

Project Evaluation Series

**Terminal evaluation of the project
“Rehabilitation of Degraded Agricultural
Lands in Kandy, Badulla and Nuwara Eliya
Districts in the Central Highlands”**

**Project code: GCP/SRL/063/GFF
GEF ID: 5677**

Annex 2. Evaluation matrix

Evaluation question	Measure/indicator of progress	Main sources of data/information	Methodology	Remarks
1) Relevance (general results) (rating required)				
<p>1. Was the project design appropriate for delivering the expected outcomes?</p> <p>a. Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc.)?</p> <p>b. Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes and utilization of outcomes to generate impact?</p> <p>2. Was the project design congruent with the GEF focal areas/operational program strategies, country priorities and FAO Sri Lanka Country Programing Framework?</p> <p>2.1 Was the project designed in line with the UNSDF and FAO Country Programing Framework?</p> <p>2.2 Does the project contribute to country priorities on land degradation as set out in the NAP (National Action Plan) for UNCCCD?</p> <p>3. Was the project design coherent with SDG 15 (and related SDGs such as SDG 13 and SDG2) goals and targets, as well as with relevant international conventions and agreements (e.g. UNCCD, UNFCCC and Paris Agreement)?</p> <p>a) How has the project deliverables contribute to achieve SDG objectives (SDG 15, SDG 13 and SDG 2)</p> <p>b) How are project deliverables aligned to overall objectives of UNCCD, UNFCCC and Paris agreement</p> <p>4. Was the project design relevant for the final beneficiaries? (Eg: farmers, CBOs, women, youth, indigenous and other vulnerable groups and stakeholders that support these beneficiaries (such as extension workers).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic. • Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach. • Level of utilization of generated outputs and outcomes by final beneficiaries. • Alignment of project outcomes and impacts to GEF Strategic objectives, program strategies, FAO country priorities. • Degree to which project outcomes and impacts contribute to SDG outcomes and alignment to the objectives of UNCCD, UNFCCC and Paris agreement • Level of acceptance for the results (Benefits) generated by the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review (ProDoc, Results Matrix, Logical framework, National SDG targets, UNCCD, UNFCCC, Paris Agreement, NAP for Sri Lanka, GEF guidelines) • FAO country program framework • Interview with LTO, NPD, PM, final beneficiaries • Document review (PIRs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis • Interviews with LTO, NPD, PM M&E staff, final beneficiaries 	

Evaluation question	Measure/indicator of progress	Main sources of data/information	Methodology	Remarks
<p>a) Was there sufficient stakeholder consultation to inform project design and in implementation?</p> <p>b) Has the final beneficiaries received expected results (benefits) as planned?</p> <p>c) What is the level of acceptance by final beneficiaries for the project results (benefits)?</p> <p>d) How does the delivered results contribute to expected project outcomes?</p> <p>5. Is the project still relevant? Were there any contextual changes which may have affected its relevance? (Eg. new national policies, plans or programmes, Covid-19?)</p> <p>a) Has there country priorities been changed over the period of time?</p> <p>b) Has there any new policies, government regulations imposed which directly impacted on project in any level?</p> <p>c) How does the combatting of Covid 19 impacted on project interventions, at which level?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of utilization of generated results (benefits) by final beneficiaries. Change of country priorities and policies related to agriculture. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interview with final beneficiaries (Eg. farmers, CBOs, women, youth, extension workers, indigenous and other vulnerable groups and stakeholders) Document review (Recent policies and Gazette notifications of GOSL) Interview of NPD, PM, M&E Staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interview with final beneficiaries Document review Interview of NPD, PM, M&E Staff 	
2) Effectiveness (General Results) (rating required)				
<p>6. To what extent were the project objectives (environmental and development objectives) been achieved, and how effective was the project in achieving those?</p> <p>6.1 Is there quality quantitative and verifiable data demonstrating incremental environmental benefits?</p> <p>6.2 To what extent do risks and barriers remain to achieve the project objective and generate Global Environmental Benefits?</p> <p>7. Did the project produce any unintended/ unexpected outcomes, either positive or negative? (applicable also to each of the outcomes)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level and magnitude of achieving project environmental and development objectives. Availability of quantitative verifiable data which depicts incremental environmental benefits (Outcomes, outputs). Alignment and reflection incremental environmental benefits through of project indicator tracking system Existence of positive or negative externalities and impacts on generated outputs and outcomes of the project and level of attribution to GEF and FAO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GEF documents (ProDoc, Results Matrix, PIR) Project M&E system, risk management system and reporting system Interview with Project beneficiaries, PSC, NPD & M&E staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Review of M&E system Interview with Project beneficiaries, PSC, NPD, & M&E staff 	

Evaluation question	Measure/indicator of progress	Main sources of data/information	Methodology	Remarks
<p>a. What are the unintended outcomes generated by project interventions at output and outcome levels?</p> <p>b. How have the unintended outcomes impacted to overall performance of the project</p> <p>8. To what extent can the achievement of such results be attributed to GEF and to FAO? (applicable also to each of the outcomes)?</p> <p>8.1. Do M&E documents provide evidence of the causality between the rationale for GEF involvement and the incremental environmental and other benefits directly associated with the project?</p> <p>8.2 Are the M&E reports evidence based</p> <p>8.3 Do the reports depicts the causality of root cause of the project and generated results (outputs, outcomes)</p> <p>8.4 To what extent have the field demonstrations and pilots been adopted effectively – institutionally, with public awareness, planning procedures, socio-economic, inter-agency coordination, community acceptance/benefits? 9.</p> <p>9. Which and how other contextual factors and actors have contributed for the results achieved?</p> <p>9.1 What factors and/or innovations contributed to successful achievements and good project progress towards targets, in terms of: implementation arrangements, oversight, engaging experts, adaptive management, planning approaches (preparing annual work plans)?</p> <p>9.2. How does other stakeholders and community participation facilitated for achieving final results?</p> <p>10. Did the project developed or adopted innovative solutions to achieve its results?</p>	<p>overall strategic and country level objectives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Result based reporting system executed and followed • Level of execution of context monitoring and risk mitigation and management • Level of innovative approaches that project has developed and adopted for achieving results 			

Evaluation question	Measure/indicator of progress	Main sources of data/information	Methodology	Remarks
Effectiveness: Outcome 1 (rating required)				
<p>11. To what extent has the Project effectively enabled institutional policy and regulatory frameworks for SLM in accordance with participatory land use development (PLUD) principles?</p> <p>11.1. Are the policy and frameworks produced adequate to achieve the aimed results, taking into account political, social, economic and environmental contexts?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gap between current and expected achievement of indicators pertaining to outcome 01. • Magnitude and intensity of identified barriers and repercussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents review (PIRs, Result framework, Log frame,) • Interview with PM, & stakeholders (DOA, LUPPD) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis • Interview with PM, & stakeholders (DOA, LUPPD) 	
Effectiveness: Outcome 2 (rating required)				
<p>12. To what extent has the project effectively demonstrated appropriate technologies and approaches for the rehabilitation of degraded lands?</p> <p>12.1. To what extent (and how) has the project been able to scale up said technologies?</p> <p>a. Are there any limiting or hindering factors for scale up of SLM?</p> <p>b. What enabling factors need to be full filled for scaling up of SLM technologies?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gap between current and expected achievement of indicators pertaining to outcome 02. • Level of adoption of SLM practices among beneficiaries 	<p>Project documents (PIRs, logframe)</p> <p>M&E & risk management system</p> <p>Interview with PM, DOA, PDoA, TRI, TSHA and with beneficiaries</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis • Interview with PM, DOA, PDoA, TRI, TSHA and with beneficiaries 	
Effectiveness: Outcome 3 (rating required)				
<p>13. To what extent has the Project effectively increased the capacity to develop innovative funding mechanisms for SLM in the public and private sectors?</p> <p>a. Have the developed funding mechanisms for SLM delivered the expected results?</p> <p>b. Are there any limitation in modality, operational process, regulatory process or with stakeholders involvement?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gap between current and expected achievement of indicators pertaining to outcome 03. • Magnitude and intensity of limiting factors in execution of the modality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents (PIRs) • M&E system • Interview with project team and beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis • Interview with project team and beneficiaries 	

Evaluation question	Measure/indicator of progress	Main sources of data/information	Methodology	Remarks
c. Are there any enabling factors to be fulfilled to operate the modality?				
Effectiveness: Outcome 4 and Knowledge Management (rating required)				
<p>14. To what extent has the project effectively enhanced national knowledge base for SLM to support adaptive results-based management?</p> <p>15. To what extent have the disseminated guidelines, knowledge and awareness been used by the targeted audiences?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gap between current and expected achievement of indicators pertaining to outcome 04 • Level of utilization of knowledge products 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents (PIRs) • M&E system • Interview with project team and beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis • Interview with project team and beneficiaries 	
3. Efficiency (rating required)				
<p>16. To what extent has the project been implemented efficiently and cost-effectively?</p> <p>16.1 Was the project implementation cost- effective?</p> <p>a. Did the pledged co-financing materialize?</p> <p>b. Were financial resources utilized efficiently?</p> <p>c. Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?</p> <p>d. To what extent the project leverage additional resources especially to test the pilots?</p> <p>17. To what extent has the management been able to adapt to changing conditions to improve the efficiency of project implementation?</p> <p>17.1 Was the Project implementation approach efficient in delivering the planned project results?</p> <p>a. Was the project implementation on schedule? If not, has it impacted on cost-effectiveness?</p> <p>b. Was the project logical framework and work plans and changes made to them post MTR used as management tools during implementation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability and quality of financial and progress reports. • Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided. • Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures. • Planned vs. actual funds leveraged. • Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation). • Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project financial reports • Interview with NPD, PM, Finance staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis • Interview with NPD, PM, Finance staff 	

Evaluation question	Measure/indicator of progress	Main sources of data/information	Methodology	Remarks
c. How was results-based management used during project implementation?				
4. Sustainability of project outcomes (rating required) Sustainability must cover all components of the project (4 outcomes and key outputs)				
<p>18. What is the likelihood that the project results will continue to be useful or will remain even after the end of the project?</p> <p>18.1 Will the farmers be able to carry out implementation of SLM and the PLUPs developed without project support? Which resources and conditions are necessary to guarantee sustainability?</p> <p>18.2. Will the GoSRL, in various levels, including service providers at local level, be able to provide adequate support to allow farmers to carry on implementation of plans and / or put in practice knowledge acquired?</p> <p>a) Is the degree of ownership at all levels/among all stakeholders sufficient to maintain project results?</p> <p>b) How can additional resources be mobilized for the continued investments in successful SLM models?</p> <p>c) Are all roles and responsibilities for promoting SLM practices and its governance at all levels agreed, clarified with all stakeholders?</p> <p>18.3. Will the farmers, public and private sector and university be able to carry on the PPP activities without project support, thus guaranteeing the funding for the continuation of results?</p> <p>a.) Have full costs of implementation of the models been incorporated in to the national agencies that participated?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intensity and magnitude of operational, technical and financial gaps in execution of SLM after project implementation. • Level of acceptance and understanding of perceived benefits of implementing of SLM by farmers. • Institutional mandates and priorities in execution of SLM after project phase out. • Legitimacy and operation modality of innovative financing (Eg: PPP) to generate incremental benefits to all involved stakeholders • Intensity and magnitude of risk factors affected to operationalizing of innovative financing models (Eg:PPP). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program documents (PIR, Innovative financing modalities) • Interview with Program staff, farmers and private sector representatives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis • Interview with Program staff, farmers and private sector representatives 	

Evaluation question	Measure/indicator of progress	Main sources of data/information	Methodology	Remarks
<p>b.) Are livelihood benefits generated through public-private partnerships and direct project intervention sufficient to continue investments in to SLM best practices?.</p> <p>19. What are the key risks which may affect the sustainability of the project benefits?</p> <p>a) Will the GoSL be able to fund certain activities/ pilots successfully in line with the new policy for chemical free and sustainable agriculture?</p>				
5) Factors affecting performance (rating required)				
<p>Quality of project implementation</p> <p>20. To what extent did FAO deliver on project identification, concept preparation, appraisal, preparation, approval and start-up, oversight and supervision? How well risks were identified and managed?</p> <p>a. Is the support of FAO is suffice to identify, develop, execute and supervise RADPL project?</p> <p>b. How well are the risks, assumptions and impact drivers being identified and managed from project identification to completion of the project?</p> <p>c. What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient?</p> <p>d. Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project</p> <p>21. To what extent did the execution agency effectively discharge its role and responsibilities related to the management and administration of the project?</p> <p>Quality of project execution Financial management and co-financing (rating required)</p> <p>22. To what extent did the expected co-financing materialize, and how short fall in co-financing, or materialization of greater than expected co-financing affected project results</p> <p>a. Did the leveraging of funds (co financing) happen as planned?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of commitment of FAO to identify, execution and supervise the project. • Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning design and in implementation • Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues • Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed • Level of commitment of execution agencies to deliver the results • Timeliness of deliverables ensured by each agency • Level of coordination any synergy of stakeholders to ensure deliverables 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents from FAO, & PMU. • RADL reports on risk identification and mitigation and monitoring system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis 	

Evaluation question	Measure/indicator of progress	Main sources of data/information	Methodology	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely provision of information to PMU and stakeholders for management decisions • Level of execution of MTR recommendations implications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M&E system • Program Documents (PIRs, MTR. MTR management response) • Interview with NPD and M&E staff • MTR management response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis • Interview with LTO, PM, NPD, M&E staff 	
6) Cross Cutting Concerns (rating required)				
<p>Gender and other equity dimensions (rating required)</p> <p>27. To what extent were gender considerations taken into account in designing and implementing the project?</p> <p>a. Was project collected and used data with gender segregation?</p> <p>b. How were perspectives of women and men involved and affected by the project monitored and assessed?</p> <p>c. To what extent was gender balance achieved/promoted in all project related activities, employment?</p> <p>Human rights issues/Indigenous Peoples (rating required)</p> <p>27.1 To what extent did knowledge products, guidelines, tools, policies and plans (e.g. PLUP) included gender considerations?</p> <p>a.) What real changes in gender equality did the project generate, pilot or contribute to; Access to/control of resources, Access to information, Decision making power/ influence, Division of labor, workload, Income generation, social status membership to organization.</p> <p>b. To what extent did activities to promote income</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existence of a gender analysis and evidence that it informed project design and implementation • Level of gender mainstream in knowledge products, guidelines tools and policies and PLUP • Level of gender mainstreaming approach used in project implementation • Level of inclusiveness of beneficiaries from all forms of vulnerable groups in targeted areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project documents • Key project stakeholders • Gender mainstreaming reports • Project documents (PIRs) • FAO, project team, and relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document analysis • Interview with LTO, PM, NPD • Document analysis • Interview with LTO, PM, NPD, M&E staff 	

Evaluation question	Measure/indicator of progress	Main sources of data/information	Methodology	Remarks
<p>generation, livelihood strategies target women? c. To what extent were women's organizations involved and supported in project activities?</p> <p>Environmental and social safeguards (rating required)</p> <p>28. Was the project implemented in a manner that ensures gender equitable participation and benefits?</p> <p>29. To what extent and how did the project include minority groups, including indigenous peoples, disadvantaged, vulnerable and people with disabilities, and youth in the design and implementation?</p> <p>30. To what extent were environmental and social concerns taken into consideration in the design and implementation of the project?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report on social or environmental concerns in design and implementation of the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beneficiary feedback 		
<p>Progress to Impact</p> <p>31. To what extent is the project likely to contribute to the reverse and arrest land degradation in agricultural lands in Central Highlands of Sri Lanka?</p> <p>32. To what extent is the project likely to contribute to the increase the provision of ecosystem goods and services and enhance food security in the Central Highlands of Sri Lanka?</p> <p>33. Are there any barriers or other risks that may prevent future progress towards long-term impact?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incremental change of impact indicators Level of utilization of delivered outputs by beneficiaries. Level of attribution of project impacts to increase provision of ecosystem goods and services and food security in central highlands in Sri Lanka <p>Magnitude and intensity of factors that affect utilization of impact</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents PIR, Project logframe & M&E system Interview with project beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interview with LTO, PM, NPD, M&E staff 	
<p>Lessons learned</p> <p>34. Are there lessons learned from project implementation that have the potential to improve future actions by being broadly replicated or by being avoided?</p> <p>a. Types of lessons learned (process related/ achievement related) identified and documented?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of lesson learns identified documented and incorporated to knowledge management system Relevance and validity of identified lessons learns pertaining to RDAL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data collected throughout evaluation Lessons learned reports APR/PIR and Quarterly reports Interviews with PMU and stakeholders ME& and Knowledge management system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document analysis Interview with LTO, PM, NPD, M&E staff 	

Evaluation question	Measure/indicator of progress	Main sources of data/information	Methodology	Remarks
b. Level of incorporation of lessons learned to knowledge management system? c. What is the level of dissemination of lessons learned and who were the targeted audience? d. Are the dissemination methods appropriate and effective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of dissemination • Level of appropriateness for targeted audience 			

Office of Evaluation
evaluation@fao.org
www.fao.org/evaluation

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Rome, Italy



Some rights reserved. This work is available
under a CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO licence.