

**Project Evaluation Series**

**Terminal evaluation of project “Climate  
change adaptation of the Eastern Caribbean  
fisheries sector” (CC4FISH)**

**Project code: GCP/SLC/202/SCF  
GEF ID: 5667**

**Annex 3. Interview guide for key informant interviews (KII)**

Unless indicated otherwise, all the questions are valid for all respondents, but some are specific to indicated countries.

*For all questions, remember to ask **examples** of what worked well / what did not work well + **WHY**. What was done to address the things that were not working well?*

**Date of interview:**

**Duration of KII:**

**Name of respondent:**

**Affiliation/organization:**

**Country or level (e.g. global/regional)**

**Main role or involvement in the project:**

**Year or period of involvement in, or benefit from, the project:**

# 1. Design/approach/relevance

1. How relevant were the project activities to your country/your organisation's needs? Have the objectives and activities of the project been really demand-driven?
2. At mid-term the project was found to be contributing to the achievement of SDGs and other national and regional development priorities. Since there has been a pandemic.
  - How did this affect the relevance of the project? Are the project objectives still as relevant today as they were 4 years ago?
  - Also, some *shifts in national strategic priorities* were also identified during the MTR, such as enhanced focus on gender equality, Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) as part of CCA; increased commitment to energy resilience; greater interest in public-private partnerships with the private sector; and on market-based opportunities
  - Have these been integrated in the project activities since the MTR?
  - Some *opportunities for collaboration* were also just starting or emerging at the time of the MTR (e.g. CC4FISH collaboration with the World Bank Billfish project, Blue Revolution project, SLU Securing funding both under CC4FISH and the Technical Cooperation Program for development of the SLU National Policy on Fisheries)
  - >Have these continued and developed? What is their status today? Have new ones emerged since the MTR?
  - The MTR also indicated that *some needed to be seized*, for ex. with the Global Maritime Distress and Safety System currently being implemented in St Vincent and the Grenadines by the NTRC.
  - Have linkages between the project and this initiative been established in St Vincent and the Grenadines? Or elsewhere?
  - Are there other initiatives with which the project has not established linkages yet, but could/should do in the future?
3. Overall, to what extent has the project deviated from its planned objectives/activities? (esp. in light of Covid and other crises – hurricanes...)

## **2. Effectiveness – outputs and outcomes**

### **2.1 Regarding outputs**

4. Which factors affected the overall effectiveness of the project and its progress towards the achievement and delivery of its outputs?

### **2.2 Regarding outcomes**

5. To what extent has the project contributed to improved awareness and understanding of climate change impacts and among which actors in the fisheries sector?  
Which activities have contributed the most in this regard?  
Whose awareness?  
Any example of practical changes/evidence that improved awareness is helping CCA?
6. To what extent has *fisher-folk, aquaculturists' and coastal community resilience to CC and variability* been improved as a result of the project intervention?  
How much have these people embraced adaptation technologies and changed their practices?
7. To what extent has the project improved the *integration of climate change adaptation (CCA) considerations in fisheries and aquaculture policies*?  
Examples? (CCA in fish policies and vice-versa Fish in CCA policies).  
How much of this can be attributed to the project itself?  
Related to this - To what extent has the project also enhanced the technical and organizational capacity of government and other stakeholders at regional, national and local levels?

### 3. Changes

**N.B.: ensure the respondent understands the difference between a project activity/output and a change that happened due to the project activity.**

E.g. a multi-stakeholder platform is an output of the project. What happened thanks to the platform? (e.g. behavior change, new practices, new relationships, policy formulation, etc. etc.)

*The respondent will have been sent the Outcome Harvesting template prior to the interview to start thinking about the changes. The OH template follows the structure below.*

*Keep in mind the diagram below while interviewing the respondent.*

*Keep track of all the significant changes the respondent mentions for each question.*



Outcome: an **observable** and **significant** change (in behavior, practice, agenda, relationship, policy...) performed by a social actor, which has been influenced by an intervention/programme.

8. Which significant changes have been brought about by the project? Can you identify 2-3 that come to your mind?
9. Were these change positive / negative, intended / unintended?
10. When and how were these changes brought about?
11. What was the contribution of the project to these changes?
12. What makes you think that the project was instrumental to the change: how do you know that this change was the result (partially, totally, directly, indirectly, intentionally, unintentionally) of the project?
13. Which project stakeholders or circumstances were instrumental in bringing about these changes?
14. Why do you consider this change important? What was done differently to make it happen? Would this change not have happened anyway?
15. Where changes did not happen, why was it so? What happened in the countries where the project intervened but no change took place? What is still needed to make the change happen?

**NB: RELATE TO THE TOC ASSUMPTIONS. HAVE TOC PRINT OUT AT HAND**

## 4. Progress to impact

16. To what extent has the project to enabled fulfilling the intermediate state assumptions to IS2? (green box)?

*Refer to Fig. 3 TOC: impact (many!) and intermediary state 2. TO PRINT AND HAVE AT HAND.*

*Also for memory – from ProDoc:*

*Barrier 1: There is insufficient understanding and awareness of climate change vulnerability of the fisheries sector at the regional, national and local level;*

*Barrier 2: Fisherfolk, aquaculturists, and coastal communities have limited resilience to climate change and variability; and*

*Barrier 3: Climate change adaptation in fisheries is ineffectively mainstreamed at multiple levels of fisheries governance.*

17. How quickly do you think the ultimate goal of the project to “increase resilience and reduce vulnerability to climate change impacts in the Eastern Caribbean fisheries sector” may be reached (as a consequence of the changes talked about earlier)?
18. What remains to be done to reach this goal (in a second phase)?

## **5. Efficiency/implementation**

19. To what extent were the management / implementing arrangements appropriate? Bottlenecks? Solutions found?
  - i. FAO procedures? Training on FAO procedures?
  - ii. Technical and administrative backstopping from FAO SLC? FAO Country Office? Task Force?
  - iii. Communications?
20. Do you think there was sufficient capacity within your country to deliver a project of that size? Where and what were issues (if any)?
21. What was the impact of the MTR recommendations on implementation and performance? Any noticeable difference since the MTR?

## 6. Sustainability

22. How effective has the project been in preparing the ground for the sustainability of its actions / its results in the longer term? What actions do you think hold promise and potential for long-term sustainability (at local, national, regional levels)?
23. Which changes (outcomes) do you consider as self-sustaining, or as stable (=not self-sustaining yet but will get there in time), or needing more support in the future? *You can make a reference to the significant changes that the respondent listed earlier.*
24. With particular reference to capacity building (technical/organizational), how do you think the project has contributed to ensuring that the knowledge and capacity gained is sustained in the future?



## 7. Risks

25. How have risks identified at the MTR played out and/or been mitigated over the second half of the project? What will be their impact on the sustainability of the project benefits?

*For memory: the MTR rated:*

*Socio-political risks: moderately unlikely to arise*

*Financial risks: unable to assess as not well defined in Prodoc. Impact of COVID-19?*

*Institutional and governance risks: most likely to arise (gov turnover, institutional capacity etc.)*

*Environmental risks: most likely to arise due to hurricanes, droughts (for aqua projects), environmental degradation from human activities superimposed on climate change impact/reducing ecological resilience to climate change impact*

*Health-related risks: COVID-19 impacts?*

## **8. Factors affecting performance**

### **8.1 Partnerships**

26. How clearly defined were the roles of the project partners at all levels? How easy was it for you to “find your place” in the project?
27. What do you think about the partnerships established by the project?
  - i. Were they effective? What worked particularly well?
  - ii. Did you have interactions with other partners at global/regional/national level?
  - iii. Any missed opportunities?
  - iv. What is the likelihood that the partnerships created by the project will generate long-lasting impact/change beyond the duration of the project?
28. How about engagement with stakeholders, including private sector and beneficiaries? How effective and what impact has their involvement had on the project results? [ask for examples]. To what extent could they fuel the sustainability of the project results beyond the life of the project itself?

### **8.2 Monitoring/knowledge management**

29. How effective do you think the project has been in its promotion of experience sharing and dissemination of lessons learned? Is there evidence of the effects of the knowledge and experiences gained from the implementation of the project?
30. What do you suggest should be done in a possible future phase of the project to (further) improve this? Any suggestion of alternative means of communication?
31. Have the engagement and impacts of the project on specific groups (indigenous groups, women, youth) been monitored [planned in prodoc but not done according to the MTR]

#### ***To ask the PCU specifically (in addition to the other questions):***

- i. How effective has the monitoring and evaluation system of the project been in:
- ii. Tracking progress of the project activities regionally/nationally
- iii. Capturing lessons learned?
- iv. Has the M & E been used effectively in adaptive management?

## **9. Safeguards and gender**

### **9.1 Targeting – youth, indigenous people, women**

32. According to you, to what extent was the youth targeted by the activities? How have they benefitted?
33. Where Indigenous People and local communities were targeted by project activities, did engagement follow FAO's FPIC guidelines?<sup>1</sup>
34. To what extent were women targeted by the activities (e.g. value chain improvements, vulnerability assessments, aquaponics...)? How have they benefitted? (impact on productivity, income, decision-making, access to assets and markets etc.?)  
How were gender issues in CCA, in fisheries, and in aquaculture taken into account by the project? What more was done since the MTR? Any gender assessment or gender strategy produced since the MTR? A different approach to involve women and 'vulnerable groups'?
35. Was the involvement of these groups more or less compared to envisaged at design? How genuine were the efforts to involve these groups equally? What could the project have done differently in this regard? How well was the project able to handle the constraints that these groups may experience to engage in a project like this?

---

<sup>1</sup> 6 steps to follow along the project cycle to ensure equal consideration of all members of the community: 1. Identification, 2. Participatory mapping, 3. Communication planning, 4. Reach consent, 5. M&E, 6. Lessons learned

## **10. Conclusions, recommendations**

36. Take home points for the terminal evaluation?
37. Any major lessons and recommendations?

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.