship between inputs, activities, expected outputs, outcomes and impacts against the specific and development objectives and validity of indicators, assumptions and risks;
- D. Quality and realism of the project/programme design, including:
  - a. Duration;
  - b. Stakeholder and beneficiary identification.
  - c. Institutional set-up and management arrangements;
  - d. Approach and methodology;
- E. Financial resources management, including:
  - a. Adequacy of budget allocations to achieve outputs;
  - b. Coherence and soundness of Budget Revisions in matching implementation needs and project/programme objectives;
  - c. Rate of delivery and budget balance at the time of the evaluation.
- F. Management and implementation:
  - a. Effectiveness of management, including quality and realism of work plans;
  - b. Efficiency and effectiveness of operations management;
  - c. Gaps and delays if any between planned and achieved outputs, the causes and consequences of delays and assessment of any remedial measures taken;
  - d. Efficiency in producing outputs;
  - e. Effectiveness of internal monitoring and review processes;
  - f. Efficiency and effectiveness of coordination and steering bodies (if any);
  - g. Quality and quantity of administrative and technical support by FAO; and
  - h. Timeliness, quality and quantity of inputs and support by the Government and resource partner.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Annex 2 of this ToR

- G. Extent to which the expected outputs have been produced, their quality and timeliness.
- H. Extent to which the expected outcomes have been achieved.
- I. Use made by the initiative of FAO's normative products and actual and potential contribution of the initiative to the normative work of the Organization.
- J. Assessment of gender mainstreaming in the initiative. This will cover:
  - a. Analysis of how gender issues were reflected in project/programme objectives, design, identification of beneficiaries and implementation;
  - b. Analysis of how gender relations and equality are likely to be affected by the initiative;
  - c. Extent to which gender issues were taken into account in project/programme management.
- K. The prospects for sustaining and up-scaling the initiative's results by the beneficiaries and the host institutions after the termination of the initiative. The assessment of sustainability will include, as appropriate:
  - a. Institutional, technical, economic and social sustainability of proposed technologies, innovations and/or processes;
  - b. Perspectives for institutional uptake and mainstreaming of the newly acquired capacities, or diffusion beyond the beneficiaries or the project/programme;
  - c. Environmental sustainability: the initiative's contribution to sustainable natural resource management, in terms of maintenance and/or regeneration of the natural resource base.
- L. Overall performance of the project/programme: extent to which the initiative has attained, or is expected to attain, its intermediate/specific objectives and FAO Organizational Result/s (impact), and hence, contribute to the relevant Strategic Objectives and carry out its Core Functions; this will also include the identification of actual and potential positive and negative impacts produced by the initiative, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

19. Based on the above analysis, the evaluation will draw specific conclusions and formulate recommendations for any necessary further action by recipients, project execution partners, FAO and/or other parties to ensure sustainable development, including any need for follow-up action. The evaluation will draw attention to specific good practices and lessons of interest to other similar activities. Any proposal for further assistance should include specification of major objectives and outputs and indicative inputs required.

#### **4. Evaluation methodology**

20. The evaluation will adhere to the UNEG Norms & Standards<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards>; both GEF and FAO evaluation units are members of UNEG and subscribe to its Norms and Standards



21. The evaluation will adopt a consultative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. Triangulation of evidence and information gathered will underpin the validation of evidence collected and its analysis and will support conclusions and recommendations.

22. The evaluation will make use of the following tools: review of existing reports, semi-structured interviews with key informants, stakeholders and participants; direct observation during field visits. To the maximum possible extent, standardised interview protocols and check-lists etc will be used throughout the evaluation, so as to ensure comparability of findings across countries.

23. The evaluation will include the following activities:

- A desk review of the project document, outputs, monitoring reports (e.g. Project inception Report, PSC Reports and reports from other relevant meetings; Project implementation Reports; quarterly, six-monthly progress reports, annual PIRs), and other internal documents including consultant and financial reports;
- A review of specific products including the annual work plans, publications and other materials and reports;
- Visit to two countries where project activities have been implemented to assess the impact of the implementation against the project activities and also to assess the success of the project in mobilising local and international resources to support future activities;
- Interviews with staff and national institutions involved in project implementation including the members of the project secretariat at Green Cross, the project manager at IPHA, operational personnel at Milieukontakt as relevant; the Lead Technical Unit and Budget Holder, National coordinators and related national counterparts (the list of key contacts is included as annex 4);
- Face-to-face interviews with project staff in the countries that will not be visited at the planned end of project lessons learnt workshop to be held in Moldova September 26 2012 (subject to confirmation), to canvass their views on achievements, issues and ways forward.

24. Apart from Moldova, the evaluation team will visit two of the nine participating countries, namely Azerbaijan and Belarus, in order to capture a varied perspective of the different context in which the programme operates and the specific challenges and progress. The selection criteria included the state of progress, allowing a mix of more and less advanced, location of FAO offices, time and cost considerations, and were agreed by OED, the LTO, the FAO GEF Unit, Green Cross Switzerland and the countries concerned.

25. The team will independently decide which outputs and outcomes to assess in detail, within resources available, after consultation with OED and programme management.

## **5. Consultation process**

26. The evaluation team will maintain close liaison with the FAO Office of Evaluation, FAO offices/correspondents at country level and the LTO as appropriate, and all key stakeholders. Although the mission is free to discuss with the authorities concerned anything

relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment on behalf of the Government, the donor or FAO.

27. At the end of the mission, the team will present its preliminary conclusions and recommendations to the LTO and Green Cross representative in Budapest.

28. The Terms of Reference of the evaluation and the final draft report will be circulated among key stakeholders before finalization; comments and suggestions will be incorporated as deemed appropriate by the evaluation team.

## **6. The Evaluation Report**

29. The evaluation team will agree on the outline of the report early in the evaluation process. The annotated outline Report Structure included in Annex I to the evaluation Terms of Reference can be modified by the evaluation team, as long as the key contents are maintained in the report and the flow of information and analysis is coherent and clear.

30. The report will be prepared in English, with numbered paragraphs. Translations in other languages of the Organization, if required, will be FAO's responsibility.

31. The evaluation report will illustrate the evidence found that responds to the evaluation issues, questions and criteria listed in the TOR. It will include an executive summary. Supporting data and analysis should be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report.

32. The recommendations will be addressed to the different stakeholders and prioritized: they will be evidence-based, relevant, focused, clearly formulated and actionable.

33. The team leader bears responsibility for submitting the final draft report to OED within 4-6 weeks from the conclusion of the mission. Upon receipt of the draft report, OED and Task Force members will provide comments within one week. The revised report will be circulated to other FAO stakeholders, who within two additional weeks will submit to the team comments and suggestions that the team will include as appropriate in the final report within one week.

34. Annexes to the evaluation report will include, but are not limited to:

- Terms of reference for the evaluation;
- Profile of team members;
- List of documents reviewed
- List of institutions and stakeholders met during the evaluation process;<sup>3</sup>
- Itinerary of the evaluation team mission;
- Data collection instruments (e.g. copies of questionnaires, surveys – if applicable)

### Ratings

---

<sup>3</sup> The team will decide whether to report the full name and/or the function of the people who were interviewed in this list.

35. In order to facilitate comparison with routine reporting to GEF and contribute to the GEF programme learning process (IWLearn), the evaluation will rate the success of the project on the GEF six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU).

36. Each of the items listed below should be rated separately, with comments and then an overall rating given.

- Achievement of objectives
- Attainment of outputs and activities
- Progress towards meeting GEF-4 focal area priorities/objectives
- Cost-effectiveness
- Impact
- Risk and Risk management<sup>4</sup>
- Sustainability<sup>5</sup>
- Stakeholder participation
- Country ownership
- Implementation approach
- Financial planning
- Replicability
- Monitoring and evaluation.

## **7. Composition of the evaluation team**

37. Mission members will have had no previous direct involvement in the formulation, implementation or backstopping of the initiative. All will sign the Declaration of Interest form of the FAO Office of Evaluation.

38. The Evaluation Team is responsible for conducting the evaluation and applying the methodology. All team members, including the Team Leader, will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings, discussions, field visits, and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs.

39. The Evaluation Team is fully responsible for its independent report which may not necessarily reflect the views of the Government or of FAO. An evaluation report is not subject to technical clearance by FAO although OED is responsible for ensuring conformity of the evaluation report with standards for project/programme evaluation in FAO.

40. The evaluation team will comprise the following skill mix:

- Team Leader with extensive experience in the evaluation of large/complex, regional technical assistance projects;

---

<sup>4</sup> Financial risks, socio-political risks, institutional framework and governance risks, and environmental risks.

<sup>5</sup> Sustainability will be assessed in terms of Likelihood: Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability. Moderately Likely (ML): There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability. Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability

- Agriculture / Environmental specialist with experience in environmental impact, including pesticide management and removal.

41. All team members will have a University Degree and a minimum of 10 years of professional experience, or equivalent level of competence, in their respective areas of specialization. Team members will be fluent in English. (Knowledge of Russian is desirable.) Individual Terms of Reference will be developed referring to this ToR, upon recruitment of each team member.

## **8. Evaluation timetable**

42. The time-table is still being developed in consultation with prospective team members. Number of days allocated to team members will vary according to responsibility

- 20 September: Appointment of external consultant(s) completed
- 24 September: Review of project documents and reports completed
- 25 September: Briefing of team in Moldova by Green Cross representative and LTO
- 25 September – mid-October (depending on flight connections, and country programme): Mission to participating countries (Azerbaijan, Belarus, Moldova)
- 26 September: Lessons Learnt Workshop
- Mid-October (tentatively 17 October: Mission debriefing with LTO in Budapest
- Mid-October (after debriefing): First draft of Aide-Memoire to OED and project stakeholders
- Mid-late November: Final draft of evaluation report

## **9. Annexes to the ToR**

Annex 1, Annotated Report Outline

Annex 2, FAO Global Goals, Strategic Objectives and Organization results

Annex 3, Log frame elements for project

Annex 4, Key contacts to be interviewed in the consultation

## **Annex 1, Annotated project evaluation report outline**

The evaluation team can modify the structure of the report, as long as the key contents are maintained in the report and the flow of information and analysis is coherent and clear.

The report should be presented with numbered chapters and paragraphs; the length of a project/programme evaluation reports should be 15-18,000 words, excluding executive summary and annexes.

### Acronyms

When an abbreviation is used for the first time in the text, it should be explained in full; it will be included in the list of acronyms when it is used repeatedly within the report.

### Executive Summary

The Executive Summary should:

- *Be in length approximately 10-15% of the main report, excluding annexes;*
- *Provide key information on the evaluation process and methodology;*
- *Illustrate key findings and conclusions;*
- *List all recommendations: this will facilitate the drafting of the FAO Management Response to the evaluation.*<sup>6</sup>

### Introduction

#### ***Background and purposes of the evaluation***

43. This section will include:
- the purpose of the evaluation, as stated in the Terms of Reference;
  - project/programme title, starting and closing dates, initial and current total budget;
  - dates of implementation of the evaluation.
44. It will also mention that Annex I of the evaluation report is the evaluation Terms of Reference.

#### ***Methodology of the evaluation***

45. This section will comprise a description of the methodology and tools used and evaluation criteria that were applied by the evaluation. This should also note any limitations incurred in applying the methodology by the evaluation team.

### Context of the project/programme

46. This section will include a description of the developmental context relevant to the project/programme (global/regional/national as appropriate) including major challenges in the area of the intervention, political and legislative issues, etc.

---

<sup>6</sup> The Management Response is the written reply by FAO to the evaluation; it illustrates acceptance or justified partial acceptance or rejection of recommendations, including actions, responsibilities and time plan for their implementation.

47. It will also describe the process by which the project/programme was identified and developed and cite other related UN (including FAO) and bilateral interventions if relevant.

## Concept and relevance

### *Design*

48. Programmes and projects are built on assumptions on how and why they are supposed to achieve the agreed objectives through the selected strategy; this set of assumptions constitutes the programme theory or ‘theory of change’ and can be explicit (e.g. in a logical framework matrix)<sup>7</sup> or implicit in a project/programme document.

49. This section will include a short description of the project/programme theory of change, of its objectives and assumptions and will analyse critically:

- The appropriateness of stated development goals and outcomes (immediate objectives);
- The causal relationship between inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes (immediate objectives) and impact (development objectives);
- The relevance and appropriateness of indicators;
- The validity of assumptions and risks.

50. This section will also critically assess:

- The project/programme’s institutional set-up and management arrangements;
- The adequacy of the time-frame for implementation;
- The adequacy of resources from all parties and appropriateness of budget allocations to achieve intended results;
- The adequacy of the methodology of implementation to achieve intended results;
- The quality of the stakeholders’ and beneficiaries identification.

### *Relevance*

51. This section will analyse the extent to which the project/programme’s objectives and strategy were consistent with country’s expressed requirements and policies, with beneficiaries’ needs, and other major aid programmes, at the time of approval and at the time of the evaluation.

52. There will also be an analysis of the degree to which the project/programme corresponds to priorities in the FAO Country Programming Framework.

## Implementation

### *Budget and Expenditure*

53. This section will contain the analysis of project/programme financial resources and management, including:

---

<sup>7</sup> Logical framework matrix, if present, should be reproduced as an Annex to the report.

- Efficiency in production of outputs;
- Coherence and soundness of Budget Revisions in matching required budget adjustments to implementation needs and project/programme objectives; and
- Assessment of rate of delivery and budget balance at the time of the evaluation, compared to the initial plan.

### ***Project/programme Management***

54. This section will analyse the performance of the management function, including:
- effectiveness and efficiency of operations management, both within the project/programme and by FAO including timeliness, quality, reasons for delays and assessment of remedial measures taken if any;
  - effectiveness of strategic decision-making by project/programme management;
  - realism of annual work-plans;
  - efficiency and effectiveness of monitoring system and internal evaluation processes;
  - elaboration and implementation of an exit strategy;.
  - role and effectiveness of institutional set-up, including steering bodies;

### ***Technical Backstopping***

55. This section will analyse the extent, timeliness and quality of technical backstopping the project/programme received from involved units in FAO, at all levels (HQ, regional, sub-regional and country offices).

### ***Government support***

56. This section will analyse government's commitment and support to the project/programme, in particular:
- Financial and human resources made available for project/programme operations;
  - Uptake of outputs and outcomes through policy or investment for upscaling;

Results and contribution to stated objectives<sup>8</sup>

### ***Outputs and outcomes***

57. This section will critically analyse the project/programme outputs: ideally, the evaluation team should directly assess all of these, but this is not always feasible due to time and resources constraints. Thus, the detailed analysis should be done on a representative sample of outputs that were assessed directly, while a complete list of outputs prepared by the project/programme team should be included as annex. If appropriate, the section will also include an analysis of gaps and delays and their causes and consequences.

58. Further, the section will critically analyse to what extent expected outcomes (specific/ immediate objectives) were achieved, or are likely to be achieved during the project/programme life's time. It will also identify and analyse the main factors influencing their achievement and the contributions of the various stakeholders to them.

---

<sup>8</sup> The term 'results' includes outputs, outcomes and impact.

### ***Gender issues***

59. This section will analyse if and how the project/programme mainstreamed gender issues. The assessment will cover:

- Analysis of how gender issues were reflected in objectives, design, identification of beneficiaries and implementation;
- Analysis of how gender relations and equality and processes of women's inclusion were and are likely to be affected by the initiative;
- Extent to which gender issues were taken into account in project/programme management.

### ***Capacity development***

60. The evaluation will assess

- the extent and quality of project/programme work in capacity development of beneficiaries;
- the perspectives for institutional uptake and mainstreaming of the newly acquired capacities, or diffusion beyond the beneficiaries or the project/programme.

### ***Sustainability***

61. This section will assess the prospects for long-term use of outputs and outcomes, from an institutional, social, technical and economic perspective. If applicable, there will also be an analysis of environmental sustainability (maintenance and/or regeneration of the natural resource base).

### ***Impact***

62. This section will assess the current and foreseeable positive and negative impacts produced as a result of the project/programme, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

63. It will assess the actual or potential contribution of the project/programme to the planned development objective and to FAO's Strategic Objectives, Core Functions and Organizational Results.<sup>9</sup>

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

64. Conclusions need to be substantiated by findings consistent with data collected and methodology, and represent insights into identification and/ or solutions of important problems or issues. They may address specific evaluation questions raised in the Terms of Reference and should provide a clear basis for the recommendations which follow.

65. The Conclusions will synthesise the main findings from the preceding sections: main achievements, major weaknesses and gaps in implementation, factors affecting strengths and weaknesses, prospects for follow-up, any emerging issues. It will consolidate the assessment of various aspects to judge the extent to which the project/programme has attained, or is

---

<sup>9</sup> See Annex 2 of the ToR



expected to attain, its intermediate/specific objectives. Considerations about relevance, costs, implementation strategy and quantity and quality of outputs and outcomes should be brought to bear on the aggregate assessment.

66. The section will include an assessment of FAO's role as implementing/ executing agency and the quality of the feedback loop between the project/programme and FAO's normative role, namely:

- actual use by the project/programme of relevant FAO's normative products (databases, publications, methodologies, etc.);
- actual and potential contribution of project/programme outputs and outcomes to FAO's normative work.

67. Recommendations should be firmly based on evidence and analysis, be relevant and realistic, with priorities for action made clear. They can tackle strategic, thematic or operational issues. Recommendations concerned with on-going activities should be presented separately from those relating to follow-up once the project/programme is terminated.

68. Each recommendation should each be introduced by the rationale for it; alternatively, it should be referenced to the paragraphs in the report to which it is linked.

69. Each recommendation should be clearly addressed to the appropriate party(ies), i.e. the Government, the resource partner, FAO at different levels (HQ, regional, sub-regional, national) and the project/programme management. Responsibilities and the time frame for their implementation should be stated, to the extent possible.

70. Although it is not possible to identify a 'correct' number of recommendations in an evaluation report, the evaluation team should consider that each recommendation must receive a response.

#### Lessons Learned

71. Not all evaluations generate lessons. Lessons should only be drawn if they represent contributions to general knowledge.

72. Where this is the case, the evaluation will identify lessons and good practices on substantive, methodological or procedural issues, which could be relevant to the design, implementation and evaluation of similar projects or programmes. Such lessons/practices must have been innovative, demonstrated success, had an impact, and be replicable.

## Annexes to the evaluation report

- I. Evaluation Terms of Reference
- II. Brief profile of evaluation team members
- III. List of documents reviewed
- IV. List of institutions and stakeholders met during the evaluation process;<sup>10</sup>
- V. Itinerary of the evaluation team mission
- VI. Data collection instruments (e.g. copies of questionnaires, surveys – if applicable)
- VII. List of outputs<sup>11</sup>
- VIII. List of consultant and FAO backstopping missions

---

<sup>10</sup> The team will decide whether to report the full name and/or the function of the people who were interviewed in this list.

<sup>11</sup> This includes training events, meetings, reports/publications, initiatives supported through the project/programme. It should be prepared by the Project/programme staff, in a format decided by the evaluation team, when details cannot be provided in the main text because too cumbersome

## Annex 2, Global Goals of FAO Member States, FAO Strategic Objectives, Organizational Results and Core Functions 2010-19

### Box 1. Global Goals of FAO Member States

a) Reduction of the absolute number of people suffering from hunger, progressively ensuring a world in which all people at all times have sufficient safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life;
b) Elimination of poverty and the driving forward of economic and social progress for all with increased food production, enhanced rural development and sustainable livelihoods;
c) Sustainable management and utilisation of natural resources, including land, water, air, climate and genetic resources, for the benefit of present and future generations.

### Box 2. FAO Strategic Objectives and Organizational Results

Code	Title	Lead Unit
A	Sustainable intensification of crop production	AG
A01	Policies and strategies on sustainable crop production intensification and diversification at national and regional levels	AGP
A02	Risks from outbreaks of transboundary plant pests and diseases are sustainably reduced at national, regional and global levels	AGP
A03	Risks from pesticides are sustainably reduced at national, regional and global levels	AGP
A04	Effective policies and enabled capacities for a better management of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (PGRFA) including seed systems at the national and regional levels	AGP
B	Increased sustainable livestock production	AG
B01	The livestock sector effectively and efficiently contributes to food security, poverty alleviation and economic development	AGA
B02	Reduced animal disease and associated human health risks	AGA
B03	Better management of natural resources, including animal genetic resources, in livestock production	AGA
B04	Policy and practice for guiding the livestock sector are based on timely and reliable information	AGA
C	Sustainable management and use of fisheries and aquaculture resources	FI
C01	Members and other stakeholders have improved formulation of policies and standards that facilitate the implementation of the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF) and other international instruments, as well as response to emerging issues	FI
C02	Governance of fisheries and aquaculture has improved through the establishment or strengthening of national and regional institutions, including RFBs	FIE
C03	More effective management of marine and inland capture fisheries by FAO Members and other stakeholders has contributed to the improved state of fisheries resources, ecosystems and their sustainable use	FIM
C04	Members and other stakeholders have benefited from increased production of fish and fish products from sustainable expansion and intensification of aquaculture	FIM
C05	Operation of fisheries, including the use of vessels and fishing gear, is made safer, more technically and socio-economically efficient, environmentally-friendly and compliant with rules at all levels	FII
C06	Members and other stakeholders have achieved more responsible post-harvest utilization and trade of fisheries and aquaculture products, including more predictable and harmonized market access requirements	FII

D	Improved quality and safety of food at all stages of the food chain	AG
D01	New and revised internationally agreed standards and recommendations for food safety and quality that serve as the reference for international harmonization	AGN
D02	Institutional, policy and legal frameworks for food safety/quality management that support an integrated food chain approach	AGN
D03	National/regional authorities are effectively designing and implementing programmes of food safety and quality management and control, according to international norms	AGN
D04	Countries establish effective programmes to promote improved adherence of food producers/businesses to international recommendations on good practices in food safety and quality at all stages of the food chain, and conformity with market requirements	AGN
E	Sustainable management of forests and trees	FO
E01	Policy and practice affecting forests and forestry are based on timely and reliable information	FOM
E02	Policy and practice affecting forests and forestry are reinforced by international cooperation and debate	FOE
E03	Institutions governing forests are strengthened and decision-making improved, including involvement of forest stakeholders in the development of forest policies and legislation, thereby enhancing an enabling environment for investment in forestry and forest industries. Forestry is better integrated into national development plans and processes, considering interfaces between forests and other land uses	FOE
E04	Sustainable management of forests and trees is more broadly adopted, leading to reductions in deforestation and forest degradation and increased contributions of forests and trees to improve livelihoods and to contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation	FOM
E05	Social and economic values and livelihood benefits of forests and trees are enhanced, and markets for forest products and services contribute to making forestry a more economically-viable land-use option	FOE
E06	Environmental values of forests, trees outside forests and forestry are better realized; strategies for conservation of forest biodiversity and genetic resources, climate change mitigation and adaptation, rehabilitation of degraded lands, and water and wildlife management are effectively implemented	FOM
F	Sustainable management of land, water and genetic resources and improved responses to global environmental challenges affecting food and agriculture	NR
F01	Countries promoting and developing sustainable land management	NRL
F02	Countries address water scarcity in agriculture and strengthen their capacities to improve water productivity of agricultural systems at national and river-basin levels including transboundary water systems	NRL
F03	Policies and programmes are strengthened at national, regional and international levels to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity for food and agriculture and the equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of genetic resources	NRD
F04	An international framework is developed and countries' capacities are reinforced for responsible governance of access to, and secure and equitable tenure of land and its interface with other natural resources, with particular emphasis on its contribution to rural development	NRC
F05	Countries have strengthened capacities to address emerging environmental challenges, such as climate change and bioenergy	NRC
F06	Improved access to and sharing of knowledge for natural resource management	OEK
G	Enabling environment for markets to improve livelihoods and rural development	ES
G01	Appropriate analysis, policies and services enable small producers to improve competitiveness, diversify into new enterprises, increase value addition and meet market requirements	

G02	Rural employment creation, access to land and income diversification are integrated into agricultural and rural development policies, programmes and partnerships	ESW
G03	National and regional policies, regulations and institutions enhance the developmental and poverty reduction impacts of agribusiness and agro-industries	
G04	Countries have increased awareness of and capacity to analyse developments in international agricultural markets, trade policies and trade rules to identify trade opportunities and to formulate appropriate and effective pro-poor trade policies and strategies	EST
H	Improved food security and better nutrition	ES
H01	Countries and other stakeholders have strengthened capacity to formulate and implement coherent policies and programmes that address the root causes of hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition	ESA
H02	Member countries and other stakeholders strengthen food security governance through the triple-track approach and the implementation of the Voluntary Guidelines to Support the Progressive Realization of the Right to Adequate Food in the Context of National Food Security	ESA
H03	Strengthened capacity of member countries and other stakeholders to address specific nutrition concerns in food and agriculture	AGN
H04	Strengthened capacity of member countries and other stakeholders to generate, manage, analyse and access data and statistics for improved food security and better nutrition	ESS
H05	Member countries and other stakeholders have better access to FAO analysis and information products and services on food security, agriculture and nutrition, and strengthened own capacity to exchange knowledge	ESA
I	Improved preparedness for, and effective response to, food and agricultural threats and emergencies	TC
I01	Countries' vulnerability to crisis, threats and emergencies is reduced through better preparedness and integration of risk prevention and mitigation into policies, programmes and interventions	TCE
I02	Countries and partners respond more effectively to crises and emergencies with food and agriculture-related interventions	TCE
I03	Countries and partners have improved transition and linkages between emergency, rehabilitation and development	TCE
K	Gender equity in access to resources, goods, services and decision-making in the rural areas	ES
K01	Rural gender equality is incorporated into UN policies and joint programmes for food security, agriculture and rural development	ESW
K02	Governments develop enhanced capacities to incorporate gender and social equality issues in agriculture, food security and rural development programmes, projects and policies using sex-disaggregated statistics, other relevant information and resources	ESW
K03	Governments are formulating gender-sensitive, inclusive and participatory policies in agriculture and rural development	ESW
K04	FAO management and staff have demonstrated commitment and capacity to address gender dimensions in their work	ESW
L	Increased and more effective public and private investment in agriculture and rural development	TC
L01	Greater inclusion of food and sustainable agriculture and rural development investment strategies and policies into national and regional development plans and frameworks	TCI
L02	Improved public and private sector organisations' capacity to plan, implement and enhance the sustainability of food and agriculture and rural development investment operations	TCI
L03	Quality assured public/private sector investment programmes, in line with national priorities and requirements, developed and financed	TCI

**Box 3. FAO Core Functions**

a	Monitoring and assessment of long-term and medium-term trends and perspectives
b	Assembly and provision of information, knowledge and statistics
c	Development of international instruments, norms and standards
d	Policy and strategy options and advice
e	Technical support to promote technology transfer and build capacity
f	Advocacy and communication
g	Inter-disciplinarity and innovation
h	Partnerships and alliances

### Annex 3, Key outputs and outcomes (based on PIR 2012 and mission observations)

Project objective and Outcomes	End-of-project target	2012 PIR	Not reported in PIR
<b>Objective</b> Reduced adverse impacts on health and environment from excessive and poorly controlled pesticide use.	At least one high risk POPs and obsolete pesticides stock safeguarded in new containers and secure storage in three countries.	Safeguarding was undertaken in Belarus (148.3 metric tonnes repacked) and in Azerbaijan (more than 65 metric tonnes).	Safeguarding undertaken in Georgia – big bags Armenia burial site recovered Number of other inventory, safeguarding and transport activities undertaken in the countries during project lifetime but through other funds – see table
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Enhanced Awareness among participating countries on prevention and disposal of POPs and obsolete pesticides	– At least two International HCH and Pesticides (IHP) Forum meetings – Awareness-raising plans developed in each country	IHP Fora held in 2009 (Brno) and 2011 (Gabala). – Awareness-raising plans written for all countries which participated in one of the two awareness-raising seminars	Azeri Parliament and Baku University display Time Bomb book- + in Russian, Armenian, Georgian, Mongolian, Azeri Steering Committee GIZ-IHPA-AN Exhibition “Obsolete and POPs Pesticides in Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia” Armenia– calendar leaflet, Toxic Free Future poster, 6 newspaper articles, TV and radio broadcasts, 719 people at 30 seminars Georgia TV programme Azerbaijan – 3 regional events @ libraries, farmers, Macedonia – 2 workshops (Skopje Fair, Velus) with 70% of pesticide companies attending, leaflet for professionals handling and storing OPs Moldova - The Eliminators in Moldova pamphlet
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Strengthened Capacity for POPs and obsolete pesticide prevention and disposal	3 countries will have developed a management plan	EMP training has been held 18-23 June 2012 in Belarus with 9 countries participating.	Romania – new legislation to simplify access to EU structural funds Azerbaijan – 2012-14 Ecological Plan Belarus – allocation 2.1 billion BLY for clean up of buried pesticide sites (2013/4) Belarus USD 70'000 to their 2011 budget to repackage 140 t of Ops
	3 Pilot/ demonstration projects on inventory, risk assessment and safeguarding of POPs/ obsolete pesticides completed	Safeguarding in Belarus and Azerbaijan done Inventory in different countries ongoing (micro-support activities)	Oversight by technical FAO expert in Belarus and Azerbaijan Macedonia – inventory, “Cemenavodstvo” and “Ohis” sites near Skopje – total pilot project + micro-support 41,399.75 litres, 62,856.13kg + 22.15 m3.

Project objective and Outcomes	End-of-project target	2012 PIR	Not reported in PIR
			Lobbying - Armenia burial site + inventory
	- Resource documents available in Russian	- Translation of EMTK Vol. 1-4 as well as inventory and empty container guidelines into Russian done. Documents currently in publication process.	Macedonia: A manual on the management of OP and POPs FAO Guideline on Management of Small Quantities of OP (Azeri) US EPA Regulation on Soil Remediation and Non-combustion Technologies (Azeri) FAO's Empty Containers Guidelines translated into Russian
			Testing of the rapid site assessment tools – Azerbaijan – with good results (ID 11/37 pesticides tested, need to include former SU products in database) Panels IHP Forum 2011 - “Rapid Identification of Unknown Substances found in Pesticide Stores”, “Risk Assessment Methodologies for Pesticides Stores and Burial Sites” Moldova experience 50 sites assessed for burial, total 1600 sites mapped?
	6 training workshops on different topics related to obsolete pesticides held.	9 trainings held: 2010: Training of Trainers (Belarus); awareness Raising 1 (Albania); Workshop and Pilot Project on inventory (Macedonia) PSMS 1 (Belarus); Awareness raising 2 (Romania); 2011: PSMS 2 (Belarus); PP on repackaging (Belarus); PP on repackaging (Azerbaijan) 2012: EMP (Belarus)	93 people trained in total Mongolia (6/10/11), Ulaan Baatar, 20 regional agricultural inspectors Training others in own country Belarus –officers from regional inspections and agricultural enterprises - later on involved in repackaging in Minsk and Grodna regions; additional 2 people on PSMS in Vitebsk Azerbaijan –three others PSMS Romania – training local authorities (30% reached) Macedonia - private sector companies, customs
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Framework for exchange of information and experience among countries on the prevention and disposal of obsolete pesticides	Agreed mechanism for information exchange established.	- Experience exchange at Steering Committee in Belarus in May 2011 and IHP Forum 2011. - obsoletepesticides.net website and related discussion forum under final development	Experience exchange at all meetings and trainings – CDs with documents Study tour in Moldova Skype and email contacts directly between project participants. Increase in use of FAO website – for new pesticides more than OP
<b>Outcome 4:</b> Greater stakeholder	- Links with at least 3 additional stakeholders	- Discussion held with EU Commission	Governments – Belarus Min Ag & Emergency Situations &



Project objective and Outcomes	End-of-project target	2012 PIR	Not reported in PIR
involvement in prevention and elimination of POPs and obsolete pesticides	established	<p>resulting in funding for a follow-on project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Side-event at 63rd session of the World Health Assembly.</li> <li>- Side-event at September 2011 Environment for Europe Conference</li> </ul>	<p>Ecology; Azerbaijan Inventory Commission, Macedonia Inter-Ministerial group on inventory, Moldova – Min Ag not previously involved in projects [can this be true?]; Montenegro and Serbia participants at inventory training, Macedonia customs authority obliged to manage stocks</p> <p>Micro-support projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Georgia - NGOs participating in project, journalist, TV</li> <li>Armenia –Mayors, Aarhus Centres, teachers, mass media -</li> <li>Azerbaijan – International Resource Complex, local libraries &amp; Baku State University volunteers</li> <li>Macedonia – pesticide traders and users</li> <li>Romania – regional authorities accessing EU Regional Development funds for contaminated sites</li> <li>Private sector – Russian firm (own cost) in repackaging training Belarus; Inventory at 10 Macedonian companies (micro-support)</li> </ul>

Source: adapted from Project Implementation Review 2012

**Annex 2. List of institutions and stakeholders met during the evaluation process**

Karyne	Yesayan	Armenia	Ministry of Agriculture	Head of Horticulture Development Division of Plant Protection, Forestry and Plant Protection Department,
Hovhannes	Hakobyan	Armenia	NGO "Vetagro"	Veterinary
Lusine	Nalbandian	Armenia	AWHHE NGO	Agro-ecologist
Arastun	Hasanov	Azerbaijan	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	Director of the National department on environment
Khosghadam	Alasgarova	Azerbaijan	Ministry of Agriculture	Head of sector of plant protection and pesticides, State Phytosanitary Control
Gulchohra	Aliyeva	Azerbaijan	UNEP-Ecores National Committee (NGO)	Deputy Chairman
Maryna	Belavus	Belarus	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection	International Projects Coordinator
Irma	Tskvitinidze	Georgia	Ministry of Agriculture	Deputy Head of Pesticides and Agrochemicals Division, National Food Agency
Ekaterine	Imerlishvili	Georgia	Ministry of Environment Protection	Head of the Waste and Chemicals Management Division
Otar	Kiria	Georgia		
Valentin	Pleşca	Moldova	Office POPs	Manager
Ion	Barbarasa	Moldova		
Mariana	Gramă	Moldova	Ministry of Defense	Lieutenant colonel, head of Department of ecology and environment protection, Logistic Command
Ruslan	Melian	Moldova	NGO "ECOS"	Deputy Director, Team Leader
Vadim	Platonov	Moldova	NGO "ECOS"	Expert
Aurel	Vleju	Moldova	Ministry of Defense	Lieutenant, Specialist of Department of ecology and environment protection, Logistic Command
Veronika	Terteă	Moldova	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Industry	Deputy chief of the Department of Plant Protection and Food Safety of Vegetable Products
Tamara	Roznerita	Moldova	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Industry	Chief of the Department of Plant Protection and Food Safety of Vegetable Products
Valentin	Gurau	Moldova	MoA	Deputy Head of the Phytosanitary supervision and seed control directorate
Mihaela	Paun	Romania	Ministry of Environment and Forests	Senior Advisor

Zulqfli	Rexhepi	Macedonia	Ministry of Environment	Junior associate, Department of waste management
Zulfia	Suleimanova	Uzbekistan	State Committee for Nature Protection	Chief of Department of the State Specilized Inspection for Analytical Control
Zhanybek	Derbishaliev	Kyrgyzstan	MoA	Director, Department of chemistry and plant protection
Vladimir	Pak	Kyrgyzstan	MoA	Deputy Director, Department of chemistry and plant protection
Kevin	Helps	Hungary	FAO, REU office	Regional Programme Coordinator
Oxana	Perminova	Hungary	FAO, REU office	Programme Assistant
Nathalie	Gysi	Switzerland	Green Cross Switzerland	Chief Executive
Stephan	Robinson	Switzerland	Green Cross Switzerland	Unit Manager (Water, Legacy)
Wouter	Pronk	Netherlands	Milieukontakt International	Project manager
Sandra	Molenkamp	Netherlands	Milieukontakt International	Project manager
John	Vijgen	Denmark	International HCH and Pesticide Association (IHPA)	Chief Executive
Khatuna	Akhalaia	Georgia	FAO	Consultant
Rodica	Iordanca-Iordanov	Moldova	EcoContact & programme Milieukontakt International	Consultant NGO
Indira	Zhakupova	Kyrgyzstan	FAO	Consultant
Wolfgang	Schimpf	Germany	GIZ Conv. Project Chemical Safety	Senior Officer Pesticide Disposal Exp.
Riny	Heijdendael	Spain	Milieukontakt International	Online collabration specialist
Martin	Murin	Slovakia	UNEP	Consultant
Vladimir	Shevtsov	Belarus	Green Cross Belarus	Project manager
Katerina	Leonchikova	Belarus	Green Cross Belarus	Communication Officer

**Annex 3. List of documents consulted****Documents downloaded from FAO's FPMIS (Field Programme Management Information System)****Documents received from ECCA partners and participating government institutions****Background Information downloaded from Internet****Information received from project:**

<b>Activities/ Outputs</b>	<b>Country</b>
<b>2009</b>	
The 10th International HCH and Pesticides Forum (IHP Forum)	Brno Czech Republic, 7-10 Sept
Project Inception Meeting	Tirana Albania, 22-24 Sept
<b>2010</b>	
Training of Trainers Workshop (Richard Thompson)	Belarus -18-29 Jan
awareness Raising workshop 1 (Sandra Molenkamp)	Albania, 2-4 March
63rd session, World Health Assembly side event	28 May
Workshop and Pilot Project on inventory	Macedonia 27 May – 4 Jun
2nd Steering Committee, 3 day workshop/study tour	Moldova, 22 – 26 June
Mini-hearing on “Obsolete Pesticides in EECCA”	EU, 29 June
PSMS workshop 1	Belarus, 18-22 Oct
Awareness raising workshop 2 & HCH forum 1 day, 30 people	Bucharest, 6-10 Dec
Tender for safeguarding materials	
<b>2011</b>	
Micro-support – approved Jun 11	
Armenia (inventory in 30 villages, awareness raising), completed Dec 11	
Azerbaijan (inventory in the remaining three border districts, update existing inventories awareness raising, enhancing of laboratory capacities)	Min
Georgia: Awareness Raising and Inventory (18 sites), TV programme 2.5m people, website, flyers, radio	All in 2012
Macedonia: inventory of 10 sites, awareness raising for industry/traders Jul 11; handbook on OP and POP management; workshop 12	
Romania: training local authorities in 8 regions on project design for accessing the EU funds	Self-funded trg. Funds go for web designer for POPs portal
Test devices for rapid on-site identification of unknown pesticides	6 – 8 Dec
The Eliminators - brochure MKI experience in Hincesti	
Ticking Time Bomb (Eng, Rus, Armenia, Azerii, Mongolian, Georgia (not yet printed))	
Translation EMTK	

COP-5 of the Stockholm Convention side-event	Geneva, 27 April
Steering Committee meeting	Belarus, 12-13 May
PSMS workshop 2	Belarus, 17-20 May
PP on repackaging	Belarus, 30 May – 18 June
11th IHP Forum	Gabala (Azerbaijan), 7-10 Sept
Steering Committee	Azerbaijan 8 September
7th Ministerial Conference - “Environment for Europe”	Astana UNECE 21-23 Sep
Second pilot project on repackaging	Azerbaijan, 7-18 Nov
Mongolia workshop and field visit	Oct 2011?
Test mature rapid site assessment methodologies, 50 contaminated sites	Moldova
<b>2012</b>	
Health study	
Repackaging Macedonia	
Environmental Management Plans training	Belarus, 18-23 June
Lessons learnt workshop	Moldova, 25 Sept

## **Annex 4. Evaluation Questionnaire**

### **Questionnaire for the Evaluation of the Project: EECCA Capacity Building on Obsolete and POPs Pesticides in Eastern European Caucasus and Central Asian (EECCA) Countries**

Dear Colleague,

You may know that the GEF-funded EECCA project was implemented by FAO through a Letter of Agreement with Green Cross in 2009-2012, to build capacity and create awareness of the issue of OP in the project countries.

The EECCA Project is currently being evaluated as part of the Terminal Evaluation, in order to provide donors (and in particular GEF), participating countries and FAO with an independent and objective assessment of the relevance, effectiveness and impact of the project. Such evaluations are a standard procedure for any GEF projects and are planned in already during project formulation. The Mission is carried out by the independent Evaluation Office of FAO; all replies will be treated on a strictly confidential basis. (The summary TOR for the evaluation are attached.)

The Evaluation Team consists of Mr Bernd Bultemeier, FAO Evaluation Officer, and Ms Eloise Touni, Independent Consultant, Greece.

We have tried to keep the questionnaire relatively short; it should take not more than 15 minutes to complete – but please feel free to make any other comments that you think may be relevant for the Evaluation Team.

It would be appreciated if you could return the questionnaire by **10 November** in order to allow the Evaluation Team time to finalize their report in November. The Evaluation may also contact you directly via email, telephone or Skype so as to clarify some points relating to your country or institution.

Please send your replies to [bernd.bultemeier@fao.org](mailto:bernd.bultemeier@fao.org).

With many thanks in advance for your collaboration and with best regards.

Bernd Bultemeier  
Evaluation Officer  
Eloise Touni  
Independent Consultant

Name:

Date:

Position/Organization:

Country:

Tel:

Skype:

Email:

1. In your opinion, what was the best result of this project?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
2. The EECCA project was implemented as a partnership with a number of partners. Please rate the contribution of the following partners:

	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Less Than Satisfactory	Highly Unsatisfactory	Don't know
FAO					
Green Cross Switzerland					
Green Cross Belarus					
MilieuKontakt International					
International HCH and Pesticides Association (IHPA)					

3. Please explain
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
4. What strengths do you think FAO brought to the project?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
5. What strengths do you think the other partner organisations brought to the project?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
6. The project was active in the areas listed below – could you please rate the success of the project?

	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Less Than Satisfactory	Highly Unsatisfactory	Don't know

	Satisfactory		Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	know
Awareness raising in the countries					
Information exchange on obsolete pesticides					
Stakeholder involvement to deal with obsolete pesticides					
Benefits from International cooperation					

7. Has the project contributed to significant changes in the way obsolete pesticide threats are perceived and managed in your country? Please describe:

8. The project has introduced FAO standards for inventory, repackaging and disposal of obsolete pesticides. Please rate the following:

	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Less Than Satisfactory	Highly Unsatisfactory	Don't know
Your knowledge of these standards					
How relevant are these standards to your country?					
How feasible is it to adopt them in your country?					
Have you applied these standards in your work?					
Has PSMS been used in your country?					

9. Comments:

10. The project provided training and support for awareness raising regarding obsolete pesticides. What was the most important new aspect you learnt about planning an awareness raising campaign?

11. Please explain the extent to which you applied your knowledge in your field work (e.g. in the frame of micro-support projects or other activities).

12. In case you gave training yourself in your country: How many other people did you train afterwards in your country? Did you feel that you had all the knowledge needed to provide the training, or that important elements were missing in the training provided by FAO?



13. How are obsolete pesticides addressed in a national policy or strategy in your country? Please describe:
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
14. Have there been any changes since 2009 in national policies or strategies? Has the EECCA project played any role in this?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
15. What sources of information do you access or use on pesticides and OP? Has the EECCA project made any difference to the information you access or share on pesticides?
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
16. Do you have any other comments?