

Project Evaluation Series
[18/2023](#)

Terminal evaluation of the project “Enhancing Climate Change Resilience in the Benguela Current Fisheries System”

Project codes: GCP/SFS/480/LDF and
GCP/SFS/480/SCF
GEF ID: 5113

**Annex 2. Guiding questions for conducting the terminal evaluation
interviews**

INTERVIEW QUESTION GUIDE

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION UNIT (PIU - BCC HQ)

Relevance

1.1 Did changes to the project design and approach post-MTE affect the relevance of the project (e.g. revised results matrix and country work plans) within the GEF focal areas/operational programme strategies, FAO Country Programming Framework and FAO's Climate Change Strategy?

1.4 Did the revised project design and approach post-MTE remain relevant to the climate change adaptation needs of local stakeholders and local coastal communities whose livelihoods depend on fisheries and mariculture? *

Effectiveness

2.1 What proportion of planned outputs and activities have been completed under component 1 (*Integrating fisheries climate change considerations into fisheries policies, programmes and inter-sectoral development*)? What contributed to the accomplishment or lack of success? What could have been done differently?

2.2 What proportion of planned outputs and activities have been completed under component 2 (*Piloting improved climate-resilient fisheries practices*)? What contributed to the accomplishment or lack of success? What could have been done differently?

2.3 What Proportion of outputs and activities have been completed under component 3 (*Capacity-building and promotion of improved climate-resilient fisheries practices*)? What contributed to the accomplishment or lack of success? What could have been done differently?

2.4 What Proportion of outputs and activities have been completed under component 4 (*M&E and adaptation learning*)? What contributed to the accomplishment or lack of success? What could have been done differently?

2.5 What were the unintended results, either positive or negative? *

Efficiency

3.1 Did the project follow the planned budget for the four components' activities and project management? (planned budget vs. actual expenditures)* Explain major factors behind any deviations.

3.2 How did the organizational set-up of the project helped in terms of synergies and complementarity between the components/activities? How did this setup also facilitate synergy and complementarity between the three project countries as well as between project sites within each country?

3.3 Did the project governance structure (OPIM partnership) enable or hamper successful project execution, timely resolution of issues during project implementation and contribution to project objectives? Were there key factors affecting coordination, collaboration and dialogue among stakeholders and partners positively or negatively?

3.4 Was the project able to adapt to any changing conditions (e.g. delays, COVID-19, and suggestions for improvement)?

Sustainability

4.1 Has the project put in place sustainability mechanisms (i.e. an exit strategy in each country)? If yes what are some of these?

4.2 What is the level of ownership of the Project's results? Are support processes for increased uptake of the results in place? Is introduced climate change adaptation knowledge among the targeted stakeholders being absorbed?, If so are these happening at both national and local level? *

4.3 Are there incentives in place for continuing the good practices related to climate adaptation and mitigation? *

Factors affecting performance

5) Monitoring and evaluation

- 5.1 Was the M&E plan, including any changes made after the MTE, practical and sufficient?
- 5.2 Did the M&E system operate as per the (updated) M&E plan? Was information gathered in a systematic manner, using appropriate methodologies?
- 5.3 Was the information from the M&E system appropriately used to make timely decisions and foster learning during project implementation?

6) Quality of implementation and execution

- 6.1 To what extent did FAO deliver on oversight and supervision? How well were risks identified and managed?

7) Financial management and mobilization of expected co-financing.

- 7.1 Did the expected co-financing materialize? How did the shortfall in co-financing (if any), or materialization of greater than expected co-financing (if any) affect project results? *

8) Project partnership and stakeholder engagement.

- 8.1 Were the choice and capacities of the range of partners included in project implementation appropriate? What was the effect on the project results (positively or negatively)?
- 8.2 Did the project consider and integrate climate-related actions, priorities and strategies by other partners active in fisheries and CCA in the three project countries?

9) Communication, knowledge management and knowledge products.

- 9.1 How did the project assess, document and share its results, lessons learned and experiences?

Cross-cutting concerns

Gender

- 10.1 Was the project implemented in a manner that ensured gender equitable participation and benefits?
- 10.2 How did the Project step up CCA actions to empower women and the marginalised in fishers' communities to participate in SSF-based value chains, particularly by building their entrepreneurship, organizational and managerial capacities, through partnerships with specialized public agencies and CSOs? *

Minority groups, including indigenous peoples, disadvantaged, vulnerable and people with disabilities, and youth

- 11) Were minority groups (e.g. people with disabilities the youth, indigenous people, etc.) taken into account in the revised design and implementation of the project? *

Environmental and social safeguards

- 12) Were environmental and social concerns taken into consideration in the revised design and implementation of the project? *

Lessons learned

- 13) What knowledge has been generated from project results and experiences, which has wider value and potential for broader application, replication and use?

COUNTRY COORDINATORS

Relevance

1.1 Did changes to the project design and approach post-MTE affect the relevance of the project? (e.g. revised results matrix and country work plans). If so how?

1.3 Was the intervention (post-MTE outputs and activities) aligned with national priorities/strategies/policies in climate action, including National Adaptation Plans and Adaptation Communications?

1.4 Did the revised project design and approach post-MTE remain relevant to the climate change adaptation needs of local stakeholders and local coastal communities whose livelihoods depend on fisheries and mariculture? *

Effectiveness

2.1 What proportion of planned outputs and activities were completed under component 1 (*Integrating fisheries climate change considerations into fisheries policies, programmes and inter-sectoral development*)? What contributed to the accomplishment or lack of success?

2.2 What proportion of planned outputs and activities were completed under component 2 (*Piloting improved climate-resilient fisheries practices*)? What contributed to the accomplishment or lack of success?

2.3 What Proportion of outputs and activities were completed under component 3 (*Capacity-building and promotion of improved climate-resilient fisheries practices*)? What contributed to the accomplishment or lack of success?

2.4 What Proportion of outputs and activities were completed under component 4 (*M&E and adaptation learning*)? What contributed to the accomplishment or lack of success? (cross-reference to the section on M&E or repeat the same information)

2.5 What were the unintended results, either positive or negative? *

3.1 Did the project follow the planned budget for the four components' activities and project management? (planned budget vs. actual expenditures)* If there were any variations, can you explain major factors behind the deviations?

Efficiency

3.2 How did the organizational set-up of the project assisted in terms of synergies and complementarity between the components/activities? And between the three project countries as well as between project sites within each country?

3.3 How did the project governance structure (OPIM partnership) facilitate or hamper project execution, timely resolution of issues during project implementation and contribution to project objectives? What were the key factors that affected coordination, collaboration and dialogue among stakeholders and partners positively or negatively?

3.4 Was the project able to adapt to any changing conditions (e.g. delays, COVID-19, and suggestions for improvement)?

Sustainability

4.1 Has the project put in place sustainability mechanisms (i.e. an exit strategy in each country)?

4.2 What is the level of ownership of the Project's results? Are support processes in place for continued adaptation or adoption of project results? To what extent is the introduced climate change adaptation knowledge among the targeted stakeholders being absorbed at both national and local level? *

4.3 What are the incentives in place for continuing the good practices related to climate adaptation and mitigation? *

Factors affecting performance

5) Monitoring and evaluation

- 5.1 Was the M&E plan, including any changes made after the MTE, practical and sufficient?
- 5.2 Did the M&E system operate as per the (updated) M&E plan? Was information gathered in a systematic manner, using appropriate methodologies
- 5.3 Was the information from the M&E system appropriately used to make timely decisions and foster learning during project implementation?

6) Quality of implementation and execution

- 6.1 Did FAO deliver on oversight and supervision? How well were risks identified and managed?
- 6.2 Did the execution agency (the BCC) effectively discharge its role and responsibilities related to the management and administration of the project?

8) Project partnership and stakeholder engagement.

- 8.1 Was the choice and capacities of the range of partners included in project implementation appropriate? What was the effect on the project results (positively or negatively)?
- 8.2 Did the Project consider and integrate climate-related actions, priorities and strategies by other partners active in fisheries and CCA in the three project countries?

9) Communication, knowledge management and knowledge products.

- 9.1 How did the project assess, document and share its results, lessons learned and experiences?
- 9.2 Do you think communication products and activities are likely to support the sustainability and scaling-up of project results?

Cross-cutting concerns

Gender

- 10.1 Was the project implemented in a manner that ensured gender equitable participation and benefits?
- 10.2 How did the Project step up CCA actions to empower women and minority groups in fishers' communities to participate in SSF-based value chains, particularly by building their entrepreneurship, organizational and managerial capacities, through partnerships with specialized public agencies and CSOs? *

Minority groups, including indigenous peoples, disadvantaged, vulnerable and people with disabilities, and youth

- 11) Were minority groups (e.g. people with disabilities the youth, indigenous people, etc.) taken into account in the revised design and implementation of the project? *

Environmental and social safeguards

- 12) Were environmental and social concerns taken into consideration in the revised design and implementation of the project? *

Lessons learned

- 13) What knowledge has been generated from project results and experiences, which has wider value and potential for broader application, replication and use?

PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE

Relevance

1.3 Were the interventions (post-MTE outputs and activities) aligned with national priorities/strategies/policies in climate action, including National Adaptation Plans and Adaptation Communications as well as the needs of local stakeholders and local coastal communities whose livelihoods depend on fisheries and mariculture? *

Effectiveness

2) To what extent have the project activities been implemented, and outputs been produced? (provide a general and broad view, not details)

Efficiency

3.3 Did the project governance structure (OPIM partnership) facilitate or hamper project execution, timely resolution of issues during project implementation and contribution to project objectives? Were there key factors affecting coordination, collaboration and dialogue among stakeholders and partners positively or negatively?

Sustainability

4.1 Has the project put in place sustainability mechanisms (i.e. an exit strategy in each country)?

Factors Affecting Performance

6) Quality of implementation and execution

6.1 Did FAO deliver on oversight and supervision? How well were risks identified and managed?

6.2 Did the execution agency (the BCC) effectively discharge its role and responsibilities related to the management and administration of the project?

Environmental and social safeguards

12) Were environmental and social concerns taken into consideration in the revised design and implementation of the project? *

Lessons Learnt

13) What knowledge has been generated from project results and experiences, which has wider value and potential for broader application, replication and use?

FAO (REGIONAL) & GEF

Relevance

1.2 Did the revised project design and approach post-MTE remain congruent with the GEF focal areas/operational programme strategies, FAO Country Programming Framework and FAO's Climate Change Strategy? If so can you explain?

Efficiency

3.1 Did the project follow the planned budget for the four components' activities and project management? (planned budget vs. actual expenditures)* Explain major factors behind any deviations

3.2 How was the organizational set-up of the project in terms of synergies and complementarity between the components/activities between the three project countries as well as between project sites within each country?

3.3 Did the project governance structure (OPIM partnership) facilitate or hamper project execution, timely resolution of issues during project implementation and contribution to project objectives? Were

there key factors affecting coordination, collaboration and dialogue among stakeholders and partners positively or negatively?

3.4 Was the project able to adapt to any changing conditions (e.g. delays, COVID-19, and suggestions for improvement)?

Factors affecting performance

5) Monitoring and evaluation

5.1 Was the M&E plan, including any changes made after the MTE, practical and sufficient?

5.2 Did the M&E system operate as per the (updated) M&E plan? Was information gathered in a systematic manner, using appropriate methodologies?

5.3 Was the information from the M&E system appropriately used to make timely decisions and foster learning during project implementation?

6) Quality of implementation and execution

6.2 Did the execution agency (the BCC) effectively discharge its role and responsibilities related to the management and administration of the project?

7) Financial management and mobilization of expected co-financing.

7.1 Did the expected co-financing materialize? How did the shortfall in co-financing (if any), or materialization of greater than expected co-financing (if any) affect project results? *

8) Project partnership and stakeholder engagement.

8.1 Were the choice and capacities needs of the range of partners included in project implementation appropriate? What were their effect of these (choices and capacities) on the project results (positively or negatively)?

8.2 Did the Project consider and integrate climate-related actions, priorities and strategies by other partners active in fisheries and CCA in the three project countries?

9) Communication, knowledge management and knowledge products.

9.1 How did the project assess, document and share its results, lessons learned and experiences?

9.2 Do you think communication products and activities are likely to support the sustainability and scaling-up of project results?

Cross-cutting concerns

Gender

10.1 Was the project implemented in a manner that ensured gender equitable participation and benefits?

Lessons learned

13) What knowledge has been generated from project results and experiences, which has wider value and potential for broader application, replication and use?

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES

Relevance

1.4 Did the revised project design and approach post-MTE remain relevant to the climate change adaptation needs of local stakeholders and local coastal communities whose livelihoods depend on fisheries and mariculture? *

Effectiveness

2.2 What proportion of planned outputs and activities have been completed under component 2 (*Piloting improved climate-resilient fisheries practices*)? What contributed to the accomplishment or lack of success?

2.3 What Proportion of outputs and activities have been completed under component 3 (*Capacity-building and promotion of improved climate-resilient fisheries practices*)? What contributed to the accomplishment or lack of success?

2.5 Were there any unintended results, either positive or negative? *

Sustainability

4.2 What is the level of ownership of the Project's results? are support processes in place? Is introduced climate change adaptation knowledge among the targeted stakeholders being absorbed?, are these happening at both national and local level? *

4.3 Are there incentives in place for continuing the good practices related to climate adaptation and mitigation? *

Cross-cutting concerns

Gender

10.1 Was the project implemented in a manner that ensured gender equitable participation and benefits?

10.2 (MTE recommendation 5): How did the Project step up CCA actions to empower women in fishers' communities to participate in SSF-based value chains, particularly by building their entrepreneurship, organizational and managerial capacities, through partnerships with specialized public agencies and CSOs? *

Minority groups, including indigenous peoples, disadvantaged, vulnerable and people with disabilities, and youth

11) Were minority groups (e.g. people with disabilities the youth, indigenous people, etc.) taken into account in the revised design and implementation of the project? *

GOVERNMENT STAKEHOLDERS

Relevance

1.3 Was the intervention (post-MTE outputs and activities) aligned with national priorities/strategies/policies in climate action, including National Adaptation Plans and Adaptation Communications

Effectiveness

2) To what extent have the project activities been implemented, and outputs been produced under each the four components? (please provide examples where possible)

2.5 Were there any unintended results, either positive or negative? *

Sustainability

4.1 Has the project put in place sustainability mechanisms (i.e. an exit strategy in each country)?

4.2 What is the level of ownership of the Project's results? are support processes in place? Is introduced climate change adaptation knowledge among the targeted stakeholders being absorbed?, are these happening at both national and local level? *

4.3 Are there incentives in place for continuing the good practices related to climate adaptation and mitigation? *

Factors Affecting Performance

6) Quality of implementation and execution

6.1 Did FAO deliver on oversight and supervision? How well were risks identified and managed?

6.2 Did the execution agency (the BCC) effectively discharge its role and responsibilities related to the management and administration of the project?

7) Financial management and mobilization of expected co-financing.

7.1 Did the Government contribute to the expected co-financing (in kind or otherwise)? How did the shortfall in co-financing (if any), or materialization of greater than expected co-financing (if any) affect project results? *

8) Project partnership and stakeholder engagement.

8.1 Were the choice and capacities of the range of partners included in project implementation appropriate? What was the effect on the project results (positively or negatively)?

8.2 Did the Project consider and integrate climate-related actions, priorities and strategies by other partners active in fisheries and CCA in the three project countries?

9) Communication, knowledge management and knowledge products.

9.1 How did the project assess, document and share its results, lessons learned and experiences?

9.2 Do you think communication products and activities are likely to support the sustainability and scaling-up of project results?

Cross-cutting concerns

Gender

10.1 Was the project implemented in a manner that ensured gender equitable participation and benefits?

10.2 How did the Project step up CCA actions to empower women and minority groups in fishers' communities to participate in SSF-based value chains, particularly by building their entrepreneurship, organizational and managerial capacities, through partnerships with specialized public agencies and CSOs? *

Minority groups, including indigenous peoples, disadvantaged, vulnerable and people with disabilities, and youth

11) Were minority groups (e.g. people with disabilities the youth, indigenous people, etc.) taken into account in the revised design and implementation of the project? *

Environmental and social safeguards

12) Were environmental and social concerns taken into consideration in the revised design and implementation of the project? *

Lessons learned

13) What knowledge has been generated from project results and experiences, which has wider value and potential for broader application, replication and use?

INTERMEDIARIES (IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES)

Relevance

1.1 Did changes to the project design and approach post-MTE affect the relevance of the project? (e.g. revised results matrix and country work plans)

1.2 Were the interventions (post-MTE outputs and activities) aligned with national priorities/strategies/policies in climate action, including National Adaptation Plans and Adaptation Communications? If so explain how giving examples.

1.4 Did the revised project design and approach post-MTE remain relevant to the climate change adaptation needs of local stakeholders and local coastal communities whose livelihoods depend on fisheries and mariculture? *

Effectiveness

2.1 What proportion of planned outputs and activities were completed under component 1 (*Integrating fisheries climate change considerations into fisheries policies, programmes and inter-sectoral development*)? What contributed to the accomplishment or lack of success

2.2 What proportion of planned outputs and activities were completed under component 2 (*Piloting improved climate-resilient fisheries practices*)? What contributed to the accomplishment or lack of success?

2.3 What Proportion of outputs and activities were completed under component 3 (*Capacity-building and promotion of improved climate-resilient fisheries practices*)? What contributed to the accomplishment or lack of success?

2.4 What Proportion of outputs and activities were completed under component 4 (*M&E and adaptation learning*)? What contributed to the accomplishment or lack of success? (cross-reference to the section on M&E or repeat the same information)

2.5 Were there any unintended results, either positive or negative? *

Efficiency

3.2 Did the organizational set-up of the project create synergies and complementarity between the components/activities and between the three project countries as well as between project sites within each country?

3.4 Was the project able to adapt to any changing conditions (e.g. delays, COVID-19, and suggestions for improvement)?

Sustainability

4.2 What is the level of ownership of the Project's results? What support processes have been put in place? Is introduced climate change adaptation knowledge among the targeted stakeholders being absorbed at both national and local level? *

4.3 Are there incentives put in place for continuing the good practices related to climate adaptation and mitigation? *

Factors affecting performance

5) Monitoring and evaluation

5.3 Was the information from the M&E system appropriately used to make timely decisions and foster learning during project implementation?

8) Project partnership and stakeholder engagement.

8.1 Was the choice and capacities of the range of partners included in project implementation appropriate? What was the effect on the project results (positively or negatively)?

8.2 Did the Project consider and integrate climate-related actions, priorities and strategies by other partners active in fisheries and CCA in the three project countries?

9) Communication, knowledge management and knowledge products.

9.1 How did the project assess, document and share its results, lessons learned and experiences?

9.2 Do you think communication products and activities are likely to support the sustainability and scaling-up of project results?

Cross-cutting concerns

Gender

10) To what extent were gender considerations taken into account in the revised design and implementation of the project?

10.1 Was the project implemented in a manner that ensured gender equitable participation and benefits?

10.2 How did the Project step up CCA actions to empower women and minority groups in fishers' communities to participate in SSF-based value chains, particularly by building their entrepreneurship, organizational and managerial capacities, through partnerships with specialized public agencies and CSOs? *

Minority groups, including indigenous peoples, disadvantaged, vulnerable and people with disabilities, and youth

11) Were minority groups (e.g. people with disabilities the youth, indigenous people, etc.) taken into account in the revised design and implementation of the project? *

Environmental and social safeguards

12) Were environmental and social concerns taken into consideration in the revised design and implementation of the project? *

Lesson Learnt

13) What knowledge has been generated from project results and experiences, which has wider value and potential for broader application, replication and use?

Office of Evaluation
E-mail: evaluation@fao.org
Web address: www.fao.org/evaluation

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Rome, Italy