

**GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form**

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date	<b>Dec 20, 2007</b>
GEF Project ID:	1410		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	298	GEF financing:	0.75	0.75
Project Name: Biodiversity Conservation and Integration of Traditional Knowledge on Medicinal Plants in National Primary Health Care Policy in Central America and Caribbean		IA/EA own:	--	--
Countries: Regional (Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Dominican Republic)		Government:	--	--
		Other* (IDRC, IUCN, TRAMIL, ENDACaribe)	0.648	0.673
		Total Cofinancing:	0.648	0.852
Operational Program:	OP-3: Forest Ecosystems	Total Project Cost:	1.398	1.525
IA	UNEP	Dates		
Partners involved:	Enda-Caribe, IDRC, MPSPG/IUCN, National Counterparts	Work Program date		September 2001
		CEO Endorsement		N/A
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		October 2001
		Closing Date	Proposed	Actual
		September 2004	December 2005	
Prepared by: Alejandro Imbach	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 36 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 51 months	Difference between original and actual closing:  15 months
Author of TE: Natalia Ortiz		TE completion date:  October 16, 2006	TE submission date to GEF OME:  Dec 2006	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 2 months

\* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

**2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS**

Please refer to document "GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for the verification and review of terminal evaluations" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (UNEP EOU assessment of project ratings)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	HS	S	MS	MS
2.2 Project sustainability	HS	MS	MS	ML
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	HS	MS	MU	MS
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	S	S

**Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why?**

Yes. The analysis provided is good and coherent among the different sections. There are just a few inconsistencies and almost all of the topics requested on the evaluation terms of reference were assessed by the evaluator.

**Is there follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc? No.**

### 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

#### 3.1 Project Objectives

- **What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?**

According to the project appraisal document the global environmental objective of the project is “to support the conservation and sustainable use of forest ecosystems in the region by identifying conservation and management needs of medicinal plants within key forest ecosystems, and integrating these issues into the broader management of selected forest ecosystems.

Based on the review of the terminal evaluation there has been no change in the global environmental objectives during the implementation of the project.

- **What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?**

The Project Document, PIR 2005 and the TE list the following as the development objectives of the project:

1. *To assess the conservation status and management needs of medicinal plants;*
2. *To work with indigenous and local communities to develop appropriate management strategies; and*
3. *To work with research institutions, NGOs, and national government agencies to integrate conservation and management of medicinal plants with rational use of traditional remedies in primary health care (PHC).*

Therefore, it can be inferred that no changes were made in development objectives of the project during implementation.

#### 3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

- **What major project outcomes and impacts are described in the TE?**

TE presents a detailed report for a large number of project outcomes and impacts at different level. A list of the most significant ones at each level is as follows:

##### Community Level

- The Project worked in 71 communities, traditional users of medicinal plants. Some of the community level impacts and outcomes as perceived by the people interviewed and reported in the revised documentation are presented below.
- Greater knowledge and awareness of conservation and threats to the plants they consider useful for their health care.
- Increased adoption of conservation practices at the community level: decrease in the practice of forest burning, improvements in the extraction techniques of some species, experimentation in the domestication of some species, the maintenance of medicinal gardens, and the protection of endangered species.
- Greater appreciation of their traditional knowledge; a better application and use of the popular remedies; access to low-cost treatment of common diseases in the medicinal gardens or through the popular health workers.
- Some traditional doctors, healers and midwives started the production of syrups and ointments, on their own, for local commercialization.
- A pilot initiative was established for the technical production and commercialization of a wild blackberry species. This is currently sold successfully through a fruit processing plant of which the community has become a partner.

##### National level: Honduras

- Honduras environmental authorities recognize the need to adopt a permanent or temporal 'closed season' system for the extraction of endangered as well as the need to designate the areas, where these plants are found, as places of conservation interest was considered.

- At the time of writing the TE report, a discussion was ongoing about the enactment of a new Wildlife Law that would incorporate the above mentioned aspects.
- In a response to a conservation model developed by this Project, the municipality of Guajiquiro created a system of incentives and disincentives for the communities of the region to avoid the burning of mixed forests during summertime. According to the former Mayor, during 2005 there were no burnings of forest, which in itself represents an impact of the project in Guajiquiro, Honduras.
- The list of MPs provided to the Honduran Ministry of Health as scientifically-validated by TRAMIL are being used at the Director's Office of Pharmacies and Drugs of the Ministry to regulate, along with the customs office, the natural products commercialized in Central America.

#### **National level: Dominican Republic**

- The National Botanical Garden, as governmental authority on the topic of flora has incorporated medicinal plants in its strategic plan and institutional organizational chart.
- The construction of the Medicinal Plant Pavilion in the National Botanical Garden. This facility will be used in the development of educational programs with 160,000 children from the country's public schools, and to raise awareness among the 30,000 tourists per year who visit the country.
- Incorporation of medicinal species as a priority in the National Strategy for Biodiversity.

#### **National level: Nicaragua**

- The PLAMOTANIC network has included the conservation of MPs within its institutional mission. During the project, this network signed a collaborative agreement with the Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources (MARENA) to implement the project actions at the local level. This collaboration has transcended the project's duration.
- The National University of Nicaragua in León and the national herbaria (both of them were involved in this project) participated in the design of the National Biodiversity Strategy, thus guaranteeing the explicit inclusion of MPs.
- In Nicaragua, a draft bill for Traditional Medicine is being studied by the Parliament for approval.

#### **National level: Panama**

- The use of MP's in PHC has been strengthened through the Traditional Medicine Section of the Ministry of Health.
- The performance of the Traditional Medicine Section of the Ministry of Health was strengthened by the Project. There is an initiative underway to make this section a Department of Traditional Medicine responsible for the validation, diffusion and promotion of MPs in the country.
- The Manual of Medicinal Plants and the Pharmacopoeia were accepted by MINSA and made available to The Department of Health Promotion and the Section of Indigenous Peoples and Traditional Medicine as a tool for Primary Health Care.

#### **Regional Environmental Sector**

- The environmental authorities in each country have been provided with a list of medicinal species identified in the selected eco-regions. This list includes information about the state of conservation and threats to the prioritized MPs, and guidelines for the definition of conservation strategies for plants and their habitats associated with varied degrees of threat.

#### **Regional Public Health sector**

- The scientific validation of MPs contributed to the valuation of traditional medicinal knowledge, and to a greater acceptance of the use of MPs in PHC by health organizations and personnel.
- In Panama and the Dominican Republic, the Project obtained the institutional approval of the Ministry of Health for the project's publications related to scientifically-validated medicinal plants.
- The Ministries of health in Honduras and Nicaragua have adopted these publications as reference documents of traditional medicine for PHC, thus suggesting its use by medical professionals in public fora.

#### **International level**

- The outcomes and experiences of the Project were incorporated into different Global Conservation Strategies: The creation of the "World Guidelines for Medicinal Plant Conservation" , organized by

IUCN, WHO and WWF; the discussion for the creation of protocols for “The Standardization of Medicinal plant Commercialization<sup>1</sup>”, in which the list of endangered MPs identified by the project was provided, and the inclusion of habitat evaluation in the standardization protocols was achieved; contributions to the development of guidelines for the implementation of The “Global Strategy for Plant Conservation’ adopted in The Hague by the Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD) in 2002, in particular, the project’s outputs contribute to the implementation of articles 1, 13, and 16, and to the establishment of methodological basis to continue moving forward in the implementation of these articles nationwide.

- The applications to incorporate 16 plants for Central America (Nicaragua, Panama and Honduras) and 12 for Dominican Republic to the Red Lists were filled out, and these will be evaluated by the IUCN in March 2007 with the support of an authority in this field.

**4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT**

**4.1.1 Outcomes (use a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU)**

<p><b>A Relevance</b>  <b>Were the project’s outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities?</b></p>	<p><b>Rating: MS</b></p>
<p>This project is located within the Biodiversity Focal Area, more specifically in OP3 – Forest Ecosystems. Making a quick analysis of the most significant outcomes presented above, a conclusion can be drawn that the majority (if not all) of the project activities and outcomes were clearly directed to the promotion and use of medicinal plants (MP). The project rationale was based on a hypothesis of a causal link between MP management and forest ecosystem conservation; however the project results outlined on the TE are insufficient to confirm this relation.</p> <p>On the other hand the project was very successful on raising awareness and promoting conservation initiatives for several endangered medicinal plant species at local, national and regional level. In terms of the Focal Area of Biodiversity this can be taken as a significant impact.</p> <p>Finally in relation with National Priorities, no evidence was found that the project initiative was really an issue or a priority for any of the participating countries. As matter of fact the TE considers that one of the most significant outcomes for this project was its ability to raise the project agenda at national level. Clearly demonstrating that the project issues were not considered as a country priority previous to the project execution. Furthermore, the TE concludes that some of the shortcomings that the project faced, particularly in regard with its capacity to influence policy makers, was due to the fact that the project topic was not considered a priority by the governments.</p>	
<p><b>B Effectiveness</b>  <b>Are the project outcomes commensurate with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address?</b></p>	<p><b>Rating: S</b></p>
<p>According to the TE almost all stated outputs required in the project document were achieved. Just a few of were not fulfilled completely or not fulfilled at all (more specifically the outcomes related to implementation of MP management plans, the integration of medicinal plants in environmental and health policies, as well as into university curricula in health and natural science departments in each country).</p> <p>The TE attributes this underachievement on some parameters to the fact that the project was too ambitious in its outcomes definition in relation with the project resources and duration.</p>	

<b>C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</b>	<b>Rating: MS</b>
<b>Was the project cost – effective? How does project’s cost/time versus outcomes equation compare to that of similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness?</b>	
<p>The project was considered to be efficient by the people interviewed in the final evaluation, especially for Components 1 and 3. The main reasons identified on the TE for this efficiency are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The recognition, credibility and know-how of the selected partners, particularly the TRAMIL regional network, which enabled time and resources saving, and the scientific quality in the research processes.</li> <li>• High commitment of the national counterparts and other partners, which resulted in considerable in-kind contributions to develop project activities.</li> </ul> <p>The Project implementation was extended 15 months longer than planned, for a project that was initially designed for 36 months; this represents an overall extent of 42% of its original duration. The TE does not provide a clear explanation about this extension.</p> <p>Apparently there was a delay of 3 to 6 months at the beginning of the project due to the period required for the formalization of agreements with the national counterparts and the set-up of financial and administrative processes to work in a decentralized fashion. The TE also concludes that the project management was very efficient, and that major savings done during execution allowed for unplanned activities to be executed which finally lead to the extension of the project duration. However, this finding is contradictory with one of the main conclusions of the TE stating that the time and resources available to guarantee the attainment of all planned objectives and outcomes were insufficient (see point 4.1.1B).</p>	

**4.1.2 Impacts**

<b>Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts?</b>
<p>The difference between outcomes and impacts is not clearly defined on the TE. Both impacts and outcomes are presented together in the same Chapter of the TE, as a long list of outcomes/impacts without any distinction between them. This confusion is a weakness that comes from the project design itself and was noticed and remarked by the evaluator on the TE report.</p> <p>The project mainly produced some good quality outputs which lead to a series of significant outcomes which could eventually result in relevant impacts if the proper follow-up is given after the project closing. But the sustainability of the project outcomes is not explicitly guaranteed.</p>

**4.2 Likelihood of sustainability.** Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of risks to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= no or negligible risk to 1= High risk)

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
<b>What is the likelihood that the financial resources will be available to continue the activities that results in the continuation of benefits?</b>	
<p>The likelihood that the benefits promoted by this project could be sustained beyond the project duration is high for those activities where a reasonable level of government and local counterparts ownership was attained (Honduras network, PLAMOTANIC Network, Guajiquiro Municipality, etc.). This is the case for all four countries where the project was executed. Evidence of this, as mentioned on the TE, is that follow up initiatives promoted by some of the project partners are already taking place.</p> <p>However it is also important to mention that the project benefits that are most likely to be sustained are those related to the economic and health contributions associated with the use of medicinal plants. This, as mentioned on point 4.4.1.A of this Review Form, does not necessarily imply or guarantee the conservation of forest ecosystems.</p>	

<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
Are there any social or political risks that can undermine the longevity of project outcomes?	
<p>TE identifies as a critical risk the lack of continuity of governmental initiatives following changes of government. The project design addressed this potential threat to sustainability by trying to include the project issues in state or local policies. This was possible in some cases but not to the full extent of the project proposed outcomes. Moreover, in the case of the integration of medicinal plants in environmental and health policies, TE reports it as the most significant project execution underachievements (see point 4.1.1.B of this Review Form).</p> <p>On the other hand the project was very successful on strengthening local counterparts and promoting the existing networks which has proven to be an effective strategy to attain social and political sustainability.</p>	
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose any threat to the continuation of project benefits?	
<p>As mentioned above, the only risk here is the fact that the project could not include the project agenda, regarding the use and promotion of medicinal plants, in local or national policies to the full extent of what was originally planned. This could jeopardize the sustainability of the project benefits that rely on government support. It is very common in these countries that as a result of political processes, almost all the staff of the government institutions changes. Raising the project agenda to a policy level would have been a good strategy to overcome these periodic changes and somehow guarantee the continuity of governmental support to this project initiative.</p>	
<b>D Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits?	
<p>Not mentioned on TE, which seems normal because it does not seem to be any obvious environmental risk associated to this project.</p>	

**4.3 Catalytic role**

<p><b>a. Production of a public good</b></p> <p>According to the TE, MPs are regarded as a cost-effective option to address public health care, particularly in remote places, where access is difficult, resources are limited, and livelihoods are precarious. The project impacts at this level were not assessed by the TE, mainly because the project objectives and activities were focused on conservation, capacity building, scientific validation and institutionalization; while the use and effect of the MP use at community level were not directly addressed by the project.</p> <p>According to the TE, one of the four project’s key components, namely, “Scientific validation of safety and efficacy of traditional plant-based remedies” generated significant contributions to guarantee the safety and efficacy of MPs use.</p>
<p><b>b. Demonstration</b></p> <p>According to the TE several aspects of the project are very likely to be used in other initiatives in the Caribbean Basin, or in other parts of the world:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ The project’s regional approach, management and implementation model through consolidated national networks and institutions.</li> <li>✓ The methodologies used to carry out inventories, identify the conservation status of medicinal plants (e.g. CAMP workshops), and design MP management models proved to be useful, effective, relatively rapid to apply and easy to adapt to local and national contexts.</li> <li>✓ The designed Medical Phytotherapy program.</li> </ul>

**c. Replication**

According to the TE steps are being taken to replicate some of the projects aspects in other places:

- ✓ The possibility of replicating the Project is being considered by the Group of Specialists in Medicinal Plants (IUCN-SSC-MPSG).
- ✓ The Project Manager has proposed the development of a conservation program as part of the Natural Products and Medicinal Plant Program in Costa Rica, for which funds are being sought.
- ✓ The TRAMIL Network has continued the process of scientific validation of MP's newly-identified uses, and the enrichment of the monographs, aiming at a third edition of the Pharmacopoeia, with the support of the island of Martinique. The publications generated by the project have been distributed among the network members in the Spanish-speaking countries. The English language version of the Pharmacopoeia will be distributed in the English-speaking countries of the Caribbean basin. It is quite possible that the TRAMIL experience will be replicated in other areas in the world. Currently, talks are being held with institutions in Malaysia and South Africa. This initiative could be supported by the World Bank. At the same time, it is expected that the survey in eight Caribbean countries using TRAMIL-GEF methodology will continue to take place.

**d. Scaling up**

The project had a specific component related to mainstreaming. Even if not all of the planned outputs related to this component were completely achieved, some important outcomes were attained in terms of policy making at national and local level (see point 3.2 of this Review Form).

Beyond this project, according to the TE, some steps have been taken to scaling up:

- ✓ TRAMIL project methodologies and approach have been adopted by other countries in Latin America through the South Cone Medicinal Plants Network (supported by IDRC).
- ✓ ENDA-Caribe is currently in discussions with the European Development Fund to obtain support for micro-businesses that will manufacture and commercialize MP by-products (syrups, oils, ointments, soaps, beverages). This initiative hopes to make use of the installed capacities the project developed in the local communities.
- ✓ Likewise, ENDA-Caribe showed the project experience and outcomes at the 24<sup>th</sup> Forest Commission for the Caribbean and Latin America (COFLAC), and in the meeting of the Regional Network Directory of Model Forests for Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC-Net), with the idea of incorporating some of the project components in integrated forest management strategies, which both organizations advocate.

**4.4 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the TE information**

**A. M&E Design at Entry**

**Rating (six point scale): MS**

At the entry point there was an initial M&E design that several good points such as: clear output and outcomes indicators, predefined report system (including number of reports, frequency and target audience), some ideas of collecting data instruments to be used, staff responsible of M&E tasks identified, etc. The most significant shortcomings at this stage were a) the lack of impact indicators, b) the absence of information management tools and standards to capture the data for measuring the different indicators. The System was not designed to operate as a participatory one, contradicting the decentralized implementation design of the Project.

**B. M&E Plan Implementation**

**Rating (six point scale): MS**

According to the TE:

- Quarterly project progress and financial reports were presented in a timely manner to the DGEF Coordination Office in UNEP-Nairobi.
- The counterpart organizations handed in quarterly reports to the Project Manager, who then consolidated the information in a report to be sent to DGEF.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ According to the Task Manager the reports were highly detailed and were useful in informing on the advancements and inconveniences encountered in the project.</li> <li>➤ Quarterly project progress reports focused mainly on activity implementation and output accomplishment, but did not report with the same clarity on advancements and difficulties in accomplishing outcomes and impacts</li> <li>➤ Performance quality and project outcomes were mainly assessed through project manager supervision missions, project internal reviews and self-evaluation exercises.</li> <li>➤ The Project kept detailed documentation of the regional coordination and project performance both centrally and in each country including established agreements, consultant's reports, technical and financial reports, project accounting, and external financial audit reports.</li> </ul>
<p><b>C.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&amp;E in the budget included in the project document?</b></p> <p>UA. According to the Project Document, 2.64% of the overall project budget (equivalent to 3.88% of the GEF contribution) was to be invested on the Project M&amp;E System.</p>
<p><b>C.2 Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&amp;E during project implementation?</b></p> <p>UA. This issue is not addressed by the TE. According to the Project budget found on the TE (see Annex 10 of TE), there is only one budget line related to M&amp;E and it is found under the travel account. It represents only the 3% of the overall Project budget.</p>
<p><b>C.3 Can the project M&amp;E system be considered a good practice?</b></p> <p>No. According to the TE the staff related with the M&amp;E tasks seemed to have a good opinion about it, nevertheless the M&amp;E system design could have been improved, for example by including impact indicators, defining data gathering instruments and standards, sharing project performance results with counterparts, etc. So even if some aspects of the M&amp;E system were good, overall it can not be considered as a good practice.</p>

**4.5 Lessons and Recommendations**

Project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

<p><b>What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ The Project's decentralized implementation through national organizations favored the empowerment and leadership of medicinal plant networks nationwide. This approach can be very useful for the development of projects which make use of thematic networks.</li> <li>✓ Validating and complementing traditional and local knowledge with scientific research proved to be useful to re-assess the value of indigenous traditions and to provide decision-makers with sound information for program and policy design and implementation. This strategy of collective knowledge-building to inform decision-makers can be replicated by other initiatives aiming to influence policy-making.</li> <li>✓ The designation of conservation sites, inside and outside the protected areas, as a conservation mechanism for native or endemic plants, could prove highly effective and more legally practical than the creation of new protected areas in countries with low resources to manage these areas. This mechanism could facilitate a true involvement of municipalities and local communities in concrete conservation and management actions, thus making this task more feasible both economically and operationally than the management of large size protected areas.</li> <li>✓ Future Medicinal plants initiatives developed with inputs from the national counterparts generally need to be handled in a multi-sectoral way including the environmental, health, and agricultural sectors. This multi-sectoral approach should take into account the different services and uses of a particular resource, and provide support to its sustainable use in order to promote the conservation and</li> </ul>



management of other plant species.

- ✓ The mainstreaming and institutionalization process requires more time and a more structured strategy which takes into account the lack of continuity in the governmental policies and the instability of public officers, typical of the countries in the region.
- ✓ The sustainability of activities and benefits promoted at the community level upon project closure has been highly affected by the poor living conditions experienced by the communities involved. Inclusion of project components that focus on processing and marketing for MP by-products to consolidate small community enterprises could help to enhance project sustainability at the community level.
- ✓ There is the need to stimulate the analysis and discussion on the issue of intellectual property regarding reported uses of native and endemic plants in the region. The inclusion of this topic in future projects should be considered a priority by organizations researching and promoting the use of medicinal plants.
- ✓ The project 'reach' concerning outcomes and impact need to be defined more precisely through more accurate indicators. These should be taken into account in future UNEP-GEF project formulation to allow for proper assessment of the use of project outputs by the stakeholders involved, and how such use contributes to project objectives.

**List (or if detailed summarize) the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation**

- ✓ The cost of financial audits was not included in the initial Project budget. For future projects, it's advisable to include this cost in order to avoid negative affects on other budget items. Project approval guidelines should ensure that this cost is included in the project budget.
- ✓ It is recommended that the national counterparts make use of the momentum generated by the project in order to achieve the following outcomes: i) inclusion of the medical phytotherapy program in the curricula of the universities that participated in the Project by ensuring their participation in the next curricula adjustment period programmed in each of the universities; ii) inclusion of medicinal plants in public health policies by using the results of the project to design new initiatives to develop a political awareness campaign and lobbying new authorities until the use of MPs in PHC becomes a state policy; and, iii) design and implement management plans for vulnerable or threatened medicinal plants and their habitats by designing and negotiating new projects with the international cooperation, national and/or local government environmental authorities.
- ✓ Ideal institutions to further promote the project outcomes are the municipal Secretaries of the Environment, Health and Agriculture. The administrative decentralization devolves responsibilities to actors that lack financial resources and technical know-how. By being comprehensible and easy to use, the methodologies and information generated by the project can become useful working tools to contribute to the development of the roles of those institutions. Their presence in the eco-regions and access to local communities could make the work more cost-effective than if developed by organizations without permanent presence in these regions. The new projects to be developed by the national counterparts could focus on promoting the inclusion of the conservation and use of MPs in the programs of such organizations. Some of the activities that could be taken up by these institutions include: domestication of MPs with commercial potential; development and maintenance of communal medicinal plant gardens; continuous community capacity development for effective and safe use of MPs in PHC; and the design and implementation of MP management plans. For this to be feasible, it is necessary that the new projects support the strengthening of the technical and technological capacity needed to perform these duties. Likewise, it would be necessary to strengthen these organizations' capacities to design and negotiate initiatives with the central government and international cooperation, as well as the establishment of alliances with ONGs and community local organizations.

A natural extension of the project in each country led by the national networks and/or project counterpart organizations could focus on the following topics:

- ✓ In **Panama**: Take advantage of the work done along with the Ministry of Health through the Traditional Medicine Unit to encourage the design and implementation of the National Strategy of Traditional Medicine. Include in this process the post-clinical follow up process of the effect of local medicinal plants included in the Pharmacopoeia in the treatment of common illnesses.
- ✓ In **Nicaragua**: Take advantage of the two laboratories linked to the PLAMOTANIC network focused on

the processing and commercialization of medicinal plant registered products, in order to encourage the design and implementation of a project which enhances their production capacity with the purpose of supplying the demand of national markets and the Ministry of Health. This initiative could be developed through the integration of local producers in the production and commercialization chain, and establishing agreements with the Ministry of Health to supply Medical health centers directly.

- ✓ In the **Dominican Republic**: Take advantage of the installed capacity in the communities to produce medicinal plants and manufacture cosmetics, essential oils and popular remedies, in order to develop the means to establish small businesses oriented to the production and commercialization of those products. An initiative of this kind should involve the strengthening of the organizational and entrepreneurial capacity of the local communities, and an analysis of their sustainable integration toward the target markets.
- ✓ In **Honduras**: Take advantage of the acquired experience in developing the two MP management plan models, to design models for new medicinal plants and implement the two existing ones. The information gathered may be used to inform the design and implementation of the new Forest Law. This initiative could be focused on installing capacities in the communities and local authorities to replicate the design and implementation of those management plans through the use of adequate technologies. The implementation of the existing management plan for the Quina Rona in Guajiquiro, would require the incorporation of a domestication component, MP production and commercialization to be developed by the communities. As for the implementation of the Quina Bejuco management plan in the Biosphere of Rio Plátano, it might be useful to include an educational component that helps increase community knowledge with the aim of guaranteeing the self-supply of popular remedies.

**4.6 Quality of the evaluation report** Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document "GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for the verification and review of terminal evaluations" for further definitions of the ratings.

**4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings from other sources such as GEF EO field visits, etc.**

The UNEP EOU Assessment of Project Ratings and Performance rated this TE as **Satisfactory**. The project ratings according to the TE and the UNEP EOU Assessment concurred for 10 criteria, for 1 criterion the two assessments differed and 10 criteria were assessed by the UNEP EOU Assessment but had no corresponding rating on the TE report. The final project rating was almost identical for both assessments: TE=Satisfactory (4.6) || UNEP EOU Assessment = Satisfactory (4.5).

According to the UNEP EOU assessment, the TE report is fully compliant with GEF Principles for conducting terminal evaluations.

<b>4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<b>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b> The TE did not clarify the initial confusion from PRODOC between impacts, outcomes and outputs. Therefore its assessment is also confusing.	4
<b>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?</b>	6
<b>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b>	5
<b>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b>	5
<b>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b>	6
<b>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&amp;E systems?</b>	5

**4.6.3 Assessment of processes affected attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.**

<p><b>Co-financing and Project Outcomes &amp; Sustainability.</b> If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkage did it affect it?</p>
<p>According to the information provided by the TE in relation with co-financing and leveraged resources, in all cases actual cofinancing was larger than planned cofinancing. The TE also shows that the Project was extended considerably (see next section). The TE then informs that more unplanned activities were undertaken, but it also shows that the Project design was too ambitious and that the Project was not able to achieve all its planned products and outcomes. The TE does not provide a clear analysis of these apparent contradictions.</p>
<p><b>Delays and Project Outcomes &amp; Sustainability.</b> If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons responsible for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkage did it affect it?</p>
<p>The Project implementation was extended 15 months longer than planned; equivalent to an overall extent of 42% of its original duration. Apparently the project management was very efficient and major savings were done during execution, in return this allowed for unplanned activities to be executed which finally lead to the extension of the project duration. The TE it is not clear whether this extension was requested because of implementation delays or to fully execute the available budget.</p>

<p><b>4.7 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended?</b> Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.</p>	<p><b>Yes:</b></p>	<p><b>No:</b> <b>X</b></p>
<p><b>Explain:</b> The description of the project impacts on the TE is not clear (see point 4.1.2 above) because of the confusion between project outputs and outcomes. Therefore, a clear identification of the Project impacts is a requisite before considering a recommendation for technical assessment of the impacts.</p>		

**4.8 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)**

<p>Project Document, PIR 2003, PIR 2005, Terminal Evaluation, UNEP EOU Commentary on Final Report</p>
---