

---

## Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme “Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia”

---

Gunilla Björklund  
Dam Quoc Tru  
Daniel Shallon  
Arne Svensson

## Table of Content

<b>1</b>	<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1	Background .....	5
1.2	Observations, Analysis and Conclusions .....	5
1.2.1	<i>General assessment .....</i>	5
1.2.2	<i>Effectiveness of programme implementation .....</i>	6
1.2.3	<i>Efficiency of programme implementation .....</i>	8
1.2.4	<i>Relevance of the programme .....</i>	8
1.2.5	<i>Sustainability.....</i>	8
1.2.6	<i>Lessons learned.....</i>	9
1.3	Recommendations .....	9
<b>2</b>	<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>12</b>
2.1	Background and Context.....	12
2.1.1	<i>Chemical management in South East Asia.....</i>	12
2.1.2	<i>Swedish policy and priorities .....</i>	13
2.1.3	<i>Regional Strategy for South East Asia .....</i>	14
2.1.4	<i>Programme partners .....</i>	14
2.1.5	<i>The Programme.....</i>	14
2.2	Purpose of the Evaluation .....	15
2.3	The Evaluation Team .....	15
2.4	Methodology and implementation of the Evaluation.....	16
2.4.1	<i>Assignment approach and comprehension.....</i>	16
2.4.2	<i>Methodology.....</i>	16
2.4.3	<i>Reviewed Documents and Persons Interviewed.....</i>	17
2.5	This Report and How to Read it.....	17
<b>3</b>	<b>Effectiveness .....</b>	<b>18</b>
3.2.1	<i>Conclusions related to each effectiveness issue.....</i>	30
3.2.2	<i>Overall conclusions.....</i>	32
3.2.3	<i>Recommendations.....</i>	33
<b>4</b>	<b>Efficiency.....</b>	<b>34</b>
4.1	Observations and analysis .....	34
4.1.1	<i>Is the programme design cost-effective?.....</i>	34
4.1.2	<i>Have the separate programme activities been implemented in a cost-effective manner?.....</i>	35
4.2	Conclusions and recommendations .....	35
4.2.1	<i>Conclusions.....</i>	35
4.2.2	<i>Recommendations .....</i>	35
<b>5</b>	<b>Relevance .....</b>	<b>36</b>
5.1	Observations and analysis .....	36
5.1.1	<i>Is the programme and its design relevant for addressing present and future priorities and needs? Does the programme design allow adjustments to changing circumstances and new opportunities? .....</i>	36
5.1.2	<i>Have partners been able to adjust to new emerging needs/problems within the framework of the programme? .....</i>	37
5.1.3	<i>Are the programme's development objectives and immediate objectives (including specification of targets and identification of beneficiaries) feasible? ..</i>	38

5.1.4	<i>Have the established relationships with external institutions been functional and beneficial for the programme?</i>	38
5.2	Conclusions and recommendations	38
5.2.1	Conclusions	38
5.2.2	Recommendations	39
<b>6</b>	<b>Sustainability</b>	<b>40</b>
6.1	Observations and analysis	41
6.1.1	<i>Does the programme promote/ensure a sustainable regional ex-change and co-ordination in order to achieve pesticide risk reduction and good chemical management?</i>	41
6.1.2	<i>Does the programme design allow for synergies/synergistic effects and encourage further collaboration?</i>	42
6.1.3	<i>Was it correct to adopt a 10 year horizon for the programme and what measures are being built in to enhance independent continuation by the recipient government departments, NGOs and farming communities?</i>	43
6.1.4	<i>What evidence is already visible of the intention of these stakeholders to independently continue project-promoted initiatives?</i>	44
6.2	Conclusions and recommendations	45
<b>7</b>	<b>Lessons Learned</b>	<b>46</b>
7.1	Four main areas of lessons learned	46
7.2	Coordination between programme partners	46
7.3	Different needs for cooperation at local and regional level	47
7.4	Short-term local perspective needs to be coordinated with long-term national and regional perspective	48
7.5	Organizational “homes”	49

## Appendices (separate document)

- Annex 1 Terms of Reference
- Annex 2 Inception Report
- Annex 3 Persons Interviewed and Consulted
- Annex 4 Documentation of Materials Reviewed and Cited
- Annex 5 Programme for the Mission 2-19 November 2011
- Annex 6 Report from Field visit to China
- Annex 7 Report from Field visit to Cambodia
- Annex 8 Report from Field visit to Laos
- Annex 9 Report from Field visit to Vietnam

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

APPPC or A3PC	The Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission
ASEAN	The Association of Southeast Asian Nations
CGFED	Research Center for Gender, Family and Environment in Development
CPAM	Continuous Community Pesticide Action Monitoring
CRP	Center for Rural Progress
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
ESCAP	UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FFS	Farmer Field Schools
HAU	Hanoi Agricultural University
IPM	Integrated pest management
KemI	The Swedish Chemicals Agency
LFA	Logical Framework Approach
NATESC	National Agro-Technical Extension and Service Centre, Ministry of Agriculture (in China)
MA	Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
MARD	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (in Vietnam)
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreements
MOA	Ministry of Agriculture (in China)
MOIT	Ministry of Industry and Trade
MTR	Mid-term Review
NGO	Non-government organisation
PAN AP	Pesticide Action Network for Asia and the Pacific
PEAC	Pesticide Eco-Alternatives Center
PGD	Policy for Global development
PGU	Den svenska politiken för global utveckling
PPD	Plant Protection Department
PPSD	Provincial Plant Protection Sub-Department
PRR	Pesticide risk reduction
RBM	Result Based Management
REAL	Rural Ecological Agriculture for Livelihoods
RPPC	Regional Plant Protection Center
SAICM	Strategical Approach to International Chemicals Management
SEK	The Swedish Currency Krona
SENSA	Swedish Environmental Secretariat for Asia
Sida	The Swedish International Development Agency
TFA	The Field Alliance
TOT	Training of Trainers
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environmental Programme
UNFCCC	The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change
WDR	World Development Report

# 1 Executive Summary

## 1.1 Background

The regional programme “*Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia*” is carried out by the Swedish Chemicals Agency (KemI) with financial support from the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida). The first Phase from January 1, 2007 to June 30 2010 was stated as a learning period for KemI but it was in collaboration with partners who had experience working in partnerships – FAO with governments and PAN AP and TFA with CSOs in the region. Phase 1 of the programme has been extended with three years through a new contract with end date June 30, 2013. The programme has a total budget of 93.5 Million SEK.

The geographical scope of the programme is South East Asia, with a primary focus on the Greater Mekong Sub-region and the countries of Cambodia, China, Laos and Vietnam in particular.

For the ongoing programme period the immediate objectives are:

**Objective 1:** Increased awareness among farming communities, consumers and decision-makers in South East Asia on the risks associated with pesticide use and their alternatives.

**Objective 2:** Strengthened capacity to innovate and scale up Integrated Pest Management (IPM) in partner countries.

**Objective 3:** Strengthened regulatory framework for the control of pesticides in 2-3 project countries.

**Objective 4:** Strengthened Chemicals Management Capacity within authorities, industries and stakeholders in the partner countries.

In addition to KemI the following programme partners are working on the different components:

- Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
- FAO Headquarters, Pesticides Risk Reduction Group
- Pesticide Action Network for Asia and the Pacific (PAN-AP)
- The Field Alliance (TFA)

This mid-term evaluation is intended to assess the achievements to date and come up with recommendations both for the remaining part of the existing agreement and the envisaged second phase. These recommendations are in line with the Swedish government Regional Strategy for South East Asia 2010-2015.

## 1.2 Observations, Analysis and Conclusions

### 1.2.1 General assessment

The general assessment is that the programme has produced outputs and outcomes that to a high extent meet the expectations according to the revised Logical Framework Approach (LFA). The prognosis for the programme reaching the targets for outcomes and objectives within the programme period is good. However, there is clear scope for more added value through closer cooperation between the programme partners and their partners in turn at all levels.

There have been some implementation problems; however, the programme partners have been able to address these on both the regional and the national level and also on the field level. These problems have mainly been related to the implementation of activities at the farmer

field schools and on provincial/national level when it comes to collaboration between Governments and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs). Naturally, it takes time for such collaboration to evolve. However, the Programme has done some ground-breaking work in fostering closer collaboration between government and CSO implementers.

Institutional problems related to implementation of Objective area 3 in one of the three countries have a different nature and have not been as easy to solve as they are beyond the control of the Programme.

### **1.2.2 Effectiveness of programme implementation**

The CSO-partners in the programme are the ones implementing Objective area 1 under the LFA. The work has produced outputs and outcomes in accordance with the LFA. The PAN AP-network is mainly responsible for the advocacy work, trainings and the generation of information materials in local languages while the TFA-partners are producing education material and running the Rural Ecological Agriculture for Livelihoods (REAL)-project to present alternatives to toxic pesticides for school-children and communities. TFA partners are cooperating with FAO/IPM in all countries except China. The CSOs are doing much appreciated work, although without much coordination between the two programme partners. TFA and PAN AP partners are conducting some joint campaign activities in some countries; however, there could be more cooperation for future activities.

However, there is some lack of coordination between the CSOs activities and the Farmer Field Schools (FFSs) which are under the FAO component implemented with government extension services..

The FAO at regional and national levels are coordinating the IPM FFS-work and the PRR-training including all linked components, in accordance with Objective area 2. In this work governments in the region showed their willingness in supporting on policy and to some extent financially; however, more support in terms of funds is necessary. Thus, they still are not taking the responsibility they would need to in terms of taking over financial responsibility with a view to sustainability.

The FAO-HQ has, under Objective area 3, provided extensive assistance to Cambodia, Lao and Vietnam in processes to reform their pesticide legislation. Although different from what was proposed, Lao now has a new Regulation, while Cambodia submitted a new Law to Parliament and Vietnam significantly revised its draft Law. Nevertheless, the legal instruments for Lao and Cambodia would have been better if the process had suffered less from internal politics.

Training of inspectors is on schedule in Lao. In Cambodia, inspections are ongoing in two pilot areas, but scaling up will be delayed until the new Law has been adopted, because the present legislation does not provide adequate options for enforcement. Lessons learned from the pilot inspections contributed to a stronger and clearer mandate for inspectors in the new Law.

The Regional Chemical Management Forums, under the Objective area 4, arranged by Kemi had a delayed start but a working group with the participating governments as members, tasked with the arrangements of the Regional Chemical Management Forums has been established. The Regional Chemical Management Forums are regarded by the participants coming mainly from central governments, as very useful. The Regional Chemical

Management Forums are good examples of the need for and benefits from a platform for regional discussions and future regional cooperation.

There have been some more detailed implementation problems experienced by the partners implementing the objective area 1; problems that they have been able to solve. The Regional Chemicals Forums had a slow start but the established working group has now increased the pace. Internal tensions within the national counterpart institution in Cambodia have delayed some of the activities and affected some of the results for Cambodia under Objective 3.

The programme partners have implemented adequate monitoring and evaluation systems at all levels. The reporting is reliable. The reporting processes are transparent and there is adequate accountability mechanisms implemented. The financial management is quite complicated with detailed budgets and processes that are time consuming and could be simplified.

Both national and provincial governments in China and Vietnam have provided significant financial support as well as policy support to the programme. In Cambodia and Laos the economic support has mainly been in-kind. The governments have made different kinds of commitments to the programme both when it comes to up-scaling the present activities with own resources, policy development and national programmes with national funding.

The recommendations made by the 2009 review mission have been implemented by the programme partners to the extent that the Programme Steering Group agreed with two partial exceptions:

- (1) The 2009 review recommended exploring the potential for collaboration with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). While there is some collaboration with a German-funded project implemented by ASEAN, this evaluation feels that more needs to be done with regard to getting ASEAN directly interested and involved in the more general objectives of the programme of chemicals management and improved regional policies for pesticide risk reduction.
- (2) Similarly, the review recommended the programme should support ongoing regional programmes of established regional organisations in order to provide assurances for sustainability, and in particular would do so by linking up with the Secretariat of the Asia Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC), hosted by FAO-RAP, to support the programmes of its standing committees on IPM and pesticide management. While there is ongoing interaction between FAO's IPM activities and the APPPC, the involvement of the APPPC with the wider work on pesticide risk reduction and improved regional regulation of pesticides was not apparent to this evaluation.

The technical options and training methods are up to date with today's development approaches.

Within the programme impact assessment studies have been carried out in Vietnam and Cambodia under the FAO component. In addition, an impact assessment study has been presented in China; however, not as part of the programme. The impact assessment studies are done with the use of established methods and models. The impact assessment studies have to some extent but not enough been used for advocacy and policy support. At present the most important results from the studies from Vietnam and Cambodia are being summarised in a format that allows for wider dissemination.

PAN AP partners actively ensure not only participation of women in all local activities but also focus studies on impact of pesticides on women in Cambodia and Vietnam and involve

women in the advocacy work. However, otherwise there have in practice been limited possibilities to address gender issues by programme partners in spite of targeted efforts by the FAO-IPM programme. Participation in for example Training of Trainers (TOT) and FFS are primarily guided by other criteria but where the gender aspect is a sub-criterion.

Programme partners have to a large extent used the regional network for planning, implementation and evaluation of programme activities.

The assumptions mentioned in the LFA have been addressed by having a flexible approach in the implementation of the programme. No systematic risk assessment was carried out; however, in practice the programme partners have applied adequate risk management.

### **1.2.3 Efficiency of programme implementation**

The programme design has been proven to be cost-effective at the regional level. The Programme design as such has the potential of being cost-effective also at other levels. But there is a need to specify the responsibilities for each programme partner and their partners in turn when it comes to how to establish and maintain cooperation with the other partners at the national level and below.

None of the implementing partners has established any instruments to measure cost-effectiveness. However, considering the limited amounts being invested in this programme, and the apparent quite wide awareness of its work and benefits, it would be safe to say that it is likely to be a cost-effective investment.

### **1.2.4 Relevance of the programme**

The programme and its design are relevant for addressing present and future priorities and needs. The programme design allows adjustments to changing circumstances and new opportunities; however, this has not yet been tested extensively in practice, though there are some examples of adaptation of programme design, such as the decision to shift response to industry pressure from national to more effective local level and the efforts to deal with new emergency pest outbreaks. Also, partners have not been forced to adjust to new emerging needs/problems within the framework of the programme.

According to the interviewees the programme's development objectives and immediate objectives are feasible. The specification of targets for the extension period is stated to be more realistic compared to that stated in the first period.

The established relationships with external institutions have been functional and beneficial for the programme.

### **1.2.5 Sustainability**

Finally, the Evaluation Team has analysed to what extent the results achieved can be sustainable and the prospects of sustainable positive effects from the provided support.

The programme promotes and ensures sustainable regional exchange and coordination in order to achieve pesticide risk reduction and good chemical management.

The programme design allows for synergies/synergistic effects and encourages further collaboration. However, the added value of having the different components working together



under the same umbrella will have a potential of increase significantly should the collaboration between governments and CSOs be further developed at all levels.

The interviews agree that it was correct to adopt a 10 year horizon for the programme. No measures are being built in to enhance independent continuation by the recipient governments, CSOs and farming communities. Anyway, the Team has found that some evidence is already visible of the intention of the stakeholders to independently continue programme-promoted initiatives.

However, a programme like this one, with a very limited budget in each country and able to reach only a very limited number of *direct* beneficiary households, is only meant to act as a pilot or demonstration to be used to draw attention to the advantages of the approach being used. The value of these actions can only be measure by the wider impact of these demonstrations on government policy and civil society awareness.

### **1.2.6 Lessons learned**

To achieve the overall long-term objective “*Health and environmental risk reduction through capacity building for the proper management, and sustainable use, of agricultural and industrial chemicals*” as well as the medium-term programme objective “*Enhanced regional collaboration to strengthen capacity for pesticide risk reduction and chemicals management in the partner countries in South East Asia*” activities need to be implemented, applying different perspectives. The programme is developed under four different “*immediate objectives*”, which to a large extent seems to be constructed according to the programme partners implementing them, more based on practical reasons, than on other reasons. Lessons learned by the implementation of the programme demonstrate that in order to reach the different objectives it is important not to downplay any of the following aspects:

- that there is clear scope for increased coordination between the programme partners overall, while recognizing that different partners play inherently different roles;
- that there are different needs when it comes to partner-cooperation at local, provincial, national and regional level respectively;
- that the programme needs are different at different time-perspectives, from a short-term local “service delivery” perspective to a more long-term national and regional policy/sustainability perspective; and
- that there can be different types of solutions to the issue of ‘organisational homes’ after finalization of the programme.

These four main areas of lessons learned are discussed more in detail in sub-sections 7.2-7.5 below.

## **1.3 Recommendations**

The recommendations are presented at the end of each section. In summary, the Evaluation Team has provided a number of recommendations as specified below divided into two broad categories as requested in the ToR.

- Recommendations for project activities until June 2013
- Recommendations for project activities beyond June 2013

However, the Team has added one more category where we have found the recommendation to be equally relevant in both the short term and the long term perspective:

- Recommendations for project activities until and beyond June 2013

Please note that the recommendations in each category are presented in the order they appear in the report. Thus, they are not ranked in any way.

### *Recommendations for project activities until June 2013*

In a shorter time-perspective, until June 2013 the following actions that will contribute towards increased effectiveness and a successful termination of phase 1 are recommended:

- It is recommended to ascertain systems for impact assessments where possible within existing budgets, as well as compatible reporting systems, to clearly assess results against which the strategic work towards a non-toxic environment can be continued within the governments
- It is recommended to further develop the Regional Chemical Management Forums aiming at making them an instrument where contentious political aspects concerning the use of pesticides can be discussed on the countries' own conditions
- It is recommended to continue promoting a more detailed system for training of farmers to ensure a system where farmers and other pesticide customers can make sure the pesticide substance they use contains as low toxicity as possible and still is effective. PRR should be more emphasized in training of farmers rather than IPM with more training dealing with "*alternative methods instead of safe use of pesticides*".
- It is recommended to continue to build capacity for enforcement of pesticide legislation through inspection in a manner that sets achievable targets
- It is recommended to facilitate possibilities for governments to constitute by-laws to the pesticide regulation that will get into force when the pesticide regulation that is now in the process towards a legal agreement and that will ensure possibilities to control illegal import of banned pesticides
- It is recommended to initiate discussions on an organisational structure/solution that might serve as the foundation for the programme during a later phase. Such discussions should be more formalized during the phase beyond 2013
- Instruments to measure cost-effectiveness should be introduced
- The impact assessments carried out should also look at the programme's impact on reducing costs related to health, environment, etc., rather than only economic return on production, in order to confirm cost-effectiveness of the programme.
- At the national level coordination and cooperation between Governments, CSOs, research communities, universities and private sector need to be strengthened when it comes to pesticide policy's formulation and implementation, and institutional networking
- In some cases, the priorities of the government and the priorities of the farmers are not identical. The Programme design and implementation needs to be reviewed in order to address the gap between the government and farmers' priorities in the context of Programme implementation.

### ***Recommendations for project activities until and beyond June 2013***

The following recommendations are equally valid for programme activities both until and beyond June 2013:

- Due to a complex programme structure the evaluation of the programme concerning economic benefits are complicated. Therefore, there is a need for more assessments of impacts on reducing costs related to health, environment, etc., rather than only economic return on production, in order to confirm cost-effectiveness of the programme.
- The programme needs to begin looking seriously into the issue of who will continue to host and support inter-country coordination and networking activities. This could be one of the regional institutions mentioned in the report or another solution, such as a rotating steering committee, the attachment of this activity to some other ongoing related initiative in the sub-region. While some interaction exists, e.g., on regional exchange through the APPPC, a full-scale host institution for coordination of future PRR and chemicals management activities has not been agreed upon. Once this is decided, work should begin right away on transferring regional coordination activities to the selected institution/system.
- Apart from IPM long-season training, it is recommended that the programme should review and adapt new training methodologies with short term trainings with more emphasize on pesticide risk reduction and identifying target groups of training in addition of farmers including local leaders and distributors of pesticides
- It is recommended that the programme should take an active interest in ensuring that the different partners involved in the four components of the programme work as much as possible in close coordination with each other, to avoid duplication and encourage synergies.
- The programme should seek to get involved more widely in each country (and regionally) with the most important entities which could contribute to this work, in particular ministries and other government entities with an interest in the programme objectives and outcomes. This involvement has the potential to smooth the path for programme adoption by government, and to develop supportive synergies with a wider range of partners.
- The programme stakeholders, and especially the implementing personnel, need to take the concept of “Exit Strategy” as a permanent action, not a circumscribed exercise for the end of the programme. The programme must *already* be strongly focused on the ‘exit strategy:’ i.e., moving everything more and more fully in governments’ and civil societies’ hands (respectively as appropriate).

### ***Recommendations for project activities beyond June 2013***

For project activities beyond June 2013 the following is recommended:

- It is recommended to ensure that the countries recognise full ownership over the programme and are fully committed towards its full implementation
- It is recommended to initiate negotiations concerning an organisational structure for the programme; a structure based at regional level and where the Regional Chemical

Management Forums might be a foundation for cooperation, towards which the programme partners would contribute

- It is recommended that the programme in cooperation with APPPC should promote regional harmonisation on policy, pesticide/chemical laws and regulations and harmonisation of pesticide registration
- As point of departure the programme should take the already established visions for the participating countries for example the Institutional Vision for MARD 2020 in Vietnam
- Regarding enforcement of pesticide legislation, assistance should be provided to make it more feasible for those regulated to meet the legal requirements. For instance, in order to require that all pesticide labels are in the local language, one may need to focus on the supply chain. At the national level it should be considered to include explore and develop a stick and carrot approach to enhance adherence component on addressing the problems related to of pesticide companies to regulatory requirements
- The ultimate goal of the programme should be based on the principle of full ownership for the regional and national partners to sustain the achievements with adequate own human and financial resources
- A clear exit strategy should be built in the programme
- On the regional level it should be considered to include a component to monitor and influence the pesticide companies/industry to implement international standards on industry responsibilities including the full implementation of the FAO International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides, and the recently adopted UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations “Protect, Respect and Remedy” Framework.”
- On the regional level it should be considered to include a component on how to address the distribution of illegal pesticides
- It should be considered to include a component on policies and strategies for disposal of pesticides and the disposal process.
- Dependent on the situation in the country it should be considered to invite representatives of relevant organisations in Myanmar to relevant regional activities, and consequently to include Myanmar in the field activities if appropriate partners can be identified.

## 2 Introduction

### 2.1 Background and Context

#### 2.1.1 *Chemical management in South East Asia*

Despite official attempts to adopt international regulations and standards for chemical management (in South East Asia), the implementation gap between developed and developing countries is still wide. Even if regulations are in place (for example, in the area of importation,

distribution and use of pesticides), the capacity to enforce them is weak or non-existent. Environment and health problems due to the use of chemicals have become an increasing burden and often it is the poor that suffer the most.

In the analysis of an appropriate agenda for the Swedish Environmental Secretariat for Asia, SENSE (a former part of the Swedish International Development Agency), building on comparative strengths of Sweden and needs of the Asia region, chemicals management was found to be an area of priority. This programme is the result of SENSE's initiative, who in the spirit of the Policy for Global development (PGD) involved KemI (Oct 2004), identified potential partners in the region and led subsequent preparative dialogue and deliberations. SENSE has thus owned the process of preparing the start of this programme although ownership was transferred to the implementing partners with KemI as lead agency in 2006. KemI has aligned their development work with Sida through a new framework agreement that was signed in December 2010. The initial project period from January 1, 2007 to June 30 2010 was a learning period for KemI, which needed to accustom to its new role in Swedish international development cooperation. Phase 1 of the programme has been extended with three years through a new contract with end date June 30, 2013.

The geographical scope of the programme is South East Asia, with a primary focus on the Greater Mekong Sub-region and the countries of Cambodia, China, Laos and Vietnam in particular.

The long-term vision of the programme is to enhance regional collaboration in support of efforts to strengthen national capacities. Pesticides issues are tackled from three angles that mutually reinforce each other: (i) broad awareness raising; (ii) strengthening of regulatory control; (iii) promotion of integrated pest management to make farming communities less dependent on pesticides and to help them move away from hazardous products. The programme has a total budget of 93.5 Million SEK.

### **2.1.2 Swedish policy and priorities**

Sustainable use of natural resources and protection of the environment are fundamental goals of the Swedish development cooperation. Sound management of chemicals is one of the priority areas for achieving these goals. Sweden has further made strong commitments to support partner countries in their efforts to achieve the UN Millennium Development Goals.

Sweden has been pioneering in the development of sound chemical management and was the first country in the world to create a public authority, the Swedish Chemicals Agency (KemI), with the mandate to develop an efficient and sound chemicals management.

The Swedish Parliament has adopted 16 environmental objectives out of which one is a policy in support of achieving a non-toxic environment. Sweden is today very active in international efforts to reduce the environmental and health impacts of hazardous chemicals. Sweden also held the international chairmanship in the process towards the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) a policy framework to promote chemical safety around the world that was negotiated and globally agreed in 2006.

Sweden has also contributed through research to much of the understanding of the interaction between chemicals and the environment.

The Swedish government has come to pay attention to the incorporation of this work into the Swedish development cooperation. In the declaration of parliament 2004 and its

Environmental emphasis and in the Letter of Appropriation for several years it has been indicated that Sida should cooperate in the area of chemical safety. In KemI's instruction it is stated that KemI shall contribute to the environmental work in the Swedish international development aid cooperation. Priority should be given to assisting Sida in the work with capacity development in cooperation countries that will lead to the development of an effective chemical management and the implementation of international conventions and regulations.

### **2.1.3 Regional Strategy for South East Asia**

The Swedish government Regional Strategy for South East Asia 2010-2015 declares that one of three strategic areas of cooperation is the environment and climate, sustainable use of natural resources which includes building institutional capacity and environmental protection for the Mekong countries. The strategy specifically mentions chemicals management as a key area where Sweden has comparative advantages.

### **2.1.4 Programme partners**

- **FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific**, which works directly with relevant government departments and NGOs in the countries concerned in developing and implementing national IPM-PRR programmes, and provides the Secretariat for the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC).
- **FAO Headquarters, Pesticides Risk Reduction Group**, which works directly with government departments responsible for regulatory control of pesticides and receives assistance from the FAO Legal Development Service and the Secretariats of the Rotterdam Convention and the International Code of Conduct on the Use and Distribution of Pesticides.
- **Pesticide Action Network for Asia and the Pacific (PAN-AP)**, which has a longstanding programme on awareness raising about pesticides and on community involvement in monitoring pesticide use. Under this programme, PAN-AP assists national partner CSOs in the programme countries with initiating or strengthening programmes on awareness raising, advocacy and monitoring.
- **The Field Alliance (TFA)** is a CSO network in South East Asia that works through various educational programmes under the Ministries of Education and assists with the development of school and community curricula on pesticides, biodiversity, ecology, etc. The underlying strategy is that education of children in rural areas in these subjects will influence not only their own approach to farming later, but also has a proven direct positive effect on the farming practices of their parents as the approach is designed to question practices of their parents and to encourages discussion towards change.
- **The Swedish Chemicals Agency (KemI)**, the government agency responsible for chemicals management and pesticides issues in Sweden. Besides its administrative responsibilities for the overall Programme, KemI itself also plays an active technical role in Objective 3 and is responsible for implementation of Objective 4.

### **2.1.5 The Programme**

The overall objective is “*Health and environmental risk reduction through capacity building for the proper management, and sustainable use, of agricultural and industrial chemicals*”.

The Programme objective is “*Enhanced regional collaboration to strengthen capacity for pesticide risk reduction and chemicals management in the partner countries in South East Asia*”.

Phase I started in 2007 for a three year period. An independent Mid-Term Evaluation conducted and commissioned by Sida in 2009 confirmed that the Programme addresses concrete needs of the countries concerned, meets Sida criteria and has delivered considerable and important achievements, but that more time is needed to implement the Phase I logical framework before moving towards a second Phase<sup>1</sup>.

The immediate objectives of Phase I have been changed in the amendment. For the ongoing period they are<sup>2</sup>:

**Objective 1:** Increased awareness among farming communities, consumers and decision-makers in South East Asia on the risks associated with pesticide use and their alternatives.

**Objective 2:** Strengthened capacity to innovate and scale up Integrated Pest Management (IPM) in partner countries.

**Objective 3:** Strengthened regulatory framework for the control of pesticides in 2-3 project countries.

**Objective 4:** Strengthened Chemicals Management Capacity within authorities, industries and stakeholders in the partner countries.

## 2.2 Purpose of the Evaluation

The evaluation is intended to assess the achievements to date of the extended phase I objectives and outputs formulated in the Programme Documents and revised (2010) Logical Frameworks<sup>3</sup>. The mission will review actions taken –and resulting impact thereof- by the Programme in follow up to recommendations made by the first (2009) Mid-Term Review. The evaluation team should provide recommendations to the Governments, FAO, KemI, PANAP, TFA and the donor on further steps necessary to consolidate and/or expand the work undertaken by the Programme as to ensure achievement of the developmental objectives. The recommendations shall cover both the remaining part of the existing agreement as well as the envisaged second phase. The evaluation will examine the ways forward to further advance regional collaboration on chemical management, including resources mobilization to ensure sustainability of the intended Programme results.

## 2.3 The Evaluation Team

The Swedish (KemI) has commissioned the Swedish management consultancy company Professional Management AB to carry out the Evaluation. The Evaluation Team comprises

- Dr. Gunilla Björklund
- Mr. Dam Quoc Tru
- Mr. Daniel Shallon
- Mr. Arne Svensson (Team leader)

<sup>1</sup> Towards a Non-Toxic Environment in South East Asia. Phase 1. Application for 3 year extension of Phase I from 1 July 2010 to 30 June 2013,

<sup>2</sup> LFA Matrix, consolidated 2010-09-21

<sup>3</sup> Terms of Reference for Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme “*Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia*”, Call for tenders, 2011-07-06

The FAO Expert Mr. Daniel Shallon is contracted separately by KemI. The other three consultants represent Professional Management.

## **2.4 Methodology and implementation of the Evaluation**

### **2.4.1 Assignment approach and comprehension**

In this section of the Evaluation Report, we elaborate on three methodological issues pertaining to the Evaluation informed by ToR: The methodology which was used, including a matrix with systematic elaboration on how information was gathered and verified per question; the implementation plan including the inception of the assignment; and reporting.

### **2.4.2 Methodology**

#### ***General approach***

The Evaluation Team has used the criteria and principles as outlined in the OECD-DAC Evaluation Quality Standards and Sida's Evaluation Manual, "*Looking Back, Moving Forward*".

The Team has also used INTOSAI's Standards and Guidelines for Performance Audits in relevant parts of the assignment especially when it comes to the criterion Efficiency.

The Evaluation Team has identified interviewees and drafted questionnaires in lieu of the purpose and main objective of the Evaluation in close cooperation with the Client.

An Inception report was submitted 2011-09-21 and approved by KemI (Appendix 2).

#### ***The Evaluation Matrix***

The Scope of the Evaluation is specified in the ToR (Appendix 1). We have assessed the programme according to the criteria recommended by OECD/DAC and adopted by Sida as standard yardsticks for the evaluation of development interventions.

For the purpose of identifying interviewees and drafting the questionnaires, the Evaluation Team has in the Inception report elaborated on a Verification Matrix (Appendix 2).

The points of departure for the evaluation are (1) the Programme documents and (2) the summaries for each country programme produced by project management covering the points of the evaluation terms of reference. The summaries were regarded as the project management's self-evaluation. These summaries were structured in the same way as the ToR and answered the evaluation questions 1-19 one by one.

The verification of the information in the self-evaluation was ensured through desk studies and multiple interviews with various stakeholders and not only policy makers. There were also interviews with officers in multi-lateral organizations as well as some NGOs and civil society organizations in the selected countries. These interviews are important for canvassing broader views on the outcome and impact of the interventions. To be sure, these were verified through interviews with policy makers and other stakeholders and vice versa.

The final stage in the analysis of data consists in combining results from different types of sources. As is detailed in our validation matrix the data-collecting techniques – studies of



written documents, interviews etc - that are used varies from one evaluation element to another. Thus, the evidence was a combination of documentary, physical, testimonial and analytical. In this way the Team provides reasonable assurance that evaluation evidence is competent (valid and reliable) and actually represents what it purports to represent. The evaluation criteria representing the normative standards against which the evaluation evidence is judged varies also; however, in many cases there is establish international best practice or good practice to compare with.

### ***The Field visits***

The Field visits in the programme region have taken place in November 2011 starting with a two day briefing period in Bangkok. Prior to this, the Team members should have had received written documentation on the programme, including summaries for each country programme to be produced by project management covering the points of the evaluation terms of reference. Two of the programme partners submitted these documents in accordance with ToR, one handed over the document during the briefing in Bangkok and one sent it to the Team later.

For the efficient performance of the field studies, the team members have worked in sub-groups as follows:

**China:** Mr. Svensson and Mr. Shallon

**Vietnam:** Mr. Svensson and Mr. Tru

**Cambodia:** Dr. Björklund and Mr. Tru

**Laos:** Dr. Björklund and Mr. Shallon

The field visit in China has included visits to Beijing and the two provinces Yunnan and Guangxi.

The fieldwork has been wrapped up with three days in Bangkok for team discussion and preparation of a summary of preliminary findings and conclusions, and a formal debriefing at a programme stakeholders' meeting to discuss the summary. Representatives of the participating countries, implementing agencies and donor partners have joined this formal debriefing session (Annex 3). In addition, the Team had an informal debriefing meeting with the programme partners and another debriefing meeting with the FAO Assistant Director General.

FAO-IPM has assisted in booking the interviews and the logistics which is highly appreciated. Please find attached the full programme for the mission (Appendix 5).

#### **2.4.3 Reviewed Documents and Persons Interviewed**

A list of persons contacted and interviewed is attached (Annex 3). Some of the interviewees have been met more than once. These interviews offered an invaluable insight on the different sub-components of the Programme.

A list of documents reviewed is attached (Annex 4).

## **2.5 This Report and How to Read it**

Following return home, team members provided their contributions to the draft report as assigned by the team leader within one week. The team leader then had one week to complete

the draft report. The findings, conclusions and recommendations are presented in a draft report that is submitted to KemI, the programme partners and Sida as agreed 2011-12-05.

The reference group had two weeks to provide written comments. Following this, the team leader had an additional four days to review the comments and incorporate them as he felt was appropriate, completing the final report. The team leader in addition allocated one day each for the other team members for (1) additional contributions that were requested by the team leader due to the comments/questions received from the reference group and (2) second reading of the final report to make sure that the quality is high and that all team members share the analysis, conclusions and recommendations.

After the receipt of comments the Final Report was submitted to KemI. KemI will submit the report to the programme partners and donor together with its comments.

This Report is divided into six sections as follows:

- The Executive Summary in section ONE contains the overall conclusions and the recommendations.
- Section TWO is introductory.
- Section THREE focus on the fulfilment of objectives and effectiveness of programme implementation
- Section FOUR elaborates on the efficiency of the programme implementation
- Section FIVE contains an assessment of the relevance of the Programme
- Section SIX is concerned with the sustainability of the results
- Section SEVEN summarises Lessons Learned

The various sections of the report answer questions pertinent to the overall purpose of the Evaluation and the elements stipulated therein. The first sub-section in each section contains actual evidence, data and observations that are relevant to the specific questions.

At the end of each section the Evaluation Team has summarized the analyses and drawn some conclusions. Based on the conclusions the Evaluation Team has finally submitted concrete recommendations.

### **3 Effectiveness**

In this section the Evaluation Team has analysed the fulfilment of objectives and effectiveness of programme implementation. The section provides information and analysis of the following Evaluation questions per ToR:

- To what extent has the programme produced outputs and outcomes compared to the revised LFA? What is the prognosis for reaching the targets for outcomes and overall objectives within the programme period?
- Have there been specific implementation problems and have programme partners been able to address these on regional and national level?
- Have programme partners implemented adequate monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, transparency and accountability mechanisms as well as efficient financial management?
- To what extent have governments provided support and made commitments to the programme?
- To what extent have recommendations made by the 2009 review mission been implemented by the programme partners?

- Are the technical options and training methods up to date with today's development approaches?
- How are the impact assessment studies that have been performed within the programme spread and used?
- To what extent has the possibility to address gender issues been taken /used by programme partners?
- To what extent have programme partners used the regional network for planning, implementation and evaluation of programme activities?
- How have assumptions and risks been handled by the programme partners?

### 3.1 Observations and analysis

This sub-section contains actual evidence, data and observations that are relevant to the specific questions. The Team has summarised the conclusions and provided recommendations in sub-section 3.2.

#### **3.1.1 To what extent has the programme produced outputs and outcomes compared to the revised LFA? What is the prognosis for reaching the targets for outcomes and overall objectives within the programme period?**

The outcomes and outputs produced compared to the revised LFA, which was revised to respond to the changes in the programme in the extended period 2010-2013, are here described related to the different immediate objectives of the LFA. As the different partners of the programme also have different responsibilities linked to the programme it is natural that the PAN AP network and the TFA-network are the main contributors of outputs and outcomes under the Immediate Objective 1, while the FAO-RAP and the national FAO-IPM units are the ones implementing the Immediate Objective 2. The Immediate Objective 3, the "FAO Policy Component" is where the outputs and outcomes is a result of FAO, mainly the HQ in Rome, providing technical assistance to help strengthening regulatory control of pesticides. The activities under the Immediate Objective 4 are where the main implementation responsibility lies with the KemI.

The Team has in this sub-section summarized the findings for each of the immediate objectives.

*Immediate objective 1: Increased awareness among farming communities, consumers and decision-makers in South East Asia on the risks associated with pesticide use and their alternatives.*

*1:1 Pesticide monitoring and advocacy/awareness*

*Outputs according to the LFA:* (1) Community Pesticide Action Monitoring (CPAM) undertaken, and results available in partner countries, (2) Attention on pesticide industry and government using the Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides and SAICM as a standard for pesticide use and distribution, (3) Contribution to the effective implementation of the Rotterdam and Stockholm Convention (Governments more aware of field level impacts of pesticides under consideration for inclusion in the Rotterdam and Stockholm Convention), (4) Contribution to the effective implementation of the Rotterdam and Stockholm Convention (Governments more aware of field level impacts of pesticides under consideration for inclusion in the Rotterdam and Stockholm Convention) and (5) Effective PAN AP database and list-serve for information sharing, enhancing networking capacity and policy advocacy.

Community Pesticide Action Monitoring (CPAM) training and activities have been undertaken at local level; in Cambodia by CEDAC, in China by PEAC and in Vietnam by CGFED, all sister-organizations to PAN AP. PAN AP in its self-assessment also describes that their local organizations have trained key farmers to participate in the compliance of specific provisions in the International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides in the community. A Handbook on Community Monitoring and International Advocacy including important information on monitoring of compliance to the specific provisions of the Code, with survey questionnaires translated into Mandarin, Vietnamese and Khmer has been prepared.

SAEDA from Laos in collaboration with the Department of Agriculture organized field work in three provinces at border towns with Thailand, China, and Vietnam in 2011 and collected data on the movement of pesticides with a special focus on banned pesticides. Paraquat and methomyl banned in Laos are widely available. CEDAC from Cambodia also did field work and collected data on illegal pesticides, as reported by the PAN AP. The PAN AP has also, sometimes in cooperation with PAN-International and representatives of the Pesticide Action Network, been actively advocating for the inclusion of endosulfan in the Stockholm Convention and the inclusion of endosulfan and paraquat in the Rotterdam Convention and highlighting that alternatives to toxic pesticides exist etc., at side events at meetings with the Conferences of the Parties to the Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions. Further PAN AP, CEDAC, SAEDA and PEAC are involved in different types of awareness raising activities. The different linked databases have uploaded for easy access lists of hazardous pesticides, information on alternatives and on international regulations etc.

So far the community exchange of capacity and strategy building on pesticides reduction in the countries has been less emphasized by the PAN AP network. However, as the FAO-IPM coordination units in the countries also are undertaking capacity and strategy building on pesticides reduction capacity exchange might take place through the FAO within the different countries. The FAO-IPM has started the coordination through joint meetings particularly in Vietnam and at the regional level. It seems, however, as there is a lack of full coordination between the different partners concerning this.

#### *1:2 Public education and awareness building*

Outputs according to the LFA: (1) Curriculum/ Materials development, (2) Schools and communities projects related to chemical reductions and/or ecological agriculture, (3) Educational Policy Supports and (4) Regional Exchange and Capacity Building.

The public education and awareness building on pesticide risks and ecological agriculture among school children, communities and the public is to a large extent depending on development of appropriate and eligible curricula. The LFA in this process emphasize the Rural Ecological Agriculture for Livelihoods, REAL-programme as an important instrument to reach these targets. The Field Alliance and its partner organisations are the ones running this programme. According to them the curriculum has been translated to the country language and is used in all participating schools. Close to 2000 students and more than 400 farmers have participated in the REAL activities, schools and communities are strongly engaged and community action plans are developed and being implemented in Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam and Thailand. However, implementation in Vietnam has been pending after 2009 due to internal and external problems for the local partner. TFA is in the process of contracting a new partner and, thus, the outcome is uncertain.

Alternative ecological agriculture is integrated into communities' action plans, although the report does not describe to what extent. Educational policy decentralized the certain percentages of curriculum content to the local/school level for Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam and Thailand. Examples of contents have included health, environment, vocational training, agriculture that is responsive to local conditions and needs. The REAL project only seeks policy supports to encourage and motivate schools to continue implementing the curriculum and dissemination to other interested schools/agencies.

An example of where close coordination between the National IPM Programme, CEDAC (local PAN-organisation) and ATSA (local TFA-organisation) is taking place is the development of the National Country Strategy Paper of Cambodia. In that Paper arrangement for working together on Community Education on Pesticide Risk Reduction (PRR) is specified. Such cooperation seems to be less frequent in the other countries.

*Immediate Objective 2: Strengthening the capacity to innovate and scale up Integrated Pest Management (IPM) in partner countries*

*Outputs according to the LFA:* (1) Functional networks of programme partners established on national and regional level as to ensure planning and implementation of more relevant and effective training programmes, with a focus on pesticide risk reduction, (2) Fortified FFS, TOT and Refresher Training curricula and training materials developed with focus on pesticide risk reduction, including IPM for new invasive pest/diseases, crops and climate change adaptation (3) Capacity of national and private sector programmes to train farmers in IPM and pesticide risk reduction strengthened and increased by at least 300 additional trainers in Southeast Asia, with focus on GMS, (4) At least 20,000 additional farmers participated in FFS and Pesticide Risk Reduction Farmer Training in the GMS region and at least 50% of trained farmers involved in community learning activities and implementation of community action plans for pesticide risk reduction. Thousands more farmers in at least three GMS countries will have indirectly benefited from FAO technical support for National IPM Programmes through participation in FFS supported under national government/other donor funded initiatives, (5) Staff trained for internal monitoring and evaluation system for training quality control. National standards for FFS set at a national level. Implementation of FFS standards initiated in four countries and (6) National and local government providing policy and funding support for IPM and Pesticide Risk Reduction training.

It is assumed that countries will endorse the conduct and publication of 'pesticide distribution and use' surveys, which would be an important step of a governmental commitment towards national ownership of the project. The FAO report does not clearly express to what extent this has happened.

Country Strategy Papers have been developed, with participation of all stakeholders, for all four countries. The reporting also indicates that for all four countries, mechanisms for the establishment of linkages with key organisations have been established, which seems a bit vague but is hopefully meeting its objective. The FAO Programme convenes Annual Regional Meetings, to which representatives for the different partners in both Cambodia and Laos were referring to as being very useful. At these meetings the Programme partners are able to share experience. The assumption that 'governments, CSO partners and private sector would commit to joint sharing of experiences and programme planning' is, however, so far only a fact at the local governmental level, in Cambodia and in Laos. At the national government level in these countries this is hampered partly due to lack of legal regulations. In China and Vietnam the contacts between government and CSOs are limited at all levels mainly due to the general attitude towards CSOs.

Regional curriculum development workshops for PRR have been held, existing training curricula and materials have been reviewed, and work on new materials has been initiated. The links between pest/diseases problems and adaptation to climate change have so far only been pursued outside the four GMS-countries.

The capacity to conduct IPM- and PRR- farmer training through the Training of Trainers (TOT) is strengthened in all four countries. So far the assumption that the governments will make the staff available is only beginning to be implemented. The amount of farmers that have participated in 'fortified' FFS supported by FAO is rapidly increasing. And a participatory monitoring and evaluation system for the IPM FFS programme focusing on monitoring the implementation of PRR learning activities have been set up in all four countries.

FAO has supported an Impact Assessment study on PRR in Cambodia and Vietnam. The studies have just been completed and so far the results of the study have not been used in the process of creating increased awareness of the pesticide risks. Only the central, provincial and local governments of China and Vietnam have started to make more considerable investments of own budget into support for IPM-FFS and PRR-training. In Laos and Cambodia the support comes mainly from the local governments.

*Immediate Objective 3: Strengthening regulatory framework for the control of pesticides in 2-3 project countries*

*Outputs according to the LFA:* (1) Improved pesticide legislation in Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam issued or under consideration, (2) Inspection schemes to enforce key elements of the legislation have been developed for Cambodia and Laos, and are under implementation. (3) Contribution to the establishment of pesticide residue testing and pesticide quality control capability in Cambodia and Laos, and (4) Regional collaboration on pesticide regulatory issues strengthened.

FAO HQ has provided intensive assistance to in particularly Laos and Cambodia, and more recently to Vietnam, in their processes to improve the regulatory control of pesticides. In 2010, Laos has issued a new pesticide regulation that was developed, with the assistance of FAO. In Cambodia a new Law on pesticides and fertilizers was in October submitted to the Government Office for approval before submitting it to the Parliament for their enactment, which should be sometimes in early 2012. The MAFF is currently developing relevant regulations. FAO's assistance to the process included an analysis of the regulatory framework and provision of guidance and reference materials to the draftsman in the government and they have provided detailed comments on a draft of the law. FAO has also responded to a request for assistance from Vietnam regarding the preparation of a new Plant Protection and Plant Quarantine law. Such FAO assistance is provided by teams that comprise both technical and legal expertise.

In the process to strengthen the capacity to enforce pesticide regulation, two workshops were organised in Lao with assistance from FAO: (1) A stakeholder workshop to review the draft pesticide legislation; (2) An awareness raising workshop for a broad range of ministries and other stakeholders to launch the new legislation.

In Cambodia awareness raising workshop about the new Law has not yet been held because the Law is not yet ready.

Training material for inspectors and pesticide retailers has been developed and inspectors trained for pilot provinces in Cambodia and Laos. Building on this, an up-scaling to national coverage is foreseen being initiated in both Cambodia and Laos for 2012.

In Lao, the project helped make an arrangement for quality control analysis of pesticides to be done in Vietnam, while in Cambodia FAO advised JICA in enhancing sustainability of a pesticide quality control laboratory they were establishing. The capacity to select and collect samples of pesticides for analysis, however, remains limited in both countries.

In Lao, the project, in close collaboration with another FAO project on capacity building in food safety, helped the government to develop a coordinated approach to pesticide residue testing. This involved assistance to a national round-table on developing a coordinated approach that brought together different ministries and private sector stakeholders. The project subsequently contributed to hands-on training of analysts. In 2010, a first round of analysis was conducted with government budget.

Training material for inspectors and pesticide retailers has been developed and inspectors trained for pilot provinces in Cambodia and Laos. Building on this an up-scaling at provincial level is foreseen being initiated in both Cambodia and Laos for 2012.

The capacity to select and collect samples of pesticides for analysis is limited both in Cambodia and Laos and although assistance not only by FAO but from Vietnam, JICA etc., have been initiated still the situation is unsatisfying and need to be solved.

Regional collaboration is being developed with the Secretariat of Asia Pacific Plant Protection Commission and its Standing Committee on Pesticides.

*Immediate Objective 4: Development of a regional chemicals management forum and a regional programme*

*Outputs according to the LFA:* (1) Needs and priorities identified for strengthening ongoing and establishing new chemical safety measures in Southeast Asia, most notably the Greater Mekong Sub region countries, (2) Capacity of government institutions to handle chemicals safety strengthened (3) Survey of ongoing activities in the area of chemicals management made and outcomes presented in annual reports, (4) Capacity to implement the global system for classification and labelling of chemicals (GHS) improved, (5) Awareness raised on trade related chemicals safety issues, (6) New or revised chemicals legislation adopted and implemented, (7) International conventions on chemicals safety adopted and implemented. Regional cooperation improved and (8) Awareness raised on good governance, gender, corruption and HIV/Aids issues connected to the program

According to KemI that has the implementation responsibility for this Objective the Regional Chemicals Management Forum including a small working group for the Forum is now established. Participants from the countries and the working group identify the most urgent needs to be handled during the Regional Chemical Management Forums. Further needs and priorities will be identified by the end of the programme period. Four Regional Chemical Management Forums have been arranged up till now, promoting both inter-ministerial contacts and networks between the countries. The Regional Chemical Management Forums aim at increased capacity of government institutions to handle chemicals safety, to improve the implementation of the global system for classification and labelling of chemicals in the countries, but also at awareness raising on trade related chemical safety issues, to promote work towards adoption and implementation of international conventions on chemicals safety,

and in this; to improve regional cooperation. As only half of the intended forums so far have been arranged it is still a bit too early to assess their outcomes although the structure is clearly targeting a higher degree of regional ability to cooperate. Comments from participants of the 4<sup>th</sup> Regional Chemical Management Forum, where a large majority came from the central governments, clearly demonstrate their satisfaction of the Forum.

### ***3.1.2 Have there been specific implementation problems and have programme partners been able to address these on regional and national level?***

PAN AP is recognizing as implementation problem the difficulty in outreach to the farmers of only describing the hazards in pesticide use without presenting an alternative such as the ecological alternatives.

The TFA specific implementation problems concerns include: High turnover/changes of staff of partners in China and Vietnam impacted the quality and supports to schools and communities' activities. Schools database of pesticides were not available in Vietnam. Community projects were not implemented in China due to the restriction of schools, children were not allowed to go outside of the school compound, thus community and school projects cannot be implemented. TFA is therefore recruiting a new partner in Vietnam and terminating the school project in China. TFA also terminated the support to Srer Khmer (Cambodia) due to inconsistency of monitoring and support to schools and consequently lack of reported data.

The regional FAO declared not having any specific implementation problems as it could benefit from already established functional partnerships with key government counterpart agencies/national IPM programmes. At national level the main concern was that there were too few possibilities for networking between government counterparts at national and local level and the IPM programme implementers. This concern was in particularly voiced by governmental representatives in Laos but was obviously more due to mis-communication and will be dealt with.

The regulatory component in Cambodia has been more or less stalled related to internal tensions within the national counterpart institution (Department of Agriculture Legislation, DAL). This has also been hampering the possibilities for new legislation and registration schemes to be enforced. The FAO-HQ dealt with the situation by shifting focus to other implementation partners. Pilot inspections in Kandal province, which are implemented by the Provincial Department of Agriculture have been going well and are showing results. In the absence of effective legal tools to enforce the legislation, the effects have been mainly educational. Many shops have made improvements after they understood their legal obligations. Experiences with those not complying have contributed to the shaping of the section in the new Law that deals with inspections, which now provides an improved mandate for inspectors. Inspections will be scaled up to national level after the Law has been adopted.

The start of the Regional Chemical Management Forums was slow but the main reason was to get governments and experts to agree on format and content including process of nominating participants to get the most relevant experts to attend. A small working group has been established to deal with these issues, which seems to be a step in the right direction.

### ***3.1.3 Have programme partners implemented adequate monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, transparency and accountability mechanisms as well as efficient financial management?***



The Monitoring and Evaluation system that is applied by the PAN AP and its sister-organizations is based on criteria within the LFA. The PAN AP partners/sister organizations meet annually to evaluate ongoing projects and the status of activities. The results from the meetings are reported to KemI. All PAN AP activities and financial reports are audited by an external auditor and all documentations are certified by an accredited auditor.

For the TFA, being a much smaller organization, the situation is quite different. TFA conducted periodic monitoring of partners activities through visits and regional meetings/workshops. TFA also conducted the financial audits by external auditor as specified in the LFA. All TFA partners conducted on-going monitor supports to target schools and communities with various degrees. Technical reports and financial reports are submitted as indicated in the agreements between TFA and KemI. Financial audit fees are very high in Cambodia and Laos, over \$2,000, thus auditing is not considered cost effective compared to the funds received. Financial records were asked to be kept and available at all times for audit, if needed. This has however not been studied in detail by the MTE-team and is thus not possible to comment on.

At country and regional level, FAO programme partners have developed detailed progress reports every 6 months. The M&E systems applied are systems developed for training quality control and national standards for FFSs developed for the different countries. Overall financial reporting to KemI is provided every 12 months. The programme benefited from already established accountable and transparent financial management systems operated by FAO at country and regional level.

KemI is conducting evaluation and reporting, including financial reporting for each Regional Chemical Management Forum but admits that evaluation of the Forums can be improved. KemI also compiles reports and financial information from all partners and submits to Sida.

### ***3.1.4 To what extent have governments provided support and made commitments to the programme?***

The principal support by governments to the programme is clearly expressed in all four countries, however somewhat different in nature.

China is providing substantial financial contributions to the programme, in particular for training related expenses for the PRR component where both the central government and local governments have provided funding. Local governments have demonstrated a particular interest to support local PRR and IPM FFS and other programme related training. China's commitment, in particularly at local governmental level is also demonstrated in them funding some 60 facilitators participation in season-long IPM and PRR training courses.

Vietnam is also providing financial support to the programme, both at the national and local government levels. Their support concerns both the programme policy and strategy but in particular to PRR training that would ensure increased food security by increasing the production of safe vegetables. Vietnam is also committed to cooperate with CSOs for example, providing support on IPM training to communities where CSOs are working.

The governments of Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam have committed themselves to the Regional Chemicals Management Forum, including hosting the Forum together with KemI and assigning relevant experts to participate.

However, neither Laos, nor Cambodia is currently in a position to provide financial support to the programme. In Cambodia the IPM programme is structured under the Ministry of Agriculture, Forests and Fishery and the General Directorate of Agriculture is responsible for its implementation, which has clearly demonstrated commitment to the programme. Laos has recently appointed a new IPM Coordinator within the Department of Agriculture, which can also be interpreted as a clear commitment. In both these countries lack of financial resources, more than lack of political will is the main reason for the manpower devoted to the issue still is rather small. Both Cambodia and Laos also demonstrated a clear commitment to cooperate with the CSO partners of the programme, in particular at local level. In both these countries provincial and national level of the Ministry of Education has also provided strong policy support in particular to the TFA implemented activities, the REAL component.

Government support for the reform of pesticide legislation has been good in Lao and Vietnam who both appreciated the assistance provided by FAO. In Cambodia, the process was highly politicized and the responsible government department therefore preferred to conduct the process itself without international assistance, although use was made of initial guidance and comments on a draft.

### ***3.1.5 To what extent have recommendations made by the 2009 review mission been implemented by the programme partners?***

During March-April 2009, an independent Mid-Term Evaluation Study of the Programme was conducted, commissioned by Sida. The evaluation confirmed that the programme remains highly relevant to the recipient countries<sup>4</sup>. A Programme Steering Group reviewed the recommendations and agreed on points where the Programme can be further strengthened during the next three years<sup>5</sup>. This includes agreement that current concept of supporting ongoing regional programmes of established regional organisations in order to provide assurances for sustainability will be further strengthened by linking up with the Secretariat of the Asia Pacific Plant Protection Commission, hosted by FAO-RAP, to support the programmes of its standing committees on IPM and pesticide management. Potential for collaboration with ASEAN will also be explored. However, it is important to note that the overall goal of ASEAN may not be in sync with the best interest of the CSO, as CSOs might not be given equal opportunities and a effective platform for participation.

Annual meetings of government and CSO partners of the FAO Regional IPM Programme will be continued and expanded to include other relevant counterparts. As such, these annual meetings will continue to serve as working group meetings as envisaged in the original Programme document and as recommended by the review mission.

According to the reports, good progress has been made by the programme partners concerning the implementation in accordance with the 2009 recommendations. As issues and recommendations were regularly addressed at the Steering Committee meetings, important items such as collaboration among partners' programmes etc. were regularly discussed. Among important recommendations is the more intensive reporting against the revised LFA where the FAO-IPM component has strengthened the 6-monthly progress reporting at both

---

<sup>4</sup> "Support to the Swedish Chemicals Agency: Towards a Non-Toxic Environment in Southeast Asia", Mid-Term Evaluation Study, Final Report, 30 April 2009, Åke Nilsson, Geoscope AB

<sup>5</sup> Annex III to the programme document "Towards a Non-Toxic Environment in South East Asia. Phase I. Application for 3 year extension of Phase I from 1 July 2010 to 30 June 2013", 2010-

national and regional level. This reporting process, as well as the reports by the TFA-group and by the PAN AP demonstrates the good progress.

On the issue of enhancing regional cooperation, the different partners have different regional coordinating organizations which to them are seen as their logical framework or arena for the cooperation. So is the PAN AP already a framework organization for their activities in Asia-Pacific and the International PAN the over-all framework organization. The FAO components of the programme already work closely with the Asian Pacific Plant Protection Commission, APPPC and its Standing Committees on IPM and pesticide management.

In the discussions of finding an “organisational home” for the project, and that was initiated from the 2009 MTE, two different perspectives can be distinguished; to find a regional “home”-organization that could be an umbrella-organization for the whole programme once the programme funding from the Swedish Sida and KemI is finished; or to promote cooperation between the existing regional “homes”. The key argument for the first would then of course be that the programme unless it will have one “home”-organization will risk dividing into different parts once the Swedish funding ends.

The key argument for keeping the organisational structure at the regional level as separate organizations is that the different partners have different framework structures because of their different characters (role, mandate) – which are also the reasons why they are included as partners of this programme. One of the roles of PAN AP and TFA is their advocacy role. As they are included in the programme partly to question a pure governmental perspective, it might even be contra-productive if they are included to closely under a common umbrella? This is the uniqueness of this collaboration, as CSO’s like PAN AP can highlight areas and gaps between the reality of farmers’ needs and governments’ needs that other programme components may or may not be able to address. So even if the APPPC and its IPM and pesticide committees seem to be a “natural” home, it might be needed to reconsider the issue.

Other recommendations of 2009 evaluation mission like cooperation between the countries in stopping trade of illegal chemicals and controlling and improving legal trade, handling of agricultural chemical waste are still less implemented. No clear solutions have been presented and there is no work plan in place on how to implement these recommendations.

### ***3.1.6 Are the technical options and training methods up to date with today’s development approaches?***

The training methods used by the PAN AP and their sister-organisations during their activities in the countries vary depending on the target audience. In the commune level more hands on methods are used in helping farmers. Workshops are taught using various methods based on participatory action research, visualization in participatory learning methods (VIPP) and CPAM tools. E-learning tools are used for training in China, where internet is accessible to consumers, students and teachers. TFA in their work within the REAL activities have been using up to date content and methods of linking school and community education including development of the Agro Biodiversity and Pesticide Impacts Assessment. And the FAO-IPM component has developed functional networks with a range of private and public sector institutions, which ensure that IPM training content remains up to date and allows farmers to experiment with the latest IPM techniques. Also, according to interviewees the training methods applied by the teams implementing the Objective areas 3 and 4 are up to date with today’s development approaches.

### **3.1.7 How are the impact assessment studies that have been performed within the programme spread and used?**

The PAN AP has conducted its own internal evaluation and planning processes to evaluate their part of the programme and its overall impact. The impact study is used in the PAN AP component of the project, as it feeds into the planning process (to improve implementation plans) and is shared in annual meetings of PAN AP partners in this project and the overall Asian partners of CPAM. However, this impact study has not been used within the Programme as a whole.

In the TFA component data has been collected at the school or community level to track the impact of the programme. The collected data are the impacts of pesticides to health and environment as well as the data on the status of the agro biodiversity. These data are collected as an on-going process by the schools and are used to review and tracking the progress at all levels. Data have been presented in countries' reports, meetings, and workshops.

Impact assessments have so far not been done for the Objective area 4.

The Impact Assessment studies that have been carried out under the FAO components have been analysed and the results are used for advocacy and policy support as well as for curriculum development and strengthening of PRR training. It was, further, used as reference at the Regional Curriculum Development Workshop for PRR training in June 2011.

### **3.1.8 To what extent has the possibility to address gender issues been taken /used by programme partners?**

Work with good chemicals management need to build on and promote education and empowerment of local communities, including women and children who are special vulnerable groups. The phase one-completion programme report for the period January 2007 to June 2010 recognise what has been confirmed by several external evaluation missions concerning the gender aspect; that these issues are carefully considered both in the strategic planning as well as the implementation of the FAO-IPM component

PAN AP is undertaking a 'Women and Pesticides' survey in Cambodia to focus on impact of pesticides on women and use the results for awareness building and its Vietnam partner is focused on gender issues ensuring the incorporation of gender issues in their project. Their expressed policy is to ensure the participation of women in all activities. This is a policy which is shared by the other partners and is evident in the presentation of gender-disaggregated data of who participates and benefits from the programme activities.

All partners are well aware of the gender issue and are promoting the possibility for women to participate in training and FFS, including by sometimes adjusting the time-schedule so that the women, who often are the ones cooking for their families, also can participate. However, all partners in the different countries prioritise that the one in the family, who has the responsibility for pesticide application, also should be the one who will participate in the training regardless of whether that is a woman or a man.

An important remark made during a field session was, however that when the husband come back home from a technical training session there is still a tendency that the wife is listening more carefully to his recapitulation from the session than the other way around!

### **3.1.9 To what extent have programme partners used the regional network for planning, implementation and evaluation of programme activities?**

There are many different kinds of regional networks, which the partners are using: the Programme Steering Committee can be regarded as the most “natural” one for planning, implementation and evaluation of programme activities, in particular when the aim is to maximise a collaborative benefit of the partners cooperating. But the different partners do also have regional networks under which the PAN AP is cooperating with its sister-organisations, TFA with its internal regional network, and the FAO-RAP and the national FAO-teams working within their network. All these networks are of course used when needed. But what might be as important is the networking that is taking place between the partners, regionally or nationally or even locally. From discussions at the briefings and debriefing sessions in Bangkok it appeared as if this cooperative networking was more intense between the FAO and PAN AP and the FAO and TFA than between the two CSO groups.

At the annual meetings, all partner-organisations involved in the programme come together to share and do some level of planning at the national level. This has been facilitated by the FAO IPM programme and is seen as a very useful outcome of the programme and has slowly provided the space for better collaboration, according to PAN AP. Some regional coordination work between partners may also take part at workshops, etc. Planning for implementation of actions under Objective area 4 is taking part at meetings with the established working group with representation from the participating countries.

Some regional planning, sharing of realities on the ground and overview perspectives are also taking place within the partners’ own regional networks. An example of that is the following: PAN AP and partners have collaborated on the “*Communities in Peril*”: Asian regional report on Community monitoring of highly hazardous pesticides use and at international level, PAN AP has worked with various organizations at the international level to publish the “*Communities in Peril: Global Report on health impacts of pesticide use in agriculture*”.

### **3.1.10 How have assumptions and risks been handled by the programme partners?**

Assumptions such as that there should be support for the programme from the local government, that there is sufficient unity within the communities that the communities are sufficiently organized and linked with the CSOs and that availability of information and campaigns would ensure companies and governments’ response, have been ensured within the programme. So have PAN AP’s project partners been able to build and enhance relations and working partnerships with the communities and garnered support of local government authorities. Events have also been organised to bring the communities together for awareness building.

Under the TFA component, PEAC was able to adjust the design of their REAL programme when confronted the restriction of educational policy that impeded the participation of students outside the school compounds as stated in the LFA 1.2.2. However, the high turnover of staff of CRP (Vietnam) was not managed effectively thus impact on the quality of the programme and resulted in termination of support to their organization (1.2.4).

The assumptions and risks such as the ones presented in the LFA under immediate objective 2 have been dealt with reasonably well by the FAO-IPM group, including the governments’ commitments to the programme and to the sharing of experiences as well as making available

staff for participation for training. However, the FAO-RAP remarks that “private sector action to aggressively promote pesticide use continues and is mostly contradictory to the pesticide risk reduction and IPM promotion messages and learning activities supported by this Programme. This fact continues to illustrate the important public sector role in promotion of pesticide risk reduction in line with the FAO promoted good agricultural practices for sustainable intensification of smallholder crop production”. The assumption related to climate change has yet to be dealt with systematically.

The assumptions and risks linked to the Immediate Objective 3 “*Strengthen regulatory framework for the control of pesticides*” have, however, been less easy to adjust to within the programme although it is very flexible. Political tensions between the ministries of Cambodia are largely beyond the influence sphere of the project.

## 3.2 Conclusions and recommendations

### 3.2.1 Conclusions related to each effectiveness issue

The more specific conclusions are presented below under each effectiveness issue.

***To what extent has the programme produced outputs and outcomes compared to the revised LFA? What is the prognosis for reaching the targets for outcomes and overall objectives within the programme period?***

The CSO-partners in the programme are the ones implementing Objective area 1 under the LFA. The work has produced outputs and outcomes in accordance with the LFA. The PAN AP-network is mainly responsible for the advocacy work, trainings and the generation of information materials in local languages while the TFA-partners are producing education material and running the Rural Ecological Agriculture for Livelihoods (REAL)-project to present alternatives to toxic pesticides for school-children and communities. TFA partners are cooperating with FAO/IPM in all countries except China. The CSOs are doing much appreciated work, although without much coordination between the two programme partners. TFA and PAN AP partners are conducting some joint campaign activities in some countries; however, there could be more cooperation for future activities.

However, there is some lack of coordination between the CSOs activities and the Farmer Field Schools (FFSs) which are under the FAO component implemented with government extension services.

The FAO at regional and national levels are coordinating the IPM FFS-work and the PRR-training including all linked components, in accordance with Objective area 2. In this work governments still are not taking the responsibility (i.e., allocating funds) they would need to. However, governments have in theory expressed their commitment in policy and financial support to IPM-PRR training but in practice more support is needed.

Apart from IPM-FFS long season training, other short terms trainings on PRR are existing for example four-days training on PRR in China and Vietnam for farmers, distributors of pesticides and local leaders. There are also examples of short training courses on safe vegetables production and training for other target groups.

The FAO-HQ has, under Objective area 3, made sufficient progress on reform of legislation and development of inspection schemes and the prognosis for reaching targets is positive.

Development of laboratory capacity has been mixed as some of the envisaged activities depend on developments on other projects. A start has been made to further develop regional collaboration through APPPC and this will get more attention in 2012.

The Regional Chemical Management Forums, under the Objective area 4, arranged by KemI had a delayed start but a working group with the participating governments as members, tasked with the arrangements of the Regional Chemical Management Forums has been established. The Regional Chemical Management Forums are regarded by the participants, coming mainly from central governments, as very useful. The Regional Chemical Management Forums are good examples of the need for a platform for regional discussions and future regional cooperation.

***Have there been specific implementation problems and have programme partners been able to address these on regional and national level?***

There have been some more detailed implementation problems experienced by the partners implementing the objective area 1, problems that they have been able to solve. The Regional Chemical Management Forums had a slow start but an established working group has now increased the pace. The main difficulty is the severe internal tensions at the department in Cambodia resulting in almost a halt in the legal process, which now seems to start moving again. The work on inspections in Cambodia has been hampered by main difficulty is the severe internal tensions within the counterpart institution.

***Have programme partners implemented adequate monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, transparency and accountability mechanisms as well as efficient financial management?***

There is no unified M&E system of the programme but the different partners are applying their own systems. These systems as well as the transparency and accountability mechanisms and the efficient financial management systems, although different for the different organisations, are working well. For a possibility to compare data for the M&E-process in a more regional perspective there would be a need to develop reporting systems that are compatible, and for Cambodia and Laos, more indicator-based.

***To what extent have governments provided support and made commitments to the programme?***

The participating governments are providing different types of support. While China and Vietnam are also providing financial support, the economically poorer Laos and Cambodia are currently not in a position to provide such support. All countries are, however, providing policy and strategy support and are building or starting to build IPM-coordination within the governmental structure. This is important for the continued programme implementation.

***To what extent have recommendations made by the 2009 review mission been implemented by the programme partners?***

Almost all the recommendations made by the 2009 review mission have been implemented. The outstanding recommendation is the one of finding a regional “home”-organisation for the programme. Such an organisation should mainly ensure programme continuation once the programme support from Sida/KemI is ended. There is, however, a contradictory opinion saying that a single “home”-organisation where governments and CSOs would collaborate

might jeopardize the latter's advocacy-role. The issue must therefore be thoroughly discussed before a decision is made.

***Are the technical options and training methods up to date with today's development approaches?***

The technical options and training methods used are up to date with today's development approaches.

***How are the impact assessment studies that have been performed within the programme spread and used?***

Impact Assessments have so far not been fully undertaken or utilized. However, the FAO components have demonstrated their importance and usefulness. The FAO IPM Component should be commended for piloting such studies in a scientific manner (multi-year before and after/ with-without).

***To what extent has the possibility to address gender issues been taken /used by programme partners?***

All community based activities are designed, planned, implemented and evaluated with gender aspects taken into account. For the FFS training the Programme has developed a gender manual. Also, in the impact assessments and the reporting the programme partners have been using gender disaggregated data that allows for analysing gender issues. In the selection process for the trainings it is considered most important to allow the family-member, who is the one dealing with the pesticide application also to be the one participating in the training.

***To what extent have programme partners used the regional network for planning, implementation and evaluation of programme activities?***

All partners seem to realise the importance of networking, both within their own organisational structure and within the regional framework of the programme although some additional efforts, particularly between PAN AP and TFA should be promoted.

***How have assumptions and risks been handled by the programme partners?***

The programme can be seen as flexible enough to allow for possibilities to deal with this as well as other assumptions and risks presented in the LFA.

### **3.2.2 Overall conclusions**

Generally it can be concluded that the programme implementation is closely following what is presented as indicative activities in the LFA. Only when it comes to outputs where the assumption is foreseeing a risky scenario there are examples where the advances are not fully meeting the expected results of the programme. One example of such an assumption is the political will that would be required for the programme to be able to strengthen the government's possibility to issue a regulatory framework for the control of pesticides. Political risks should always be assessed and when the risk is high the Programme must be in a position to limit the risks through proactive risk management.



The 2009 recommendation that is so far not met concerns finding a regional “home” for the programme, which would also be part of an “exit strategy”. The discussion present two different perspectives to that issue: (1) For the programme composed by 4 objective areas and 4 different executing organisations, one common regional organisation, one “home”-organisation, might seem natural, or else the programme might fall apart after the end of the second phase of the Sida/KemI-funded project. (2) The opposite perspective is that the CSOs may not naturally be included under the framework of APPPC or ASEAN as the regional umbrella organisation. The overall goal of ASEAN may not be in sync with the best interest of the CSO, as CSO might not be given equal opportunities and a relevant platform for participation. Maybe an umbrella-organisation where all the partners could cooperate is not such a good idea; under this kind of structure the advocacy role of the CSOs may not be possible.

It is also important to ensure full commitment from the governments. Full commitment would include also financial commitment. As also the governments of Cambodia and Laos now are building an IPM-unit within the government, this could be a first step towards a fully governmentally own structure under which more in-depth IPM- and PRR-training would ensure the foundation of a policy and strategy directed towards pesticide risk reduction in the countries.

### **3.2.3 Recommendations**

#### **3.2.3.1 Recommendations for project activities until June 2013**

In a shorter time-perspective, until June 2013 the following activities that will contribute towards increased effectiveness and a successful termination of Phase 1:

- It is recommended to ascertain systems for impact assessments where possible within existing budgets, as well as compatible reporting systems, to clearly assess results against which the strategic work towards a non-toxic environment can be continued within the governments
- It is recommended to further develop the Regional Chemical Management Forums aiming at making them an instrument where contentious political aspects concerning the use of pesticides can be discussed on the countries’ own conditions
- It is recommended to continue promoting a more detailed system for training of farmers to ensure a system where farmers and other pesticide customers can make sure the pesticide substance they use contains as low toxicity as possible and still is effective. PRR should be more emphasized in training of farmers rather than IPM with more training dealing with “*alternative methods instead of safe use of pesticides*”.
- It is recommended to continue to build capacity for enforcement of pesticide legislation through inspection in a manner that sets achievable targets
- It is recommended to facilitate possibilities for governments to constitute by-laws to the pesticide regulation that will get into force when the pesticide regulation that is now in the process towards a legal agreement and that will ensure possibilities to control illegal import of banned pesticides so does.

- It is recommended to initiate discussions on an organisational structure/solution that might serve as the foundation for the programme during a later phase. Such discussions should be more formalized during the phase beyond 2013.

### **3.2.3.2 Recommendations for project activities beyond June 2013**

The Team has the following recommendations for project activities beyond June 2013:

- It is recommended to ensure that the countries recognise full ownership over the programme and are fully committed towards its full implementation
- It is recommended to initiate negotiations concerning an organisational structure for the project, a structure based at regional level and where the Regional Chemical Management Forums might be a foundation for cooperation, towards which the programme partners would contribute.
- It is recommended that the programme in cooperation with APPPC should promote regional harmonisation on policy, pesticide/chemical laws and regulations and harmonisation of pesticide registration.

## **4 Efficiency**

In this section the Evaluation Team has analysed the efficiency of programme implementation. The section provides information and analysis of the following Evaluation questions per ToR:

- Is the programme design cost-effective?
- Have the separate programme activities been implemented in a cost-effective manner?

### **4.1 Observations and analysis**

This sub-section contains actual evidence, data and observations that are relevant to the specific questions. The Team has summarised the conclusions and provided recommendations in sub-section 4.2.

#### **4.1.1 Is the programme design cost-effective?**

The idea of having a Programme instead of a number of separate projects is that there will be an added value by making sure that the different projects/components and partners are cooperating and make use of each other's resources, knowledge and experience. The four partners executing the programme are, not always but to some extent, working together, thereby using the potential of being cost-effective.

The CSO and NGO-components, mainly including education and training, Farmers Field Schools and advocacy work, the methods used tend to be low-costs or methods were the cost sometimes is carried by other partners, with whom they are cooperating, in publishing material, participating at panel discussions etc. For the FAO-IPM component, impact assessment results showed satisfactory economic and social benefits obtained from the pesticide risk reduction community training programmes. At a regional level, active involvement of the countries in the regional meetings, workshops, training activities, etc. and sharing information by using various media tools has certainly been positive in this sense.

At national level, the Programme closely integrates IPM- PRR activities with other training programmes such as safe vegetable production, training on GAP related to trade promotion, safe use of pesticides etc. which has a positive effect with regard to cost-efficiency. In Cambodia the National IPM-programme continuously makes efforts to update training curricula as to address new emerging issues such as invasive trans-boundary pest and diseases. The programme's design allowed more partners' participation and with strategy to emphasize on community work rather than individual farmers.

Although the Programme design as such gives a potential of cost-efficiency, there is a need to specify the responsibilities for each Partner when it comes to how to establish and maintain cooperation with the other Partners. A prerequisite for partnership is that both partners are interested in the cooperation and take initiatives to make the cooperation work.

#### ***4.1.2 Have the separate programme activities been implemented in a cost-effective manner?***

None of the implementing countries has established any instruments to measure cost-effectiveness. However, the IPM-PRR-component sub-projects and other programmes such as "Safe vegetables production" in Vietnam also show cost-effectiveness. Considering the very limited amounts being invested in this programme, and the apparent quite wide awareness of its benefits, the investments in the programme components in China can probably be considered very cost-effective. In Cambodia, components such as Farmer Field Schools as well as the different experiences with the REAL-project both in Laos and Cambodia were clearly showing the use of cost-effective methods.

## **4.2 Conclusions and recommendations**

### ***4.2.1 Conclusions***

The cost- effectiveness of the programme is difficult to assess due to that none of the implementing partners has established instruments to measure the cost-effectiveness of its own activities.

However, the programme design shows an effort to facilitate cost-effectiveness by implementing different components together and makes use each other resources, knowledge and experiences. Apart from training on IPM-PRR activities, the meetings, workshops, training activities and sharing information by using various media tools are also making the programme more cost-effective.

On the other hand, the programme shows limitations due to: Lack of human resources and technical staff involved. Too many resources are allocated for service delivery without clear links to changes on the policy level (with the possible exception of Vietnam). There are also limitations when it comes to proactive cooperation between the Governments and CSOs working in the Programme. There are few studies undertaken on the impact of the Programme.

### ***4.2.2 Recommendations***

#### ***4.2.2.1 Recommendations for project activities until June 2013***

Two main recommendations are suggested at regional level for the final part of the present programme:

- Instruments to measure cost-effectiveness should be introduced

- The impact assessments carried should also look at the programme's impact on reducing costs related to health, environment, etc., rather than only economic return on production, in order to confirm cost-effectiveness of the programme.

#### **4.2.2.2 Recommendations for project activities until and beyond June 2013**

The following recommendation is valid for programme activities both until and beyond June 2013:

- Due to a complex programme structure the evaluation of the programme concerning economic benefits are complicated. Therefore, there is a need for more assessments of impacts in terms of reducing costs related to health, environment etc. This is more urgent than calculating only on economic return on production in order to confirm cost-effectiveness of the programme.

## **5 Relevance**

In this section the Evaluation Team has analysed the relevance of the programme. The section provides information and analysis of the following Evaluation questions per ToR:

- Is the programme and its design relevant for addressing present and future priorities and needs? Does the programme design allow adjustments to changing circumstances and new opportunities?
- Have partners been able to adjust to new emerging needs/problems within the framework of the programme?
- Are the programme's development objectives and immediate objectives (including specification of targets and identification of beneficiaries) feasible?
- Have the established relationships with external institutions been functional and beneficial for the programme?

### **5.1 Observations and analysis**

This sub-section contains actual evidence, data and observations that are relevant to the specific questions. The Team has summarised the conclusions and provided recommendations in sub-section 5.2.

#### **5.1.1 *Is the programme and its design relevant for addressing present and future priorities and needs? Does the programme design allow adjustments to changing circumstances and new opportunities?***

In all four countries, the Programme is very much in line with the governments' policy and strategy, where the pesticide risk reduction and IPM promotion efforts for sustainable intensification of crop production for increased food security and food safety are of great importance and where other priorities such as care for the environment, good chemicals management and climate change issues also are related to the project design.

In China the Programme is implemented in Yunnan and Guangxi provinces, which both are parts of the Greater Mekong Sub-region. Rice, fruits and vegetables are the most important food and cash crops for farmers in these two provinces. However, these crops are the crops most sprayed with pesticides. The increasing attention being paid by the government of China to the issue of pesticides and pesticide risks, including accelerating issuance of rules,

regulations, bans and guidelines on use of a wide range of pesticides and other agricultural chemicals, indicate that the PRR programme is highly relevant to national policy at this time.

In Vietnam, food safety and food security are highest priorities in the agriculture sector. But at present, pesticides are still heavily sprayed, particularly on vegetables and fruit crops. Since Vietnam joined the WTO in 2007, due to the pressure of market trade and consumers' requirements, production should satisfy to the demand of local consumers and meeting with the standards and requirements of importing countries, therefore PRR is considered as highly relevant to the government policy. Because of that the government is committed to support policy and funds for expanding programme with emphasizing on PRR component.

In Cambodia and Vietnam, the National IPM Programme also continuously makes efforts to update training curricula as to address newly emerging issues such as invasive trans-boundary pest and diseases, and the flexible Programme framework and implementation networks established allow for addressing changing needs and capturing opportunities for new interventions as these emerge.

In Laos, the programme and its design is relevant for addressing present and future priorities and needs, given the current situation, the increasing of land concession, contract farming and farmers gradually increasing pesticide use, herbicides in particular. This is increasing the need for farmer education.

#### ***5.1.2 Have partners been able to adjust to new emerging needs/problems within the framework of the programme?***

Through interviews, different partners have expressed that the Programme design allows for adjustments to changing circumstances and to the new emerging needs. The CEDAC, Cambodia and HAU, Vietnam has started the study on impact assessment to find out specific needs including up-scaling of activities, which would then demonstrate any such needs. The National IPM Programmes in Vietnam and Cambodia with updating training curricula as to address newly emerging issues such as trans-boundary pest's movement with PAN AP and PEAC also addressing this emerging issue in China with seminars with farmers, local government and experts in this field, joint action for illegal trade of pesticides, new pests and diseases on rice, mungbean, cassava and sugarcane and with the flexible programme framework and implementation networks established allows for addressing changing needs and capturing opportunities for new interventions as emerges. The programme design allows for adjustments to changing circumstances and new opportunities; however, this has not been tested in practice to sufficient extent to make an assessment.

In China a situation of fluctuating commodity prices and consequent rapid crop switching by farmers indicated that there might be a need to have more flexibility built in the training programmes and possibly also a shorter version of Training of Trainers to be able to adjust with sufficient rapidity to changing technical needs.

When it comes to emerging needs the further development in Myanmar should be taken into account when planning for the next Phase. Dependent on the situation in the country it should be considered to invite representatives of relevant organisations in Myanmar to relevant regional activities, and consequently to include Myanmar in the field activities if appropriate partners can be identified.

### **5.1.3 Are the programme's development objectives and immediate objectives (including specification of targets and identification of beneficiaries) feasible?**

According to the interviewees the programme's development objectives and immediate objectives are relevant and achievable. The revised LFA is stated as being more realistic than the old one. Community expressed willingness to follow and apply the training/ education on IPM-PRR. The programme has been useful and beneficial for farmers' communities and for the governments' pesticide management and policy reform.

### **5.1.4 Have the established relationships with external institutions been functional and beneficial for the programme?**

In general, the ultimate objective is to reduce the risk of pesticides, to reach that the programme design allows the establishment of relationships between the partners of the programme and important external institutions. In Cambodia, the FAO-IPM component has developed functional networks with a range of private and public sector institutions, which ensure that IPM-PRR training content remains up to date. The governments at local and national level have also gained by these relationships.

In Vietnam, the National IPM Coordinator has played an important role in creating links and establishing contacts with external institutions like private and public sector institutions, NGOs, researchers, policy makers, local governments.

In China the Programme has established limited relationships with external institutions, mainly in the form of involving university faculty as specialists in some of the training activities. This was reported to be successful in both strengthening content of the training, and raising awareness at the university, leading to some further collaboration outside of the project.

Publications like Asian Regional report highlight problems of pesticide use at the national level. CSOs find it necessary to put pressure government to address the problems on the ground. This sometimes can be further enhanced with international action through existing international instruments. Policy advocacy at the international level is effective to provide international standards for national governments to take action. For example, the listing of endosulfan in the Stockholm Conventions is a powerful tool to ensure global ban on endosulfan and the Rotterdam Convention provides tools for information exchange.

However, what should be remarked is the lack of clear coordination and cooperation between governments and CSOs involved in the programme and when it comes to pesticide regulation.

## **5.2 Conclusions and recommendations**

### **5.2.1 Conclusions**

The programme and its design are relevant for addressing present and future priorities and needs. The programme is in line with the governments' policies on chemicals management, IPM/PRR, promotion efforts for sustainable intensification of crop production for increased food safety and food security.

The programme design allows for adjustments to changing circumstances and new opportunities; however, this has not been tested in practice to some more extent. Also in the next Phase it is relevant to focus on the countries that at present are involved in the Programme. However, dependent on the situation in the country it should be considered to

invite representatives of relevant organisations in Myanmar to relevant regional activities in the next phase, and consequently to include Myanmar in the field activities if appropriate partners can be identified.

With updating training curricula as to address newly emerging issues and the flexible programme framework and implementation networks established this will allow for addressing changing needs and capturing opportunities for new interventions as emerges.

The programme's development objectives and immediate objectives are relevant and achievable.

Programme has developed functional networks with a range of private and public sector institutions, which ensure that education/training and other activities remains up to date.

Programme design allows creating links and establishing contact with external institutions like private and public sector institutions, CSOs, researchers, policy makers and local governments.

In some cases, the priorities of the government and the priorities of the farmers are not identical. In reality, Governments interest may not always serve the best interest of farmers; CSO's are actively trying to address this gap by empowering farmers and through policy advocacy work. The programme design and implementation needs to be reviewed in order to address the gap between the government and farmers' priorities in the context of programme implementation.

The profit making endeavour of companies often contradicts with the objective of pesticide risk reduction of the project so given this there should be a component to monitor and influence their implementation of agreed instruments of corporate responsibilities. Efforts to promote adherence to the International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides among pesticide companies should continue at both the regional and national levels.

Disposal operations are extremely expensive and way beyond the scope and budget of this project. In Vietnam there already is a separate GEF project on pesticide disposal. This project and the Programme under review recently agreed to coordinate more closely. In order to develop a more comprehensive view on preventive actions related to the use of pesticides it should be considered to include a component on policies and strategies for disposal of pesticides and the disposal process.

## **5.2.2 Recommendations**

### **5.2.2.1 Recommendations for programme activities until June 2013**

For the national level:

- Coordination and cooperation between Governments, CSOs, research communities, universities, and private sector need to be strengthened when it comes to pesticide policy's formulation and implementation, and institutional networking.
- In some cases, the priorities of the government and the priorities of the farmers are not identical. The programme design and implementation needs to be reviewed in order to address the gap between the government and farmers' priorities in the context of programme implementation.

### 5.2.2.2 Recommendations for project activities beyond June 2013

For the national level:

- As point of departure the programme should take the already established visions for the participating countries for example the Institutional Vision for MARD 2020 in Vietnam
- Regarding enforcement of pesticide legislation, assistance should be provided to make it more feasible for those regulated to meet the legal requirements. For instance, in order to require that all pesticide labels are in the local language, one may need to focus on the supply chain. At the national level it should be considered to include explore and develop a stick and carrot approach to enhance adherence component on addressing the problems related to of pesticide companies to regulatory requirements

For regional level:

- The ultimate goal of the programme should be based on the principle of full ownership for the regional and national partners to sustain the achievements with adequate own human and financial resources
- A clear exit strategy should be built in the programme
- On the regional level it should be considered to include a component to monitor and influence the pesticide companies/industry to implement international standards on industry responsibilities including the full implementation of the FAO International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides, and the recently adopted UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing the United Nations “Protect, Respect and Remedy” Framework.”
- On the regional level it should be considered to include a component on how to address the distribution of illegal pesticides
- It should be considered to include a component on policies and strategies for disposal of pesticides and the disposal process.
- Dependent on the situation in the country it should be considered to invite representatives of relevant organisations in Myanmar to relevant regional activities, and consequently to include Myanmar in the field activities if appropriate partners can be identified.

## 6 Sustainability

Finally, in this section the Evaluation Team has analysed to what extent the results achieved can be sustainable and the prospects of sustainable positive effects from the provided support. The section provides information and analysis of the following Evaluation questions per ToR:

- Does the programme promote/ensure a sustainable regional ex-change and co-ordination in order to achieve pesticide risk reduction and good chemical management?
- Does the programme design allow for synergies/synergistic effects and encourage further collaboration?



- Was it correct to adopt a 10 year horizon for the programme and what measures are being built in to enhance independent continuation by the recipient government departments, NGOs and farming communities?
- What evidence is already visible of the intention of these stakeholders to independently continue project-promoted initiatives?

## 6.1 Observations and analysis

This sub-section contains actual evidence, data and observations that are relevant to the specific questions. The Team has summarised the conclusions and provided recommendations in sub-section 6.2.

### 6.1.1 ***Does the programme promote/ensure a sustainable regional ex-change and co-ordination in order to achieve pesticide risk reduction and good chemical management?***

The regional programme “*Towards a Non-Toxic Environment in South East Asia*” had as one of its main objectives to build regional mechanisms by which the participating countries would exchange information and experiences, coordinate, and possibly achieve agreements and collaborative actions to help move forward on the objective of reducing chemical risks in the Greater Mekong region.

From what this evaluation team was able to observe, the programme has certainly succeeded in achieving regional coordination among the different national components. All of those met who were directly involved in implementing the project, be it on the CSO side, government side, or actual project staff, spoke with varying levels of enthusiasm of the many regional meetings, workshops, networking, information sharing and other regional initiatives under the project.

Most of the regional work is linked to either the IPM component or the CSO/awareness component. However, some examples did exist of programme-sponsored interactions between participating countries in the area of regulation. The example of Vietnam, under the auspices of the programme, assisting Lao PDR (which has insufficient capacities in laboratory testing) to identify composition and origins of chemicals being imported and sold in local markets is a positive one. Likewise agreements on border control collaboration among the countries of the Greater Mekong sub-region is a promising initiative being supported by the Programme, potentially leading to lasting inter-country mechanisms for control of cross-border trade in illegal or controlled pesticides. Also, exchange of information on movements of fake and sub-standard pesticides is one of the activities the project intends to support within APPPC.

However, with regard to the sustainability of the regional coordination, the programme did not appear to be dealing systematically with ensuring the establishment of more than ad-hoc mechanisms for future collaboration. The border control collaboration is an example of an initiative which should result in longer-term agreements between the participating countries. But in the other inter-country coordination work, including the workshops, regional meetings, etc., the evaluation team did not see any evidence of efforts to establish the basis for longer-term mechanisms that would continue after the end of programme funding.

For Components 3 and 4 on policy, regulatory frameworks, legislation, etc., the issue of regional coordination is, of course, even more important than it is for the adoption of PRR training and awareness building in the field. While action has progressed much more slowly in these components, what has been done by FAO and KemI has clearly included attempts at

driving home the importance of international standards, agreements, joint action and collaboration between neighbouring countries, as well as enforcement of global conventions. However here too, it is not clear how this support to inter-country coordination will continue after the end of outside support.

Among other issues, that of identifying a potential institutional home for a long-term regional coordinating structure did not appear to have been addressed. Upon questioning, programme staff indicated that the FAO Regional Office in Bangkok could play this role, though it would probably need to have some type of external funding to continue its coordination activities. It was also suggested that APPPC is a clear potential institution for this role when it comes to PRR, also considering its interaction with the programme thus far. Other potential institutions for which the evaluation team heard arguments for and against were ASEAN, the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC, or A3PC), and the UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP). The evaluation team is not in a position to provide specific guidance to the programme management on the best choice among these or other regional institutions, but encourages management to consider this issue and identify mechanisms to perpetuate the very good work being done under the programme in regional coordination.

#### **6.1.2 Does the programme design allow for synergies/synergistic effects and encourage further collaboration?**

There is no doubt that programme design allows for synergies and indeed encourages them in some areas, though less so in others. As noted above, synergy between the different national components of the programme is an area where much is being done, such as through networking, regional training and coordination meetings.

However, in the area of synergies between government and non-governmental actors – where by design this programme should be creating strong interactions – the picture is more mixed. In both China and Vietnam, the evaluation found that the government-centred components (IPM and policy) were being implemented quite independently of the CSO component (awareness raising and education) other than some collaboration on developing the Country Strategy Paper in Vietnam. In spite of attending some of the same regional workshops and meetings, there was little awareness on either side of the work being done by the others, and apparently not much effort to link or seek synergies. This can be understood to be related to the political culture in those countries, which is only slowly moving toward a greater acceptance of civil society activism.

In Lao PDR and Cambodia the situation is quite different. In Cambodia, government counterparts of the programme are interacting frequently with the CSOs being supported by PAN-AP and TFA. For example, a National Country Strategy Paper has been developed jointly by the government IPM programme and the two local CSO counterparts, CEDAC and ATSA, in which arrangements are detailed for working together on Community Education in Pesticide Risk Reduction.

In Lao PDR, while collaboration is not as systematic or advanced as in Cambodia, the evaluation team observed that one of the CSO counterparts, SAEDA, viewed the programme as a key facilitator in improving its links to government ministries, allowing it to achieved far greater impact. Joint work is being done or planned between the FAO/government IPM unit, the education CSO NALD, SAEDA, and the OXFAM supported Phonsoung Agriculture Development Project.

Another area where synergy is very important to achieving programme sustainability is in the internal synergies between parts of government, where project activities touch on the domains of several different ministries in addition to Agriculture. The Ministry of Environment is the most obvious of these, and the programme has worked with both Agriculture and Environment in nearly all the countries involved (less so in China). However, there are several other ministries which are key to achieving the objectives of the programme.

These include first of all the Ministry of Health, as the PRR work is largely centred on the negative health impacts of agricultural chemicals. However contacts with this ministry appeared strangely absent from the programme discourse during the MTE's field visits. The team was later informed that in the limited area of laboratory work (residues testing in Lao PDR and setting up a pesticide laboratory in Cambodia), this ministry had been approached (as well as WHO in the latter case). The training and education work of the programme also relates closely to the role of the Ministry of Education. Where TFA partners were active, there were generally good links with this ministry and some representatives were invited by TFA to the 2010 annual programme meeting, but this ministry was not present not in any other parts of the programme. Other related ministries with which the evaluation team did not find any active links (other than in the occasional general stakeholder workshops) were Industry, Commerce/Trade, and Science and Research. With regard to Components 3 and 4 on policy and its implementation, political bodies and the Justice Ministry (implicated in the Lao PDR legislation work) will also be key.

Any hope to achieve sustainability of the programme's goals following the end of external funding will necessarily involve the synergies between a number of these ministries. While (to reply directly to the question) programme *design* allows for (does not impede) synergies, the team was nonetheless left with impression that the programme could be quite a bit more pro-active in seeking opportunities for these synergies, both inside and outside of programme.

### **6.1.3 Was it correct to adopt a 10 year horizon for the programme and what measures are being built in to enhance independent continuation by the recipient government departments, NGOs and farming communities?**

The answer to the first question is a clear yes: there can be no doubt that the programme designers were correct to adopt a 10-year horizon for this kind of work. This was evident (as well as fully supported) in all the countries visited. In fact, 10 years is an absolute minimum for such complex changes in technology, economics, politics, legislation and behaviour to develop and become durable. If anything, the donor may expect to be called on to consider a further extension of this timeframe when the 10 years are up, especially for the work in the areas of Components 3 and 4. In this, Sweden has shown a desire to live up to the Paris Declaration commitment to "*provide more predictable and multi-year commitments on aid flows,*" and should, in the eyes of this team, be strongly commended for taking this approach. It should, if anything, be a lesson to be learned by other donors and agencies.

With regard to the measures for post-intervention sustainability, unfortunately the outlook did not appear quite as positive. The observation of the evaluation team in visiting field activities of the project (mostly components 1 and 2) was that the focus of programme personnel tended strongly to be at the level of the individual activities being implemented, without the wider vision of the overall goals of the programme. The measures for success presented by the implementers tended to be limited to whether that particular group of farmers or shopkeepers or school children was benefiting from the programme investment.

However, a programme like this one, with a very limited budget in each country and able to reach only a very limited number of *direct* beneficiary households, is only meant to act as a pilot or demonstration to be used to draw attention to the advantages of the approach being

used. The value of these actions can only be measured by the wider impact of these demonstrations on government policy and civil society awareness. The list compiled in Vietnam on the policy spin-offs from the field work in that country is a good indication of the policy importance of the field work, and an indication that there, at least in part, this issue is already on the agenda.

For the programme to achieve sustainability, the key issue is to move focus of implementing personnel and agencies *upwards*, from field activities to their demonstration and advocacy value. All work of the programme should be oriented toward enabling positive policy change, (including allocation of resources!) by government to support this work.

The predominant vision when discussing the end of project funding with project stakeholders was that there should/would be a vaguely defined ‘exit strategy’ at the end of the programme to deal with the transition out of external funding. The idea was that this would be developed somewhere in the future, close to the end. While common in this type of development programme, this perception is troublesome, as it demonstrates a tendency to dismiss the post-funding phase of the programme in favour of that which is visible today and now. For there to be any hope of sustainability, this vision needs to change.

For the policy and regulatory components (3 and 4), this was not an issue, as the stakeholders involved in this work were of course well aware of the need for policy change and the strategic and long-term view. The issue in this case is just achieving it.

#### **6.1.4 What evidence is already visible of the intention of these stakeholders to independently continue project-promoted initiatives?**

The evidence of intentions to take over the IPM-PRR/FFS work as government policy is already visible mostly in China and Vietnam. Both those governments had already taken up (in the context of IPM work) the concept of less pesticides and softer pesticides, which contribute directly to PRR. Under the present programme, the focus on pesticide/chemical risks is greater, and the shift was easy to make. In both these countries, government resources are already being allocated both centrally and at decentralised levels for implementation of IPM/FFS, and integration of PRR is underway.

It is of note, however, that this government adoption cannot be much attributed to the present programme. In both those countries there has been a strong IPM and FFS programme for nearly two decades, and both also have a luxury missing in Cambodia and especially Lao PDR: a relative abundance of funding for implementation of government policies. Of course to say this is not negative at all, quite the contrary. It is very positive for this programme to be able to tap into ongoing developments in awareness and policy, in order to be able to achieve its own longer term goals.

However, the issue is very different in Cambodia and Lao PDR, where lack of resources means that any attempt to achieve sustainability implies convincing government and civil society to remove funds and personnel from some other priority area to place them in the area of PRR. This did not appear to be happening with much success at the time of this evaluation, especially in the case of Lao PDR. There was some mention by programme staff of interest of development banks and donors in the work of the programme, though it is yet to be seen if this will have a lasting effect on these countries’ ability to internalise PRR.

With regard to the policy, regulatory and legislative changes sought under components 3 and 4, the impression of the team is that significant change will not take place on the basis of

internal action and impulse alone, and that the programme will need to carry through as far as it can (in terms of time and resources) in support of the changes it is seeking to facilitate.

## 6.2 Conclusions and recommendations

Overall, the programme can be said to be having significant impact and be well designed in the areas considered here: regional coordination and collaboration, and— in some aspects — development and support of synergies. However much remains to be done to better orient the vision of the stakeholders working in the programme in order for actions to be more directly aimed at achieving long-lasting change.

The 10-year time horizon is commendable, but likely to need further extension in the case of some countries and some activities. However more of that time than is now the case will need to be seen as mainly focused on ensuring sustainability.

It should be noted that both regional and national organizations working together within the context of this Programme will continue to exist beyond the life-time of this Swedish funded programme. What adds value is the additional scope of coordination and joint activities supported as part of this Programme. Implementation and ownership is, in most partner programmes, already straight into the hands of local governments and civil society organizations. In various earlier evaluations of the FAO-IPM Programmes the importance of an exit strategy has been part of the set of recommendations. Substantial actions must be taken on the transfer of ownership.

Given the topic at hand – sustainability – the recommendations offered do not distinguish between the current phase to 2013 and the following phase to the end of the programme.

### ***Recommendations for project activities until and beyond June 2013:***

- The programme needs to begin looking seriously into the issue of who will continue to host and support inter-country coordination and networking activities. This could be one of the regional institutions mentioned in the report or another solution, such as a rotating steering committee, the attachment of this activity to some other ongoing related initiative in the sub-region. While some interaction exists, e.g., on regional exchange through the APPPC, a full-scale host institution for coordination of future PRR and chemicals management activities has not been agreed upon. Once this is decided, work should begin right away on transferring regional coordination activities to the selected institution/system.
- Apart from IPM long-season training, it is recommended that the programme should review and adapt new training methodologies with short term trainings with more emphasize on pesticide risk reduction and identifying target groups of training in addition of farmers including local leaders and distributors of pesticides
- It is recommended that the programme should take an active interest in ensuring that the different partners involved in the four components of the programme work as much as possible in close coordination with each other, to avoid duplication and encourage synergies.
- The programme should seek to get involved more widely in each country (and regionally) with the most important entities which could contribute to this work, in particular ministries and other government entities with an interest in the programme

objectives and outcomes. This involvement has the potential to smooth the path for programme adoption by government, and to develop supportive synergies with a wider range of partners.

- The programme stakeholders, and especially the implementing personnel, need to take the concept of “Exit Strategy” as a permanent action, not a circumscribed exercise for the end of the programme. The programme must *already* be strongly focused on the ‘exit strategy:’ i.e., moving everything more and more fully in governments’ and civil societies’ hands (respectively as appropriate).

## 7 Lessons Learned

### 7.1 Four main areas of lessons learned

To achieve the overall long-term objective “*Health and environmental risk reduction through capacity building for the proper management, and sustainable use, of agricultural and industrial chemicals*” as well as the medium-term programme objective “*Enhanced regional collaboration to strengthen capacity for pesticide risk reduction and chemicals management in the partner countries in South East Asia*” activities need to be implemented, applying different perspectives. The programme is developed under four different “*immediate objectives*”, which to a large extent seems to be constructed according to the programme partners implementing them, more based on practical reasons, than on other reasons. As the strength of the different programme partners varies this might be important as some aspects or interests might otherwise have been minimized or neglected. However, lessons learned by the implementation of the programme demonstrate that in order to reach the different objectives it is important not to downplay any of the following aspects:

- that there is clear scope for increased coordination between the programme partners overall, while recognizing that different partners play inherently different roles;
- that there are different needs when it comes to partner-cooperation at local, provincial, national and regional level respectively;
- that the programme needs are different at different time-perspectives, from a short-term local “service delivery” perspective to a more long-term national and regional policy/sustainability perspective; and
- that there can be different types of solutions to the issue of ‘organisational homes’ after finalization of the programme.

These four main areas of lessons learned are discussed more in detail in sub-sections 7.2-7.5 below.

### 7.2 Coordination between programme partners

All parties seem to be aware that it is neither always possible nor desirable to have close collaboration between partners. (e.g. CSO’s campaigning for stronger regulatory control of pesticides, and FAO advising governments on how to strengthen regulatory control). The strength of the programme is in exchange and coordination more than in collaboration, although there also are areas where direct collaboration is possible.

Although it is of course very important that the different partners have their respective responsibilities under a programme, and a useful way of identifying these responsibilities might be by tasking the partners with specific parts (or sub-parts) of the programme, it is very

important that coordination, cooperation and information between these sub-parts is frequent and intensive enough.

In the implementation of this programme the FAO is playing a specifically important role as a big part of the programme was developed out of a former FAO-project. The FAO-RAP is conducting bi-annual meetings with the partners and is, thus, promoting cooperation at regional and national level. But this is obviously not enough as the cooperation between the two groups of CSOs including how they use each others competences on awareness-building, or between FAO and each of the CSO-groups, sometimes are not strong enough. Where such cooperation was in place the awareness building and training-/education activities was much more effective. This was demonstrated during the field visit in the Pour village, Kampong Leave district, Cambodia, where farmer groups initiate and manage their own learning activities on how to further reduce pesticide risks under the FAO-supported IPM-PRR programme at the same time as their children were trained in risks of using pesticides in school by the CSO ATSA. The children and their parents, both being taught could discuss and spread the knowledge. And where there has been cooperation by different CSO-groups and FAO in preparing information material that has been able to reach out to larger groups.

There is also a need for closer cooperation between the CSO-partners and KemI in their implementation of the Objective 4. The lack of experienced coordination between these two programme partners might, however, more depend on lack of coordination and awareness between the different groups they are working with, the farmers and communities respective the national government representatives (See below).

### **7.3 Different needs for cooperation at local and regional level**

The programme is building on cooperation between the governments, national, provincial and local, and the CSOs at different levels in the four countries and the programme partners' need to enforce this cooperation. The bottom-up approach in policy development is important and has for a long time been a Swedish priority both in the support to civil society and in public administration.

The Paris-agenda and the Accra Action Agenda have provided guiding principles for Sweden in development assistance. According to the Paris-agenda, the Accra Action Agenda and the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation, the governments (with participation of their parliamentarians, CSOs and other stakeholders) in the countries of cooperation themselves are the ones to democratically own the development projects and their implementation in their countries. Some lessons from implementing the programme, however, demonstrate that better information exchange and cooperation between the different groups would benefit the outcome of the programme. It is also stated that the programme could be a bridge between governments and CSOs.

In one of the countries awareness-building is taking place or is planned at different levels, both at governmental and at community level, and as the different partners were not aware of each other misunderstandings was causing a great deal of confusion. Better information-sharing could instead result in better educated support-groups.

However, it has to be acknowledged that the priority of farmers, CSOs, and governments may be vastly different – for example, calling for bans of certain pesticides that cause acute or chronic effects that the government thinks is economically justified. So there needs to be a different way of working which is not just a question of cooperation but of persuasion.

In some of the countries there was a need to identify the different roles the IPM-coordinators play. As this obviously varies, both due to country size, economy and context and to community structure, it is difficult to find lessons learned that would fit all the countries. What is pretty obvious for all countries, however, is the need to clearly identify the role of the FAO-IPM-advisors and the governmentally designated IPM-coordinators and that they would need to cooperate as tightly as possible – or be the same. Cambodia is an example where that works well.

The regulatory work on pesticides has contributed to increased awareness about issues related to pesticides and the need to regulate and enforce. Findings of studies and pilot activities have fed into the legislative process. New legislation and updated lists of banned pesticides have a lasting effect. The next challenge will be to build, use and maintain the capacity to enforce.

#### **7.4 Short-term local perspective needs to be coordinated with long-term national and regional perspective**

According to the development assistance policy that is identified under the Paris-agenda and that is Swedish priority, any development programme that Sweden supports shall have as one of the goals to build up a sustainable structure, which will allow for the positive outcomes of the programme to sustain after the Swedish funding has finished. For a regional programme to be able to do so there needs to be commitments by the governments towards the programme and towards funding. There also needs to be a programme structure aiming for a more sustainable outcome, and the programme needs to have an “*exit strategy*”.

The different components of the programme do not only have a difference in space with which they working – from local and provincial to national and regional. They also address different time-perspectives. But as they are part of a regional programme there needs to be linkages between them. Currently farmers and local villagers, who are taking parts in Farmer Field Schools or Training of Trainers, mainly feel the need from other farmers etc. to participate in the same type of training. But when more and more of the training is geared towards providing longer Pesticide Risk Reduction training and to where also the governments are sending students to build capacity at governmental level, as is the case in Vietnam a closer link to sustained outcome of the programme is built. And the government is demonstrating commitment.

The links from the local short-term level of mainly service delivery to the Regional Chemicals Management Forum at the regional level which would be the real regional outcome of the programme in a long-term sustainable perspective are still somewhat weak. Particularly it seems as the participants of the different Regional Chemical Management Forums are not always, interactively, reporting back. If the Regional Chemical Management Forum shall be the important regional outcome of the programme and where the emphasis will be during the second phase of the programme it is important that very substantive linkages all the way down to the farmers are ensured otherwise there is a risk that the Regional Chemical Management Forums might be a club for governmentally designated experts, such as some UN-committees, and would then not fulfill the role.



## 7.5 Organizational “homes”

All important “lessons” to be “learned” concerning development programmes clearly indicate the need for an “*exit strategy*”, in particular for the recipient country/-ies to be prepared to implement the continued programme or programme outcomes not to lose what has been gained. This programme has so far not any more detailed such strategy. This has to be prioritized in the near future.

One aspect of an “*exit strategy*” that was already raised in the 2009 MTE was the issue of an “*organizational home*” for the programme. As indicated above in sub-section 3.1.5 there are two different perspectives on this. And even if lessons from other programmes indicate a need for organizational home, they also clearly indicate the importance of trying to find the best possible solution to this.

Appendices

2011-12-22

**Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme  
“Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia”**

***Appendices***

- Annex 1 Terms of Reference
- Annex 2 Inception Report
- Annex 3 Persons Interviewed and Consulted
- Annex 4 Documentation of Materials Reviewed and Cited
- Annex 5 Programme for the Mission 2-19 November 2011
- Annex 6 Report from Field visit to China
- Annex 7 Report from Field visit to Cambodia
- Annex 8 Report from Field visit to Laos
- Annex 9 Report from Field visit to Vietnam

**Annex 1****Terms of Reference**

**KEMI**  
Kemikalieinspektionen  
Swedish Chemicals Agency  
International Secretariat  
Ule Johansson & Jenny Rönngren

Call for tenders

2011-07-06

KemI reference  
number:

240-H11-00833

**The Swedish Chemicals Agency invites interested parties to make a tender for a  
Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic  
environment in South East Asia"**

**Terms of Reference for Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme  
"Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"**

This document outlines the Terms of Reference for the Mid-Term Evaluation of the Sida supported programme on chemical management in Southeast Asia, a regional programme headed by the Swedish Chemicals Agency (KemI) entitled; "Towards a Non-Toxic Environment in Southeast Asia". This evaluation should build on an earlier review commissioned by Sida in 2009. The evaluation will cover the main features, experiences and results of the programme to date (2007-2011), make suggestions for any adjustments in programme strategies and work plans for the remaining years of Phase I (until the end of June 2013) and spell out recommendations and priorities for continued work in a possible Phase II of the programme (beyond June 2013). The results will be used by the programme partners for further development and implementation of the programme as well as by Sida as a part of their reporting to the Swedish government and as a base for future decisions concerning the programme.

**1. Background*****Chemical management in South East Asia***

Despite official attempts to adopt international regulations and standards for chemical management (in South East Asia), the implementation gap between developed and developing countries is still wide. Even if regulations are in place (for example, in the area of importation, distribution and use of pesticides), the capacity to enforce them is weak or non-existent. Environment and health problems due to the use of chemicals have become an increasing burden and often it is the poor that suffer the most.

In the analysis of an appropriate agenda for the Swedish Environmental Secretariat for Asia, SENSEA (part of the Swedish International Development Agency), building

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

on comparative strengths of Sweden and needs of the Asia region, chemicals management was found to be an area of priority. This programme is the result of SENSEA's initiative, who in the spirit of the Policy for Global development (PGD) involved KemI (Oct 2004), identified potential partners in the region and led subsequent preparative dialogue and deliberations. SENSEA has thus owned the process of preparing the start of this programme although ownership was transferred to the implementing partners with KemI as lead agency in 2007. KemI has aligned their development work with Sida through a new framework agreement that was signed in December 2010. The initial project period from January 1, 2007 to June 30 2010 was a learning period for KemI, which needed to accustom to its new role in Swedish international development cooperation. Phase 1 of the programme has been extended with 3 years through a new contract with end date June 30, 2013.

The geographical scope of the programme is South East Asia, with a primary focus on the Greater Mekong Sub-region and the countries of Cambodia, China, Laos and Vietnam in particular.

The long-term vision of the programme is to enhance regional collaboration in support of efforts to strengthen national capacities. Pesticides issues are tackled from three angles that mutually reinforce each other: (i) broad awareness raising; (ii) strengthening of regulatory control; (iii) promotion of integrated pest management to make farming communities less dependent on pesticides and to help them move away from hazardous products. The program has a total budget of 93,5 Million SEK.

***Swedish policy and priorities***

Sustainable use of natural resources and protection of the environment are fundamental goals of the Swedish development cooperation. Sound management of chemicals is one of the priority areas for achieving these goals. Sweden has further made strong commitments to support partner countries in their efforts to achieve the UN Millennium Development Goals.

Sweden has been pioneering in the development of sound chemical management and was the first country in the world to create a public authority, the Swedish Chemicals Agency (KemI), with the mandate to develop an efficient and sound chemicals management.

The Swedish Parliament has adopted 16 environmental objectives (miljömål) of which one is a policy in support of achieving a non-toxic environment. Sweden is today very active in international efforts to reduce the environmental and health impacts of hazardous chemicals.

Sweden has also contributed through research to much of the understanding of the interaction between chemicals and the environment.

The Swedish government has come to pay attention to the incorporation of this work into the Swedish development cooperation. In the declaration of parliament 2004 and its Environmental emphasis and in the Letter of Appropriation for several years it has been indicated that Sida should cooperate in the area of chemical safety. In KemI's instruction it is stated that KemI shall contribute to the environmental work in the Swedish international development aid cooperation. Priority should be given to assisting Sida in the work with capacity development in cooperation countries that

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

will lead to the development of an effective chemical management and the implementation of international conventions and regulations.

The Swedish government Regional Strategy for South East Asia 2010-2015 declares that one of three strategic areas of cooperation is the environment and climate, sustainable use of natural resources which includes building institutional capacity and environmental protection for the Mekong countries. The strategy specifically mentions chemicals management as a key area where Sweden has comparative advantages.

#### Programme partners

- *FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific*, which works directly with relevant government departments and NGOs in the countries concerned in developing and implementing national IPM programmes, and provides the Secretariat for the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission.

- *FAO Headquarters, Pesticides Risk Reduction Group*, which works directly with government departments responsible for regulatory control of pesticides and receives assistance from the FAO Legal Development Service and the Secretariats of the Rotterdam Convention and the International Code of Conduct on the Use and Distribution of Pesticides.

- *Pesticide Action Network for Asia and the Pacific (PAN-AP)*, which has a longstanding programme on awareness raising about pesticides and on community involvement in monitoring pesticide use. Under this programme, PAN-AP assists national partner CSOs in the programme countries with initiating or strengthening programmes on awareness raising, advocacy and monitoring.

- *The Field Alliance (TFA)* is an CSO network in South East Asia that works through the Ministries of Education and assists with the development of school curricula on pesticides, biodiversity, ecology, etc. The underlying strategy is that education of children in rural areas in these subjects will influence not only their own approach to farming later, but also has a proven direct positive effect on the farming practices of their parents as the approach is designed to question practices of their parents and to encourages discussion towards change.

- *The Swedish Chemicals Agency (KemI)*, the government agency responsible for chemicals management and pesticides issues in Sweden. Besides its administrative responsibilities for the overall Programme, KemI itself also plays an active technical role in Objective 3 and is responsible for implementation of Objective 4.

## 2. Purpose of the Evaluation

The evaluation is intended to assess the achievements to date of the extended phase I objectives and outputs formulated in the Programme Documents and revised (2010) Logical Frameworks. The mission will review actions taken –and resulting impact thereof- by the Programme in follow up to recommendations made by the first (2009) Mid-Term Review. The evaluation team should provide recommendations to the Governments, FAO, KemI, PANAP, TFA and the donor on further steps necessary to consolidate and/or expand the work undertaken by the Programme as to ensure

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

achievement of the developmental objectives. The recommendations shall cover both the remaining part of the existing agreement as well as the envisaged second phase. The evaluation will examine the ways forward to further advance regional collaboration on chemical management, including resources mobilization to ensure sustainability of the intended Programme results.

### **3. Scope of the Evaluation**

The Evaluation Mission (Mission) will assess the programme according to the following criteria<sup>1</sup>:

#### **EFFECTIVENESS**

- To what extent has the programme produced outputs and outcomes compared to the revised LFA? What is the prognosis for reaching the targets for outcomes and overall objectives within the programme period?
- Have there been specific implementation problems and have programme partners been able to address these on regional and national level?
- Have programme partners implemented adequate monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, transparency and accountability mechanisms as well as efficient financial management?
- To what extent have governments provided support and made commitments to the programme?
- To what extent have recommendations made by the 2009 review mission been implemented by the programme partners?
- Are the technical options and training methods up to date with today's development approaches?
- How are the impact assessment studies that have been performed within the programme spread and used?
- To what extent has the possibility to address gender issues been taken /used by programme partners?
- To what extent have programme partners used the regional network for planning, implementation and evaluation of programme activities?
- How have assumptions and risks been handled by the programme partners?

#### **EFFICIENCY**

- Is the programme design cost-effective?
- Have the separate programme activities been implemented in a cost-effective manner?

#### **RELEVANCE**

- Is the programme and its design relevant for addressing present and future

---

<sup>1</sup> Criteria recommended by OECD/DAC and adopted by Sida as standard yardsticks for the evaluation of development interventions.

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

priorities and needs? Does the programme design allow adjustments to changing circumstances and new opportunities?

- Have partners been able to adjust to new emerging needs/problems within the framework of the programme?
- Are the programme's development objectives and immediate objectives (including specification of targets and identification of beneficiaries) feasible?
- Have the established relationships with external institutions been functional and beneficial for the programme?

#### SUSTAINABILITY

- Does the programme promote/ensure a sustainable regional ex-change and co-ordination in order to achieve pesticide risk reduction and good chemical management?
- Does the programme design allow for synergies/synergistic effects and encourage further collaboration?
- Was it correct to adopt a 10 year horizon for the programme and what measures are being built in to enhance independent continuation by the recipient government departments, NGOs and farming communities?

#### 4. Composition of the Mission

The mission will comprise of 3-4 team members: Between the Team Leader and the other mission members there should be expertise in each of the following fields: i) Agro-chemical management, IPM, agro-ecology and natural resource management; ii) education and extension; iii) rural development policy formulation and planning; iv) agricultural production systems; v) knowledge in chemicals management including, industrial and consumer chemicals as well as pesticides and biocides.

1. An independent Team Leader with:
    - At least 5 years of international experience in IPM//Rural Development/Pesticide Risk Reduction
    - Familiarity with programmes and policies of governments, CSOs and donors (particularly Sida) in Asia
    - Evaluation experience
    - Ability to manage a team and to deliver within agreed time periods.
    - Fluency in English and demonstrated reporting skills
  2. An evaluator from FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) with knowledge of the region and experience in development policy and planning, institutional development and extension methods and approaches. This person will be contracted and paid separately by KemI.
- 3-4. One or two other team members with experience and skills falling within the above list and complementing the team leader and the FAO evaluator, knowledge of the region, and evaluation experience.

The candidacy of the Team Leader will be approved by Sida Stockholm, KemI and the Office of Evaluation at FAO-HQ.

#### 5. Timetable and Itinerary of the Mission

*Professional Management*

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

The Mission is scheduled to take place in November 2011 with approximately 25 days doing field work in the programme region.

This will start with a two day briefing period in Bangkok. Prior to this, the mission members will receive written documentation on the programme, including summaries for each country programme to be produced, by project management covering the points of the evaluation terms of reference.

Following the briefing period, the team will undertake country/field visits of 4-6 days each in the four countries covered by the project: China, Lao PDR, Cambodia and Viet Nam. These missions should be carried out in parallel by sub-groups of the evaluation team of one or two members, in order to complete all the visits in not more than three weeks.

The fieldwork will be wrapped up with 3 days in Bangkok for team discussion and preparation of a summary of preliminary findings and conclusions, and debriefing at a programme stakeholders' meeting to discuss the summary. Representatives of the participating countries, implementing agencies and donor partners should join this debriefing session.

Following return home, team members will be allowed one week to provide their contributions to the final report as assigned by the team leader. The team leader will then have another week to complete the draft final report.

The draft report will be circulated for comments to the reference group who will have a minimum of 2 work-weeks to provide written comments. Following this, the team leader will have an additional 4 working days to review the comments and incorporate them as he/she feels is appropriate, completing the final report.

The mission leader bears responsibility for the finalised report, which will be submitted to KemI within the schedule above. KemI will submit the report to the programme partners and donor together with its comments.

## **6. Consultations**

The mission shall consult with the reference group concerning the proposed schedule and layout of the field visits. The mission shall also consult with concerned national agencies, national and international project staff, and selected farming communities during field visits. Although the mission should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned anything relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitments on behalf of the Government, the donor, KemI, FAO, PANAP or TFA.

The evaluation report should be sent to the reference group for comments before its finalization.

The reference group comprise the following members:

- Representative from Sida
- Representative from KemI
- Representative from PAN-AP
- Representative from FAO IPM Component



*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

- Representative from FAO Regulatory Control Component
- Representative from TFA

## 7. Reporting

The mission is fully responsible for its independent report which may not necessarily reflect the views of the Government, the donor, KemI, PANAP, TFA or FAO. The report will be written in conformity with the headings shown below:

- I. Executive Summary (Main Findings and Recommendations)**
- II. Introduction**
- III. Background and Context**
- IV. Findings**  
Factual evidence, data and observations that are relevant to the specific questions asked by the evaluation
  - A. Effectiveness
  - B. Efficiency
  - C. Relevance
  - D. Sustainability
- V. Conclusions and Recommendations**
  - A. Conclusions
  - B. Recommendations
    - For project activities until June 2013
    - For project activities beyond June 2013
- VI. Lessons Learned**
- VII. Annexes** (at least these three, plus technical and analytical annexes if needed)
  1. Terms of Reference
  2. List of places visited and key persons met by the mission
  3. List of documents and other reference materials consulted by the mission

## 8. Specification of the tender.

The tender should be written in English and sent to the Swedish Chemicals Agency, P.O. Box 2, SE-172 13 Sundbyberg, Sweden, it must be filled no later than the 31<sup>st</sup> of August 2011 at KemI. The envelop should be marked with "Tender, reference number 240-H11-00833"

The tender should have the following content and structure;

1. Specification of the company (name, address and contact person(s)) responsible for the tender.

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

2. Information about the persons that will carry out the evaluation including their CV and personal references (name and telephone number)
3. Proposed methodology and implementation plan.
4. Total price for the assignment including work and expenses such as travel costs, excluding VAT.
5. Specification of date when the assignment can start.

#### Administrative regulations

The tender procedure will follow Swedish law on public procurement (LOU).

The tender can be decided without prior negotiations.

The tender should be valid until the 23<sup>rd</sup> of September 2011.

KemI will use the conditions as written in the KemI standard consultancy agreement, see annex.

The budget for the evaluation is approximately 700 000 SEK

#### Evaluation of the tenders

In order to evaluate the tender the requirements under section 4 and 5 has to be fulfilled.

When KemI evaluates the tenders the following criteria (ranked as below) will be used:

1. The competence and experience of the team members according to CV and personal references
2. The proposed methodology and plan for implementation of the assignment
3. The price in Swedish Kronor (SEK)

### **9. Contact persons at KemI and FAO**

#### KemI

Mr Ule Johansson, telephone: + 46 8 519 41 210, e-mail: ule.johansson@kemi.se

Ms Jenny Rönngren, telephone: +46 8 519 41 285, e-mail: jenny.ronngren@kemi.se

#### FAO, Office of Evaluation

Mr Robert Moore, telephone: +3906-5705-3903, e-mail: Robert.Moore@fao.org

We recommend contact by e-mail.

**Annex 2****Inception Report**

**Inception report**  
2011-09-21

Swedish Chemicals Agency,  
P.O. Box 2,  
SE-172 13 Sundbyberg,  
Sweden

**Inception report: Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme  
"Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"****1. Introduction**

The Inception report is based on the following:

- ToR (attached at Annex 1)
- Contract between KemI and Professional Management
- Tender submitted by Professional Management
- Desk review of documents provided by KemI
- Meeting with KemI 2011-09-13

**2. The Team**

The Evaluation Team comprises

- Dr. Gunilla Björklund
- Mr. Dam Quoc Tru
- Mr. Daniel Shallon
- Mr. Arne Svensson (Team leader)

The FAO Expert Mr. Daniel Shallon is contracted separately by KemI. The other three consultants represent Professional Management.

**3. Methodology and implementation plan****3.1 Assignment approach and comprehension**

In this section of the Inception report, we elaborate on three methodological issues pertaining to the Evaluation informed by ToR: The methodology which we will use, including a matrix with systematic elaboration on how information will be gathered and verified per question; the implementation plan including the inception of the assignment; and reporting.

**3.1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation**

The evaluation is intended to assess the achievements to date of the extended phase I objectives and outputs formulated in the Programme Documents and revised (2010) Logical Frameworks. The

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

mission will review actions taken –and resulting impact thereof- by the Programme in follow up to recommendations made by the first (2009) Mid-Term Review. The evaluation team should provide recommendations to the Governments, FAO, KemI, PANAP, TFA and the donor on further steps necessary to consolidate and/or expand the work undertaken by the Programme as to ensure achievement of the developmental objectives. The recommendations shall cover both the remaining part of the existing agreement as well as the envisaged second phase. The evaluation will examine the ways forward to further advance regional collaboration on chemical management, including resources mobilization to ensure sustainability of the intended Programme results.

### 3.1.2 Methodology

#### 3.1.2.1 General approach

The Evaluation Team will use the criteria and principles as outlined in the OECD-DAC Evaluation Quality Standards and Sida's Evaluation Manual, "*Looking Back, Moving Forward*".

The Team will also use INTOSAI's Standards and Guidelines for Performance Audits in relevant parts of the assignment especially when it comes to the criterion Efficiency.

The Evaluation Team will identify interviewees and draft questionnaires in lieu of the purpose and main objective of the Evaluation in close cooperation with the Client.

#### 3.1.2.2 The Evaluation Matrix

The Scope of the Evaluation is specified in the ToR. We will assess the programme according to the criteria recommended by OECD/DAC and adopted by Sida as standard yardsticks for the evaluation of development interventions. We have used these criteria and similar evaluation questions as those formulated in the ToR in the evaluations mentioned above that we have carried out for among others Sida and the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency.

For the purpose of identifying interviewees and drafting the questionnaires, the Evaluation Team will use the following Matrix which has proven effective in similar evaluations we have carried out for among others Sida and the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency. The Matrix draws on the Scope of the Evaluation as stated in ToR:

**Table 1: Matrix showing the Evaluation questions, elaboration of the questions, sources of data and verification methods**

Evaluation questions	Sources of information and verification methods
<p><i>Effectiveness</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent has the programme produced outputs and outcomes compared to the revised LFA? What is the prognosis for reaching the targets for outcomes and overall objectives within the programme period?</li> <li>Have there been specific implementation problems and have programme partners been able to address these on regional and national level?</li> <li>Have programme partners implemented adequate monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, transparency and accountability</li> </ol>	<p>For all evaluation questions 1-10:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Summaries for each country programme to be produced by project management covering the points of the evaluation terms of reference</li> <li>Briefing in Bangkok</li> <li>Desk review of all relevant documentation provided by KemI and programme partners</li> <li>Interviews with a sample of relevant stakeholders: relevant ministries and other national counterparts at central level, national counterparts at provincial level, national and international long and short</li> </ol>

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

<p>mechanisms as well as efficient financial management?</p> <p>4. To what extent have governments provided support and made commitments to the programme?</p> <p>5. To what extent have recommendations made by the 2009 review mission been implemented by the programme partners?</p> <p>6. Are the technical options and training methods up to date with today's development approaches?</p> <p>7. How are the impact assessment studies that have been performed within the programme spread and used?</p> <p>8. To what extent has the possibility to address gender issues been taken /used by programme partners?</p> <p>9. To what extent have programme partners used the regional network for planning, implementation and evaluation of programme activities?</p> <p>10. How have assumptions and risks been handled by the programme partners?</p>	<p>term professional staff and key institutions and persons involved in activities including NGOs/CSOs/Environmental groups</p>
<p><i>Efficiency</i></p> <p>11. Is the programme design cost-effective?</p> <p>12. Have the separate programme activities been implemented in a cost-effective manner?</p>	<p>For evaluation questions 11-12:</p> <p><b>a.</b> Summaries for each country programme to be produced by project management covering the points of the evaluation terms of reference</p> <p><b>b.</b> Benchmarks provided by FAO</p> <p><b>c.</b> Briefing in Bangkok</p> <p><b>d.</b> Desk review of budgets, financial reports and assessments of cost-effectiveness provided by project management</p> <p><b>e.</b> Interviews with a sample of relevant stakeholders: relevant ministries and other national counterparts at central level (Q11), national counterparts at provincial level (Q11), national and international long and short term professional staff and key institutions (Q11-12) and persons involved in activities including NGOs/CSOs/Environmental groups (Q12)</p>
<p><i>Relevance</i></p> <p>13. Is the programme and its design relevant for addressing present and future priorities and needs? Does the programme design allow adjustments to changing circumstances and new opportunities?</p> <p>14. Have partners been able to adjust to new emerging needs/problems within the framework of the programme?</p>	<p>For evaluation questions 13-16:</p> <p><b>a.</b> Summaries for each country programme to be produced by project management covering the points of the evaluation terms of reference</p> <p><b>b.</b> Briefing in Bangkok</p> <p><b>c.</b> Desk review of all relevant documentation provided by Keml and programme partners</p> <p><b>d.</b> Interviews with a sample of relevant</p>

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

<p>15. Are the programme's development objectives and immediate objectives (including specification of targets and identification of beneficiaries) feasible?</p> <p>16. Have the established relationships with external institutions been functional and beneficial for the programme?</p>	<p>stakeholders: relevant ministries and other national counterparts at central level, national counterparts at provincial level, national and international long and short term professional staff and key institutions and persons involved in activities including NGOs/CSOs/Environmental groups</p>
<p><i>Sustainability</i></p> <p>17. Does the programme promote/ensure a sustainable regional ex-change and co-ordination in order to achieve pesticide risk reduction and good chemical management?</p> <p>18. Does the programme design allow for synergies/synergistic effects and encourage further collaboration?</p> <p>19. Was it correct to adopt a 10 year horizon for the programme and what measures are being built in to enhance independent continuation by the recipient government departments, NGOs and farming communities?</p> <p>20. What evidence is already visible of the intention of these stakeholders to independently continue project-promoted initiatives?</p>	<p>For evaluation questions 17-19:</p> <p><b>a.</b> Summaries for each country programme to be produced by project management covering the points of the evaluation terms of reference</p> <p><b>b.</b> Briefing in Bangkok</p> <p><b>c.</b> Desk review of all relevant documentation provided by KemI and programme partners</p> <p><b>d.</b> Interviews with a sample of relevant stakeholders: relevant ministries and other national counterparts at central level, national counterparts at provincial level, national and international long and short term professional staff and key institutions and persons involved in activities including NGOs/CSOs/Environmental groups</p>

The points of departure for the evaluation are (1) the Programme documents and (2) the summaries for each country programme to be produced by project management covering the points of the evaluation terms of reference. The summaries will be regarded as the project management's self-evaluation. These summaries should be structured in the same way as the ToR and answer the evaluation questions 1-19 one by one.

The verification of the information in the self-evaluation will be ensured through desk studies and multiple interviews with various stakeholders and not only policy makers. There will also be interviews with officers in multi-lateral organizations as well as some NGOs and civil society organizations in the selected countries. These interviews are important for canvassing broader views on the outcome and impact of the interventions. To be sure, these will be verified through interviews with policy makers and other stakeholders and vice versa.

The final stage in the analysis of data consists in combining results from different types of sources. As is detailed in our validation matrix the data-collecting techniques – studies of written documents, interviews etc - that are used varies from one evaluation element to another. Thus, the evidence will be a combination of documentary, physical, testimonial and analytical. In this way the Team will provide reasonable assurance that evaluation evidence is competent (valid and reliable) and actually represents what it purports to represent. The evaluation criteria representing the normative standards against which the evaluation evidence is judged varies also; however, in many cases there is establish international best practice or good practice to compare with.

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

### **3.1.2.3 The Field visits**

The Field visits in the programme region are scheduled to take place in November 2011. This will start with a two day briefing period in Bangkok. Prior to this, the Team members will receive written documentation on the programme, including summaries for each country programme to be produced by project management covering the points of the evaluation terms of reference.

Following the briefing period, the team should according to the ToR undertake country/field visits of 4-6 days each in the four countries covered by the project: China, Lao PDR, Cambodia and Viet Nam. These missions should according to the ToR be carried out in parallel by sub-groups of the evaluation team of one or two members, in order to complete all the visits in not more than three weeks.

For the efficient performance of the field studies, we propose that the team members will work in sub-groups as follows:

**China:** Mr. Svensson and Mr. Shallon

**Vietnam:** Mr. Svensson and Mr. Tru

**Cambodia:** Dr. Björklund and Mr. Tru

**Laos:** Dr. Björklund and Mr. Shallon

This division of responsibilities certifies that all the requirements on expertise per ToR are met in each of the sub-groups. At the same time this organisation gives an opportunity for each Team member to work together with two of the colleagues in sub-groups.

The fieldwork will be wrapped up with 3 days in Bangkok for team discussion and preparation of a summary of preliminary findings and conclusions, and debriefing at a programme stakeholders' meeting to discuss the summary. Representatives of the participating countries, implementing agencies and donor partners should join this debriefing session.

Thus, we propose the following schedule for the field work:

- 1-2 November: Travel to Bangkok
- 3-4 November: Briefing in Bangkok
- 5-15 November: Field studies in two countries per Team member in sub-groups as proposed above
- 16-18 November: Team discussion and preparation of a summary of preliminary findings and conclusions, and debriefing at a programme stakeholders' meeting to discuss the summary.
- 19-20 November: Travel home

### **3.1.2.4 The Interviews**

The interviews will take place during the period 6-15 November 2011 as follows:

#### **China**

For China it has been deemed important to include the provincial capitals (Kunming, Yunnan and Nanning, Guangxi) in the itinerary. Including Beijing would allow us to meet national counterparts at their workplace (NATESC) and also meet with other MOA and Beijing Municipality stakeholders responsible for institutionalization of IPM, pesticide risk reduction and Farmers Field Schools in China. FAO's Representation is also based in Beijing.

#### **Kunming**

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

Mr. Svensson and Mr. Shallon 6-8 November

***Beijing***

Mr. Svensson 9-11 November

***Nanning***

Mr. Shallon 9-10 November

***Vietnam***

Mr. Tru 11-15 November

Mr. Svensson 12-15 November

***Cambodia***

Dr. Björklund and Mr. Tru 6-10 November

***Laos***

Dr. Björklund and Mr. Shallon 11-15 November

**3.1.2.5 Guidelines for booking interviews**

FAO-IPM has offered assistance in booking the interviews which is highly appreciated.

We have presented the following guidelines for booking the interviews:

- a. Individual interviews as well as group interviews are welcome
- b. We would like to meet with a sample of relevant stakeholders: relevant ministries and other national counterparts at central level, national counterparts at provincial level, national and international long and short term professional staff and key institutions and persons involved in activities.
- c. The interviews will be carried out in the English language. Mr. Tru will carry out his interviews in Vietnam in the Vietnamese language. Mr. Shallon's level of Chinese is intermediate.
- d. Each interview will be carried out by one member of the sub-group. Thus, the consultants will have interviews with different stakeholders in parallel.
- e. Please schedule the interviews 8.00-17.00. Exception: The last day in each country the interviews should be finalised 15.00.
- f. Allow 1½ hours each for the interviews with key informants and groups. One hour for the other interviewees.
- g. Interviews may be carried out over lunch if it is convenient for the interviewee. Otherwise allow one hour for lunch.
- h. Please minimise travelling

**3.1.2.6 Desk review**

All members of the Team have been provided with relevant documentation for the planning of the evaluation. The documents that have been submitted by KemI are listed in Annex 4 to the final report.

In addition, KemI is presently gathering contact information regarding the organizations to meet with during the field visit. The organizations will be presented country by country and under each "mother" organization, FAO, PANAP, TFA or KemI. The persons met and interviewed will be listed in Annex 3 to the final report.



**3.1.2.7 Reporting**

The reporting will be done in accordance with the outline that is specified in section 7 of the ToR.

Following return home, team members will be allowed one week (21-27 November) to provide their contributions to the final report as assigned by the team leader. The team leader will then have another week (28 Nov – 4 Dec) to complete the draft final report. We have in addition in our tender allocated one day each for the other team members for second reading of the draft to make sure that the quality is high and that all team members share the analysis, conclusions and recommendations.

The draft report will be circulated for comments to the reference group who will have a minimum of 2 work-weeks to provide written comments (5 – 18 December). Following this, the team leader will have an additional 4 working days (19-22 December) to review the comments and incorporate them as he/she feels is appropriate, completing the final report. We have in addition in our tender allocated one day each for the other team members for (1) additional contributions that may be requested by the team leader due to the comments/questions that is received from the reference group and (2) second reading of the final report to make sure that the quality is high and that all team members share the analysis, conclusions and recommendations.

The Team leader bears responsibility for the final report, which will be submitted to KemI within the schedule that is specified above. KemI will then submit the report to the programme partners and donor together with its comments.

**3.2.1 Work- and Time Plan**

The Evaluation team consists of four consultants as mentioned above. Below please find a detailed work- and time plan for the fulfilment of the Assignment that specifies the tasks performed and the time allocated to each of the team members.

The FAO Expert Mr. Daniel Shallon will not be available for the briefing in Bangkok due to other assignments. Mr. Svensson will summarise the briefing during their visit to Kunming.

**Table 2: Work- and time plan**

Activity	Time schedule	Consultant	Days
<b>Phase 1 Inception Phase</b>			
1.1 Signing of Contract	W 38	AS	
1.2 Commencement of the work	W 38	AS	
1.3 Contacts with KemI and Sida/SENSA to get all available documentation	W 38	AS	0.25
1.4 Desk review of relevant documents for the planning of the evaluation	W 39	AS	2
1.5 Identifying key stakeholders for the selection of interviewees and drafting the questionnaires	W 39-40	AS	1

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

1.6 Preliminary selection of interviewees for field studies in close consultation with KemI	W 40	AS	0.25
1.7 Drafting Evaluation Matrix	W 40	AS	0.5
1.8 Drafting Inception report	W 40	AS GB MT DS	1 1 1 1
1.9 Inception report submitted to KemI	W 40	AS	
1.10 Approval of the Inception report	W 41		
<b>Phase 2 Data collection</b>			
2.1 Formal commencement of the evaluation after approval of the Inception report. Team meeting (skype).	W 41	AS GB MT DS	0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5
2.2 Detailed planning, booking interviews, travel arrangements, booking hotels	W 40-41	AS GB MT DS	0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5
2.3 Desk review of all other available documents in addition to 1.4	W 43	AS GB MT DS	3 3 3 3
2.4 Travel to Bangkok. Team meeting on hypothesis to be checked and validated in the field visits	W 44 (2 November)	AS GB MT DS	2 2 2 2 (4/11)
2.5 Briefing period in Bangkok	W 44 (3-4 November)	AS GB MT	2 2 2
2.6 Field visits to selected countries	W 44-46 (5-15 November)	AS GB MT DS	10 10 10 10
2.7 Team discussion and preparation of a summary of preliminary findings and conclusions, and debriefing at a programme stakeholders' meeting to discuss the summary. Travel back.	W 46 (16-19 November)	AS GB MT DS	4 4 4 4
<b>Phase 3: Reporting</b>			
3.1 Content analysis and drafting contributions to the final report	W 47 (21-27 Nov)	AS GB MT	5 5 5

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

		DS	5
3.2 Drafting the final report	W 48 (28 Nov – 4 Dec)	AS GB MT DS	5 1 1 1
3.3 The draft final report submitted to KemI and the reference group	W 48	AS	
3.4 Written comments from the reference group	W 49-50 (5-18 Dec)		
3.5 Work on the final report	W 51	AS GB MT DS	4 1 1 1
3.6 Final report submitted to KemI	W 51 (no later than 22 Dec)	AS	
<b>Total number of days</b>			<b>131</b>

AS= Mr. Arne Svensson, GB= Dr. Gunilla Björklund, MT= Mr. Dam Quoc Tru, DS=Mr. Daniel Shallon

The manning schedule is tentative and may be reviewed as a result of the elaboration on the feasibility of the scope of the evaluation during the consultation process.

**Table 3: Manning Schedule**

Team member	Days
Dr. Gunilla Björklund	30
Mr. Dam Quoc Tru	30
Mr. Arne Svensson	41
Mr. Daniel Shallon	30
<b>Total</b>	<b>131</b>

Norra Kroksholmen 21st of September 2011

Arne Svensson  
President  
Professional Management AB

**Annex 3****Persons Interviewed and Consulted****1. KemI**

Mr Ule Johansson, Programme Manager  
Ms Jenny Rönngren, Programme Manager

**2. Sida****2.1 Sida HQ in Stockholm**

Ms. Alexandra Wachtmeister, Programme Officer, Sida – Stockholm

**2.2 Embassy of Sweden in Bangkok**

Ms AnnaMaria Oltorp, Counsellor, Head of Development Cooperation Section  
Mr Ola Möller, first Secretary, Senior Regional Advisor

**3. FAO****3.1 FAO HQ in Rome**

Dr Harry Van der Wulp, Senior Policy Officer

**3.2 FAO-RAP in Bangkok**

Mr Hiroyuki Konuma, Assistance Director General and FAO Regional Representative  
Mr. Jan Willem Ketelaar, Team Leader/CTA, FAO Regional IPM/Pesticide Risk Reduction Programme  
Ms Alima Linda Abubakar, IPM Programme Development Officer, FAO Regional IPM/Pesticide Risk Reduction Programme  
Mr Piao Yongfan, Senior Plant Protection Officer, Executive of APPPC  
Mr Daniel Salvini, Budget Holder Project GCP/RAS/229/SWE

**4. Pesticide Action Network – Asia Pacific (PANAP)**

Ms Sarojeni Renggam, Executive Director,  
Ms Chela Vazquez, Expert  
Ms Deeppa Ravindran, Program Officer

**5. The Field Alliance (TFA)**

Mr. Marut Jatiket, Director, the Field Alliance and the Thai Education Foundation

**6. Field visit to China**

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

## **6.1 Visit to Beijing**

### **6.1.1 Ministry of Agriculture (MOA)**

Mr. Ji Shaoqin, Director, Division of Agriculture Extension of Science and Education Department

### **6.1.2 National Agro-Technical Extension and Service Centre (NATESC), Ministry of Agriculture**

Mr. Zhong Tianrun, National IPM Programme Coordinator and Deputy Director General  
Mr. Yang Puyun, Director, Division of Pest Control,  
Mr. Jingquan Zhu, Division of Pest Control,

### **6.1.3 Beijing city**

#### **6.1.3.1 Agricultural Bureau of Beijing City**

Dr. Zhang Linjun, Director of Plant Protection station, Agricultural Bureau of Beijing City, Professor Beijing Institute for the Control of Agrochemicals  
Mr. Xiao Changkun, Director of Science and Education Division of Beijing PPS  
Mr. Zhang Tao, Beijing Plant Protection station  
Mr. Chong Zing Mu, Beijing Plant Protection station  
Mr. Zheng Shuheng, Vice Director, Beijing Plant Protection station

#### **6.1.3.2 Xixincheng Village, Xingshou Town, Changping district, Beijing city**

Mr. Xiao Changkun, Director of Science and Education Division of Beijing PPS  
Mr. Wang Yizhong, Vice Director of Beijing PPS  
Mr. Hu Xuejun, Director of PPS of Changping district, Beijing city  
Two facilitators of the ongoing FFS  
30 participants in the ongoing FFS

### **6.1.4 FAO in China**

Mr. Percy Wachata Misika, FAO Representative China, DPR Korea and Mongolia  
Mr. Zhang Zhongjun, Assistant FAO Representative  
Ms. Hu Xinmei, National Programme Officer, FAO-IPM office, Kunming

## **6.2 Visit to Yunnan province**

### **6.2.1 Pesticide Eco-Alternatives Center (PEAC)**

#### **1. Presentations in PEAC office (9:00-12:00)**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Position</b>
Chen Zhen	Male	Director of the board
Kuang Rongping	Male	Board member
Xin Anjing	Female	Board member
Tu Wanli	Female	Board member
Xiang Rongjiong	Male	Board member
Zhou Jiuxuan	Female	Executive General Director
Sun Jing	Female	Deputy General Director

Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"

Zuo Zhi	Male	Administrative director & project officer
Li Zhuoru	Female	Financial officer
Li Qing	Female	Project officer
Dou Hong	Female	Project officer
Yang Hongyan	Female	Project officer
Wang Siming	Female	Project staff
Liu Xia	Female	Project staff
Ji Ming	Female	Project officer
Chen Xin	Male	IT technician
Xu Chao	Male	Designer of IT group
Yang Yajie	Male	IT technician

## 2. Farmers who attended meeting at field visit in Heinigou village (afternoon)

Name	Gender	Position
Yang Shaoqing	Male	Coordinator of "community multiple help group" (farmer group) & Farmer leader of Heinigou village
Long Xinmei	Female	Director of farmer group
Zhang Shaolan	Female	Deputy director of farmer group
Zhang Shaolan*	Female	Member of farmer group
Yang Shaohua	Female	Member of farmer group
Zhang Zhulan	Female	Member of farmer group

### 6.2.2 Yunnan Province PPS

Mr.ZhongYongrong, Party secretary, Yunnan PPS

Mr.LiYongchuan, Vice-director, Yunnan PPS

Mr.LuoRrong, chief, pest control and agro-implement Management section, YunnanPPS

Ms.MaTingchu, vice-chief, pest control and agri-implement management section, Yunnan PPS,

Ms.LiYahong, pest control and agro-implement section, Yunnan PPS

### 6.2.3 Visit to Jinning County

Mr.TianDingzhong, vice-director, Jinning Agricultural Bureau

Mr.Wang Yao, Vice-director,Jinning Agro-technical ExtensionCentre,Jinning Agricultural Bureau

Ms.YuanQiongfen, Vice-director,Jinning Agro-technical Extension Centre,Jinning Agricultural Bureau

Mr.XuGuanghui,FFSfacilitator,Jinning County

Mr.JinZhenhua, FFS facilitator,Jinning County

Ms.BiYangfang, FFS facilitator,Jinning County

Ms.JinHongli,Head, JinchengTownship agricultural Sciences Extention Station, Jinning County

Ms.LiShaoxian, Agronomist,Jincheng Township agricultural Sciences Extention Station, Jinning County

Mr.DuJiwei, Party Secretary, Sanhe Village Committee,JinchengTownship,Jinnng County

Mr.LiangYifan, Secretary, Sanhe Village Committee,JinchengTownship,Jinnng County

Mr.YangHua, IPM FFS graduates, Sanhe Village

Ms.Zhang Zhu, IPM FFS graduates, Sanhe Village

Mr.Yang Bo, IPM FFS graduates, Sanhe Village

Ms.YangQiongfang, IPM FFS graduates, Sanhe Village

Mr.XuRong, IPM FFS graduates, Sanhe Village

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

Mr. Du Gang, IPM FFS graduates, Sanhe Village

#### **6.2.4 Visit to Chenggong County**

Mr. Yang Ming, Vice-director, Chenggong Agricultural Bureau  
 Mr. Li Wei, Director of Chenggong PPS, Chenggong Agricultural Bureau  
 Mr. Zhang Xueyang, FFS facilitator  
 Mr. Zhang Xueyang, Party Secretary, Wanxichong Community  
 Mr. Yang Wenqiang, Director, Wanxichong Community  
 37 FFS graduates

#### **6.3 Visit to Guangxi Province**

Mr. Shan Xunan, Agronomist, Pest Control Division, NATESC, MOA  
 Mr. Zhu Xiaoming, Agronomist, Pest Control Division, NATESC, MOA  
 Mr. Wang Huasheng, Chief Agronomist, Guangxi PPS  
 Mr. Qin Baorong, Section Chief, Pest Control Section, Guangxi PPS  
 Ms. Li Li, Vice Section Chief, Pest Control Section, Guangxi PPS  
 Mr. Xie Yiling, Agronomist, Pest Control Section, Guangxi PPS  
 Ms. Chen Lili, Vice Section Chief, Pest Control Section, Guangxi PPS  
 Mr. Huang Liuchun, Director, Nanning PPS  
 Mr. Qin Yanguang, Director, Shanglin PPS  
 Mr. Xu Shenggang, FFS Facilitator, Nanning PPS  
 Mr. Wen Lianhu, FFS Facilitator, Shanglin PPS  
 Mr. Wei Lixun, Director, Rongan Agricultural Bureau  
 Mr. Chen Fanjun, Vice-director, Rongan Agricultural Bureau  
 Ms. Yi Qiaoling, Director, Rongan PPS  
 Mr. Chen Wenge, FFS Facilitator in Rongan County  
 Mr. Lan Jianjun, FFS Facilitator in Rongan County  
 Mr. Wu Qiqian, FFS Facilitator in Rongan County  
 Mr. Luo Kexin, FFS graduates, Farmer trainer, Head of farmer cooperative, Rongan County  
 Mr. Qin Zhongmin, FFS graduates, Member of farmer cooperative, Rongan County  
 Mr. Huang Mingqiong, FFS graduates, member of farmer cooperative, Rongan County  
 Ms. Lu Yufen, FFS graduates, member of farmer cooperative, Rongan County  
 Mr. Luo You, FFS graduates, member of farmer cooperative, Rongan County

### **7. Field visit to Cambodia**

#### **7.1 Visit to Phnom Penh**

##### **7.1.1 MAFF**

##### **7.1.1.1. General Directorate of Agriculture (GDA)**

Mr. Ngın Chhay, Director of Department of Rice Crop and Deputy Director of the National IPM Programme  
 Mr. Chou Cheythyrih, FAO IPM Project Coordinator  
 Ms. Srun Khema, IPM Assistance project Coordinator

##### **7.1.1.2. Department of Agriculture Legislation (DAL)**

Mr. Dy Sam An, Deputy Director of Department of Agricultural Legislation.  
 Mr. Chea Chan Veasna, Deputy Director of Department of Agricultural Legislation

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

### **7.1.2 MOE**

Mr. Long Rithirak, Deputy Director General of Ministry of Environment  
Mr. Sophal Laska, Assistant to Secretary of State of Ministry of Environment

### **7.1.3 CENTDOR**

Mr. Suon Seng, Executive Director, Center for Development Oriented Research in Agriculture and Livelihood Systems (CENTDOR).

### **7.1.4 CEDAC**

Mr Keam Makarady, Program Officer of Cambodian Center for Study and Development in Agriculture (CEDAC)

## **7.2. Visit Battambang Province**

### **7.2.1. Provincial Department of Agriculture (PDA)**

Mr. Chhim Vachira, Deputy Director of PDA  
Mr. In Sovanmony, Chief of Agronomy and Land Improvement Office and Provincial IPM Coordinator.  
IPM Farmers' Group: post-FFS activities at Kor Kour village, Chrey commune, Thmor Koul district  
IPM Farmers' Club at Ang village, Tamoeun commune, Thmor Koul

## **7.3. Visit Kampong Chhnang Province**

### **7.3.1. Provincial Department of Agriculture (PDA)**

Ms. Heng Kimsreang, Deputy Director of PDA and Provincial IPM Coordinator.  
Mr. Meas Sophat, IPM Trainer  
Mr. Ly Som Ol, IPM trainer  
IPM Farmer Group: Post-FFS activities at Pour village, Pour commune, Kampong Leng district

### **7.3.2 ATSA**

Ms. Pan Sodavy, Executive Director of ATSA,  
Mr. Chea Somnang, Technical Officer, ATSA  
Ms. Chhay Kry, Technical Officer, ATSA  
Mr. Som Seun, Director of Pour Secondary School, Pour commune, Kampong Leng district  
Students in Pour Secondary School.

## **7.4. Visit to Kandal Province**

### **7.4.1 PDA**

Mr Buntuon Simona, Director of PDA  
Mr. Kim Sa Voeun, Deputy Director of PDA  
Mr. Hing Kosal, Former Chief of Agricultural Legislation Office (retired), Working as advisor of the Legislation office of PDA  
Mr. Kang Som Bol, Chief of Agricultural Legislation Office, PDA  
Mr. San Voeun, Vice Chief of Agricultural Legislation, PDA



*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

A Pesticide Shop at Sa Ang district, Kandal provinc

#### **7.5 FAO in Cambodia**

Ms. Nina Brandstrup, FAO Representative

### **8. Field visit to Laos**

#### **8.1 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Department of Agriculture**

Dr. Monthathip Chanphengxay, Director General

Ms Khamphoui Louanglath, Director of Regulatory Division & National IPM Coordinator

Mr Tiangkham Vongsabouth, Deputy Director, Plant Protection Centre

#### **8.2 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Agriculture and Forestry Service of Vientiane Capital, Section of Agriculture**

Dr. Lasay Nouanthasing, Director

Mr. Anousone Bandavong, officer planning activities

#### **8.3 Ministry of the Natural Resources and Environment, the Cabinet Office**

Mme Monemany Nhoibouakong, permanent secretary and director general

Mr Khonekeo Kingklambang, program coordinator

Ms Xaysomphone Souvannavong, ESEA BAT/BEP program coordinator

#### **8.4 FAO in Laos**

Dr Dong Qingsong, FAO Representative a.i.

Mr. Thongsavanh Taipangnavong, national IPM-expert, FAO-IPM Programme Office

Ms Vornthalom Chanthavong, senior admin/ programme development assistant, FAO-IPM Programme Office

#### **8.5 Sustainable Agriculture and Environment Development Association (SAEDA)**

Mr Thongdam Phongphichith, SAEDA Co-Director

Mr Bounlap Phathilath, Project coordinator

#### **8.6 Non-profit Association for Lao Development (NALD)**

Mr Bandith Keothongkham, Project manager of REAL

Farmers and school children of the REAL project in Saithany District, Vientiane Capital

Farmers in Donxingxou Villlage, Sikhottabong District, Vientiane Capital

Farmers in Mai Village, Sikhottabong District, Vientiane Capital

### **9. Field visit to Vietnam**

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

### **9.1 Vietnam Chemicals Agency (Vinachemia) - Ministry of Industry and Trade (MOIT)**

Mr Luu Hoang Ngoc, Deputy Director General,  
Ms Nguyen Thi Ha, Director, Department of Convention and International cooperation

### **9.2 Plant Protection Department (PPD), Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD)**

Dr Nguyen Xuan Hong, Director General, PPD  
Mr Ngo Tien Dung, Deputy Director General, National IPM Coordinator, PPD  
Mr Le Tien Binh, Assistant National IPM Coordinator, Plant protection Division, PPD  
Mr Nguyen Thu Duy, IPM staff, Plant protection Division, PPD  
Mr Tran Van Hieu, Project Assistant, FAO-IPM Programme

### **9.3 Research Center for Gender, Family and Environment (CGFED)**

Ms. Pham Kim Ngoc, Director  
Ms. Pham Huong Thao, Programme Officer,

### **9.4 Visit to Thai Binh Province**

#### **9.4.1 PPSD (Provincial Plant protection Sub-Department)**

Ms Ta Thi Minh, Director  
Mr Tran Xuan Hoa, Deputy Director  
Mr Phi Ngoc Hung, Chief, Vegetables Division  
Ms Dinh Thi Nu, Vice-Chief, Vegetables Division  
Mr Vu Van Minh, Staff, Vegetables Division

#### **9.4.2 Cooperative at Thai Giang Commune, Thai Thuy District**

Mr Nguyen Huy Giap, Chairman of Cooperative  
Mr Pham Van Thuan, Vice-Chairman  
Mr Bui Truong Son, Farmer

### **9.5 The Center for Rural progress (CRP)**

Mr. Tran van Long, director  
Ms. Nguyen Thi Thu Nga, Project officer

### **9.6 HAU ( Hanoi University)**

Dr Do Kim Chung, Dean, Faculty of Economics and Rural Development  
Ms Tran Thi Nhu Ngoc, Lecture, Department of agriculture economic and policy  
Mr Dang Xuan Phi, Lecture, Department of agriculture economic and policy

### **9.7 Visit to Hanoi City**

#### **9.7.1 PPSD**

Ms Nguyen Thi Hoa, Director  
Mr Do Danh Kiem, Vice Director and IPM Trainers  
Mr Nguyen Hong Anh, Vice Director

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

Mr Nguyen Van Thuan, Chief of pesticide management Division  
 Mr Nguyen Minh Cong, Technical staff, quality control Division  
 Ms Luu Thi Hang, Deputy Chief, Technical Division

#### **9.7.2 Cooperative Van Duc, Gia lam District**

Mr Nguyen Van Minh, Vice Chairman  
 Ms Do Thi Hau, Officer, Plant protection station  
 Ms Nguyen Thi Uyen, Import/Export Officer  
 Mr Nguyen Van Uyen, Storage Keeper

#### **9.8 FAO in Vietnam**

Ms Yuriko Shoji, FAO Representative  
 Mr Vu Ngoc Tien, Assistant FAO Representative  
 Ms Nguyen Thi Huong, Program Officer

#### **9.9 Visit to Hung Yen province**

##### **9.9.1 RPPC**

Mr Bui Xuan Phong, Deputy Director  
 Ms Nguyen Thi Thanh Tra, Chief of Forecasting Division  
 Ms Ngo Thi Ai Van, Plant protection Officer  
 Mr Nguyen Danh Dinh, Plant protection Officer

#### **9.10 Visit to Hai Duong Province**

##### **9.10.1 Cooperative Vinh Hong, Binh Giang District**

Mr Ngo Duc Dang, Chairman  
 Mr Bui Thanh Tam, Vice Chairman  
 Mr Dao Quang Thon, Accountant  
 Mrs Vu Thi Than, Farmer  
 Ms Vu Thi Tinh, Farmer

### **10 Participants at presentation of preliminary findings from the evaluation, Siam City Hotel, 18 November 2011.**

Name	Title	Organisation
Sirisap Bijlmakers	Project Associate	FAO-RAP
Niran Nirannoot	Regional Coordinator	FAO-RAP
Daniele Salvini	Budget Holder	FAO-RAP
Piao Yongfan	Senior Plant Protection Officer	FAO-RAP
Jan Willem Ketelaar	Chief Technical Adviser	FAO-RAP
Alma Linda M Abubakar	Programme Development Officer	FAO-RAP
Nawarat Phayungkij	Administrator	FAO-RAP
Harry van der Wulp	Senior Policy Officer	FAO HQ
Deeppa Ravindran	Programme Officer	PAN-AP

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

Sarojeni V. Rengam	Executive Officer	PAN-AP
Chela Vasquez	Programme Officer (Pesticides)	PAN-AP
Nugroho Wienarto	Executive Director	Field Indonesia
Marut Jatiket	Director	The Field Alliance
Ule Johansson	Programme Manager	KemI
Jenny Rönngren	Senior Scientific Officer	KemI

## Annex 4

### Documentation of Materials Reviewed

#### 1. KemI

1. The program document, 2010-09-21: "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia, Phase I – Application for 3 year extension of Phase I, and supporting annexes:
  - I: Updated logical framework for 2010-2013
  - II: Results 2007-2009 (against original logical framework)
  - III: Response to Mid-Term Evaluation Study
  - IV: Risk management matrix
2. LFA matrix 1 a summary of the program: Agreement period 2010-07-01 – 2013-06-30
3. Agreements between Sida and KemI
4. Examples of agreements between KemI-FAO/PANAP/TFA
5. Support to the Swedish Chemical Agency: Towards a Non-Toxic Environment in Southeast Asia. Mid-Term Evaluation Study, Final Report, April 2009 by Åke Nilsson, Geoscope AB, commissioned by Sida/SENSA.
6. Towards a Non-Toxic Environment in South-East Asia. Programme annual report to Sida for 2009. Submitted to Sida on 27<sup>th</sup> of April 2010.
7. Towards a Non-Toxic Environment in South-East Asia. Phase one completion report, January 2007 to June 2010. Submitted to Sida on 15<sup>th</sup> of June 2011.
8. Steering group Protocols from meetings:
  - a/ 27-28 August 2009
  - b/ Nov 2009
  - b/ 9 – 10 September 2010
  - c/ 18 November 2010
  - d/ 24-25 May 2011 (Minutes from the meeting)
9. Chemical Management Forum – A regional meeting place for development cooperation, training and networking. A background paper. 2009-03-20
10. Agenda and draft Minutes from the Third Regional Chemicals Management Forum, 12-14 January 2011.
11. Agreement between Swedish Chemicals Agency (KemI) and Pesticide Action Network Asia and the Pacific (PAN AB), November 2010
12. Consolidated annual report from KemI to Sida, 2009 and 2010
13. Reports to KemI from FAO, TFA and PANAP.
14. Self-evaluation "KemI, activity 4.1 – 4.8 in the LFA. Development of a regional chemicals management forum and a regional program"

#### 2. Sida

1. In-depth Assessment of Support to the Swedish Chemical Agency "Towards a Non-Toxic Environment in South East Asia", continuation of Phase 1, 1 July 2010 – 30 June 2013. 5<sup>th</sup> May, 2010.
2. Decision of support to "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia, continuation of Phase 1, 17<sup>th</sup> May, 2010. (In Swedish). Appended to that:
  - a/ Överenskommelse om tjänster mellan Sida och Kemikalieinspektionen
  - b/ Budget: Sydostasienprogrammet 2010-07-01 – 2013-06-30.

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

3. Support to the Swedish Chemicals Agency: Towards a Non-Toxic Environment in Southeast Asia, Mid-Term Evaluation Study, Final Report, 30 April 2009, Åke Nilsson, Geoscope AB

### **3. FAO**

1. Project Progress Report. Trust Fund Program GCP/RAS/229/SWE: Pesticide Risk Reduction in South East Asia. IPM Component. Progress Report (January-June 2011) with the following annexes:
    - Ia: Regional Progress Report
    - Ib: Table 1: Logical Framework Analysis: FAO Regional Programme (IPM component)
    - II: Cambodia CPR (Jan-June 2011)
    - III: China CPR (Jan-June 2011)
    - IV: Lao CPR (Jan-June 2011)
    - V: Vietnam CPR (Jan-June 2011)
  2. FAO IPM Progress report January-June 2011, with annexes
  3. Fifth progress report IPM Component Jan-June 2009
  4. Sixth progress report IPM Component July-Dec 2009
  5. Seventh progress report IPM Component Jan-June 2010
  6. Eighth progress report IPM Component July-Dec 2010
  7. Policy progress report July-Dec 2010
  8. The revised Country Strategy Papers developed by FAO-IPM for each of the 4 member countries outlining project intervention strategies for extension period 2010-13 with LFAs
  9. Empowering Farmers to Reduce Pesticide risks, A work in progress, Nov 2011
  10. Self Assessment FAO Policy Component
  6. Self Assessment FAO IPM Component
- + Documents on the FAO-IPM website [www.vegetableipmasia.org](http://www.vegetableipmasia.org)

### **4. PAN AP**

1. Annual report 2009 and supporting annexes:
  1. CGFED Report
    - a. Narrative Report:
    - b. Publications: "Reduction of pesticide abuse for women's health and for a safe agriculture"; copies of Gender Equity Review; pamphlets for farmers
  2. An Giang University Report
    - a. Narrative Report on workshop
    - b. Report: Chau Thanh district
    - c. Warning! Pesticides are dangerous to your health (Vietnamese version)
  3. CEDAC Narrative Report
  4. PEAC Narrative Report

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

5. Summary report on Lao PDR visit
  6. PAN AP publication: *Community Monitoring of SAICM Implementation on Pesticide Use and Practices: Initial Results of the Community Monitoring and International Advocacy Project in Asia*
  7. PAN briefing paper: *Community Monitoring of SAICM Implementation of Pesticide Use and Practices: A Briefing*
  8. PAN AP Statement delivered at FAO COAG meeting, 22-25th April 2009 Rome
  9. Press Release by PAN AP, ROCA and WECF, Rome, 24 March 2009
  10. Report on POPRC 5
  11. Endosulfan monographs (2nd Ed.)
  12. Glyphosate monograph
  13. Press Release: No Pesticide Use Day 2009
  14. Summary report: PAN AP and Partners Meeting, Phnom Penh, July 18-21 2009
  15. Databases and Websites:
    - a. PAN Germany – OISAT
    - b. PAN North America – Pesticide Info
2. Annual Report 2010 and supporting annexes:
1. CEDAC Narrative Report
  2. PEAC Narrative Report
  3. CGFED Narrative Report
  4. RCRD Narrative Report
  5. SEADA Narrative Report
  6. Copy of Communities in Peril: Asian Regional report on Community monitoring of highly hazardous pesticides.
  7. Copy of Communities in Peril :Global Report on health impacts of pesticide use I agriculture
  8. Report on UNEP- World Custom Organization workshop
  9. IUF press release
  10. Edosulfan Campaign materials
  11. No Pesticide Use Week Campaign materials
  12. Vietnman Trip Report
  13. CPAM partners meeting.
  14. Task Force meeting notes
3. Annual Report 2011 (January to September) and supporting annexes:
1. CEDAC Narrative Report, January to June, 2011
  2. CGFED Narrative Report, January to June, 2011
  3. RCRD Narrative Report, January to June, 2011
  4. PEAC Narrative Report, January to June, 2011
  5. SAEDA Narrative Report, January to June, 2011
  6. PAN International and Berne Declaration's Press Release: *Syngenta's bestseller 'Gramoxone' on the way to be listed as Severely Hazardous Pesticide Formulation by the Rotterdam Convention.*
  7. PAN International, Berne Declaration, IPEN and Rapal's Press Release: *Killer pesticide endosulfan to be phased out globally*
  8. Press Release: *Health and community groups around the world call for an end to endosulfan*

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

9. PAN International Closing Statement at the Fifth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP 5) to the Stockholm Convention.
  10. & 11. Presentations on PAN International HHPs list and the Global Community Monitoring Report, and PAN AP's Asian Regional Report on Community Monitoring of Highly Hazardous Pesticide Use
  12. PAN AP and IPEN made a joint submission of information on alternatives to endosulfan.
  13. Press Release NGOs: Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil must not allow IOI Corporation to sell its palm oil as green and sustainable.
  14. PAN AP Publications and Press Release
  15. Summary Report of the People's Health Forum
4. Contacts of all PAN AP partners and key people.
5. Cross Sectional Issues that other programmes with in PAN AP work on, including Biodiversity Based Ecological Agriculture, Climate Change issues and Gender Equality.
- Biodiversity Base Ecological Agriculture
1. Week of Rice Action Campaign (WORA) 2007 reports from PEAC and CEDAC
  2. Week of Rice Action Campaign ( WORA) 2008 reports from PEAC and CEDAC
  3. Year of Rice Action ( YORA) 2009- 2010 reports from PEAC,CEDAC and SAEDA
  4. Collective Rice Action Campaign ( CORA) reports from PEAC,CEDAC and SAEDA
- Climate Change
1. Climate change and its implications for small farmers ( Publication) by Rosario Bella Guzman.
  2. Asia Pacific Conference on Confronting the food crisis and climate change ( Proceedings)
  3. Weathering the Climate Crisis , The Way of Ecological Agriculture ( Publication) by Prabhakar Nair
- Gender Equality
1. Women and Pesticide report from Cambodia by PAN AP and NGO Forum on Cambodia
  2. Ruined Lives Ravaged Livelihoods: Impact of Agrochemicals TNCs on Rural Women by Prabhakar Nair
6. Information and Communication Mileage.
- i. Record of the number of publications distributed and downloaded number of hits on PAN AP website.
    1. PAN AP Information Materials Distribution (PESTICIDES)
    2. PAN AP Overall Website Statistics
    3. PAN AP List Serve, Alerts and E-updates 2009 - 2011
    4. PAN AP News Alerts, Updates, Press Releases, Declaration and Statements, 2009-2011
  - ii. Website citations of the Asian Regional Report



*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

7. PAN AP's annual report form 2009- 2011. This annual reports give an overview of all activities done in PAN AP for the duration of 2009- 2011.
8. Supporting Documents from Partners include softcopies of banners, posters, publications and various reports translated in the local language.
9. PAN AP's three and half year evaluation Report sent to KemI

## **5. The Field Alliance**

The Field Alliance Self Assessment on Scope of the Evaluation

The Field Alliance Report to KemI, July – December 2010

The Field Alliance 2011 Progress Report for the "Toward the Non-Toxic Environment in Southeast Asia" Program, not dated

BD1 Orientation to Biodiversity in the Farmland

BD002 Recruitment of the Biodiversity Task Force

BD3 ID areas, habitats and mapping

BD4 Biodiversity Sample Collection

BD5 Identify Threats to Biodiversity

BD6 Ranking and Selection of BD Species for Conservation

BD7 Food Web

BD8 What do we know about treats to species and habitats?

BD9 Habitat Action Plan

## **6. Field visit to China**

### **6.1 Visit to Beijing**

Documents available only in the Chinese language

### **6.2 Visit to Yunnan province**

#### **6.2.1 Pesticide Eco-Alternatives Center (PEAC)**

Constitution for Pesticide Eco-Alternatives Center

Community-Based Pesticide Action Monitoring in Yunnan province, China

Rural Ecological Agriculture for Livelihood (REAL) Project 2007.5-2010.6

Ecological study 2010-06-24

Analysis of Hygienic Insecticides use and relevant factors in some counties and cities of Yunnan Province, Yang Hong-yan, 2009-11-30

Preliminary study on small scale farmers' self protection behavior and the risk when spraying pesticide, Sun Ying, Li Qing, Zhao Yuanxian, Lv Jianping

Spatial patterns and sampling technique of *Schizaphis piricola* Matsumura in Red Pear Plantation, Zhou Jiu-xuan et al, 2010-02-24

Newsletter, Oct 2011

Heinigou village, Songming county of Kunming city

+ a significant amount of documents in the Chinese language (reviewed by Mr. Shallon)

### **6.3 Visit to Guangxi province**

Documents available only in the Chinese language (reviewed by Mr. Shallon)

## **7. Field visit to Cambodia**

1. Fortified curriculum FFS on Vegetable Crop

2. Fortified curriculum FFS on Rice Crop

3. Fortified curriculum of post FFS on Vegetable Crop

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

4. Fortified curriculum of post FFS on Rice Crop
5. Final Curriculum of IPM farmer club.
6. Eighth 6-month Progress Reports of Pesticide Risk Reduction Project from starting
7. Research Paper on Summary the Impact Assessments of the National IPM Programme, Chou Cheytherith, 2007.
8. Summary activities and achievement of Pesticide Risk Reduction Project, 2007-2011.
9. Presentation of the National IPM Programme and Pesticide Risk Reduction Project.
10. Self Assessment of the achievements of Pesticide Risk Reduction Project.
11. Leaflet of Summarizing the National IPM Programme and Pesticide Risk Reduction Project.
12. History of IPM farmer club at Ang village Tamoeun commune, Thmor Koul.
13. History of IPM farmer group at at Kor Kour village, Chrey commune, Thmor Koul district
14. Impact Assessment of the Pesticide Risk Reduction Project
15. Report on Women and Pesticide in Cambodia, CEDAC
16. Pesticide Community Monitoring in Cambodia 2009- Oct. 2011, CEDAC

## **8. Field visit to Laos**

1. Lao PDR Country Progress Report for Pesticide Risk Reduction. Project GCP/RAS/229/SWE (January – June 2008)
2. Lao PDR Country Progress Report. (July – December 2008)
3. Lao PDR Country Progress Report (January – June 2009)
4. Lao PDR Country Progress Report (July – December 2009)
5. Lao PDR Country Progress Report (January – June 2010)
6. Lao PDR Country Progress Report (July – December 2010)
7. Lao PDR Country Progress Report (January – June 2011)
8. Country Strategic Paper, Lao PDR, Extension period: July 2010-June 2013
9. Trip report: The Study of Effect of Pesticides on Health and Environment & the Development of Pesticides Risk Reduction Fortified IPM-FFS Curriculum. Vientiane Capital, Lao PDR, May 3-14, 2009
10. Trip Report M&E for Farmer Training on PRR in Xiengkhouang and Vientiane Province, March 14-30, 2010
11. Trip Report M&E for Farmer Training on PRR in Saignabouly and Vientiane Province, March 14 – April 02, 2010
12. Trip Report M&E on PRR-FT in Xiengkhouang/Vientiane Province, Lao PDR & Regional Workshop on Curriculum Development for PRR, Kunming, China PR.
13. Report on the Intensive TOT on PRR in Saignabouly Province, 21-31 December 2009  
Report on TOT on IPM and PRR in Viengkham District, Vientiane Province, Lao PDR. 7-19 June 2010
14. Report of Refresher Trainings and Evaluation and Planning Workshops of Farmer Training on PRR, Viengkham District, 21-23 June and Saiyabouly District 30 June – 2 July, 2010
15. M&E Report on PRR Farmer Training, Vientiane Capital, 7 April – 24 June, 2011
16. M&E Report on PRR Farmer Training in Sayabouly, Vientiane Province and Capital 30 April – 2 June, 2011
17. Report: Roundtable on Pesticide Residue Testing Capacity Development in Lao PDR, Vientiane, Lao PDR, 25 September 2007
18. Report: Louanglath, Taipangnavong and van der Wulp: Pesticide Survey Northern Lao PDR, 8-12 January, 2008
19. Latdavong, Chiaradia-Bousquet and van der Wulp: Review of Pesticide legislation in Lao PDR, January 2008.
20. Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Lao PDR: Regulation on the control of pesticides in Lao PDR. 11 June 2010

Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"

## 9. Field visit to Vietnam

1. Country report for project GCP/RAS/229/SWE (January to June 2011)
  2. Note on visit to Vietnam, September 11 to October 2010. Marjon Fredrix, AGP, FAO
  3. Final report "To support of the pesticide residue analysis for baseline/impact study". PPDstudy
  4. Baseline for longer-term impact assessment of pesticide risk reduction in Vietnam. Do kim Chung & co-workers. HAU
  5. Impact assessment of pesticide risk reduction in Hanoi and Thaibinh: Preliminary finding. Do kim Chung. HAU
  6. Impact of community education on pesticide risk reduction in Vietnam, by Prof. Dr. Do Kim Chung and co-workers. Hanoi University of Agriculture. Paper presented at the FAO's Impact Assessment Meeting, 14 Nov. 2011, Hanoi,
  7. Report on Community education on pesticide risk reduction year 2010. PPD
  8. Report on Community Education Programme on Pesticide Risk Reduction in Vietnam.2011. PPD
  9. Progress report: "Capacity Building and Policy reform for Pesticide Risk Reduction in Vietnam under One UN-2 Initiative". UNJP VIE 041 UNJ. July to December 2010. PPD
  10. Vietnam report: Monitoring of pesticide residues in fresh produce in Vietnam . March 2010. FAVRI
  11. Report of regional workshop on "Monitoring of pesticide residues in fresh produce", 9-11 March, 2011. FAVRI.
  12. List of pesticides permitted, restricted and banned in use in Vietnam. 20 May, 2011. MARD.
  13. Reports of CGFED
  14. Reports of RCRD, An Giang Univesity
  15. Fifth Draft on " Law of Plant protection and quarantine" 25 August 2011. PPD
- + a significant amount of documents in the Vietnamese language (reviewed by Mr. Tru)

## Annex 5

Mid Term Evaluation Mission for GCP/RAS/229/SWE  
Final Programme 2 – 19 November 2011

**Team Cambodia:** Dr. Gunilla Bjorklund and Dr. Dam Quoc Tru

**Team China:** Mr. Arne Svensson and Mr. Daniel Shallon

**Team Laos:** Dr. Gunilla Bjorklund and Mr. Daniel Shallon

**Team Vietnam:** Mr. Arne Svensson and Dr. Dam Quoc Tru

Date/ Departures	Arrivals	Itinerary
2 November, Wednesday		
<b>Departure from Stockholm</b>  via TG 961 at 1340H	<b>Arrival in Bangkok</b>  via TG 961 at 0555H	Check in at Siam City Hotel Address: 477 Si Ayuthaya Road, Phayathai Bangkok Tel.: 0-2247-0123 Fax.: 0-2247-0165 Email: ratchanikrit@siamhotels.com

*Professional Management*

## Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"

Date/ Departures	Arrivals	Itinerary
<p><b>(Dr. Gunilla Bjorklund and Mr. Arne Svensson)</b></p> <p><b>Departure from Hanoi</b></p> <p>via VN 611 at 0900H (<b>Dr. Dam Quoc Tru</b>)</p>	<p><b>(Dr. Gunilla Bjorklund and Mr. Arne Svensson)</b></p> <p>via VN 611 at 1050H (<b>Dr. Dam Quoc Tru</b>)</p>	<p>Website: <a href="http://www.siamhotels.com/siamcity/">http://www.siamhotels.com/siamcity/</a></p>
<p>3 November, Thursday</p>		<p><i>Morning:</i></p> <p>Briefing on the Regional Programme "Towards a non-Toxic Environment in Southeast Asia":</p> <p><i>NGO-Component on broad awareness raising about issues related to agricultural and industrial chemicals</i></p> <p><b>Ms. Sarojeni Renggam</b>, Executive Director Pesticide Action Network – Asia Pacific</p> <p><i>Afternoon:</i></p> <p><b>Mr. Marut Jatiket</b>, Director The Field Alliance/Thai Education Foundation</p> <p><b>Mr. Ule Johansson</b> KemI</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> Kaewkamol room 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Siam City Hotel Address: 477 Si Ayuthaya Road, Phayathai Tel.: 0-2247-0123 Fax.: 0-2247-0165</p>
<p>4 November, Friday</p> <p><b>Departure from Rome</b></p> <p>via AZ 790 at 1320H (<b>Mr. Daniel Shallon</b>)</p>		<p><i>Morning:</i></p> <p>Continuation: Briefing on the Regional Programme "Towards a non-Toxic Environment in Southeast Asia"</p> <p><i>FAO Component on stepping-up field programmes to help farmers adopt Integrated Pest Management and eliminate the use of highly hazardous pesticides</i></p> <p><b>Mr. Jan Willem Ketelaar</b>, Chief Technical Adviser &amp; <b>Ms. Dada Abubakar</b>, IPM Programme Development Officer FAO Regional IPM Programme for Asia</p> <p><i>FAO Component on strengthening pesticide regulatory framework and policy reform</i></p> <p><b>Mr. Harry van der Wulp</b>, Senior Policy Officer FAO Rome</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> Kaewkamol room 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Siam City Hotel Address: 477 Si Ayuthaya Road, Phayathai</p>

## Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"

Date/ Departures	Arrivals	Itinerary	
		<p>Tel.: 0-2247-0123 Fax.: 0-2247-0165</p> <p><i>Afternoon:</i> Group work</p> <p><b>1630H:</b> Departure from Hotel to FAO RAP</p> <p><b>1730H:</b> Discussions with <b>Mr. Hiroyuki Konuma</b>, Assistant Director-General and FAO Regional Representative for Asia and the Pacific</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Room B-207 39 Phra Atit Road, Bangkok Tel: (66-2) 697 4314</p>	
		<p align="center"><b>Team Cambodia:</b></p> <p><b>1500H:</b> travel to <b>Battambang</b> by car (approx 5 hrs)</p> <p><i>Component:</i> <i>Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i> Briefing on the National IPM Programme <b>Mr. Chou Cheythyrieth</b>, IPM Programme Coordinator, FAO IPM Cambodia (concepts: strengthening the abilities of local and national staff in planning, organising and managing IPM-PRR programmes)</p> <p><b>Check in at Steng Sangke Hotel</b> National Road No 5, Prek Mohatep Village, Sangkat Svay Por, Battambang City, Battambang province Tel: (855) 53-953-495 to 7, Fax: (855) 53-953-494 <b>Web Site:</b> <a href="http://www.stungsangkehotel.com">www.stungsangkehotel.com</a></p>	<p align="center"><b>Team China:</b></p> <p><b>Check in at Expo. Garden Hotel</b> No.5 Expo Road, Panlong District, Kunming 650224, China Tel: +86-(0)871-5012666-06 Fax: +86-(0)871-5012898</p> <p>PEAC will arrange picking up at the airport. Contact person: <b>Ms. Sun Jing</b> Cellphone: +86-13759199766 Tel: +86-(0)871-5656769 / 5656268 Fax: +86-(0)871-5656373 Email: <a href="mailto:peac.sj@gmail.com">peac.sj@gmail.com</a> <a href="http://www.panchina.org">www.panchina.org</a></p>
<p><i>5 November, Saturday</i></p> <p><b>Departure from Bangkok</b></p> <p>via PG 933 at 1340H <b>(Dr. Gunilla Bjorklund and Dr. Dam Quoc Tru)</b></p> <p>via MU 2026 at 1305H <b>(Mr. Arne Svensson)</b></p>	<p><b>Arrival in Phnom Penh</b></p> <p>via PG 933 at 1450H <b>(Dr. Gunilla Bjorklund and Dr. Dam Quoc Tru)</b></p> <p><b>Arrival in Kunming</b></p> <p>via MU 2026 at 1725H <b>(Mr. Arne Svensson)</b></p> <p>via CZ 3901 at 1230H <b>(Mr. Daniel Shallon)</b></p>		

## Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"

Date/ Departures	Arrivals	Itinerary	
6 November, Sunday	<p><i>Team Member #1</i></p> <p><i>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i> 0800H: Visit post-FFS at Kor Kour village, Chrey commune, Thmor Koul district (concepts: capacity development for post-FFS activities on how to further reduce pesticide risks; farmer groups initiate and manage their own learning activities; uptake of FAO-supported IPM-PRR programme by local governments)</p> <p><i>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i> 1400H: Meeting with <b>Mr. Cheam Chansophorn</b>, Director of Provincial Department of Agriculture (PDA), Battambang Province (concepts: functional links fostered between research and extension/ training through the PRR programme)</p> <p>Travel to Kampong Chhnang province (approx 3 hrs)</p> <p>Check in at Raksmei Sokha New York Hotel Sre Pring Village, Sangkat Kampong Chhnang, Kampong Chhnang City, Kampong</p>	<p><i>Team Member #2</i></p> <p><i>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i> 0800H: Visit Ang IPM Farmers' Club, Tamoeun commune, Thmor Koul district (concepts: funding of farmer education activities by Self-Help Groups; development of local policies in support of IPM-PRR)</p>	<p><i>Component: Advocacy/Awareness Raising</i> Brief introduction about Pesticide Eco-Alternatives Center (PEAC) by <b>Dr. Zhou Jiuxuan</b>, Executive Director, PEAC</p> <p><i>Component: Advocacy/Awareness Raising</i> Introduction to SENSAPANAP Project by <b>Ms. Li Qing</b>, Project Officer (concepts: pesticide risk reduction through pesticide risk monitoring, awareness raising and participatory development of alternatives in Yunnan province of China)</p> <p><i>Component: Advocacy/Awareness Raising</i> Introduction to SENSATFA project (REAL) by <b>Ms. Sun Jing</b>, Deputy Director and Project Coordinator (concepts: improve awareness to pesticide risk and agro-biodiversity conservation through integration with primary school education)</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> Office of Pesticide Eco-Alternatives Center (PEAC). Apt. 1212,1214,1216, 12F.,14BLOK, Yunnan Yingxiang Quarter, Northern Chuanjin Rd., Kunming city Tel: +86-(0)871-5656769 / 5656268 Fax: +86-(0)871-5656373 www.panchina.org</p> <p><i>Component: Advocacy/Awareness Raising</i> 1330H: Travel (1.5 hrs.) to SENSAPANAP project site for field visit and interview with key farmers in Heinigou village, Songming county of Kunming city</p> <p>Location: Heinigou village, Songming county, Kunming city</p>

## Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"

Date/ Departures	Arrivals	Itinerary					
		<p>Chhnang Tel: (855) 26 666 1 555 MB: 097 70 27 366; 099 70 55 67 Fax: (855) 26 770 162 Email: raksmeynewyork-sk@yahoo.com Website: www.sknewyork.com</p>					
7 November, Monday		<p><i>Component: Advocacy/Awareness Raising</i> <b>0700H:</b> Briefing on Activities under the Advocacy Component <b>Ms. Pan Sodavy</b>, Executive Director, Agriculture Technology Services Association (ATSA)</p> <p><i>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM &amp;</i> <i>Component: Advocacy/Awareness Raising</i> <b>0830H:</b> Visit collaborative NIPM-ATSA post-FFS activities at Pour village, Pour commune, Kampong Leave district (concepts: added value of collaborative NIPM-CSO IPM-PRR activities; funding of FFS programmes by local government and Commune Councils; use of FAO FFS-based farmer education programme for other sectors and community agenda)</p> <p>Travel to Kandal province (approx 1.5 hrs)</p> <p><i>Component: Policy Reform</i> <b>1500H:</b> Meeting with <b>Mr. Buntuon Simona</b>, Director of Provincial Department of Agriculture (PDA) and <b>Mr. Hing Kosal</b>, Chief of Legislation Office and Coordinator of the Pilot Inspection Scheme, Kandal Province (concepts: strengthening pesticide regulatory framework policy reform to support the PRR programme)</p> <p><i>Component: Policy Reform</i></p>	<p><b>Morning (0830H-1200H)</b></p> <p><i>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i> Briefing on activities undertaken in Yunnan under IPM component: - Presentation by <b>Yunnan PPS</b> - Presentation by <b>Kunming PPS</b> - Presentation by <b>Chuxiong PPS</b> (concepts: project implementation progress report and introduction to the field visit)</p> <p>- Introduction by <b>Yunnan DOA Representative Leaders</b> (concept: the relevance of the project to Yunnan provincial government/agriculture policy)</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> Yunnan PPS Meeting Room Address: No.19, Yongxing Road, Kunming City Email address: hu.xinmei@gmail.com Tel: +86-13888862620</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="643 1137 1278 1776"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="643 1137 911 1189"><i>Team Member #1</i> <b>(Mr. Arne Svensson)</b></th> <th data-bbox="911 1137 1278 1189"><i>Team Member #2</i> <b>(Mr. Daniel Shallon)</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="643 1189 911 1776"> <p>Departure at <b>1330H</b></p> <p><i>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i> Travel to Jinning County (approx 1 hr) in Kunming City to visit IPM village and meet with Jinning government officials from county, township and village levels and FFS alumni (concepts: sustainability of PRR project; the impact of the project and uptake of PRR FFS and concept by local government)</p> </td> <td data-bbox="911 1189 1278 1776"> <p>Departure at <b>1330H</b></p> <p><i>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i> Travel to Chuxiong City (approx 2 hrs) to visit ongoing PRR FFS training and see action plan implemented by FFS alumni (concept: robust PRR training ongoing and the impact of FFS )</p> <p>Return to Kunming after dinner</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<i>Team Member #1</i> <b>(Mr. Arne Svensson)</b>	<i>Team Member #2</i> <b>(Mr. Daniel Shallon)</b>	<p>Departure at <b>1330H</b></p> <p><i>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i> Travel to Jinning County (approx 1 hr) in Kunming City to visit IPM village and meet with Jinning government officials from county, township and village levels and FFS alumni (concepts: sustainability of PRR project; the impact of the project and uptake of PRR FFS and concept by local government)</p>	<p>Departure at <b>1330H</b></p> <p><i>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i> Travel to Chuxiong City (approx 2 hrs) to visit ongoing PRR FFS training and see action plan implemented by FFS alumni (concept: robust PRR training ongoing and the impact of FFS )</p> <p>Return to Kunming after dinner</p>
<i>Team Member #1</i> <b>(Mr. Arne Svensson)</b>	<i>Team Member #2</i> <b>(Mr. Daniel Shallon)</b>						
<p>Departure at <b>1330H</b></p> <p><i>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i> Travel to Jinning County (approx 1 hr) in Kunming City to visit IPM village and meet with Jinning government officials from county, township and village levels and FFS alumni (concepts: sustainability of PRR project; the impact of the project and uptake of PRR FFS and concept by local government)</p>	<p>Departure at <b>1330H</b></p> <p><i>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i> Travel to Chuxiong City (approx 2 hrs) to visit ongoing PRR FFS training and see action plan implemented by FFS alumni (concept: robust PRR training ongoing and the impact of FFS )</p> <p>Return to Kunming after dinner</p>						

## Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"

Date/ Departures	Arrivals	Itinerary	
		Visit to pesticide shops  Travel to Phnom Penh (approx 30 mins)  Check in at Anise Hotel  N° 2C, St 278 off 57, Beoung Keng Kang I, Chamkamorn, Phnom Penh, Cambodia.  Tel: (855)23-222-522, Fax: (855)23-222-533  Web Site: <a href="http://www.anisehotel.com.kh">www.anisehotel.com.kh</a>	
8 November, Tuesday  <b>Departure from Kunming</b>  via CA 906 at 1835H (Mr. Arne Svensson)  via CZ 3864 at 2035H (Mr. Daniel Shallon)	<b>Arrival in Beijing</b>  via CA 906 at 2155H (Mr. Arne Svensson)  <b>Arrival in Nanning</b>  via CZ 3864 at 2155H (Mr. Daniel Shallon)	<b>Team Member #1</b>  <b>Component: Advocacy/Awareness Raising 0800H:</b> Briefing on Activities under the Advocacy Component <b>Mr. Keam Makarady</b> , Programme Officer, Cambodian Center for Study and Development in Agriculture (CEDAC) (concepts: local CSO awareness raising initiatives on pesticide-related issues)	<b>Team Member #2</b>  <b>Component: Chemicals Management 0800H:</b> Meeting with Ministry of Environment Contact person <b>Mr. Long Rithirak</b> , Deputy Director General  <b>Meeting Venue:</b> Address: 48 Samdech Preah Sihanouk, Phnom Penh Tel : (855) 232 19287 Mobile : (855) 1690 5153 Email : Sopal_laska@yahoo.com
		<b>Morning:</b> Travel to Chenggong County in Kunming City (approx 1 hr)  <b>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</b> Visit post-FFS activities and the supply chain of IPM products produced by FFS alumni (Concept: sustainability of FFS, FFS improve food safety, FFS help farmers better access to market )  <b>Afternoon:</b> Feedback from Review Mission on findings and recommendations and further discussions (as needed) on the Yunnan component of the PRR programme  <b>Meeting Venue:</b> Yunnan PPS meeting room	



## Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"

Date/ Departures	Arrivals	Itinerary	
		<p><i>Component : Policy Reform</i>  <b>1000H:</b>            Meeting with <b>Mr. Ouk Syphan</b>, Director, Department of Agricultural Legislation (DAL) and <b>Mr. Chea Chan Veasna</b>, Deputy Director DAL and Institutional Counterpart for the Policy Component  <b>Meeting Venue:</b>            Department of Agricultural Legislation (DAL), MAFF            Address: # 200, Norodom Boulevard, Phnom Penh</p>	
		<p><b>Component:</b>            Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM  <b>1400H:</b> Meeting with <b>H.E. So Khan Rithykun</b>, General Director of General Directorate of Agriculture (GDA) and Director of the National IPM Programme and with <b>Mr. Ngin Chhay</b>, Director of Department of Rice Crop and Deputy Director of National IPM Programme Team (concept:</p>	<p><i>Team Member #1 (Mr. Arne Svensson)</i>            Check in at Hotel Kunlun            Address: 2 Xin Yuan Nan Lu, Chaoyang District, Beijing            Tel: 86-10-6590 3388            Fax: 86-10-6590 3228            Email: info@hotelkunlun.com</p>
			<p><i>Team Member #2 (Mr. Daniel Shallon)</i>            Check in at Guangxi Wharton International Hotel            Address: Road Minzu 88 #, Nanning City, Guangxi province            Telephone: 86-771-2111888</p>

## Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"

Date/ Departures	Arrivals	Itinerary		
		<p>Government-FAO partnership in strengthening the abilities of local and national staff in planning, organising and managing IPM-PRR programmes )</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> General Directorate of Agriculture Address: House 54B, Street 656, Sangkat Teuk Laak 3, Khan Toul Kork, Phnom Penh Tel: (855-12) 833 777</p>	<p><b>Web Site:</b> <a href="http://hotelkunlun.com">http://hotelkunlun.com</a></p>	
9 November, Wednesday		<p><b>Component:</b> <i>Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i></p> <p><b>0800H:</b> Meeting with <b>Mr. Suon Seng</b>, Executive Director, Center for Development Oriented Research in Agriculture and Livelihood Systems (CENTDOR) (concept: impact of PRR training)</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> House No. 71-D. St. 186, Sangkat Toek Laok III, Khan Toul Kork, Phnom Penh Tel: (855-12) 820 695; Fax: (855-23) 881 031 Email: suonseng@online.com.kh</p> <p><b>1030H:</b> Plenary MTE Mission Debriefing on key findings and recommendation with <b>Ms. Nina Brandstrup</b>, FAO Representative, FAO Cambodia and all local partners/ stakeholders (concept: feedback on initial MTE mission observations/recommendations and validation/correction of information obtained)</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> House No. 5. St. 370, Boeung Keng Kang II,</p>	<p><b>Team Member #1</b> <b>(Mr. Arne Svensson)</b></p> <p><b>Morning:</b> <b>Component:</b> <i>Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i></p> <p>Briefing on the development and impacts of the IPM/PRR Programme in China <b>Mr. Yang Puyun</b>, Director, Division of Pest Control, NATESC</p> <p><b>Component:</b> <i>Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i></p> <p>Symposium with <b>Mr. Zhong Tianrun</b>, National IPM Programme Coordinator and Deputy Director General, NATESC</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> Building #20, Maizidian Street, Chaoyang District, Beijing Tel: 86-10-59194542 Fax: 86-10-59194542 Email:</p>	<p><b>Team Member #2</b> <b>(Mr. Daniel Shallon)</b></p> <p><b>Component:</b> <i>Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i></p> <p>Briefing on the development of the PRR programme in Guangxi <b>Mr. Wang Huasheng</b>, Vice Director, Guangxi PPS</p> <p><b>Component:</b> <i>Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i></p> <p>Symposium with the relevant programme administrative staff and Trainers <b>(Mr. Qin Baorong; Ms. Li Li; Ms. Chen Lili; Mr. Xie Yilin; Mr. Liu Jianwen</b> from Guangxi PPS and some Trainers from Nanning city PPS)</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> Guangxi Prov. PPS. Road Minzu 38-18, Nanning City, Guangxi Prov. Tel: 86-771-5868258 Fax: 86-771-5868258 Email: gxfz@vip.163.com</p> <p><b>Component:</b> <i>Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i></p> <p>Visit to FFS in Shanglin county (approx 2 hrs)</p> <p><b>Component:</b> <i>Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i></p> <p>Visit demonstration field for rice-duck production established by Farmer Trainees</p> <p><b>Component:</b> <i>Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i></p> <p>Interview with farmers (concepts: the impacts of and changes from PRR training; basic information about</p>

Kommenterad [A1]:

## Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"

Date/ Departures	Arrivals	Itinerary		
		<p>Khan Chamkamorn, Phnom Penh Tel: (855-23) 216 566; Fax: (855-23) 216 547 Email: FAO-KH@fao.org</p> <p>Report writing</p>	<p>yangpy@agri.gov.cn</p> <p><i>Component:</i> <i>Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i></p> <p>Symposium with <b>Mr. Ji Shaoqin</b>, Director, Division of Agriculture Extension of Science and Education Department, MOA (concept: the relevant policy and finance support from the government for FFS in China)</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> #11, Nongzhanguan Nanli, Chaoyang District, Beijing Tel: 86-10-59192266</p> <p><i>Afternoon:</i> Visit to the FAO Representation <b>Mr. Percy Wachata Misika</b>, FAO Representative <b>Mr. Zhang Zhongjun</b>, Assistant FAO Representative</p>	<p>GO-NGO cooperation)</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> Gaojiu Village, Shanglin county, Nanning City</p> <p>Travel from Shanglin County to Rongan County (approx 5 hrs)</p> <p><b>Check in at Hotel</b> <b>Address:</b>Rongan County, Guangxi province <b>Telephone:</b> Details to be provided</p>
<p>10 November, Thursday</p> <p><b>Departure from Phnom Penh</b></p> <p>via VN 920 at 1630H <b>(Dr. Gunilla Bjorklund and Dr. Dam Quoc Tru)</b></p>	<p><b>Arrival in Vientiane</b></p> <p>via VN 920 at 1800H <b>(Dr. Gunilla Bjorklund)</b></p> <p><b>Arrival in Hanoi</b></p> <p>via VN 920 at 1945H <b>(Dr. Dam Quoc Tru)</b></p>	<p>Report writing</p> <p><b>Check in Chanthapanya Hotel, 138 Nokeokuman Street, Ban Mixay, Chanthabouli District, Vientiane, Lao PDR</b> Telephone: +856 21 244 284</p>	<p><i>Team Member #1 (Mr. Arne Svensson)</i></p> <p><i>Morning:</i> <i>Component:</i> <i>Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i></p> <p>Briefing on the development of the IPM programme in Beijing and the relevant policy support from Agricultural Bureau of Beijing City <b>Mr. Zhang Linjun</b>, Director of Beijing City</p> <p><i>Component:</i> <i>Farmer/Community</i></p>	<p><i>Team Member #2 (Mr. Daniel Shallon)</i></p> <p><i>Morning:</i> <i>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i></p> <p>Visit to a Peasant Association organized by FFS alumni (concepts: the achievements of PRR in the village; the impact on farmer trainee/association member)</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> Banmao Village, Rongan County, Guangxi Province</p> <p><i>Afternoon:</i> Travel from Rongnan County to Nanning City (approx 5 hours)</p>

## Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"

Date/ Departures	Arrivals	Itinerary	
			<p><i>Education on PRR and IPM</i> Symposium with <b>Mr. Xiao Changkun</b>, Director of Science and Education Division of Beijing PPS</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> No. 9, Beisanhuan Middle Road, Xicheng District, Beijing Tel: 86-10-82071405</p> <p><i>Afternoon: Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i> Visit to FFS (approx 1 hr) and interview with farmers (concept: impacts and effects of PRR training)</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> Xixincheng Village, Xingshou Town, Changping county, Beijing city</p>
<p>11 November, Friday</p> <p><b>Departure from Beijing</b></p> <p>via VN 513 at 1545H (Mr. Arne Svensson)</p> <p><b>Departure from Nanning</b></p> <p>via MU 783 at 1015H (Mr. Daniel Shallon)</p>	<p><b>Arrival in Hanoi</b></p> <p>via VN 513 at 1820H (Mr. Arne Svensson)</p> <p><b>Arrival in Vientiane</b></p> <p>via MU 783 at 1050H (Mr. Daniel Shallon)</p>	<p><b>Team Vietnam:</b> (<b>Dr. Dam Quoc Tru</b>)</p> <p><b>0830H</b> Meeting with <b>Mr. Vuong Truong Giang</b>, Chief; <b>Dr. Tran Thai Hoa</b>, Vice Chief and <b>Mr. Do Van Hoe</b>, Pesticides Management Division, Plant Protection Department, MARD</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> Plant Protection Department, MARD Address: 149 Ho Duc Di Street, Dong Da, Hanoi Tel: (84-4) 3533 1562/3851 8194 Email: p.qlt@fpt.vn</p> <p><b>1400H</b> Meeting with <b>Mr</b></p>	<p><b>Team Laos:</b></p> <p><i>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i> (<b>0900H-1000H</b>) Courtesy visit to <b>Dr. Monthathip Chanphengxay</b>, Director General of Department of Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry</p> <p><i>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i> (<b>1300H-1430H</b>) Briefing discussions with FAO IPM Programme Staff, <b>Mr. Thongsavanh Taipangnavong</b> and <b>Ms. Vornthalom Chanthavong</b></p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> FAO-IPM Programme Office, Salakham Plant Protection Centre, Hatsayphong District, Vientiane Capital</p> <p><b>Component: Policy Reform</b> (<b>1430H-1600H</b>) Discussion meeting with <b>Ms. Khamphoui Louanglath</b>, Director of Regulatory Division/National IPM and Policy Component Coordinator</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> National IPM Programme Office, Salakham Plant Protection Centre</p> <p><i>Component: Policy Reform</i> (<b>1615H-1630H</b>) Visit to pesticide shop(s) in Hatxayphong (approx 15 mins) and/or in Saithany District (approx 40 mins)</p>

## Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"

Date/ Departures	Arrivals	Itinerary	
		<p><b>Huynh Van Thon</b>, Chairman, An Giang Plant Protection Service Company (AGPPS) Hanoi Branch</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> AGPPS Hanoi Branch Address: BT1, BT6, Phap Van, Tu Hiep, Hoang Liet Ward, Hoang Mai District, Ha Noi city Tel. (84-4) 3681 5126/ 3681 5127 Fax (84-4) 3681 5128</p> <p><b>(Mr. Arne Svensson)</b> Check in at Hanoi Horizon Hotel 40 Cát Linh, Ba Đình Hà Nội, Vietnam Tel: (844) 719 0532</p>	
12 November, Saturday	<p><i>Team Member #1</i> <b>(Mr. Arne Svensson)</b></p> <p><i>Component: Chemicals Management</i> 0830H Meeting with <b>Mr Luu Hoang Ngoc</b>, Deputy Director General, Vietnam Chemicals Agency (Vinachemia) - Ministry of Industry and Trade (MOIT)</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> MOIT Address: 91 Dinh Tien Hoang, Hoan Kiem, Ha Noi Mobile phone: (84) 913 393 606 Tel: (844) 22</p>	<p><i>Team Member #2</i> <b>(Dr. Dam Quoc Tru)</b></p> <p><i>Component : Advocacy/ Awareness Raising</i> 0830H Meeting with <b>Ms. Pham Kim Ngoc</b>, Director and <b>Ms. Pham Huong Thao</b>, Programme Officer, Research Center for Gender, Family and Environme nt (CGFED) (concepts: local CSO advocacy in</p>	<p><i>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i> <b>(0900H-1200H):</b> Meeting (interview) with farmers in Donxingxou Village, Sikhottabong District, Vientiane Capital (approx 30 mins) (concepts: Impact of IPM FFS and results of PRR FT)</p> <p><i>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i> <b>(1400H-1700H):</b> Meeting (interview) with farmers in Mai Village, Sikhottabong District, Vientiane Capital (approx 30 mins) (concept: results of PRR farmer training)</p>

## Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"

Date/ Departures	Arrivals	Itinerary	
		205 136 Fax: (844) 22 205 038 Email: ngochl@moit.gov.vn	support of pesticide risk reduction)  <b>Meeting            Venue:</b> CGFED Address: 19-A26 Nghia Tan Street, Cau Giay, Hanoi Tel: (844) 3756 5929, Fax: (844) 3756 5874 Web site: www.cgfed.org.vn
		<p><i>Component:</i>  <i>Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i></p> <p><b>1330H</b> Overview of the Vietnam National IPM Programme by <b>Mr. Ngo Tien Dung</b>, Deputy Director of Plant Protection Department, MARD and National IPM Programme Coordinator (concepts: Government-FAO partnership in strengthening the abilities of local and national staff in planning, organising and managing IPM-PRR programmes)</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> Plant Protection Department, MARD            Address: 149 Ho Dac Di Street, Dong Da, Hanoi            Tel: (84-4) 3533 0778/9 ext 107            Fax: (84-4) 3533 0780            Email: ipmppd@fpt.vn</p> <p><b>1500H</b> Meeting with <b>Mr. Nguyen Xuan Hong</b>, Director General, Plant Protection Department, MARD</p>	
13 November, Sunday		<b>0600H</b> Travel to Thai Binh province (approx 3 hrs)	<p><i>Component: Advocacy/Awareness Raising</i></p> <p>Morning: Visit REAL activities with <b>Mr. Bandith Keothongkham</b>, Project Manager, Non-profit Association of Lao Development and Environment</p>

## Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"

Date/ Departures	Arrivals	Itinerary	
		<p><i>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i>  <b>0900H</b> Meeting with <b>Ms. Ta Thi Minh</b>, Director, Thai Binh Plant Protection Sub Department (PPSD) and IPM Trainers (concepts: uptake of FAO IPM-PRR programme; use of FFS-based farmer education programme for GAP; development of local policies in support of IPM-PRR local government and community commitment and action towards pesticide risk reduction)</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> Thai Binh PPSD  Address: 18 Quang Trung street, Thai Binh city, Thai Binh province  Tel: (84-36) 3834 800</p> <p><i>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i>  <b>1300H</b> Meeting with IPM-PRR FFS alumni engaged in minimum tillage potato production (concepts: results of community IPM-PRR education programmes such as community action plans to address pesticide risk reduction and other concerns such as adaptation to changes in the environment)</p> <p>Location: Thai Giang commune, Thai Thuy district, Thai Binh province</p> <p><b>1600H</b> Return travel to Hanoi</p>	<p>(NALDE) in Saithany District, Vientiane Capital (concepts: results of the pesticide impact assessment; and results of activities on biodiversity conservation)</p> <p><i>Afternoon:</i> Free</p>
14 November, Monday		<p><b>0700H</b> Travel to Hanoi province (approx 1.5 hrs)</p>	<p><i>Component: Advocacy/Awareness Raising</i>  <b>(0900H-1000H):</b> Meeting with <b>Mrs. Monemany Nhoibouakong</b>, Director General of Cabinet Office of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment</p> <p><i>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i>  <b>(1030H-1200H):</b> Meeting with <b>Dr. Laxay Nouanthasing</b>, Director of Agriculture Section of Vientiane Capital</p> <p><i>Component: Advocacy/Awareness Raising</i>  <b>(1330H-1700H):</b> Meeting with <b>Mr. Thongdam Phongphichith</b>, Co-Director,</p>

## Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"

Date/ Departures	Arrivals	Itinerary	
			Sustainable Agriculture and Environment Development Association (SAEDA)  <b>Meeting Venue:</b> No. 291 Unit 15, Ban Saphangmoh, Xaisettha District, Vientiane Capital
		<p><i>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i> Visit IPM-PRR Farmers' Groups attached to Huong Canh Company in Van Duc commune, Gia Lam District, Ha Noi (concepts: results of community IPM-PRR education programmes, i.e., IPM-PRR farmers' groups have better access and links to markets)</p> <p><i>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM &amp; Component: Advocacy/Awareness Raising</i> Meeting with <b>Ms. Nguyen Thi Hoa</b>, Director and <b>Mr. Do Danh Kiem</b>, Vice Director, Hanoi PPSD and IPM Trainers (concepts: uptake of IPM-PRR programme; funding of FFS under Safe Vegetable Programme; development of local policies in support of IPM-PRR; collaborative NIPM-CSO IPM-PRR and agro-biodiversity activities in schools)</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> Hanoi PPSD Address: Mai Dich, Cau Giay district, Hanoi city Tel: (84-4) 3763 3617</p>	
		<p>1130H Return travel to Hanoi capitol</p> <p><i>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</i> 1400H Meeting with <b>Dr. Do Kim Chung</b>, Dean Faculty of Economics and Rural Development, Hanoi University of Agriculture (concept: impact of PRR training)</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> HUA Address: Gia Lam district, Hanoi city Tel: (84-4) 3676 2681; Fax: (84-4) 3827 6522 Email: dkchung@hua.edu.vn</p> <p>14H00 Meeting with Mr. Tran van Long, director and Ms. Nguyen Thi Thu Nga, Project officer, The Center for Rural progress (CRP)</p>	
15 November, Tuesday  <b>Departure from Hanoi</b>  via TG 565 at	<b>Arrival in Bangkok</b>	0700H Travel to Hung Yen Regional Plant Protection Center (approx 1.5 hrs)	Morning: Debriefing meeting/feedback session with National & FAO IPM Staff, REAL and SAEDA representative  <b>Meeting Venue:</b> Programme Office, Salakham Plant Protection Centre



## Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"

Date/ Departures	Arrivals	Itinerary	
2025H (Mr. Arne Svensson and Dr. Dam Quoc Tru)  Departure from Vientiane	via TG 565 at 2215H (Mr. Arne Svensson and Dr. Dam Quoc Tru)		(1400H-1500H): Debriefing meeting with <b>Dr. Dong Qingsong</b> , FAOR a.i., FAO Laos  <b>Meeting Venue:</b> FAO Representation Office in Vientiane Tel: (856-21) 414 503; Fax: (856-21) 414 500 Email: FAO-LAO@fao.org
via TG 575 at 2150H (Dr. Gunilla Bjorklund and Mr. Daniel Shallon)	via TG 575 at 2255H (Dr. Gunilla Bjorklund and Mr. Daniel Shallon)	<p><b>Component: Farmer/Community Education on PRR and IPM</b></p> <p>Meeting with <b>Mr. Tran Quyet Tam</b>, Director and officials of the Northern RPPC (concepts: functional links fostered between research and extension/ training through the IPM-PRR programme)</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> Hung Yen RPPC Address: Trung Trac commune, Van Lam district, Hung Yen province Tel.: (84-321) 3980 121</p> <p>Meeting with FFS alumni engaged in production and utilization of metarhizium for the management of brown plant hoppers (concepts: alternatives to chemicals for pest management)</p> <p>Location: Vinh Hong village, Binh Giang district, Hai Duong province</p>	
16 November,		<p><b>1130H</b> Return travel to Hanoi</p> <p><b>1400H</b> Plenary MTE Mission Debriefing on key findings and recommendation with <b>Ms. Yuriko Shoji</b>, FAO Representative, FAO Vietnam and all local partners/ stakeholders (concept: feedback on initial MTE mission observations/recommendations and validation/correction of information obtained)</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> No. 3, Nguyen Gia Thieu Street, Hanoi Tel: (844) 3942 4208; Fax: (844) 3942 3257 Email: FAO-VNM@fao.org</p> <p>Report writing</p> <p>Check in at Siam City Hotel Address: 477 Si Ayuthaya Road, Phayathai Bangkok Tel.: 0-2247-0123 Fax.: 0-2247-0165 Email: ratchanikrit@siamhotels.com Website: <a href="http://www.siamhotels.com/siamcity/">http://www.siamhotels.com/siamcity/</a></p>	

Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"

Date/ Departures	Arrivals	Itinerary
Wednesday		<p>Morning: 09.00 Visit to the Swedish Embassy 20<sup>th</sup> Floor, One Pacific Place 140 Sukhumvit Road, Bangkok Tel: (66-2) 263-7200 Fax: (66-2) 263-7260</p>
17 November, Thursday		<p>Morning: Team discussions</p> <p>13H30-16H30: MTE Mission Debriefing (informal): Presentation and Discussions with all regional partner/stakeholders at RAP</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> Siam City Hotel</p> <p><b>1630H:</b> Departure from Hotel to FAO RAP</p> <p><b>17H30-18H30:</b> Debriefing with <b>Mr. Hiroyuki Konuma</b>, Assistant Director-General and FAO Regional Representative for Asia and the Pacific</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Room B-207 39 Phra Atit Road, Bangkok Tel: (66-2) 697 4314</p>
18 November, Friday		<p>Morning: Team discussions</p> <p>14H00 – 17H00 MTE Mission Debriefing (formal) Presentations and Discussions with all regional partner/stakeholders and interested RAP staff, donors at RAP</p> <p><b>Meeting Venue:</b> Siam City Hotel</p> <p>Team discussions</p>

**Annex 6****Report on field visit to China**

The points of departure for the evaluation are (1) the Programme documents and (2) the summaries for each country programme that has been produced by project management covering the points of the evaluation terms of reference. The summaries are regarded as the project management's self-evaluation.

The verification of the information in the self-evaluation is ensured through desk studies (Annex 3) and multiple interviews with various stakeholders (Annex 4). The Sub-team visiting China has in this Annex summarised the observations and analysis during the field visit to China.

This Annex draws on the Scope of the Evaluation as stated in ToR. It summarises the sub-team's observations on each of the evaluation questions one by one.

**1. Effectiveness****1.1 To what extent has the programme produced outputs and outcomes compared to the revised LFA? What is the prognosis for reaching the targets for outcomes and overall objectives within the programme period?**

In Yunnan province 189 FFSs have been implemented in the 48 counties of 13 prefectures and 4204 farmers have participated in these FFSs. The main target groups are rice, vegetable, fruit, and sugarcane, wheat, potato and maize farmers. In total 3 TOT/RTOT/LTOT have been carried out and 84 facilitators have received training. The main activities in Yunnan are focusing on strengthening ongoing field training work, reforming the training curriculum for pesticide risk reduction.

In the ToT during 2007-2009 participated 32 IPM and PRR-FFS facilitators in season-long IPM courses and three-day PRR training courses funded partly by the Programme. Another 30 IPM-FFS facilitators were trained in refresher courses to upgrade knowledge and skills on community education for PRR.

Most of the IPM-PRR trainers are now actively involved in the implementation of fortified IPM-Pesticide Risk Reduction farmer training.

In Yunnan province, from 2008 to 2011, there have been a total of 179 3-day PRR FFSs conducted in 43 counties, training a total of 52 facilitators and 5230 participants. In Guangxi province 195 FFSs have been implemented in the 33 counties of 13 prefectures. Altogether 96 facilitators have been trained and 5850 farmers have participated in these FFSs. The main target group includes rice, vegetable, fruit and maize farmers. In total 3 TOT/RTOT/LTOT have been implemented and 150 person-time have received training. The main activities in Guangxi have been focused on strengthening the training team, developing the regional IPM-FFS capacity.

The following results were reported:

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

- Compared with the untrained farmers, the trained farmers reduced pesticide applications up to 4 times per season, decreased 33% amounts and 38% costs in rice.
- Compared with the untrained farmers, the trained farmers reduced pesticide applications up to 4 times per season, decreased 30% amounts and 36% costs in vegetable.
- Compared with the untrained farmers, the trained farmers reduced pesticide applications up to 2 times per season, decreased 21% amounts and 25% costs in fruit.

Other results that are reported of the Programme include:

- The traditional curriculum for FFS has been enriched with PRR.
- Extended the coverage of national prioritized crops with tobacco that is preferred by farmers due to the increased income
- Introduced FFS and PRR in Guangxi province
- Promoted FFS and PRR in local governments in both provinces
- Extended the experiences to Beijing city
- The new training methods are more participatory. As told repeatedly to the mission by trainees, the approach is bottom-up not top-down as in the usual Chinese model.
- Promote farmers perspective of the use of pesticides taking their own driving forces as point of departure

The total number of FFS in Yunnan and Guangxi provinces is 374. This can be compared with Beijing city where during the period 2005-2010 a total of 723 FFS were set up. During the same period 920 facilitators has been trained. During spring 2011 another 154 FFS has been set up in Beijing city. The main difference between these cases is the amount of investment by the Beijing City government compared too much greater dependence on project support in Yunnan and Guangxi.

When the FFS was introduced in Beijing city 2005 with the assistance from Yunnan province and technical support from the Canadian CIDA the goal was to establish 100 FFS during the period 2005-2010. The goal for the present period 2011-2015 is to set up 1 000 new FFS, thus, covering 50% of the villages. The new program is to 99% financed by the local government. NATESC and CIDA are providing some technical support only.

### **1.2 Have there been specific implementation problems and have programme partners been able to address these on regional and national level?**

FFS was introduced in China 1994. The main problem on national level is lack of government funding meeting the requirements for broadened service delivery. Presently FFS is introduced in some 20 provinces. Out of more than 200 million farmer households in all of China, 200 000 so far have participated in national programmes. In the national financed programme an additional 30 000 farmer households per year will be trained through FFS. In the national programme another 800 FFS will be set up. In the national programme the IPM old training model without PRR is still used. However, there is an ongoing process on further developing the model taken into account the experiences in Yunnan, Guangxi and other provinces with integration of PRR.

One problem is that the farmers' individual incentives are not always consistent with national priorities. Farmers tend to prioritize the family economy and therefore they prefer producing for example tobacco that gives higher income despite the fact that food security is the priority in China. The Government is trying to find a balance between different driving forces within the country's priorities.

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

Recent unusually large price fluctuations in agricultural commodities have also meant that farmers will often switch cash crops between one season and the next, and IPM/PRR facilitators have had trouble keeping abreast of the necessary skills for the new crops. Efforts are being made to update the capacities of facilitators as fast as possible.

### **1.3 Have programme partners implemented adequate monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, transparency and accountability mechanisms as well as efficient financial management?**

In order to help guide trainers maintain FFS training quality, a FFS Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) system has been introduced in TOTs and embedded into FFS reports for self monitoring. Relevant staff from NATESC, Guangxi PPS, Yunnan PPS and FAO IPM office has undertaken M&E visits to training/ field activities.

External evaluations such as this one have also been conducted regularly for safeguarding and improving training quality.

### **1.4 To what extent have governments provided support and made commitments to the programme?**

For 2011, the Programme's contribution to activities and project operations in China under the PRR project is approx. US\$ 90,350 with the greatest part (90%) for training-related expenses (approx. US\$ 81,000). As counterpart contribution, NATESC and local governments has funded approx. US\$ 88,250 to support local PRR and IPM FFS and other programme related training activities in Yunnan and Guangxi.

During 2003-2010, the FAO Vegetable IPM and IPM/PRR programs contributed about US\$ 600,000 for supporting training activities in Yunnan and Guangxi Provinces. National and local governments have provided US\$ 316,000 to support local FFS activities.

As for local government commitment on expanding trainers' network, some 60 facilitators have also participated in season-long IPM courses and in PRR training courses in Yunnan Province funded entirely by local governments.

While not directly under the KemI programme being evaluated here, it should also be noted that the Ministry of Agriculture is making a large investment in disseminating the IPM-FFS approach as a national extension methodology in several parts of the country, and in particular, the team saw the work being financed by Beijing Municipality in promoting this approach.

### **1.5 To what extent have recommendations made by the 2009 review mission been implemented by the programme partners?**

Most of the interviewees were not aware of which decisions the Programme Steering Group agreed on after reviewing the recommendations made by the 2009 review mission. However, the Ministry of Agriculture expressed an interest in being more actively involved in order to upgrade the Programme from mainly service delivery to more strategic policy issues.

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

### **1.6 Are the technical options and training methods up to date with today's development approaches?**

The improved training model in Yunnan province includes 3-days community training in PRR and then IPM/FFS ongoing during the whole growing season. The concept of a 3-days community education model on PRR as a prelude to IPM FFS training was introduced and piloted in Yunnan Province. This is a unique concept that is not practiced in any other province or in the national programme.

The following training materials have been developed and used in the processes at the national level:

- Draft Ecological guides for Chinese cabbage, sugar pea and tomato production in Chinese prepared earlier were reviewed by technical consultants and will be published in the first half year of 2012.
- Tested and refined a fortified pesticide risk reduction curriculum for integration in IPM and PRR FFS and FFS-follow-up training activities. In Guangxi and Yunnan, the fortified FFS curricula were pilot tested and refined in FFS, post FFS training activities.
- TOT logs developed in both Guangxi and Yunnan has served as valuable reference for PRR community education conducted by TOT graduates.

### **1.7 How are the impact assessment studies that have been performed within the programme spread and used?**

Impact assessment on IPM-FFS training was carried out in Yunnan with FAO support during the period 2004-2007. A Results Presentation and Policy workshop was organized in Yunnan in May 2010. Participants including policy makers, extension agents, farmers and researchers learned more about IPM FFS impacts and the potential of FFS for rural development. Participants expressed commitments for continued support to IPM and PRR and also institutionalization of FFS in local rural development projects.

The economic benefit analysis of IPM and FP pilot in Rongan county shows that the average income has increased with 4860 Yuan per mu (2700 kg/mu×1.8 Yuan/kg) in the FP Pilot and 6720 Yuan per mu (2800kg/mu×2.4Yuan/kg) in the IPM Pilot.

### **1.8 To what extent has the possibility to address gender issues been taken /used by programme partners?**

In the 378 IPM FFSs with fortified PRR curriculum in Yunnan and Guangxi about 48 % of the participating about 10,000 farmers are female. In some of the FFSs encountered in Yunnan and Guangxi, the group is dominated by a large majority of women. When selecting facilitators for ToT and selecting participants for FFS different criteria has been used in the provinces but also locally. In most cases interested farmers have been invited to apply through some kind of advertising (posters, meetings, Intranet). Two requirements seems to have general 1) the participant must be the decision-maker in the household 2) the participant shall have the potential to inspire also others that are not participating in the FFS. In several of the villages we visited, the majority of men migrated to the cities in search of economic opportunities, and the groups were almost entirely women. In the cases where local production was significantly beneficial cash crop (a famous variety of pears in one case, and of kumquat oranges in another), men did not leave and the corresponding groups were made up almost exclusively of men.

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

### **1.9 To what extent have programme partners used the regional network for planning, implementation and evaluation of programme activities?**

The Chinese Partners are NATESC at the national level, Yunnan and Guangxi PPS at the province level and the CSO PEAC. They have all actively participated in the regional network.

So far the regional network has to a limited extent been used for planning, implementation and evaluation of programme activities. Implementation is done by each organization not using input from the other organizations in a systematic way.

However, there is an interest in more exchange of experiences and collaboration between the partners working on different components in the Programme. For example, following observation of inadequate communication and interaction between the CSO component and the government components of the programme, at the debriefing meeting the Evaluation Team organised participation of the leadership of the Yunnan PPS, Kunming PPS and the CSO PEAC. The parties expressed an interest in more in-depth sharing of experiences and possible collaboration at the same sites with complementary approaches, to identify how to use the results achieved to further improve the FFS model. This could be an interesting collaboration of strategic importance as there is no CSO involved in the national programme, the Beijing city programme or any other programme on province level.

Also, the Ministry of Agriculture has in the interview expressed an interest in being more involved in the Programme for example by participating in the regional network's activities.

### **1.10 How have assumptions and risks been handled by the programme partners?**

There are four assumptions formulated in the LFA:

- Governments and stakeholder in the program countries take an active interest in the programme and set aside financial and human resources for implementation of sustainable measures, such as implementation of legislation. *This has been done.*
- Communities are interested and actively involved in programme activities. *This has been the case.*
- Relevant decision - makers will attend the seminars and meetings. *This has been the case.*
- National and local governments continue to make available staff for the implementation of IPM/Pesticide risk reduction farmer training. *This has been the case.*

## **2. Efficiency**

### **2.1 Is the programme design cost-effective?**

The idea of having a Programme instead of a number of separate projects is that there will be an added value by making sure that the different projects/components are working together and make use of each others resources, knowledge and experiences. At a regional level, active involvement of the China components in the regional meetings, workshops, training activities, etc. has certainly been positive in this sense. Internally, the China programme's close integration of PRR work with

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

the IPM activities has also been a positive achievement with regard to efficiency and, probably, cost-effectiveness. However, there has been no proactive cooperation between the Government and the CSO working in the Programme. The persons we have met were not aware of what kind of work that the other "Partner" has carried out and what the lessons learned has been.

The Programme design as such has the potential of being cost-effective. But there is a need to specify the responsibilities for each Partner when it comes to how to establish and maintain cooperation with the other Partners. A prerequisite for partnership is that both partners are interested in the cooperation and take initiatives to make the cooperation work.

## **2.2 Have the separate programme activities been implemented in a cost-effective manner?**

None of the implementing partners has established any instruments to measure cost-effectiveness. However, considering the very limited amounts being invested in this programme, and the apparent quite wide awareness of its work and benefits, it would be safe to say that it is likely to be a very cost-effective investment.

## **3. Relevance**

### **3.1 Is the programme and its design relevant for addressing present and future priorities and needs? Does the programme design allow adjustments to changing circumstances and new opportunities?**

In China the Programme is implemented in Yunnan and Guangxi provinces, which both are parts of the Greater Mekong Sub-region. Rice, fruits and vegetables are the most important food and cash crops for farmers in these two provinces, along with tobacco. However, these crops are the crops most sprayed with pesticides. For example, overuse of pesticides in rice has led to the outbreaks of BPH in recent years.

The increasing attention being paid by the government of China to the issue of pesticides and pesticide risks, including accelerating issuance of rules, regulations, bans and guidelines on use of a wide range of pesticides and other agricultural chemicals, indicate that the PRR programme is highly relevant to national policy at this time. Add to this the fact that NATESC at central level continues to express a growing interest in taking up and disseminating the PRR/FFS approach, and relevance to priority present needs is clear.

The PRR program was initiated in Guangxi and Yunnan 2007, the whole period is from 2007 to 2011. The program has been implemented based on the previous training capacity built by FAO/China vegetable IPM program. The emphasis on PRR training has been focused on rice, fruit and vegetable farmers, who heavily rely on pesticides for pest control.

As mentioned above the priorities of the Government and the priorities of the farmers are not identical. There is a tendency among farmers and FFS in Yunnan province to also include – and in some villages even prioritise - tobacco production instead of the production of food. There are in the Programme design or the implementation of the Programme no instruments to safeguard against using the Programme partly for the benefit of the tobacco industry instead of for food security.



*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

### **3.2 Have partners been able to adjust to new emerging needs/problems within the framework of the programme?**

Various TOT models have been developed and experimented with in Yunnan and Guangxi provinces respectively. The effectiveness of various models has not yet been assessed. The current four-month TOT model is challenging for institutionalisation in local agriculture extension system, Beijing city presently uses a one-month TOT model. According to the facilitators we met this is enough. Also, we were told that the number of facilitators in Guangxi and Yunnan needs to be further increased for expansion of facilitators' network. The issue mentioned above of fluctuating commodity prices and consequent rapid crop switching by farmers indicates that there is a need to have more flexible and possibly a short version of TOTs for trainers to be able to adjust with sufficient rapidity to changing technical needs.

One problem seems to be related to the actual implementation on field level. When it comes to the implementation of the 3-day community PRR training and season-long IPM, some FFS farmers expressed preference for having a possibility to address all kinds of crop production problems in the training rather than a focus on primarily PRR as per the current curriculum of the three-day PRR training. In the interviews farmers has emphasised the need of taking a holistic view of FFS and not to split it up in bits and pieces due to donors or implementing partners priorities.

In May 1, 2011 China banned smoking at all indoor public and work places. However, participants as well as facilitators are still smoking in the classroom at FFS. In addition to non-compliance with government regulations this has a negative effect on the training and also brings doubts about the seriousness in addressing the health problems connected with use of pesticides when at the same time health problems related to the use of tobacco is neglected. Also, it has in the interviews been stated that the State Tobacco Monopoly Administration has more influence on FFS than NATESC thus given priority to tobacco production in the Yunnan province. These issues have not been addressed by the programme partners.

In May 1, 2011 China banned smoking at all indoor public and work places. However, participants as well as facilitators are still smoking in the classroom at FFS. In addition to non-compliance with government regulations this has a negative effect on the training and also brings doubts about the seriousness in addressing the health problems connected with use of pesticides when at the same time health problems related to the use of tobacco is neglected. Also, it has in the interviews been stated that the State Tobacco Monopoly Administration has more influence on FFS than NATESC thus given priority to tobacco production in the Yunnan province. These issues have not been addressed by the programme partners.

The Team has not been provided with any other examples of need to adjust to unforeseen problems on other levels in the framework of the Programme.

### **3.3 Are the programme's development objectives and immediate objectives (including specification of targets and identification of beneficiaries) feasible?**

The revised LFA is stated as being more realistic than the old one. According to the interviewees the programme's development objectives and immediate objectives are relevant and achievable.

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

### **3.4 Have the established relationships with external institutions been functional and beneficial for the programme?**

In China the Programme has established limited relationships with external institutions, mainly in the form of involving university faculty as specialists in some of the training activities, mainly with Yunnan University in Kunming. This was reported to be successful in both strengthening content of the training, and raising awareness at the university, leading to some further collaboration outside of the project.

## **4. Sustainability**

### **4.1 Does the programme promote/ensure a sustainable regional ex-change and co-ordination in order to achieve pesticide risk reduction and good chemical management?**

While this question refers mainly to inter-country regional work of the programme as a whole, here it is looked at from the point of view of exchange between regions within the country.

During 2003-2010, the FAO Regional vegetable IPM & IPM/PRR programs provided technical assistance to government-supported IPM training activities in other provinces/municipalities (Shandong, Beijing, Tianjin, Chongqing, Hubei, Shanxi, Guizhou, Jiangxi). In addition, the work done in Yunnan province led to activities in other provinces mainly based on the ad-hoc transfer of staff involved in the project to other regions.

However, sustainable in-country exchange between regional ex-changes and co-ordination is a responsibility of the Government and not the Programme, and it would appear that Government has promoted such exchange effectively.

When it comes to Institutionalization and sustainability the following should be mentioned:

- In Yunnan, Guangxi and Beijing City local governments have taken a keen interest in FFS approaches to rural extension and are providing support for FFS programs as part of a local commitment to implement the national government policy of creating a harmonized rural society.
- Other relevant projects include the MOA-GEF project, which provides funding for FFS in Shanxi, Shandong and Hubei provinces.
- The Science, Technology and Education Department of MOA has launched a new initiative aimed at promoting the FFS model at policy level for institutionalisation and up-scaling of the FFS-based extension and farmer education programs in 800 demonstration counties. With government funds, each county will reform and build agro-extension system, including development and implementation of a local county FFS program.

### **4.2 Does the programme design allow for synergies/synergistic effects and encourage further collaboration?**

The programme design allows for synergies/synergistic effects and has established a ground for further collaboration. However, particularly with regard to collaboration between the CSO component and the government components, the potential has not yet been fully used (see above).

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

**4.3 Was it correct to adopt a 10 year horizon for the programme and what measures are being built in to enhance independent continuation by the recipient government departments, NGOs and farming communities?**

Yes, all major stakeholders agree it was correct to adopt a 10 year horizon for the programme. So far, no measures are being built in to enhance independent continuation by the recipient government departments, NGOs and farming communities.

**4.4 What evidence is already visible of the intention of these stakeholders to independently continue project-promoted initiatives?**

As noted above, growing government investment in FFS and PRR is clear evidence of the intention of national, and to some extent local, government to independently continue project-promoted initiatives.

**Annex 7****Report on field visit to Cambodia**

The points of departure for the evaluation are (1) the Programme documents and (2) the summaries for each country programme that has been produced by project management covering the points of the evaluation terms of reference. The summaries are regarded as the project management's self-evaluation.

The verification of the information in the self-evaluation is ensured through desk studies (Annex 3) and multiple interviews with various stakeholders (Annex 4). The Sub-team visiting Cambodia has in this Annex summarised the observations and analysis during the field visit to Cambodia.

This Annex draws on the Scope of the Evaluation as stated in ToR. It summarises the sub-team's observations on each of the evaluation questions one by one.

**1. Effectiveness****1.1 To what extent has the programme produced outputs and outcomes compared to the revised LFA? What is the prognosis for reaching the targets for outcomes and overall objectives within the programme period?*****Objective area 1: 1. Pesticide monitoring and advocacy***

CEDAC, the Cambodian Centre for Study and Development in Agriculture, is one of the partners of the PAN-AP Network, active in Cambodia. CEDAC is actively monitoring pesticide use among the farmers in communities. These monitoring aimed at investigating health effects of the use of hazardous pesticides among the farmers, later to compare with use of ecological produced substances for this kind of treatment. Advocacy campaigns building on these results were held in 5 districts with more than 100 farmers. The campaigns aim at inform people about the strongly adverse impact of pesticides and encouraging the use of alternative ecological methods/substances. The campaigns have included raising awareness on banned products particularly toxic pesticides as well as an attempt to claim a "no pesticide use day".

According to the Narrative Report on the project implementation produced 2010 by the PAN AP and partners including CEDAC, the results of the study were shared with various CSO's and journalists for policy advocacy. It was also used in reports by the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries and by the Ministry of the Environment as reference material. Further these results were also used for drafting new curricula for education concerning pesticides as well as for community awareness building. CEDAC is also a member of the Pesticide Reduction Network in Cambodia, an important forum for sharing information with the government at central and local levels and for information sharing and discussion with other NGOs.

***Objective area 1: 2 Public education and Awareness***

Two different NGOs under the PAN AP network have implemented activities under this area; the CEDAC and ATSA (Agriculture Technology Services Association). CEDAC has been running training activities in 8 communes targeted in 40 villages. They are in this using media broadcasting network; TV-panels, newspapers, magazines, monthly bulletins, etc.

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

ATSA is a local NGO working with The Field Alliance. In 2007 they introduced the concept of "school education for teachers and students" were initiated. 2010 two classes been implemented at secondary school at commune level. The teachers and local education authorities showed interest and adopted the approach. Students used the results of field data when identifying problems and used these to make their parents and other farmers aware of hazardous pesticides, proper storage of pesticides, collecting wastebottles and bags after use, etc.

A National Country Strategy Paper has been developed jointly by the National IPM Programme, CEDAC and ATSA in which detailed arrangements for working together on Community Education on Pesticide Risk Reduction, PRR, are specified.

### ***Objective Area 2: Strengthening of IPM field programmes***

The National IPM Coordinator is linking up with and coordinates with NGOs, government agencies, research and extension, local government and farmers communities in their work to plan and implement IPM and PRR activities in the countries. Further, according to the National Country Strategy Paper, the IPM Coordinator is responsible for overseeing the development, documentation and dissemination of information including impact assessment of successful IPM-work for community education on PRR.

Fortified Farmer Field Schools', Training of Trainers' and Refresher Training curricula and training materials have been developed with focus on pesticide risk reduction, including IPM for new invasive pest/diseases, crops and climate change adaptation. A synergistic approach means that the National IPM Programme has been focusing on farmers training on pesticide risk reduction and CSO have been focusing on awareness raising hazards of chemical pesticide. The National IPM Programme conducted several participatory action researches for updating farmer training curricular on pesticide risk reduction.

During the field visits the MTE team was made aware of that the training methodology on IPM-PRR was positive adopted by farmer communities. Members of the National Team have regularly visited field activities to monitor and provide backstopping to all IPM Trainers in the targeted provinces for improving both technical aspects, facilitation skills and the quality of all IPM activities. Staff has been trained in monitoring and evaluation systems to provide increased training quality concerning FFS. Existed M & E guidelines have been translated, although the M&E results have so far not been used to the extent possible.

The national Government has expressed its support to programme, both concerning policy and strategy. Local governments, where the project is implemented, have committed themselves to support in extension and policy work. The communities have declared their willingness to cooperate with partners; however funding support from the government is still very limited, therefore the sustainable implementation needs to be closely followed.

### ***Objective Area 3: Regulatory Framework and Policy reforms***

The Ministry of Agriculture, Forests and Fisheries has, a month ago, submitted a Law on Pesticides and Fertilizers to the Council of Ministers for approval before submitting it to the Parliament for their enacting, which should be sometime in early 2012. The MAFF has also reviewed and updated the pesticide list including banned, restricted and permitted products. Further, the MAFF is currently overseeing relevant by-law system. The MAFF has in this process a need for assistance as it is important that these by-laws are drafted so that they immediate will get into force when the law is so.

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

One important aspect that needs to be dealt with urgently is the disposal of pesticide containers. So far due to lack of clear instructions and of facilities for disposal, pesticides, including the most harmful ones, are often buried in the ground or thrown as pesticide wastes into canals or irrigation systems.

The Ministry of Environment (MoE) has drafted a Law on chemicals, which is currently submitted to the Council of Ministers for review. The MOE has requested inputs from the Project in this process.

The lack of coordination between the different ministries as well as between the departments within the ministries and the associated agencies has been evident. According to a high level-placed source the communication in the government is mainly directed step-wise from the top and downwards in the different ministries with very little horizontal communication between the different ministries, especially at higher level. There has also been little communication between the different chemical law-teams. A positive sign was therefore that the MTE-team was received by representatives from the MoE, who are involved in the work on the "environmental chemical law" at its arrival to Cambodia. Another, and more important and hopefully sustainable sign is that a National Steering Committee for the Pesticide Law with representatives from all ministries concerned has now been set up chaired by the Minister of MAFF.

New materials for training of inspectors to oversee how the pesticides are dealt with in shops have been produced and pilot inspections were undertaken in Kandal province and in Phnom Penh. The MTE team found that the positive outcome of the activity is limited due to the lack of follow up and legal regulations to control the activities. Inspections done only to advise shop keepers to follow the rules rather than applying penalty when the rules have been offended would be rather lame. The 2009 evaluation report recommended a stronger regulation, including a more viable implementation of the inspections when it comes to pesticides appearing in the shops with text only in languages that people are unable to read. Inspections have, however, shown that in average 80% of the pesticides in some shops still lack text in a language the users are able to read! There is, however, under the Department of Agriculture Legislation (DAL) at the MAFF, measures planned to strengthen this type of inspection according to a discussion paper of April 2010. These measures would be part of the follow-up package linked to the new law. DAL has in the work to strengthen the regulatory control of pesticides been provided assistance by donors such as FAO, WHO, ADB and JICA. Lessons learned from the pilot inspections have contributed to a stronger and clearer mandate for inspectors in the new Law.

***Objective Area 4: Strengthened Chemicals Management Capacity within authorities, industries and stakeholders in the partner countries***

The government of Cambodia, as well as the ones of Laos and Vietnam has committed itself to the "Regional Chemical Management Forums", to host the forum together with Kemi and assign relevant experts to participate. The forums shall identify needs and priorities for strengthening ongoing and establishing new chemical safety measures in Southeast Asia, particularly the GMS, strengthen the capacity of governmental institutions to handle chemicals safety, but also raise awareness of the need for adequate chemical legislation in place and implemented, as well as safety issues in trade related to chemicals. The initiation of these forums has been delayed.

So far have four Regional Chemicals Management Forums taken place, all with participation of expertise also from Cambodia. The 4<sup>th</sup> Forum was held in Cambodia October 11-13, 2011. Issues such as the phasing out of mercury and lead in paint and chemicals and hazardous waste were on the agenda. A large majority of participants were from central governments. The participants were overall satisfied with the forum although, as the issues were to some participants new, they needed more information and more possibilities to discuss.

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

An important regional aspect that might need somewhat more emphasis is the networking between the participants from the different countries.

**1.2 Have there been specific implementation problems and have programme partners been able to address these on regional and national level?**

Problems of implementation concerning education and training or advocacy work are mainly due to lack of collaboration between what is implemented at the local level and the anchoring at governmental level. The Pesticide Reduction Network is an NGO-lead network under which issues including training, Farmers Field Schools, advocacy work etc. are dealt with. The FAO IPM-coordinators are also active in this network. A problem is, however, that the more formal meetings with the network are too few and therefore, although there are more frequent informal discussions, decisions and results of these discussions/meetings are not always fully accessible for all partners. And the website where that could be solved is not as active as it should be.

**1.3 Have programme partners implemented adequate monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, transparency and accountability mechanisms as well as efficient financial management?**

The IPM trainers in every target province have implemented project activities effectively based on their proposed activities. The Provincial Coordinator monitors the IPM field activities in his/her province and reports to the National team for reviewing, and action is taken according to the recommendations. The National team members have regularly undertaken backstopping visits to provinces for monitoring and evaluation and at the same time provide advice on technical aspects and facilitation skills with the aim to improve the quality of activities.

The FAO IPM Programme Coordinator together with the National Expert and staff write seasonal reports and activity reports and then submitted to the FAO Regional IPM Programme in Bangkok for reviewing and finalizing.

Financial management is mainly provided by the FAO Finance Assistant, who oversees the budget and releases the budget for field implementation in the target provinces, based on the requests from the Provincial Coordinators. There has, however, not been a possibility for the MTE team to have clear insight into the financial arrangements for Cambodia.

**1.4 To what extent have governments provided support and made commitments to the programme?**

The government has shown a great interest and expressed its support to the programme, although its support in budgetary contribution is very limited. Local governments (in the provinces) have committed support in extension and policy work including to the IPM. The IPM programme is structured under MAFF and General Directorate of Agriculture is responsible for its implementation.

**1.5 To what extent have recommendations made by the 2009 review mission been implemented by the programme partners?**

Basically, recommendations of the 2009 Evaluation are being implemented although due to budgetary constraints and a retarded decision making process at the ministries (from top-down with very limited horizontal collaboration) the implementation process, particularly related to policy issues, is rather slow.

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

However, the increased regional perspective that is asked for under the "content" recommendations of the 2009 recommendation is slowly being achieved in the country but with very few linkages to other countries in the region. The following is referring to the progress achieved under the different items of the 2009 evaluation: On coordination, now the Department of Agricultural Legislation is clearly being the main stakeholder when it comes to develop the new Pesticide Law (See above) and consultations have also taken place with other stakeholders such as CEDAC. A first step towards inter-ministerial cooperation is the new legal steering committee. Concerning monitoring and reporting this process has now resulted in a newly released Impact Assessment. Increased partnership with CEDAC has resulted in them being consulted at several occasions although much still has to be done at field level. The MTE-team has not seen any direct co-operations within projects on natural resource management and climate change adaptation in the country. A reason for this might be that such cooperation that could have resulted in synergies may not be considered a priority.

#### **1.6 Are the technical options and training methods up to date with today's development approaches?**

The National IPM Programme in Cambodia has developed some documents up to date based on the project activities and the requirements of the farmers' and IPM Trainers' needs. The materials were up-dated such Vegetable Disease Management book for Trainers, fortified FFS curriculum, a guide to IPM trainers for facilitating farmers to make liquid compost and compost, etc. The National IPM Programme Coordinator developed SRI guide book for IPM trainers and other stakeholders for educating farmers to grow healthier rice crop and reducing chemical pesticide use especially pesticide. These technical options and training methods are up-to-date and well suited for the country, including as the training methods respond to emerging field problems brought about by changing environments etc.

#### **1.7 How are the impact assessment studies that have been performed within the programme spread and used?**

Pesticide monitoring and pesticide impact assessment report done by CEDAC, as an example, was used for community avocation and results was shared with government (MOE, MAFF) for policy formulation and drafting of the laws (of chemicals under MOE and of pesticides under MAFF). The results were also contributing in the drafting of the new curriculum for IPM-PRR training.

#### **1.8 To what extent has the possibility to address gender issues been taken /used by programme partners?**

The Cambodian National IPM Programme has provided equality opportunity for female and male farmers to participate the PRR-FFS for building up their capacity. Participation in programme activities is based on assessments on who does the work in crop production and therefore who needs the training. The National IPM Programme has provided alternative arrangements for women so that they are encouraged to participate in IPM field activities, e.g., the FFS schedule was started earlier and finished before noon for providing them a chance to cook for their family, mothers bring their small children to training, etc.

PAN AP is undertaking a 'Women and Pesticides' survey in Cambodia to focus on impact of pesticides on women and use the results for awareness building.



*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

### **1.9 To what extent have programme partners used the regional network for planning, implementation and evaluation of programme activities?**

The Seasonal Evaluation and Planning Meetings held at the province level in target provinces were used to evaluate the activities, sharing experience and planning for activities in every season. The results of project implementation have been used and shared with the Pesticide Network organized by the NGO-forum and that the participants usually use for planning, implementation and evaluation of their programme activities.

In the regional level, annual regional meetings of the national IPM programmes have become the main platform for planning and review, and sharing of lessons learned, that now involves all programme partners.

### **1.10 How have assumptions and risks been handled by the programme partners?**

Among the risks identified in the application for a 3 year extension of the programme one that is becoming a reality is the one on that 'New legislation and registration schemes will not be enforced because of constrains in human and financial resources'. This risk so far is real in that the enforcement of registration schemes is hampered by these constrains. The Department of Agricultural Legislation (DAL), also have had severe constraints, mainly due to internal politics, in drafting and developing the pesticide law. But another real risk for the enforcement of the law is a lack of coordination in the responsible divisions, which has slowed down the process.

## **2. Efficiency**

### **2.1 Is the programme design cost-effective? Have the separate programme activities been implemented in a cost-effective manner?**

For the FAO-IPM component, impact assessment results show satisfactory economic and social benefits obtained from the pesticide risk reduction community training programmes. The CSO and NGO-components, mainly including Farmers Field Schools, education and training, and advocacy work, the methods used tend to be low-cost methods or methods where the cost sometimes is carried by other partners, such as participating in TV-interview panels etc. This means that overall the activities have been implemented in a cost-effective way.

## **3. Relevance**

### **3.1 Is the programme and its design relevant for addressing present and future priorities and needs? Does the programme design allow adjustments to changing circumstances and new opportunities?**

The programme is inline with the government policy, where the pesticide risk reduction and IPM promotion efforts for sustainable intensification of crop production for increased food security and food safety are of great importance and where other priorities such as care for the environment and climate change issues also are related to the project design. The National IPM Programme also continuously makes efforts to update training curricula as to address newly emerging issues such as invasive trans-boundary pest and diseases, and the flexible Programme framework and implementation networks established allow for addressing changing needs and capturing opportunities for new interventions as these emerge.

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

**3.2 Have partners been able to adjust to new emerging needs/problems within the framework of the programme?**

The different partners of the programme have not expressed any difficulty to adjust to new emerging needs. In fact as, for instance the CEDAC has started an internal as well as other impact assessment to among other things find out specific needs including up-scaling of activities, which would then demonstrate any such needs.

**3.3 Are the programme's development objectives and immediate objectives (including specification of targets and identification of beneficiaries) feasible?**

Yes, this is also voiced by the parties.

**3.4 Have the established relationships with external institutions been functional and beneficial for the programme?**

According to the FAO-IPM Coordinator this is very much the case for the FAO-IPM Component of the National IPM Programme, to which the MTE-team fully agrees. The FAO-IPM Component has developed functional networks with a range of private and public sector institutions, which ensure that IPM training content remains up to date as elaborated above. The governments at local and national level have also gained by these relationships. However, what should be remarked is the lack of clear coordination and cooperation when it comes to pesticide regulation enforcement etc.

## 4. Sustainability

**4.1 Does the programme promote/ensure a sustainable regional ex-change and co-ordination in order to achieve pesticide risk reduction and good chemical management?**

The programme creates a good opportunity and forum for not only regional exchange and coordination but also national exchange and coordination related to PRR and chemical management. All the different objective areas include several components that facilitate such exchange which should promote pesticide risk reduction and good chemical management. Cambodia proposed that also other countries in the region should join the project for the partners to gain more relevant experience.

**4.2 Does the programme design allow for synergies/synergistic effects and encourage further collaboration?**

The components under the programme are developed so that for example the CEDAC in its capacity of development and awareness building is paving for a better ground for the national and the FAO IPM-programme to convince farmers to divert from use of more toxic pesticides to less polluting, preferably organic pesticides allowing for pesticide risk reduction, PRR, which is not necessarily only for pesticide reduction. By being included in the IPM-programme farmers may be aware of the need to know more about the effects of the pesticides not only on the land and on their health and life-expectancy but also in a longer perspective the effects of pesticides on the economy.

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

#### **4.3 Was it correct to adopt a 10 year horizon for the programme and what measures are being built in to enhance independent continuation by the recipient government departments, NGOs and farming communities?**

This question is difficult to respond to for a single country like Cambodia. From a Cambodian perspective it could be motivated by the following: Working towards promotion of pesticide risk reduction and development of a more sustainable agricultural sector in the Cambodia can only be successfully stimulated through a longer-term assistance effort, in tandem with better pesticide regulation, ensuring that small stakeholders are also involved.

#### **4.4 What evidence is already visible of the intention of these stakeholders to independently continue project-promoted initiatives?**

For instance, the small scale farmers, in particularly the subsistence farmers which have taken part in several steps of Farmers Field Schools are now according to what they claimed during the field visits well motivated to continue using organic fertilizers. The NGO-teams have demonstrated that they are fully motivated to continue their advocacy work, which also includes fund raising for their work. The government group will most probably loose in pace when they will need to work independently. More and more of the representatives from the ministerial group are, however, now becoming convinced of the need for a non-toxic environment, including by it is representing economic revenue that exceeds that of an economy that builds on an agricultural production using hazardous pesticides, especially when the externality costs are included.

#### **Summary:**

1. In general, the partners of the programme are actively involved in the project implementation in terms of pesticide monitoring, public education, training and advocacy on pesticide risk reduction, etc. It is, however, recommended that support will be geared towards a stronger coordination among the partners. Much of what today is conceived as coordination is a result of a strong NGO-representative, who is used as advisor. This coordination among the partners should be better formalized so that the cooperation does not fail should this person leave for other assignments.
2. The cooperative arrangements at local level, between stakeholders, are stronger. The partners of the programme are receiving support by the local government and the community in the implementation, which is resulting in a high level of acceptance of the farmers, in particularly the ones involved in the IPM-programmes and the FFS. This could result in that farmers who have been included in the FFS, with support from the local government and community could assist in further development of FFS.
3. The general education, planning and decision-making related to a changing policy on better management of pesticides, towards IPM, is so far not developed within an overall framework. Currently the training implies training towards a safe use and risk reduction of pesticides rather than training farmers in pesticide reduction, which would include the other aspects. It is thus recommended to review the curricula so that they do not confuse the message but aim towards a non-toxic environment.

The main recommendation, which should be included in all three recommendations above, is the need for a stronger coordination of measures taken by the different partners and a better c

**Annex 8****Report on field visit to Laos**

The points of departure for the evaluation are (1) the Programme documents and (2) the summaries for each country programme that has been produced by project management covering the points of the evaluation terms of reference. The summaries are regarded as the project management's self-evaluation.

The verification of the information in the self-evaluation is ensured through desk studies (Annex 3) and multiple interviews with various stakeholders (Annex 4). The Sub-team visiting Laos has in this Annex summarised the observations and analysis during the field visit.

This Annex draws on the Scope of the Evaluation as stated in ToR. It summarises the sub-team's observations on each of the evaluation questions one by one.

**1. Effectiveness****To what extent has the programme produced outputs and outcomes compared to the revised LFA? What is the prognosis for reaching the targets for outcomes and overall objectives within the programme period?**

The programme has produced several outputs and outcomes that follow what is indicated in the revised LFA. It is below grouped under the different immediate objectives.

***Objective 1. Increased awareness on the risks associated with pesticide use.***

Increased awareness of pesticide risks is among others created through the advocacy campaigns that the SAEDA, supported by its network is arranging. In this SAEDA is cooperating with NALD. Other partners are government partners at village level. The SAEDA is also, in their awareness building and education cooperate with the FAO-IPM Programme, and several of those farmers who have participated in the IPM-courses are now actively working on awareness building for SAEDA or NALD. Currently SAEDA is also preparing for the "No pesticide risk"-week that will be arranged over several of the districts of the Vientiane Capital starting December 9<sup>th</sup>.

In addition to awareness raising activity done by the FAO-IPM Programme through a 3 day Pesticide Risk Reduction Farmer Training, articles on the negative effects of chemical pesticides on health and environment is being published in the local newspapers twice a week since 2009.

Another network that is to be improved during the next 5 years and where useful information, education and awareness would be spread is the Plant Protection Network, where the local government (Agriculture Section of the Provincial Agriculture and Forestry Office, Vientiane Capital) is active. Pesticide Risk Reduction is seen as an important aspect of plant protection.

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

Functional linkages between existing project partners the FAO-IPM, NALD, SAEDA, Phonsoung Agriculture Development Project (PSADP) under support by OXFAM Belgium Solidarity) have been established and could be further strengthened. Efforts to establish new functional linkages with government (e.g. research institutes (Hattorkeo Horticulture Research Centre), agriculture colleges and universities) have been made.

**Objective II. Strengthening of capacity to innovate and scale up IPM and PRR training**

The above mentioned networks have also been used for more effective training. For example, NALD in collaboration with the IPM Programme conducted IPM FFS in the project implementation area after completion of pesticide baseline survey and conducting training on agrobiodiversity conservation; SEADA in collaboration with IPM (& Policy) Component planned to conduct PRR training for farmers (and dissemination of a new Regulation on the Control of Pesticides in Lao PDR) in Sangthong District of Vientiane Capital. As to reduce pesticide risk and to link farmers to market, the Programme collaborated with PSADP to conduct IPM-GAP TOT, FFSs & post FFSs.

Meetings with project partners are held to discuss issues related to collaboration work e.g. awareness raising and training on PRR and IPM-GAP. However, such meetings need to be organized more regularly.

A National Curriculum Development Workshop was held in May 2009. As a result, a draft curriculum for fortified IPM-PRR FFS in yard-long bean has been developed, was revised during the Refresher TOT (RTOT) held in June 2010 and pilot tested in fortified FFS currently being conducted in 2011. TOT on Pesticide Risk Reduction Farmer Training (PRR FT) was held in December 2009. A draft PRR FT curriculum has been developed & pilot tested in PRR FT in early 2010, revised during the Refresher Training and Evaluation & Planning Workshop held in July 2010 for pilot tested in PRR FT in 2011. This curriculum was revised again during the Regional Curriculum Development Workshop held in Kunming in late June-early July 2011. Farmer participatory action research on pest and disease management continued to be carried out. Training materials including exercises, session guides and hand-outs were developed and revised for use in TOT, Refresher Training and PRR FT.

Capacity of national and private sector programmes, project partners to train farmers in IPM and pesticide risk reduction strengthened and increased by 33 additional trainers has been done.

**Objective III: Strengthen regulatory framework for the control of pesticides**

Laos has since June 2010 a new Regulation on the Control of Pesticides in place. The regulation is a "tool for the monitoring and control of production, processing, import-export, distribution, transportation, storage, use, and proper disposal of pesticides to ensure the safety of people, plants, and the environment". According to a representative at the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry they are aiming at a decree that should include the use of all types of pesticides. Building on this the Ministry is developing a policy on 'clean agriculture'.

In the process to strengthen the capacity to enforce pesticide regulation two workshops were organized with assistance from FAO: a stakeholder workshop to review the draft pesticide regulation and; an awareness raising workshop for a broad range of ministries and other stakeholders to launch the new legislation.

The Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, which is tasked with Laos' membership in the Stockholm and Rotterdam Conventions and is the Laos' focal point to SAICM, is currently drafting a decree on hazardous chemicals. In these legal processes the ministries of course communicate.

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

**Objective IV: Strengthened Chemicals Management Capacity within authorities, industries and stakeholders in the partner countries**

The government of Laos, as well as the ones of Cambodia and Vietnam has committed itself to the "Regional Chemical Management Forums", to host the forum together with KemI and assign relevant experts to participate. The forums shall identify needs and priorities for strengthening ongoing and establishing new chemical safety measures in Southeast Asia, particularly the GMS, strengthen the capacity of governmental institutions to handle chemicals safety, but also raise awareness of the need for adequate chemical legislation in place and implemented, as well as safety issues in trade related to chemicals. The initiation of these forums has been delayed but they are now progressing.

So far have four Regional Chemicals Management Forums taken place, all with participation of expertise also from Laos. The 3<sup>rd</sup> Forum, which was arranged by the Water Resource and Environmental Administration of Laos in cooperation with KemI, was held in Luang Prabang, Laos January 12-14, 2011. A majority of participants were from central governments. An important item on the agenda was the Global Harmonization System that from a perspective of major accident industries is regarded very important. The participants were overall satisfied with the forum and they declared as important that the outcomes of the forums should have impacts. To that effect there was a suggestion to involve a ministerial level in the forum.

A ministerial segment might create a more political platform for the issues, which would emphasize the importance of the issues. It is, however, important not to lose the possibilities to exchange views and experience between the participating countries as well as between different levels within the countries.

**Have there been specific implementation problems and have programme partners been able to address these on regional and national level?**

In addition to the initial delay in start-up of the Lao component, the main implementation problems that can be registered are due to lack of sufficient coordination and communication between participating partners, both horizontally and vertically. There is for instance not as frequent communication between the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment as it could have been, which might hamper the linked processes.

**Have programme partners implemented adequate monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, transparency and accountability mechanisms as well as efficient financial management?**

Progress reports are prepared and sent to the regional FAO office and to KemI twice a year. Monitoring and evaluation of training activities have been regularly implemented by the FAO and National IPM Programme Staff. The IPM programme that started as an FAO programme but has developed and includes complementing activities such as the ones under Objectives 1 and 4, benefits when it comes to the Objective 2 in particular from already established and transparent financial management systems operated by FAO Country IPM Office. The NGO- and CSO implemented parts of the programme are financed through their regional partners, the PAN-AP and the TFA, which are using the funding from KemI to undertake activities through their networks. From visits to field sites and interviews in Vientiane, the system appeared to be working quite well.

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

**To what extent have governments provided support and made commitments to the programme?**

In Lao PDR, programme development and implementation capacity at national level has, according to several of the interviewed persons, been less than optimal, which has been demonstrated by a decrease in staff at critical divisions. However, the recent appointment of a new national IPM coordinator and the demonstrated interest at the Department of Agriculture including by the Director General of Department of Agriculture at the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry it seems likely this capacity will be strengthened in the remaining Programme implementation years.

**To what extent have recommendations made by the 2009 review mission been implemented by the programme partners?**

The programme implementation for Laos has been followed what was outlined in the revised LFA of the country strategy paper for the extended phase and thus what was recommended in the 2009 review.

**Are the technical options and training methods up to date with today's development approaches?**

Yes, the technical options and training methods are up to date, in particularly as a result of a participatory action research and training programme.

**How are the impact assessment studies that have been performed within the programme spread and used?**

Due to late start of the programme in Laos, no impact assessment studies have yet been conducted for the training programme.

**To what extent has the possibility to address gender issues been taken /used by programme partners?**

The gender issue has been encouraged in every activity whenever possible. But what is even more important is that gender is not the only determining factor; when it comes to selection of participants of the FFS or PRR, the selection is done based on who is the one in the family dealing with pesticide use. While this is generally the man, this was not always the case, and the selection process did not in itself appear to be discriminating against women. However, timing of the education are often such so that the women, who normally are cooking for the family shall also be able to attend.

**To what extent have programme partners used the regional network for planning, implementation and evaluation of programme activities?**

The Programme in Laos has used bi-annual regional meetings and a regional network for planning, implementation and evaluation of programme activities.

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

### **How have assumptions and risks been handled by the programme partners?**

Risks include low participation of farmers in the season long FFSs & strong advertisement of pesticide by commercial companies. Otherwise the programme is flexible enough to allow for modification due to risks.

## **2. Efficiency**

### **Is the programme design cost-effective? Have the separate programme activities been implemented in a cost-effective manner?**

As in the case of the other countries and activities, a programme with this type of complex and multi-faceted expected outcomes (behavioural changes, re-orientation of laws and regulations, completely new production approaches and methods, etc.), it is not possible nor useful to make any direct economic or financial estimates of rates of return on financial investment.

That said, the impression of the evaluation team on this question is that with a very limited investment in Lao PDR over the period from 2008 to the present, the programme has achieved some significant milestones: 33 new trainers have been trained (of which 4 women), and an additional 27 trainers were trained in the new PRR module; some 3693 farmers in 95 communities in four provinces (of which 1254 women) participated in the farmer training (FT) on pesticide risk reduction, and 90% of these went on to implement the community communication action plans for pesticide risk awareness. In addition:

- Three fortified/IPM-PRR FFSs were piloted in 2011 with 75 farmers (including 42 women).
- Seven IPM-GAP FFSs on cucumber and yard-long beans conducted in collaboration with project partner (PSADP) in 2009 & 2010 with 124 farmers aiming to link farmers to market.
- Bio-control testing on DBM in cabbage was conducted in 8 villages of 3 Southern provinces in 2007-2009. Over 100 farmers participated in the training. Participating farmers learned how to identify DBM parasitoids and were able to reduce number of pesticide applications from 9 to 6.
- Various field studies on vegetable pest and disease management and variety resistance were conducted by IPM farmers and trainers in Vientiane Capital and Province.

## **3. Relevance**

### **Is the programme and its design relevant for addressing present and future priorities and needs? Does the programme design allow adjustments to changing circumstances and new opportunities?**

Yes, the programme is relevant for addressing present priorities and needs- but it is not possible to predict the future - given that in the current situation in Lao PDR, farming systems with high tendency to pesticide and herbicide use are increasing. These include land concessions, contract farming and commercial farmers, many related to the strong demand and the rich entrepreneurs from the big neighbour Thailand.

Programme design does allow for adjustments as the annual meetings and periodic reviews (like this one) are meant to lead to such changes if needed.



*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

**Have partners been able to adjust to new emerging needs/problems within the framework of the programme?**

No particular examples encountered by mission of new needs and problems requiring adjustments.

**Are the programme's development objectives and immediate objectives (including specification of targets and identification of beneficiaries) feasible?**

Immediate targets appear feasible with project funding, but development objectives will depend on government decision to allocate resources – see the 'Sustainability' sections below.

**Have the established relationships with external institutions been functional and beneficial for the programme?**

No relationships with external institutions encountered by the mission. The programme staff stated that attempts had been made to link up with universities and other projects, but that they had not been very successful.

#### **4. Sustainability**

**Does the programme promote/ensure a sustainable regional ex-change and co-ordination in order to achieve pesticide risk reduction and good chemical management?**

Yes for regional coordination and exchange: several mechanisms in the programme such as regional meetings, workshops, networking, information sharing. The Lao component participates actively in all of these.

Regarding the sustainability of the regional coordination, however, as noted in the main report, there are still issues to be resolved with regard to location and functioning of any post-programme regional coordination mechanism.

**Does the programme design allow for synergies/synergistic effects and encourage further collaboration?**

The programme reportedly has had a positive impact on development of synergies between government and participating CSOs in Laos. The team heard that working on this programme had allowed some CSOs to have a more respected position around the table with government, especially local level government.

Regarding internal synergies between parts of government, the team's interviews with the ministry authorities responsible evidenced a situation in which for the moment, the components on pesticide policy (under the FAO-objective area) and on general chemicals management policy (KemI) were implemented working quite separately in two different ministries, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry and Ministry of Natural Resource and Environment, with as yet little or no synergies. However the chemicals management component is still at an early stage and there is room for this interaction to further develop.

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

**Was it correct to adopt a 10 year horizon for the programme and what measures are being built in to enhance independent continuation by the recipient government departments, NGOs and farming communities?**

For Lao PDR, the 10-year horizon is the very minimum, or even below the minimum, which will be needed for the programme to achieve sustainability.

**What evidence is already visible of the intention of these stakeholders to independently continue project-promoted initiatives?**

Currently, no measures are being built into implementation to enhance independent continuation by the government due to lack of government resources. Government policy promotes IPM, clean agriculture production, GAP, organic vegetables, etc., and there are many projects implementing these activities. However, all these activities are implemented with external funding, and allocation of government resources does not appear to be a possibility in the foreseeable future.

**Annex 9****Report on field visit to Vietnam**

The points of departure for the evaluation are (1) the Programme documents and (2) the summaries for each country programme that has been produced by project management covering the points of the evaluation terms of reference. The summaries are regarded as the project management's self-evaluation.

The verification of the information in the self-evaluation is ensured through desk studies (Annex 3) and multiple interviews with various stakeholders (Annex 4). The Sub-team visiting Vietnam has in this Annex summarised the observations and analysis during the field visit.

This Annex draws on the Scope of the Evaluation as stated in ToR. It summarises the sub-team's observations on each of the evaluation questions one by one.

**1. Effectiveness****1.1 To what extent has the programme produced outputs and outcomes compared to the revised LFA? What is the prognosis for reaching the targets for outcomes and overall objectives within the programme period?*****Objective area 1: 1 Pesticide monitoring and advocacy***

The Research Center for Gender, Family and Environment in Development (CGFED) and Research Center for Rural Development (RCRD), An Giang University are two partners of the PAN-AP Network in Vietnam. The aim of CGFED work is to (1) provide the selected rural community with further knowledge on pesticides; (2) advocate for better realization of government commitment and policies in relation to FAO Code and implementation of the Rotterdam convention RC; and (3) to highlight the gender issue in pesticide use and risk reduction.

CGFED has carried out baseline studies on pesticide use in rice and tea production in two districts in North of Vietnam and RCRD at AnGiang University has focused on rice in the South. Results of the surveys have been used for community education and for dissemination to the concerned government institutions for policy reform and advocacy.

Handbooks on community monitoring and international advocacy, community in peril, leaflets and posters has been translated and disseminated. CGFED has also used CPAM tools for monitoring through surveys and has used the results for CPAM training to increase awareness among farmers and agricultural workers of the adverse impact of pesticides on their health and the environment.

Due to high percentage of women involved in pesticide use (about 70% in North and 30% in South), CGFED has conducted a study on impact of pesticides use to health of women. A consultation workshop on "*Potential impact of pesticide use in agriculture production to health of Vietnamese women, food safety and food security and challenge for the risk reduction programme*" has been carried out jointly with the National IPM programme.

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

The advocacy campaigns were conducted in two years 2009-2010 on "*No pesticides week*" in the period 3-10 Dec. The campaigns aimed at informing farmers about the strongly adverse impact of pesticides and encouraging the use of alternative methods. A number of other activities are presented in the Narrative report 2010-2011 by CGFED.

CGFED states that the Programme and the work on awareness rising on pesticide risk reduction are useful and should be expanded. However, it is emphasized there is a need for more coordination and involvement of the SCOs supported from the government sector for sharing information and experience of the work.

### **Objective area 1: 2 Public education and Awareness**

Two NGOs under the PAN AP network have implemented activities under this area; the CGFED and RCRD, AnGiang University. In addition The Field Alliance (TFA) through its Rural Ecological Agriculture for Livelihood (REAL) Programme has been involved in the implementation. These components aim to include information about pesticides, their risks and alternatives into the curriculum of rural schools. TFA has provided technical support and funding of its Vietnamese NGO partner, the Center for Rural Progress (CRP) to pilot the REAL in Hanoi. Due to external factors affecting CRPs capacity to carry out its activities as planned only one of the objectives were focused namely "*introduction of biodiversity in Farmland in schools to raise awareness among local school children and residents*". The number of classes and students respectively was 5/229 2007, 12/445 2008 and 11/517 2009. CRP activities have not been funded after 2009 due to difficulties to get access to the schools for the training and limited commitment from the government to cooperate and use the experience in policy processes.

More baseline studies of pesticide risk assessment are needed in order to complete curricula served for schools teaching and dissemination of information. This kind of activities needs to study how the communication strategies and methods should be further developed in order to reach the general public through the children and empower the citizens as customers and consumers.

### **Objective Area 2: Training/education on IPM and PRR**

The IPM Programme was initiated 1992 with the support from regional FAO/ IPM programme in South-East Asia. In 1994 the National IPM programme Steering Committee was established. This IPM Committee is linking up with government agencies, research and extension, local government and farmers' communities. The Committee is also responsible for the development, documentation and dissemination of information related to community training and education on IPM/PRR. The key areas supported by the national IPM Committee are a) training to raise awareness in the community on pesticide risks to the environment and the health and to improve skills related to reducing the risks posted by pesticides when using or exposed to pesticides, b) support farmers to develop and apply alternatives to pesticides as biological control, mechanical and physical measures etc. through IPM training, c) support dealing with emergence of new transboundary pests; and d) support to improve legislation and support local government on strengthening pesticide management.

Fortified Farmer Field Schools', Training of Trainers (TOT) and Refresher Training curricula and training materials have been developed with focus on pesticide risk reduction. During 2007-2010, with funding under the One UN Programme and with technical support from the Swedish Pesticide Risk Reduction Programme, four season-long TOTs for community education programmes on PRR and safe crop production in compliance with GAP/VietGAP on rice and vegetable crops with total 150 trainers at different regions was carried out. The trainers have been used for FFS training in the

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

communities. Under the Swedish-funded PRR Programme, five technical and refresher courses on PRR with a total of 207 participants have been carried out. In the Programme 235 FFS with 7045 participants has been conducted. In addition 1761 FFS with 44712 participants have been conducted with local government fund. A total of 1,761 FFS with 51,757 (53% female) participants received training. The Swedish-supported PRR programme piloted the activities and the GoV bought in and prioritized it under the One UN Programme with funding support of US\$1.2 million from 2009-2011

At present FFS has been introduced in 23 provinces (out of 63). Other activities supported by the National IPM programme include: a) Community biological control production and utilization b) Minimum tillage for improve soil ecology c) integration of PRR in training farmers on system of rice intensification (SRI), d) Support dealing with emergence of new trans-boundary pests (control of sugarcane shoot disease and community management of rice brown plant hoppers associated with virus diseases).

An impact assessment study on PRR has been done by Hanoi University (HAU) with the scope to identify risk situations and measure impact of PRR trainings in two selected case studies in Hanoi city and Thai Binh province. The results will be used to draw policy recommendations for adopting PRR approach to eliminate the use of hazardous and persistent pesticides with better access to alternative pest management options and support for national pest management policy reform.

During the field visits the MTE team observed that three forms of trainings have been performed: FFS long season training for farmers, safe vegetable training using VietGAP and short term training (for community leaders, policy makers, pesticide sellers and others). The meetings and interviews showed that the training methodology on IPM-PRR was positively adopted by the visited farmer communities.

Apart from the National IPM-PRR training/education programme, other agencies and CSOs are also involved in training activities, awareness raising and advocacy. Crop Life (pesticide industry association AP network) every year since 2003 has supported the PPD education programme on "safe use of pesticides" with a budget that has varied between 7000 and 10000 USD/year. An Giang Plant Protection Service Company (AGPPS) has carried out community education programmes on safe use of pesticides through campaign "*together with farmers in the field*".

The National Government has expressed strong support to the programmes, both concerning the need to get input for the development of policies and strategies. National and Local Government are committed to policy and financial support in a sustainable way to the Programme. In Thai Binh province Programme implementation was supported by the Government with 55,000 USD in 2011 and 85,000 USD in the plan for 2012. Local government of Hanoi City expressed strongly support for the programme and has supported 200,000 USD early for this programme.

Through the visits and interviews it is clear that a) Community has expressed willingness to adopt the IPM/PRR training model b) local government is strongly committed to support the programme financially as well as when it comes to necessary policy changes, c) the programme showed economic advantages for the farmers through lower costs (including costs of pesticide and labour) and sometimes higher prices for the products (rice, vegetables etc.), d) training on FFS is still more focused on pesticide reduction (by using alternative methods) rather than pesticide risk reduction. e) National IPM committee should coordinate all partners and encourage partners to use same curricula of IPM-PRR.

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

### **Objective Area 3: Regulatory Framework and Policy reforms**

The Plant Protection Department (PPD), MARD is drafting the Law of plant protection and quarantine. The Programme has provided guidelines and comments at the beginning of the process. Work is going on and the Law will be submitted to the Assembly in 2013. There is a need for further support in reviewing the draft Law. One important aspect that needs to be dealt with urgently is the disposal of pesticides. In the pilot villages bags and bottles are collected in containers that are made available by the Programme. However, due to lack of facilities for disposal of pesticides these are buried in the ground in the villages or sometime farmers throws wastes in canals or irrigation system This issue needs clearly to be addressed in policies and in concrete actions of support from the government.

Another issue that was frequently mentioned during field visits is that pesticide sellers that are sent out by the pesticide companies are actively promoting increased use of pesticides which influence the implementation of the PRR programme. Thus, the pesticide advertisement is another issue that needs adequate policy development and control. The mix of cocktail pesticides is still common in Vietnam. The illegal pesticides and the hazardous pesticides class 1a and 1b are undergoing reasonable good control by inspections and sanctions. However, some of the interviewees state that the sanctions are too weak and the fines too low. Even if the pesticide seller has to pay the small fines the business is still profitable.

#### **1.2 Have there been specific implementation problems and have programme partners been able to address these on regional and national level?**

There are no specific problems of implementation concerning education / training, advocacy or regulatory/policy reform. However, due to many pesticide companies (around 400) and retail shops (more than 30,000) in Vietnam with active sale promotion it is difficult for the PRR training/education programmes to compete with forces that are going in another direction.

Another problem that has an impact on the regional cooperation is the need for prevention when it comes to illegal pesticides trade due to long border lines between China-Vietnam-Lao- Cambodia and Thailand that makes it very difficult to control the distribution over borders.

Thus, the Government should review its policies on the issue of control of pesticide import, distribution and promotion. There are needs to harmonize pesticide registration scheme in the partner countries.

#### **1.3 Have programme partners implemented adequate monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, transparency and accountability mechanisms as well as efficient financial management?**

The reporting shows that IPM Trainers in every target province have implemented the Programme activities as planned. The Provincial Coordinator monitors the IPM field activities in his/her province and reports to the National team for review. Action is taken according to the recommendations.

The partners of Programme in Vietnam and the National IPM Coordinator provide six-monthly reports that are then submitted to PANAP, TFA, FAO Regional IPM Programme in Bangkok for review and finalizing.

#### **1.4 To what extent have governments provided support and made commitments to the programme?**

The Government has expressed strong support to the Programme, both concerning policy and

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

strategy. National and local governments are committed to increase the financial support in a sustainable way to the Programme. In particular support is given to food safety programmes in which safe vegetables with PRR training approach is of high priority in terms of financial support at both the central and local levels.

**1.5 To what extent have recommendations made by the 2009 review mission been implemented by the programme partners?**

Basically, most recommendations of the 2009 evaluation are being implemented. However, the monitoring and impact assessments on the quantity and quality of implementation and the degree of perception and adoption of communities/farmers to the Programme activities are still difficult to analyze. Impact assessments on the perception and adoption in the communities to the PRR programme should be further developed in order to have proper analyzes.

**1.7 Are the technical options and training methods up to date with today's development approaches?**

The National IPM Programme and the work of other partners like CGFED, HAU and the An Giang University in Vietnam has been updated based on the Programme activities and the requirement of the farmers and the IPM training needs. The documents drafted and published are up dated and responses to the new problems are in line with today's development approaches.

**1.7 How are the impact assessment studies that have been performed within the programme spread and used?**

Pesticide risk reduction's impact assessment has been carried out by Hanoi University (HAU). It has been used for community advocacy (in two communes) in Thai Binh province and Hanoi city. The results have been shared with the Plant protection Department (PPD) for pest management policy reform. Resulting from sharing this information, the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD) has issued three directives regarding strengthening pesticide management and pesticide management in vegetables. The results are also used in the drafting of the new curriculum for IPM-PRR training.

Dissemination of results of the impact assessments on PRR are still in initial stage and apply for awareness and advocacy in very small areas. This work needs more studies and the Programme should use mass media for dissemination of information on the results.

**1.11 To what extent has the possibility to address gender issues been taken /used by programme partners?**

In Northern of Vietnam, women are actively involved in agriculture production. In some areas more than 70% of the farmers that applies pesticides are women. The National IPM Programme provide equal opportunity for female and male to participate in the PRR-FFS for building up their capacity.

**1.12 To what extent have programme partners used the regional network for planning, implementation and evaluation of programme activities?**

At the regional level, annual regional meetings of the national IPM programmes have facilitated for planning and review, and sharing experiences. Within Vietnam seasonal and annual meetings to evaluate activities as well as for planning and work plan drafting have been held at the province level.

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

The meetings held include activities to evaluate, sharing experience and planning for activities in every season.

### **1.13 How have assumptions and risks been handled by the programme partners?**

The Team has not been provided with any risk assessment. The risks are identified ad hoc. Among the risks identified in the extension phase are that pesticides sale promotion in communities is ongoing at the same time and in the same areas where training/education on IPM-PRR is given. This will reduce substantially the project's impact. Also, most farms are small and thus the Programme should study and have a suitable strategy for adaptation to the small farmer's context.

## **2. Efficiency**

### **2.1-2.2 Is the programme design cost-effective? Have the separate programme activities been implemented in a cost-effective manner?**

The Programme in Vietnam has a budget of only 100,000 USD for the present extension phase (2010-13). The large budget allocation for IPM/PRR work under the One UN project (USD 1.2 million for period (2009-11) provides the rationale for a limited budget allocation for Vietnam under project GCP/RAS/229/SWE. For the period 2007-2010 the total amount was 600,000 USD. For the IPM-PRR component and other training programmes such as training on safe vegetables production and VietGAP training, impact assessment results show satisfactory economic and social benefits obtained from the pesticide risk reduction community training programmes. In Vietnam other programmes like "Safe vegetables production" and production vegetables followed GAP/VietGAP also show cost-effectiveness.

## **3. Relevance**

### **3.1 Is the programme and its design relevant for addressing present and future priorities and needs? Does the programme design allow adjustments to changing circumstances and new opportunities?**

In the priorities of the Vietnam government in the agriculture sector it is emphasized that Food safety and Food security are of highest priority, therefore, the Programme is very much in line with the government policy. The National IPM Programme also continues to update training curricula as to address newly emerging issues occurred.

### **3.2 Have partners been able to adjust to new emerging needs/problems within the framework of the programme?**

The National IPM Programme has the potential to adjust to new emerging needs like transboundary pest's movement, join action for illegal trade of pesticides, new pests and diseases on rice, cassava and sugarcane.

### **3.3 Are the programme's development objectives and immediate objectives (including specification of targets and identification of beneficiaries) feasible?**

Yes. Through interviews, people expressed their willingness to follow and apply the training methodology on PRR. The Programme has been useful and benefited for farmer's community.



*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

### **3.4 Have the established relationships with external institutions been functional and beneficial for the programme?**

Yes, the National IPM Coordinator has played an important role in creating links and to establish contacts with external institutions like private and public sector institutions, NGOs, Researchers, policy makers, local governments.

## **4. Sustainability**

### **4.1 Does the programme promote/ensure a sustainable regional ex-change and co-ordination in order to achieve pesticide risk reduction and good chemical management?**

The programme creates a good forum for regional and national exchanges and coordination related to IPM-PRR and chemical management. It has been emphasized that more can be done to further develop curriculum through exchange of ideas and experiences regionally.

### **4.2 Does the programme design allow for synergies/synergistic effects and encourage further collaboration?**

Through interviews and observation, it's clearly noted that the synergies in the area of pesticide risk reduction is evident. Partners have expressed their willingness to join the network and to use results for conducting education, trainings and to encourage more collaboration and cooperation with outside partners of the program.

In the interviews it has been suggested to arrange more technical workshops with the aim to develop new and improved models and methods.

### **4.3 Was it correct to adopt a 10 year horizon for the programme and what measures are being built in to enhance independent continuation by the recipient government departments, NGOs and farming communities?**

It's observed from interviews that working towards promotion of pesticide risk reduction in communities and the transmission to more sustainable agriculture production methods will take long time. It has been underlined that the Programme should develop a long term strategy ensuring that small farmers can get good access to trainings, services for adoption of pesticide risk reduction strategy ensuring environment and health of people be protected.

The Programme is in line with MARD's Institutional vision 2020. However, the Institutional vision should be clearly stated as point of departure for the Programme. The Programme is mainly producer- and production oriented and to a more limited extent customer- or consumer oriented. It is important to consider the whole value chain and establish an enabling environment where the market is guided by the preferences of well informed costumers.

It has emphasized that a clear exit strategy must be developed for the Programme.

### **4.4 What evidence is already visible of the intention of these stakeholders to independently continue project-promoted initiatives?**

*Mid-Term Evaluation of the regional programme "Towards a non-toxic environment in South East Asia"*

As noted above, growing government investment in FFS and PRR is clear evidence of the intention of national, and to some extent local, government to independently continue project-promoted initiatives.