EVALUATION FRAMEWORK MATRIX: EVALUATION QUESTIONS, RESPONDENTS, INDICATORS AND DATA SOURCES

EVALUATION QUESTIONS *A. Strategic Relevance*	Project Team	CONAP, OTECBIO, NCAs	Steering Committee	Min. Education?	Private Industry	NGOs	UNEP Task Manager	UNEP Finance Manager	Indicators	Data Source
1. To what extent were project objectives and implementation strategies consistent with national and sub regional environmental issues and needs?	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓			Respondent perceptions, level of achievement of objectives and outcomes	Interviews, Project document, MTE, Final Report
2. To what extent were project objectives and implementation strategies consistent with (i) UNEP's mandate and policies at the time; and (ii) the GEF Biodiversity focal area, strategic priorities and operational programme(s).							▓		Respondent perceptions, project design	Interviews, Project document, MTE
3. Were project objectives realistic, given the time and budget allocated to the project, the baseline situation and institutional context?	▓	▓	▓				▓		Respondent perceptions, project delivery and level of achievement	Interviews, MTE, PIRs and Final Report
4. To what extent did UNEP and GEF engage NCAs and other national biosafety stakeholders in project design, implementation, monitoring and reporting?	▓	▓	▓			▓			Respondent perceptions, project delivery and level of achievement	Interviews, PDF reports
B. Achievement of Outputs										
5. How successful was the project in achieving its planned outputs, considering aspects such as quantity, quality, sequencing, timeliness and usefulness? To what extent have project outputs contributed towards the expected outcomes?	▓	▓	▓				▓		Respondent perceptions, project delivery and level of achievement	Interviews, Final Report
C. Effectiveness: Attainment of Objectives and Expected Outcomes										
6. How and to what extent did the project succeed in	▓	▓	▓				▓		Respondent	Interviews,

Question		Indicators	Sources
developing and implementing a framework for biosafety? To what extent has this strengthened the involvement of the NCAs in the implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (CPB)?		perceptions, continued involvement of Public Health Min. and other NCAs in NBF	Project document, Final Report
7. To what extent has the project had an impact on the development of capacities for biosafety management?	(MAG)	Respondent perceptions, # and outcomes of cases of liability/redress	Interviews, Final Report
8. How and to what extent did the project build administrative capacities to handle requests, make informed decisions and communicate them to applicants and the BCH?		Respondent perceptions, # of applications, communication of decisions	Interviews, Final Report, CONAP /BCH data
9. To what extent has the project ensured that decisions on LMOs are based on risk assessments, are timely, transparent and coordinated, and avoid duplicity or unnecessary bureaucracy?		Respondent perceptions, # of applications, decisions and processing time	Interviews, Final Report, CONAP /BCH data
10. To what extent did the project increase the capacity to monitor and ensure regulatory compliance?		Respondent perceptions, trends in enforcement and compliance	Interviews, CONAP and BCH data, PIR and Final Reports
11. Are sufficient technical and human capacities being put in place for risk assessment and management for decision-making, considering both traditional and new generation LMOs?		Respondent perceptions, CAN agreements w/ CTNBio, TORs and # personnel involved	Interviews, signed agreements w/ NCAs, personnel assigned.
12. Are trans boundary movements of LMOs occurring in accordance with the CPB, and in a manner that is understood and accepted by the private sector (exporters /importers)?		Respondent perceptions, number of documented trans boundary movements, enforcement of regulations for trans boundary movement of LMOs	Interviews, # trans boundary LMO movements.
13. To what extent have BS public sensitization and educational strategies been contributed to increase public awareness? To what extent is this leading to a change in human behavior?		Results from any surveys conducted by project on public awareness and attitudes and changes to baseline situation	Interviews, data from Min. of Education or other implementers
14. To what extent has the project contributed to increase		Same as above;	Same as above.

information sharing through greater access to biosafety information?									institutional agreements; access and "hits" to online biosafety web page.	
D. Sustainability										
15. *Socio-political:* Are there any social or political factors that influence positively or negatively the sustenance of project results and impacts?									Respondent perceptions, continuity of project-supported initiatives	Interviews, Final Report
16. To what extent did UNEP and GEF engage the participation of national biosafety stakeholders in project design, implementation, monitoring and reporting?									Respondent perceptions, workshops and consultation events during design phase	Interviews, PDF reports
17. Is there sufficient government/stakeholder commitment to enforce and implement the programmes, plans, agreements, monitoring systems etc. prepared and agreed upon under the project?									Respondent perceptions, policies of new government, budget and staff allocations	Interviews
18. *Financial*: To what extent is the continuity of project results and their impact dependent on continued financial support? Will adequate financial resources be made available to ensure the continuity of programmes, plans, agreements, monitoring systems etc. that were prepared and agreed upon under the project?									Same as above.	Same as above.
19. *Institutional:* To what extent is the sustenance of the results and progress towards impact dependent on national institutional frameworks and governance? To what extent are institutional governance structures and capacities in place to sustain processes, policies, agreements and legal/regulatory aspects that were supported by the project?									Same as above	Same as above
Catalytic Role & Replication: Has the project had a catalytic role in promoting institutional change, changes in behavior, policy changes, new opportunities or follow-up support?										
E. Efficiency										
21. Did the project apply any time or cost-saving mechanisms in order to achieve results within the approved timeframe and budget?									Project expenditure and delivery trends, project work plans and budget revisions	Interviews, project unit documentation, signed budget revisions, MTE, PIRs

No. Question		Indicator	Source
22. Did the project face any obstacles (financial, administrative, managerial) and to what extent has this affected its efficiency?		Respondent perceptions, project expenditure and delivery trends, recruitment and procurement timelines	Interviews, MTE, PIRs
23. To what extent did the delay in implementation affect the delivery of the project outcomes?		Respondent perceptions, project delivery trends (recruitment, procurement, contracts) in comparison with planned timelines	Same as above.
24. To what extent did the project succeed in securing the necessary funds to implement the educational strategy?		Co-financing is made available.	Project financial reports.
25. Were the required progress and financial reports prepared satisfactorily and submitted on schedule?		Reports submitted on time and accepted.	PIRs, financial reports
F. Factors affecting Project Performance			
Preparation and Readiness:			
26. Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe?		Respondent perceptions, project performance and delivery trends, positive appraisal of project document	Interviews, project document, Quality Assurance assessment, MTE
27. What factors influenced the quality-at-entry of the project design, choice of partners, allocation of financial resources etc.?		Same as above.	Same as above, PDF reports
28. Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project implementation? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities) and enabling legislation assured? Were adequate project management arrangements in place?		Respondent perceptions, institutional arrangements and counterpart contributions clearly spelt out in project document.	Interviews, project document, PDF reports
Project Implementation and Management:			
29. To what extent were the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document effective in delivering project outputs and outcomes? Were		Respondent perceptions, project performance and level	PIRs, MTE, Final Report

Evaluation Question										Indicators	Sources of data
adaptations made to the approaches originally proposed										of achievement of outputs/outcomes.	
30. How effective and efficient was project management by CTNBIO and the PMU, and how well did they adapt to changes during the project lifetime?										Same as above.	Same as above.
31. To what extent did the Steering Committee provide guidance and contribute to effective project implementation?										Respondent perceptions, implementation of SC decisions/recommendations	Interviews, minutes of SC meetings
32. To what extent did the project management and national partners respond to the guidance/recommendations provided by the Steering Committee, the UNEP Task Manager and Mid-Term Review.										Respondent perceptions, implementation of SC/UNEP/MTE recommendations by PMU/CNAs	Interviews, minutes of NCC meetings, PIRs, MTE
33. Identify any operational and political / institutional problems and constraints that influenced implementation, and how the project partners tried to overcome these problems.										Respondent perceptions; identified obstacles/constraints and remedial actions taken	Interviews, minutes of SC meetings, Pairs, MTE, Final Report
Stakeholder Participation and Public Awareness											
34. What approaches were used to identify and engage stakeholders in project design and implementation?										Respondent perceptions, evidence of workshops or other consultation mechanisms	Interviews, PDF reports, PIRs, MTE
35. To what extent have project partners and stakeholders collaborated/interacted effectively during project design and implementation?										Respondent perceptions, documented interactions	Same as above.
36. Did the project promote mechanisms for stakeholder participation in decision-making in the programmes, plans and other initiatives that it generated?										Respondent perceptions, evidence of stakeholder participation in planning and decision-making	Same as above.
Country Ownership and Driven-ess											
37. To what degree has CONAP assumed responsibility for the project and provided adequate support to project execution, including the cooperation received from the										Respondent Perceptions, performance of CONAP	Interviews, PIRs, MTE, Final Report

Question	Indicators	Sources
various public institutions involved and timeliness of counter-part funding?	and project team in implementation, timeliness of project delivery	
38. To what extent have the national and regional political/institutional frameworks facilitated project performance?	Respondent perceptions, consistency of NBFs in Central America, synergies with other countries through regional WB/GEF biosafety project	Same as above
Financial Planning & Management		
39. Were sufficient financial resources made available and disbursed in a timely manner to the project and its partners?	Respondent perceptions, timeliness of disbursements, budget revisions	PIRs, budget revisions, financial reports
40. Were administrative processes such as staff recruitment, procurement of goods and services (including consultants), and preparation/ negotiation of cooperation agreements conducted efficiently and in a timely manner?	Same as above.	Same as above
41. Were co-financing commitments met as programmed and made available in a timely manner?	Same as above.	Same as above.
42. Were additional resources – financial, in-kind – leveraged by the project, beyond those that were already committed prior to the project's approval?	Budget revisions, increased allocations to existing/new budget lines through co-financing	Same as above.
43. Identify irregularities (if any) in procurement, use of financial resources and human resource management, and the measures taken by CONAP or UNEP to correct/prevent such irregularities.	Documented irregularities, interrupted procurement/disbursement processes	Interviews, PIRs, MTE, audit reports
UNEP supervision and backstopping:		
44. Assess the quality and efficiency of UNEP's supervision plans, outcome monitoring, PIR reporting and financial/administrative services	Respondent perceptions, timeliness and acceptance of PIR and financial reports; timeliness of disbursements and administrative support	Interviews, PIRs, MTE

Question									Finding	Source
									services by UNEP	
Monitoring and evaluation>										
45. Did the project's design include a viable M&E plan that is based on outcomes and includes indicators?									Monitoring Plan is included in the project document.	Project document
46. Did the project's design include a monitoring budget?									Project document includes monitoring budget line.	Project document.
47. Have monitoring findings influenced adaptive management and contributed towards resolving implementation problems?									Respondent perceptions, evidence of technical/management decisions based on monitoring findings	Interviews, monitoring reports
48. Are there specific indicators for each of the project objectives? Are the indicators measurable, attainable (realistic) and relevant to the objectives? Are the indicators time- bound?									Indicators are included in Results Framework for each objective.	Project document.
49. Have the responsibilities for M&E activities been clearly defined? Were the data sources and data collection instruments appropriate? Was the frequency of various monitoring activities specified and adequate? In how far were project users involved in monitoring?									Designated parties conduct monitoring activities periodically with inputs from project participants. The monitoring approach is considered methodologically appropriate by the evaluator and most respondents.	Interviews, monitoring reports.