

Project evaluation series

**Mid-term evaluation of Disposal
of Obsolete Pesticides including
Persistent Organic Pollutants,
Promotion of Alternatives and
Strengthening Pesticides
Management in the Caribbean**

**GCP/SLC/204/GFF
GEF ID 5407**

**ANNEX 2. MTE Matrix (evaluation questions and sub-
questions)**

MTE Matrix

Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Methods	Source of information
Relevance/design	To what extent are the planned project interventions aligned to regional and national needs and priorities?	How and how many project activities are part of national programmes? Comparison before and after programme.	Desk review, regional survey of institutional engagement and capacity development, observation, key informant interviews, and focus group discussions (FGD)	Country and/or Regional development plans or programs, interviewees, results from institutional survey, field level beneficiaries
	Is the project design suitable to address key issues related to pesticides in the region?	Percentage of budget assigned to the project for each country Number of regional and national consultations carried out to design the project and number of adjustments to the design derived from the consultations Feedback from farmers implementing alternatives	Desk review, regional survey of institutional engagement and capacity development, observation, key informant interviews, and focus group discussions (FGD)	
	Does the project design take into account previous projects in the area of pesticides elimination and management, benefitting from lessons learned?	Level of relevance or suitability of the indicators to measure the progress and success of the project	Desk review, observation, key informant interviews, and focus group discussions (FGD)	

Effectiveness	To what extent is the project on track towards achieving the planned results under each of the outputs?	Number of indicators of the Results Matrix (of the PRODOC) complying with the target values indicated for the year 3.	Field observation, desk review, key informant interviews, focus groups for FFS (separated by gender), and regional survey of institutional engagement and capacity development	Project documentation, Project Implementation Reviews (PIR), six monthly reports, interviewees, SC meeting minutes, notes from site visits and results from institutional survey
	How much progress towards project outcomes can be measured?	Number of lobbying actions with relevant authorities to harmonize and adopt regulations	Desk review, observation, key informant interviews, and focus group discussions (FGD)	
	To what extent has national and regional partners, in particular the CGPC, appropriated the project approach?	Number of meetings and meeting reports and number of agreements and consultancies	Desk review, observation, key informant interviews, and focus group discussions (FGD)	
	To what extent is management responsive to national and regional needs? Is the project able to adapt to changing circumstances or emerging needs?	Number/types of adjustments to the workplans	Desk review, observation, key informant interviews, and focus group discussions (FGD)	
	To what degree is the project on track towards the attainment of project objectives and higher-level results, including assessment of the likelihood of impact and implementation of adaptive management?	Number of meetings between LTOs and regional and national project coordinators and number of visits of LTOs to the relevant sites	Desk review, observation, key informant interviews, and focus group discussions (FGD)	
	To what degree has the support from FAO leader technical officials (LTOs) been effective?	Number of adaptive actions implemented to face unforeseen situations	Desk review, observation, key informant interviews, and focus group discussions (FGD)	
		Level of coordination between national project coordinators and the regional project coordinator		
Efficiency (and cost-effectiveness)	What has been the cost-effectiveness of the project?	Number of project activities effectively finished according to the PRODOC timeline	Desk review, key informant interviews and focus group discussions	Project documentation (financial reports), Project Implementation Reviews (PIR), Six monthly reports and interviewees
	Were project activities timely implemented?	Number of recommendations of the Steering Committee or from the PIR implemented to improve project performance	Desk review, key informant interviews and focus group discussions	

	Are the assigned financial resources appropriate to implement all project activities?	Level of alignment between Annual Working Plans and Budget with expected annual project results	Desk review, key informant interviews and focus group discussions	
	Were there sufficient management procedures to effect efficiency, including regular monitoring and evaluation?	Level of incorporation of findings of other related projects (Rotterdam Convention project, EC 153)	Desk review, key informant interviews and focus group discussions	
	Have national and regional resources (financial, human and institutional) been leveraged?	Number of cofinancing letters Number of project partners Level of co-financing commitment	Desk review, key informant interviews and focus group discussions	
Sustainability	What are, if any, the socio-political, financial, institutional and governance, and environmental risks to sustainability?	Number of lobbying actions with relevant authorities to harmonize and adopt regulations Level of usefulness of received trainings according to official's perception	Desk review, key informant interviews and survey of institutional engagement and capacity development	Project Implementation Reviews (PIR), Six monthly reports, interviewees and results from institutional survey.
	What evidence exists indicating the feasibility of replication or catalysis of project results	Technical group to address regional registration on pesticides on place	Desk review, key informant interviews, observation focus group discussions	
	According to the current project performance and activities, could the project benefits last following project closure?	Number of countries with stakeholder networks to manage empty pesticide containers	Desk review, key informant interviews, observation, focus group discussions and survey of institutional engagement and capacity development	
Stakeholders engagement and partnerships	How has FAO collaborated with partners and to what extent does the project develop new partnerships or enhance existing ones?	Level of participation of stakeholders in the project activities (high, medium, low)	Desk review, key informant interviews, observation, focus group discussions and survey of institutional engagement and capacity development	Minutes of meetings, results from institutional survey, Project Implementation Reviews (PIR), Six monthly reports and interviewees
	To what extent are stakeholders engaged in the project?	Percentage of co-financing materialised respect project total budget	Desk review, key informant interviews, observation, focus group discussions and survey of institutional engagement and capacity development	

	How, if at all, has FAO and the project contributed to improve organizational policies, strategies and programmes?	Number of collaboration agreements between countries or entities on the sound management of pesticides	Key Informant interviews, observation and focus group discussions	
	What linkages, if any, exist between the capacities developed among diverse types of beneficiaries? (government ownership, partnerships, capacity development)	Number and type of trainings/workshops or knowledge (individual level) Number of institutional arrangements promoted by FAO and the project, if any, to improve organizational policies, strategies or programs Indications of multistakeholder collaboration, policy adjustments Harmonized approach between different levels of CD	Key Informant interviews, observation and focus group discussions	
	How effective has the materialization of co-financing been?	Percentage of co-financing materialised respect project total budget	Key Informant interviews, observation and focus group discussions	
Gender perspective	How has the project effected gender dynamics in participating countries? What lessons, if any, can be drawn?	Number of women participating in project activities (i.e. trainings) Quality of women's participation	Desk review, key informant interviews, survey and focus group discussions	Minutes of meetings, results from institutional survey and interviewees