

**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 2. Details of the methodology**

1. During the inception phase, which ran from 15 September to 31 October 2021, key project documentation as listed in the bibliography was reviewed and key Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) project personnel (regional project coordinators [RPC], lead technical officers [LTO] and funding liaison officers [FLO]) were consulted to refine the scope of the evaluation and determine its approach, tools, and methodology. Activities conducted and stakeholders consulted during this preparatory phase are listed in Annex 1.
2. The overall approach to the terminal evaluation was underpinned by the following characteristics:
  - i. *Utilization-focused*: it aimed to respond to the needs expressed by key stakeholders (participating governments and regional bodies), as well as the different interested parties at FAO and the Global Environment Facility (GEF). It is both retrospective (what worked, what did not work) and forward-looking (what can be done better).
  - ii. *Participatory and inclusive*: The terminal evaluation adopted a consultative, participatory (albeit virtual), and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders. Special efforts were made to seek inputs from the project's direct beneficiaries including women. In addition, an outcome mapping/validation session was held with stakeholders (regional partners and selected countries), and preliminary findings and recommendations were shared with FAO personnel in FAO SLC and headquarters for review and feedback, to build understanding and ownership of the evaluation results.
  - iii. *Complexity-aware*: CC4Fish is a complex project and functions in a context where multiple and dynamic actors influence one another and their immediate systems. Consequently, cause and effect relationships can be difficult to ascertain, there is a high chance for unexpected results (or even no result) to occur, change depends on the actions of actors that the project can only influence, and the timeframe of outcomes may be uncertain.
  - iv. *Complying with established evaluation standards and policies*: such as those established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (2015), and FAO (e.g. FAO , 2015a, FAO, 2019, FAO, 2020a), as well as FAO Policy on Gender Equality (FAO, 2020b), FAO policy on working with indigenous peoples and local communities (FAO, 2016), GEF policies on co-financing (GEF, 2018), environmental and social safeguards (GEF, 2019), gender equality (GEF, 2017a), stakeholder engagement (GEF, 2017b), and guidance on use of data collected for indicators of the GEF climate change Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT).
3. The terminal evaluation used mixed data collection methods.

### **Primary data collection**

4. Qualitative through semi-structured key informant interviews (KII) conducted virtually (principally Zoom, in addition to Skype, telephone, and WhatsApp calls) with project stakeholders on all the changes – either positive and negative, intended and unintended – that have happened (or not) thanks to the project; the project's performance, successes and bottlenecks, in alignment with the evaluation questions (Appendix 1–. Evaluation matrix) and GEF evaluation criteria. Key informants for the KII were selected to represent i) the range of project beneficiaries and partner organisations and ii) the countries where the project was implemented. A total of 42 people were interviewed, of whom 23 (56 percent) were women. Stakeholders who were common to both projects were interviewed jointly with the StewardFish project evaluator. The list of people interviewed is available in Appendix 3. Interviewees represented all the project countries, organisational partners, and key consultants and FAO personnel who had provided specific support or inputs into the project activities. The interviews followed the template presented in Annex 2. A form was also designed using the philosophy of outcome mapping to collect

information from the regional project coordinator (RPC) and lead technical officer (LTO) on their perceptions of the changes brought about by the CC4Fish project (Annex 3). The qualitative data collection phase also included a virtual outcome mapping-based session with key regional partners and representatives of SLU and TT to validate and refine the outcomes identified by the evaluation team. Fifteen people including ten women participated in this session.

5. A quantitative, structured online survey to reach the widest range of stakeholders and beneficiaries possible, provided quantitative answers to the evaluation questions and a quantitative estimate of the scale of changes. The survey design took into account preliminary information collected during semi-structured interviews and provided in writing by the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) through the “changes” template. Sampling for the e-survey was semi-purposive. Names and email addresses for recipients of the e-survey were compiled from the list of people who had been consulted during the mid-term evaluation, as well as from lists of participants available in workshop, training and meeting reports made available to the evaluation team. No distinction was made of their role, position or nature of their participation in the project. The Qualtrics software was used to design and distribute the questionnaire and collect answers electronically. The questionnaire (Annex 5) included a section on fisherfolk organisations, targeted at fishers who had also benefited from the StewardFish project and whose contact details were collected in the same way. It was sent to 361 people and had a 44 percent response rate (159 answers), which is higher than what can be expected for questionnaire surveys (Baruch and Holtom, 2008). An overview of the respondents is provided in the first table in the e-survey results (Annex 6). The data was analysed using descriptive statistics. Where relevant, cross-tabulations were performed to examine answers by type of respondents, or affiliation/occupation or sex. A full overview of e-survey results can be found in Annex 6.

## **Secondary data collection**

6. Secondary data sources included all project documentation made available to the evaluation team in the SharePoint folder, as well as all project outputs disseminated more widely (e.g., news articles and letters, technical papers, videos, training materials, social media pages etc.). Documents of relevance to the region, such as FAO Country Programming Frameworks (CPF), the 2017–2021 United Nations Multi-Country Sustainable Development Framework (UNMSDF) in the Caribbean, the Caribbean Community Common Fisheries Policy (CCCFP) and its Small-scale Fisheries (SSF) Protocol, CRFM Strategic Plan and Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan, and the CLME+ Strategic Action Programme (SAP), were also reviewed.
7. These multiple lines of evidence across different data sources have enabled corroborating findings and increasing confidence in the evaluation findings.
8. The evaluation team had frequent email exchanges with the PCU, mostly to answer/clarify questions that emerged during the evaluation process, or to review specific evaluation outputs, i.e., the inception report and the preliminary findings.
9. The level of engagement of all stakeholders approached for the evaluation was excellent given the virtual nature of the interactions, as imposed by the COVID-19 pandemic (see section 1.5).

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.