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 1. Terms of Reference for the MTE

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
Rome, 2019

Contents

Acronyms and abbreviations

BH	Budget holder
CAHFSA	Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency
CARICOM	Caribbean Community
CGPC	Coordinating Group of Pesticides Control Boards of the Caribbean
CPF	Country Programming Framework
EM	Evaluation Manager
EOI	Expression of Interest
ET	Evaluation team
ETL	Evaluation team leader
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FPMIS	Field Project Management Information System
FR	Follow-up Report
IICA	Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture
LTO	Lead technical officer
LTU	Lead technical unit
MR	Management Response
MTE	Mid-term evaluation
OED	FAO Office of Evaluation
OECS	Organization of Eastern Caribbean States
PC	Programme Committee
PEC	Project Evaluation CoordinaTOR
PIF	Project Identification Form
PTF	Project Task Force.
RO	Regional office
SO	FAO Strategic Objective
SRO	Sub-regional office
TCI	FAO Investment Centre
TCSR	Donor Liaison and Resource Mobilization Team
TOC	Theory of Change
TOR	Terms of Reference
UWI	University of the West Indies

1 Background and context of the project/programme

1. These are the Terms of Reference for the Mid-Term Evaluation of the GEF-funded, FAO-implemented project, "Disposal of Obsolete Pesticides including POPs, Promotion of Alternatives and Strengthening Pesticides Management in the Caribbean." A 4-year project launched in November 2015, it is expected to close at the end of September 2019. The total budget of the project is USD 26 368 739, with a GEF-contribution of USD 4 357 500 to be implemented by FAO. Currently, delivery is at USD 2 223 357. The project is operational in the following countries: Antigua & Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Guyana, Jamaica, Saint Kitts & Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent & The Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad & Tobago

2. Between December 2010 and December 2013, Caribbean countries National Authorities[1] undertook invenTORies of obsolete pesticides sTOCks, which was facilitated by FAO and undertaken as part of the activities of GCP/INT/063/EC. This work found an estimated 300 tonnes of obsolete sTOCks. At the same time, it was recognized that life-cycle management of pesticides in the Caribbean was generally weak. Apart from the safeguarding and environmentally sound removal of obsolete pesticides sTOCks, other areas identified and prioritized the PIF were transfer of locally available technology for the remediation of pesticides contaminated sites; empty pesticides container and waste management; strengthening the institutional and regulaTORy capacities for pesticides life cycle management and the promotion of alternatives to toxic chemical pesticides.

3. Specific objectives of to the project are to: safely destroy POPs and obsolete pesticides (Component 1); remediate pesticide-contaminated sites (Component 2); and establish mechanisms to deal with empty pesticide and other waste plastic containers (Component 3). As well as addressing the end-of-life cycle stage, the project aims to prevent wastes by interventions at earlier life cycle stages, strengthen the institutional and regulaTORy framework for managing pesticides through their life cycle (Component 4); and increasing the successful uptake of alternatives to the most hazardous chemical pesticides on key crops (Component 5). These five components are supported by a horizontal project management, MoniTORing and Evaluation (M&E) and awareness/communication component (Component 6) which will inform project execution decisions and create the necessary conditions for beneficiary knowledge and participation in project activities. The project seeks to promote the sound management of pesticides throughout their life cycle in the Caribbean Region, and reduce the risk posed by pesticides to human health and the environment.

[1] Antigua & Barbuda, The Bahamas, Barbados, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Guyana, Jamaica, Saint Kitts & Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent & The Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad & Tobago

4. The intended beneficiaries are pesticides regulaTORy authorities; government soils technicians; farmer organizations, farmers and farm households; women farmers; the environment; public health; ministries of agriculture, health, environment, legal affairs, finance, information; private secTOR; youth farmers; indigenous groups: regional organizations; and NGOs.

Context

5. The Caribbean Region consists largely of Small Island Developing States (SIDS) in which tourism and agriculture are major revenue earners and important sources of employment. While Caribbean countries were long viewed primarily as exporters of sugar, coffee, and tobacco, this changed in the 1990's with increasing trade liberalisation, and diversification of national economies away from agriculture towards tourism and financial services. This has been particularly driven by shifts away from commercial production of commodities (sugarcane, bananas) – for example, in Saint Kitts and Nevis, a poor harvest in 2005 led the government to close the sugar industry, after several decades of losses. One impact of this shift has been to contribute to an estimated 200 tons of sTOCkpiles of obsolete chemicals belonging to former commodity farms, which are beyond the capacity of the governments to dispose of in an environmentally sound manner.

Figure 1: Map of the Caribbean states

6. Toxic chemicals and waste present particular acute challenges to these ecosystems, and the CEPF Investment Priorities include promotion of sustainable agriculture in conservation corridors. Pollution and sedimentation has negatively affected marine environments by smothering coral reefs, killing fish and reducing the recreational value of beaches. The Global International Waters Assessment[2] identified the impacts of chemical pollution on water resources in the Caribbean small islands as moderate, observing that "*the use of agro-chemicals within the agricultural secTOR is a source of significant damage to both surface and groundwater resources*" and highlighting indiscriminate and improper disposal of agricultural wastes as a priority issue.

Policies and programmes

7. New agriculture initiatives have increased agricultural production, particularly in short-term crops for local consumption and regional markets (vegetables, root crops,

[2] GIWA (2006) Regional Assessment 3a – Caribbean Sea/Small Islands Assessment

fruits etc.) where indiscriminate use of pesticides is widespread, and has led to an increase in the demand for agro-chemicals and pesticides. Annual imports of pesticides into the region are estimated at approximately 10,000 tonnes.[3]

8. The Revised OECS Regional Plan of Action for Agriculture (2012-2022), identifies "conducting agricultural production on a competitive, market-oriented, internationally integrated and environmentally sustainable basis" as a means of achieving the goal of "transforming the agricultural secTOR of the OECS Member States while reducing poverty and promoting food and nutrition security". The Plan aims to build the capacity of institutions to promote innovations in agricultural technology and production. It also urges inter-alia the development of 'a robust harmonized legislative framework that will provide the necessary protection to measures in sustainable natural resources management; the efficient delivery of services that will facilitate innovation and productivity enhancement measures; and the adoption and implementation of agriculture health and food safety measures'.

9. FAO Country Programme Frameworks (CPF) for the participating countries prioritise several issues related to pest and pesticide management, e.g. concerns of pesticide leaching in watershed areas, increasing pest problems with consequent increased pesticide usage and limited moniTORing and enforcement capabilities for pesticide management. The project indicated alignment with these priorities.

Resources

10. In June 2012, in Grenada FAO conducted a *Workshop on Pesticides Risk Reduction and Obsolete Pesticides Elimination*. This activity was implemented under the EU-funded project GCP/INT/063/EC: *Capacity Building related to Multilateral Environmental Agreements in Africa, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) States – Clean-up of obsolete pesticides, pesticides management and sustainable pest management"* and was held in collaboration with the Coordinating Group of Pesticides Control Boards of the Caribbean (CGPC) and hosted by the Pesticides Control Board and the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Grenada. During this workshop priority areas for pesticides management in the Caribbean were identified and a GEF Project Identification Form (PIF) developed with assistance from the FAO Pesticides Risk Reduction Group at FAO HQ.

[3] Country Presentations at the 19th Meeting of the Coordinating Group of Pesticides Control Boards of the Caribbean. Antigua and Barbuda June 2-3, 2014

Table 1: Project co-financing

Financing Plan: GEF allocation:	USD 4 357 500
Co-financing:	
FAO (TCP, EC)	USD 5,191,109
IICA	USD 2 250 000
CAHFSA	USD 200 000
CARDI	USD 591 242
UWI	USD 200 000
Governments: Antigua and Barbuda	USD 2 000 000
Barbados	USD 837 594
Dominica	USD 621 151
Dominican Republic	USD 857 944
Guyana	USD 2 250 000
Jamaica	USD 3 026 000
Saint Kitts and Nevis	USD 1 267 537
Saint Lucia	USD 4 651 419
Saint Vincent and The Grenadines	USD 330 246
Suriname	USD 909 987
Trinidad and Tobago	USD 1 184 510
Subtotal Co-financing:	
Total Budget:	USD 26 368 739
	USD 30 726 239

11. Key Stakeholders include: Pesticides and Toxic Chemical regulaTORy authorities in project participating countries. Ministries of Agriculture and Health; Ministries of the Environment; Ministries of Legal Affairs; Ministries of Information; Regional organizations: CARICOM, CAHFSA, UWI, IICA, OECS Commission, Private SecTOR, including pesticides manufacturers, distribuTORs and retailers; waste recyclers. The implementing agencies are FAO and the CGPC.

1.1 Results achieved

12. The following are results achieved by the project thus far, as reported by the project team:

Table 2: Results reported by component

Component 1	Environmental Assessments (EAs) / Environmental Management Plans (EMPs) developed for project countries. Health Safety & Environment Management Plans developed by the waste contracTOR for each project country. Environmentally-sound disposal of 319 tonnes of obsolete pesticides sTOCks, including POPs from 11 project beneficiary countries. Capacity built in each of those countries on conducting invenTORies of, safeguarding and repackaging obsolete pesticides sTOCks.
Component 2	Pesticides-contaminated sites reported from six (6) project countries, Rapid Environmental Assessments (REAs) conducted on all sites and two (2) sites identified for potential pilot remediation studies, using locally available materials. Nine (9) technicians trained in the identification of and collecting samples from, pesticides-contaminated sites.
Component 3	Empty Pesticides Containers management KAP Surveys conducted in two countries and management network pilot launched in one of them. The other to be launched shortly. Awareness campaigns on triple rinsing of empty pesticides containers were conducted in the survey districts in Suriname and Antigua and Barbuda.
Component 4	• 30 technicians from 15 countries trained in the use of the FAO Pesticides Registration Toolkit. • 30 pesticides and customs inspecTORs trainers from 13 countries trained in pesticides import/export control and the related provisions of the Basel, Rotterdam and STOCkholm Conventions • Cost recovery analysis of 4 pesticides regulaTORy authorities conducted. Report submitted. • Gaps in 9 countries' pesticides legislation and regulations identified with a view to proposing updated model legislation so they could be in line with the International Code of Conduct in Pesticides Management. • Coordinating Group of Pesticides Control Boards of the Caribbean (CGPC) acting as the main driver and as a key vecTOR of regional harmonization.
Component 5	• Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs) from the Registered Pesticides Lists from 5 countries identified using the FAO Pesticides Registration Toolkit • Report on status of HHPs in project countries produced • Field plots established for the testing of alternatives to toxic pesticides on pests and diseases of Caribbean vegetable crops.
Component 6	• 3 six-monthly and 2 Project Implementation Review Reports submitted • Draft issue briefs produced • Project presentations made to the CARICOM COTED in October 2016 and October 2017 • Project achievement(s) publicised by Caribbean media

2 Evaluation purpose and scope

13. The MTE will serve both learning and accountability purposes. It will seek to identify any problems and constraints and formulate appropriate recommendations for corrective actions for effective implementation of the remaining part of the planned project intervention.

14. The MTE will review the effectiveness of implementation in terms of achieving the project objective, outcomes and delivering outputs. The MTE will contribute through operational and strategic recommendations to improve implementation for the remaining period of the project's life.

15. The mid-term evaluation will assess the implementation period of the project from November 2015 to November 2018, time of the MTE. The evaluation will cover all activities undertaken within the framework of the project as described in the project document. Planned project results will be compared with actual results and an assessment will be undertaken to determine the likelihood of sustainability and impact of the project, providing any information relevant to the future decision-making and project implementation.

3 Evaluation objective and key questions

16. The main objective of the MTE is to assess the relevance of the project, its progress in achieving positive outcomes for beneficiary countries, the cost-effectiveness and efficiency, the strategy for stakeholder engagement and partnerships and likelihood of sustainability.

17. Evaluation questions incorporating GEF evaluation criteria guide the evaluation. The MTE will look at indications of potential impact of project activities on beneficiaries and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development.

18. The evaluation questions are the following:

- To what extent are the planned project interventions aligned to regional and national needs and priorities? (relevance, design)
- To what extent is the project on track towards achieving the planned results under each of the outputs? How much progress towards project outcomes can be measured, and 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 (using a Review of Outcomes to Impacts analysis) and implementation of adaptive management? (effectiveness)
- What has been the cost-effectiveness of the project? Were project activities timely implemented, and were there sufficient management procedures to affect efficiency, including regular moniTORing and evaluation? (efficiency)
- Partnerships and stakeholder engagement: How has FAO collaborated with partners and to what extent does the project develop new partnerships or enhance existing ones? To what extent are stakeholders engaged in the project? How, if at all, has FAO contributed to improve organizational policies, strategies and programmes? What linkages, if any, exist between the capacities developed among diverse types of beneficiaries? (government ownership, partnerships, capacity development)
- How effective has the materialization of co-financing been?
- What are, if any, the socio-political, financial, institutional and governance, and environmental risks to sustainability? What evidence exists indicating the feasibility of replication or catalysis of project results, likelihood project activities will continue following project closure (financial and operational sustainability)
- How has the project affected gender dynamics in participating countries? What lessons, if any, can be drawn?

4 Methodology

19. The first question on relevance relies on data collected through key informant interviews, desk review, observation and some results from institutional survey.

20. Regarding the question on effectiveness, field observation, desk review, key informant interviews, focus groups for FFS (separated by gender), and results from the survey of institutional engagement and capacity development will be used. A sampling of countries was selected for site visits based on the following criteria:

    1- Country typology: large island states, small island states, large countries to assess various implementation contexts;
    2- innovativeness of the piloted technique or approach;
    3- degree of uptake by participating national institutions; and finally
    4- varied representation of institutional and field level activities.

21. To support the selection, the project team supplied information regarding activities implemented in each country, summarized in Annex 1:

22. The countries selected for site visits are the following:

23. Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Trinidad and Tobago, Suriname, Guyana, Jamaica, Dominica, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.

24. Skype interviews and an online survey will be conducted with stakeholders in countries not scheduled for field visits.

25. To gather data related to the third evaluation question on efficiency and the fifth question on sustainability, the evaluation will conduct desk review and interviews with key informants and, whenever possible, focus group discussions.

26. To assess stakeholder engagement and capacity development, the evaluation will rely on desk review, interviews as well as a survey instrument. The concept for the survey instrument is to measure engagement, which for these purposes is defined as participation, alignment and integration of project activities into national-led initiatives. Capacity development, drawing from the FAO corporate approach to capacity development, is defined as improved skills and knowledge that contribute to enhanced organizational effectiveness. The survey instrument will be complimented by the following to assess engagement and capacity development:

    - Participation records in meetings – analysis over time (from 2015-2018)
    - Expression of interest by national partners
    - Similar/linked programmes at national level
    - Cohesiveness with national policy priorities
    - Evidence of usage of skills/knowledge acquired – survey

27. These aspects analyzed together will provide information as to the degree of engagement and the progress towards development of institutional capacity. Finally, the capacity development aspect will be analysed using the Office of Evaluation's tool for measuring capacity development, which is harmonized with FAO capacity development approach.

28. To evaluate co-financing, the evaluation team will rely on the validation of the initial estimates, drawing from data and information made available and collected during the evaluation.

29. The final question related to a gender analysis will benefit from desk review, key informant interviews and focus group discussions, and draw heavily from the guidance provided in OED's framework to evaluate gender results.[4]

Roles and responsibilities

30. This section describes the different roles that key stakeholders play in the design and implementation of the evaluation in the case of OED-led evaluation and in the case of decentralised evaluations.

31. The **Office of Evaluation (OED)**, in particular the Evaluation Manager (EM) develops the first draft TOR with inputs from PTF and using the guidance of this document. This TOR includes the Theory of Change (TOC), developed by EM and based on document review, discussions with PTF and if possible a face-to-face meeting with LTO to get a good understanding of the project.

32. The BH and LTO provide inputs for the EM in drafting the TOR, in the identification of the consultants and in the organization of the mission. EM is responsible for the finalization of the TOR and of the identification of the evaluation team members[5]. EM shall brief the evaluation team on the evaluation methodology and process and will review the final draft report for Quality Assurance purposes in terms of presentation, compliance with the TOR and timely delivery, quality, clarity and soundness of evidence provided and of the analysis supporting conclusions and recommendations in the evaluation report. The EM will also organize briefing sessions before and after the main data collection mission with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit.

33. OED also has a responsibility in following up with the BH for the timely preparation of the Management Response and the Follow-up to the MR.

34. The **Project Task Force (PTF)**, which includes the FAO Budget Holder (BH), the Lead Technical Officer (LTO) and the Team of the project to be evaluated, are responsible for initiating the evaluation process, providing inputs to the first version of the Terms of Reference, especially the description of the background and context chapter, and supporting the evaluation team during its work. They are required to participate in meetings with the evaluation team, as necessary, make available information and documentation, and comment on the terms of reference and report. Involvement of different members of the PTF will depend on respective roles and participation in the project. The BH is also responsible for leading and coordinating the

[4] http://www.fao.org/evaluation/resources/manuals-guidelines/en/

[5] The responsibility for the administrative procedures for recruitment of the team will be decided on a case-by-case basis.

preparation of the FAO Management Response and the Follow-up Report to the evaluation, fully supported in this task by the LTO and others members of the PTF. OED guidelines for the Management Response and the Follow-up Report provide necessary details on this process.

35. The **Evaluation Team (ET)** is responsible for further developing and applying the evaluation methodology, for conducting the evaluation, and for producing the evaluation report. All team members, including the Evaluation Team Leader (ETL), will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings, discussions, field visits, and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs for the final draft and final report. The evaluation team will agree on the outline of the report early in the evaluation process, based on the template provided by OED. The ET will also be free to expand the scope, criteria, questions and issues listed above, as well as develop its own evaluation tools and framework, within time and resources available and based on discussions with the EM, consult the BH and PTF where necessary. The ET is fully responsible for its report, which may not 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 Quality Assurance of all evaluation reports.

36. The ETL guides and coordinates the ET members in their specific work, discusses their findings, conclusions and recommendations and prepares the final draft and the final report, consolidating the inputs from the team members with his/her own.

37. For further details related to the tasks of the ETL and ET members, please refer to template job descriptions provided by OED.

5 Evaluation team composition and profile

38. The evaluation team will consist of:

- A regional consultant, with expertise in pesticides and evaluation; and
- 1-2 national consultants, with experience in environmental development and review/evaluation, to support the regional consultant in the collection of data in selected countries.

6 Evaluation products (deliverables)

Evaluation Matrix
Inception Report
Draft evaluation report
Final evaluation report
Evaluation brief and other knowledge products or participation in knowledge sharing events, if relevant.

7 Evaluation time frame

Task	Dates	Duration	Responsibility
Launch of the evaluation	6 months before the project NTE		BH/PTF
TOR finalization		Oct 2018	PTF and OED for comments and quality control
Team identification and recruitment		Oct-Jan 2019	PTF
Mission organization		Jan 2019	PTF
Reading background documentation provided by PTF		Jan 2019	ET
Inception Report		Jan 2019	ET
Briefing of ET		Jan 2019	PTF, supported by OED when necessary
Organization of the Evaluation Mission (travel arrangements, meetings arrangements with project stakeholders and partners, field visits, etc.)		Jan 2019	PTF
Evaluation mission		Feb 2019	ET
Evaluation Report first draft for circulation		March 2019	PTF and OED for comments and quality control
Evaluation Report final draft for circulation		April 2019	PTF and OED for comments and quality control
Validation of the recommendations		April 2019	ET to the PTF (OED may attend)
Final Report, including publishing and graphic design		May-June 2019	PTF
Management Response	1 month after the Final report is issued	May 2019	PTF
Follow-up report	1 year after the MR is issued	May 2020	PTF

Appendix 1. Project activities by component and country

Component	Activities	Countries	Status
1 – Safe Disposal of POPs and other Obsolete Pesticides and PCBS	Disposal of obsolete pesticides including POPs (Approx 320 tonnes)	Antigua and Barbuda Barbados Dominica Dominican Republic Guyana Jamaica Saint Kitts and Nevis Saint Lucia Saint Vincent and the Grenadines Suriname Trinidad and Tobago	Completed
	Disposal of PCBs (Approx 37 tonnes)	Antigua and Barbuda Barbados Saint Kitts and Nevis Suriname Trinidad and Tobago	Tender for disposal being developed at FAO HQ
2 – Technology Transfer of Methodologies for the Remediation of Contaminated Sites	Reported pesticides contaminated sites	Barbados Dominica Dominican Republic Suriname Trinidad and Tobago Saint Kitts and Nevis	REAs conducted and pilot sites selected. Technicians trained in soil sampling.
	Pilot sites for detailed studies	Saint Kitts and Nevis Suriname	Samples collected and sent for analysis. Further site investigations to be conducted.
	Region-wide training of technicians	All project countries	To be done after remediation pilots completed
3 – Development of Systems for the Management of Empty Pesticides Containers	Country reviews for baseline data	Antigua and Barbuda Dominican Republic Guyana Saint Lucia Saint Kitts and Nevis Suriname	Baseline data collected from countries indicated.
	KAP Surveys on empty pesticides container management and distribution of communications materials	Antigua and Barbuda Suriname	1st KAP Survey conducted and communications materials distributed

	Empty Pesticides Container Management network established	Suriname	Pilot network launched in 1 agricultural district
			Empty container management toolkit containing KAP Survey guidance notes and presentations; communications posters, leaflets and videos just submitted. Presently being technically reviewed
4 – Strengthening the regulaTORy Framework and Institutional Capacity for sound management of Pesticides	Review of pesticides related legislation	Antigua and Barbuda Barbados Dominica Guyana Jamaica Saint Kitts and Nevis Saint Lucia Saint Vincent and the Grenadines Trinidad and Tobago Suriname	Completed for English-speaking project countries Completed for Suriname On-going for Dominican Republic
	FAO Pesticides Registration Toolkit Training	Antigua and Barbuda Barbados Belize Cuba Dominica Dominican Republic Grenada Guyana Haiti Jamaica Saint Lucia Suriname Trinidad and Tobago	Completed Toolkit in use in some countries. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and St Kitts and Nevis did not participate
	Customs and Pesticides InspecTOR Training on Import/Export control and related Conventions	Antigua and Barbuda Barbados Dominica Dominican Republic Guyana Jamaica Saint Kitts and Nevis Saint Lucia Saint Vincent and the Grenadines Suriname Trinidad and Tobago	Training of Trainers completed. Follow-up training commenced in Suriname, Dominica and Guyana
	Workshop on Development of	Antigua and Barbuda Barbados	Efforts to form a working group to

	Harmonized Systems for Pesticides Registration, control and Information sharing	Dominica Dominican Republic Grenada Guyana Jamaica Saint Kitts and Nevis Saint Lucia Saint Vincent and the Grenadines Suriname Trinidad and Tobago	consider registration applications and make recommendations for pesticides registration still on-going
	Cost recovery Analysis of Select Pesticides RegulaTORy Authorities	Barbados Guyana Saint Lucia Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Just completed. Report and recommendations being reviewed.
5 – Alternatives to conventional chemical pesticides up-scaled and used of highly hazardous pesticides (HHPs) reduced	Identification of Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs) using the Pesticides Registration Toolkit	Antigua and Barbuda Guyana Saint Lucia Suriname Trinidad and Tobago	HHPs Identified Identification of HHPs from other project countries' registered pesticides lists, being considered
	Field-testing of alternatives to conventional chemicals	Jamaica Trinidad and Tobago	Work plans developed and field trial plot established in Jamaica and being established in Trinidad and Tobago
	Identification of alternatives to HHPs and promotion of HHPs	All project countries	Work plan under development