

## GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		February 2011
GEF Project ID:	1591 FSP		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	GF2760-03-4680	<b>GEF financing:</b>	7,165,000	7,165,000
Project Name:	Regional Program of Action and Demonstration of Sustainable Alternatives to DDT for Malaria Vector Control in Mexico and Central America	IA/EA own:	854,440	12,321,440
Country:	Regional: (Central America) Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, and Panama	Government:	51,164	58,838
		Other*:	0.0	260,000
		<b>Total Cofinancing:</b>	905,604	12,380,538
Operational Program:	OP#10 Contaminant-Based Operational Program; OP#14 Draft Operational Program on Persistent Organic Pollutants	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	8,070,604	<b>19,545,238**</b>
IA:	UNEP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	PAHO – Pan-American Health Organization	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		August 2003
		Closing Date	Proposed: July 2006	Actual: December 2008
TER Prepared by:	TER peer reviewed by:  Oreste Maia-Andrade	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 36 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 65 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 29 months
Author of TE:	Alberto Narváez Olalla	TE completion date:  April 2009	TE submission date to GEF EO:  August 2010	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 16 months

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

\*\* The Final Evaluation reports GEF financing of USD 7.16 million, actual cofinancing of USD 12.38 million, but a total of USD 14.49.

## 2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	HS	S	S	MS
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	L	L	ML

2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	S	MS	MS	MS
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	N/A	MS	MS	S
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?

No, this final evaluation (or Terminal Evaluation, TE) should not be considered a good practice.

- The TE is excessively subjective. It is widely based on the opinion of interviewees instead of verifiable facts. Some positive ratings in the TE (such as “adequate” or even “highly satisfactory”) have questionable base on substantial facts.
- The insufficient coverage of the role of executing agency, the lack of explanation for reasons behind delays, and the inadequate analysis of the M&E system, among other factors, all diminish the overall quality of the TE.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?

No such findings were noted in the TE.

### 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

#### 3.1 Project Objectives

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

According to the Project Document (ProDoc) submitted for CEO Endorsement, the “overall objective of the project” was:

- “*To demonstrate* that methods for malaria vector control without DDT or other persistent pesticides are replicable, cost-effective and sustainable, thus preventing the reintroduction of DDT in the region. Human health and the environment will be protected in Mexico and Central America by promoting new approaches to malaria control, as part of an integrated and coordinated regional program. *The establishment of a regional network* will facilitate the exchange of best practices and lessons learned among neighboring countries. Major outcomes will be [not only] an increased governmental and local community awareness of DDT and other pesticides’ hazards to the environment and human health, [but also the] adjustment of future behavior regarding the use of persistent pesticides.”

The TE presents the same global environmental objective of the ProDoc.

**b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)**

According to the TE, the “project activities” were organized under the following four components:

- Component 1: *Demonstration and Dissemination of Projects*. The objective was to implement, evaluate, and disseminate the alternative strategies of malaria vector control without use of DDT. The main outcome was to avoid future reintroduction of DDT or other persistent pesticides in national malaria control programs.
- Component 2: *Strengthening of national institutional capacity to control malaria without DDT*. The outcome of this component was to strengthen national capacities of malaria risk assessment, development of laboratory infrastructure, community participation and training regarding malaria vector control and pesticide management.
- Component 3: *Elimination of DDT stockpiles*. This component was to address the existing problem of stockpiles in six of the eight participating countries. All activities were to be documented and management plans were to be put into place to prevent further accumulation of stockpiles of pesticides.
- Component 4: *Coordination and Management*. A regional coordinator and eight national coordinators were to be hired for this project under terms of reference established by the steering committee. This component also included three annual meetings of the steering committee to plan, evaluate and report activities.

There were no practical changes regarding project components in the TE in relation to the ProDoc, but simply a more succinct rephrasing.					
<b>Overall Environmental Objectives</b>		<b>Project Development Objectives</b>		<b>Project Components</b>	<b>Any other (specify)</b>
N/A		N/A		N/A	N/A
<b>c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)</b>					
<b>Original objectives not sufficiently articulated</b>	<b>Exogenous conditions changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed</b>	<b>Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious</b>	<b>Project was restructured because of lack of progress</b>	<b>Any other (specify)</b>	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

#### 4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

##### 4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or a unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)

<b>a. Relevance</b>	<b>Rating: 5</b>
<p>Satisfactory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project outcomes were consistent with the operational program strategies and regional priorities, regarding a non-pollutant combat of malaria. Moreover, the project was reported to have “contributed to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the Roll Back Malaria goal, and [possibly] to eliminate the malaria in these territories. Additionally, the project has a high compliance among the community and families and impact on other health problems.”</li> <li>According to the TE, “DDT and other COPs were not used, [and] the use of other insecticides also was diminished.” Also noted in the TE, “integral vector control with the elimination of habitat (refugees) and mosquito breeding sites [are] highly valued strategies by all actors in this evaluation.”</li> <li>The expected project outcomes were fully consistent with program strategies and countries’ priorities, aimed to eliminate contaminating pollutants. Beyond that, the project outcomes are reported to have contributed to MDGs and other goals, so their relevance is rated as satisfactory.</li> </ul>	
<b>b. Effectiveness</b>	<b>Rating: 4</b>
<p>Moderately Satisfactory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effectiveness was analyzed in detail per component in the TE and, although components 1, 2 and 4 were satisfactorily fulfilled, component 3 has not succeeded at all, despite the efforts of the agencies, whose failure with that particular regard was argued not to depend only on them. Therefore, the outcomes were moderately commensurate with expected outcomes and are rated as moderately satisfactory. Following is a summary of the effectiveness analysis of the TE per component:</li> <li>Component 1: Demonstration and dissemination: Designed as the most important and complex component of the Project, and thereby receiving most of resources, institutional and community effort, this component achieved successful implementation in 202 demonstration communities and 52 municipalities of nine demonstration projects, one in each country. It has directly benefited 159,018 inhabitants and 6, 845,000 indirectly, which account for 29% of the population living in highly malaria endemic areas of Mesoamerica. All the countries have adopted technical alternatives of vector control at the demonstrative areas, not only without using DDT, but also without the use of other persistent insecticides.</li> <li>Component 2: Capacity building: From 2004 to mid 2008, the Project maintained a technical training program in epidemiological surveillance, entomology, social participation, participative planning and evaluation of risk factor due to exposure to DDT and other POPs, geographic information systems and other technical areas complemented with guidelines and manuals generated by the Project’s experience. With Project’s resources, many documents were edited and published to support the training, exchange and dissemination programs as part of the strategy to strengthen local institutional capabilities for malaria vector control without using DDT. Through almost 900 events – such as consultation meetings and training workshops – it was possible to share information, knowledge and experience among a total of 21,306 participants, from which 54% where community personnel (11,459) and the rest institutional personnel.</li> <li>Component 3: Elimination of DDT reserves: An inventory with the participation of national authorities and</li> </ul>	

the ministries of health and environment founded 136.7 tonnes of DDT and 64.5 of other POPs. Although the TE reports that many efforts were made, the document affirms that it was not possible to export and eliminate the stockpiles of DDT and other POPs. The main reason reported to have affected the achievement of this component was the European Union’s harder regulations with regard to notification and request of transit; Therefore, the report mentions that UNEP/GEF and PAHO are still analyzing alternatives to adequately solve the pending implementation of this key component.

- Component 4: Project’s management and coordination: The project was implemented by UNEP and executed by PAHO under the overall responsibility of the Director, Division of Health and Environment and Ministries of Health. The UNEP Division of GEF Co-ordination, in association with PAHO, monitored activities undertaken during the execution of the project. The Director, Division of Health and Environment of PAHO was responsible for maintaining systematic overview of the implementation of the project through monthly project monitoring meetings or consultation and preparing to monitor reports. Regional Coordination provided an accurate and permanent technical communication among those involved in administering, managing and implementing the project, verifying the flow of communication to all the participating communities.
- Considering that at least a fourth of the project’s outcomes was not achieved, but the other three fourths were satisfactorily accomplished, overall effectiveness is rated as moderately satisfactory.

**c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness) Rating: 5**

Satisfactory:

- According to the TE, “payment of workshops, meetings, supervision and community support represent the highest amount of the total inversion. There was no inversion in human resources because the project employed existing structures and resources. [...] The general agreement among the civil servants and health workers, who had experience using insecticides in control of malaria vectors, is that the cost-effectiveness of the strategy was highly superior to spraying. [...] Although community participation could be expensive at the beginning, the cost would diminish during the intervention. [...] Implementing methods of vector control activities through community mobilization (cleaning house and patios, control of shelters and mosquito breeding sites) were proved to be cost-effective and resulted in savings.”
- Considering the reported appropriate use of resources and the achievement of most expected results, efficiency is rated as satisfactory.

**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= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

**a. Financial resources Rating: 4**

Likely:

- According to the TE, in the second half of 2008, Guatemala, Panama and Costa Rica had the strategies executed without the proper financing of the project – due to the international financial crisis – but communities were reported to have continued with the malaria interventions as the procedures had already become routine for them. As major difficulties, floods in September 2008 and January 2009 were reported to have constituted a real test for financial sustainability.
- A probable medium term financial source is the Mesoamerican Health System (Plan Puebla Panama Initiative), which will be financed by the Foundations Bill and Melinda Gates and Carson, with the aim to eliminate malaria in Mexico and Central America.
- The lack of financing during a significant period of time could have represented a moderately unlikely financial sustainability, but it was due to the exceptional financial crises. Besides, there are expectations that regular funds have returned to normal standards and the Gates and Carson Foundations are also expected to join the effort. Therefore, financial sustainability is rated as likely.

**b. Socio political Rating: 3**

Moderately Likely:

- The TE reports a disseminate perspective among communities according to which the outcomes of the project did not depend of socio-political factors, though at the regional level, as well as in Mexico and Costa Rica, it is believed that sustainability could indeed be affected by presidential elections, which could change public health policies. In Guatemala, the general opinion is that as the strategy has a health promotion basis, the

<p>outcomes and impact will probably be independent of changes in government. In most cases, people working in vector control have job stability and awareness about the subject, and they continue attending meetings even after the project had finished.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The global economic crisis was identified as a negative issue, since the bankruptcy of shipping companies delayed the elimination of stockpiles of DDT and other POPs. To the TE, “at the regional level, political instability, expressed in constant government’s changes, is identified as the main threat for sustainability and a cause of failure in achieving planned objectives. Changes in national/central government that imply changes at the local level were perceived as a threat/menace to employment stability. [...] In Mexico, because of the change in mayors, political connections with municipalities were interrupted. Changes in high-level authorities in the National Institute of Health affected the national program since the new managers adopt different policies. [...] The opinion in Costa Rica and Mexico is that the changes in municipal authorities will partially affect local activities, even though they believe that the existence of career civil servants would guarantee the continuity of the process.”</li> <li>• Considering socio-political instabilities and poor planning – usually based on no more than expectations – socio-political sustainability is rated as moderately likely.</li> </ul>	
<b>c. Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: 3</b>
<p>Moderately Likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In several countries, the political decentralization carried out during the 1990s weakened the then centralized malaria control programs. However, the project reinforced malaria control programs because local committees joined the Health Ministry’s structures, especially at the vector control programs, taking advantage of the technical expertise and the structure that had remained from the vertical elimination program.</li> <li>• In Mexico, there is still a semi-autonomous specialized program, well integrated with the general health services. In Guatemala, the vector control structure persists, but under regional leadership through an integrated structure. Costa Rica is the country with the most decentralized intervention, and there is not a parallel or independent structure for vector control. The area counts with a multidisciplinary team, composed of epidemiologists, teachers and vector inspectors who work in the communities. There is a narrow coordination between health general services and the health staff.</li> <li>• The TE also notes that PAHO has a strict control of funds to ensure transparency and proper management of resources. The report also mentions that in PAHO headquarters and each of its country offices, there are strict internal and external audit mechanisms.</li> <li>• The TE affirms that “in the majority of the places (8/9) the interviewees think that there is a completely likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for, the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained”. The TE also affirms that “all the interviewees consider that the systems for accountability and transparency and the required technical know-how were completely in place.” However, as in many other aspects, the TE does not clarify which facts exactly base the interpretations of these interviewees, reason why the good aspects of institutional and governance sustainability are not ranked higher than moderately likely.</li> </ul>	
<b>d. Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: 4</b>
<p>Likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to the TE, “the most threatening aspect to environmental sustainability is the risk of natural disasters, consequent from hurricanes, tropical storms and floods, which are frequent in the demonstrative areas. Nevertheless, in Guatemala, Costa Rica and Panama, health services and communities reacted so well against the effects of tropical storms determining that until January 2009 no outbreaks or epidemics occurred. These threats were controlled without the use of any kind of insecticides.”</li> <li>• Considering that most of risks to environmental sustainability depend on natural matters, and communities and authorities are reported to be working in mitigation aspects, environmental sustainability is rated as likely.</li> </ul>	

**4.3 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.**

<p><b>a. Co-financing.</b> To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by cofinancing well integrated into the project? 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? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?</p>
---

The amount of cofinancing was much beyond expected:

- Multilateral agencies, including PAHO and CECE's actual contribution was 92% higher than programmed. Central governments contributed with 13% more than programmed. Contribution from the private sector and municipal governments was not expected, but the latter financed important infrastructure constructions and provided logistical and human resources as a counterpart to the Project. Their contribution was estimated in approximately US\$ 180.000 as co-financing.
- According to the TE, "thanks to these additional contributions the project could be replicated in other localities. Nevertheless, it is impossible to assure that these contributions should be kept to medium and long term, for what it is necessary to search new funds."

**b. Delays.** If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Delays were reported as related to institutional arrangements:

- All the TE mentions about delays is that "institutional arrangements delayed in one year the implementation of the project, but with two extensions the project was completed successfully, except for component 3 – elimination of DDT reserves". No further explanation regarding delays is provided in the TE.

**c. Country Ownership.** Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability highlighting the causal links.

Country Ownership varies from one country to the another in this particular project, but potential political instabilities in the region represent risks:

- The TE reports a disseminate perspective among communities according to which the outcomes of the project did not depend of socio-political factors, though at the regional level, as well as in Mexico and Costa Rica, it is believed that sustainability could be affected by presidential elections that could change public health policies. In Guatemala, the general opinion is that as the strategy has a health promotion basis, the outcomes and impact will probably be independent of changes in government. In most cases, people working in vector control have job stability and awareness about the subject, and they continue attending meetings even after the project had finished.
- According to the TE, "there is high empowerment of the health workers of the local levels and of community leaders. In all the levels, there was a very engaged participation of stakeholders through national, local committees and community working groups. [...] All participating countries have joined the Millennium Development Goals and adopted Roll Back Malaria Initiative, becoming signatories to the conventions for the elimination of POPs. Except for Mexico and El Salvador, who had already reduced the malaria transmission before the start of project, malaria combat was considered a public health priority in the other countries. Community organizations, mayors, police, churches, firemen, all participated in the local committees at demonstration areas level with an excellent performance."

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

**a. M&E design at Entry** **Rating (six point scale): 3**

Moderately Unsatisfactory:

- As explained in the TE, "the system of M&E had two documents of reference, the project document and the technical guide. The M&E project document referred to aims and activities planned, and the guide focused on malaria epidemiological surveillance and monitoring of the strategies of control implemented. The M&E Project was referring to the aims and activities developed with a qualitative approach, with few goals or thresholds, working through quarterly reports and other reports presented to Technical Committees." This system was qualified as adequate by the TE.
- "The technical guide defined an extended list of indicators (approx. 1200), covering procedures, products, results and the impact. After a Mid-Term Evaluation, the Regional Coordination defined 20 core indicators", which certainly increased the feasibility of the evaluation process.
- The TE mentions that "the M&E section of the Project Plan did not contain M&E of malaria control interventions and epidemiological surveillance of the malaria situation. This was developed in the Technical Guide, which presents a chapter "Demonstrative Projects Evaluation". In this chapter, four evaluation aspects are described: the impact, the process, the effectiveness, and efficacy. Some of the key interventions did not have monitoring indicators, as the coverage and treatment compliance. The complexity of the malaria surveillance system presented in the technical guide and the heterogeneity of the surveillance systems of the countries determined that each country used their own surveillance and monitoring systems."
- The TE argues that this independent choice of each country had then become the problem: "The lack of

<p>uniformity of surveillance systems for malaria in the countries caused a serious difficulty to evaluate the impact and results of the project in relation to the incidence of malaria and control of mosquito breeding sites and refuges. A monitoring plan was not designed to the national level, only to the regional level.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Therefore, if M&amp;E at entry was already unsatisfactory, and then the technical guide’s additional proposals were moderately unsatisfactory, the overall rating of M&amp;E at entry cannot be higher than moderately unsatisfactory.</li> </ul>
<p><b>b. M&amp;E plan Implementation                      Rating (six point scale): 4</b></p>
<p>Moderately Satisfactory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The TE qualifies the M&amp;E system as adequate in spite of its problems in quantifying activities, products and results, explaining some adaptations in the evaluation: “the system of the Technical Guide turns out to be [excessively detailed] and very few indicators were in use.”</li> <li>• According to the TE, “in all the countries, a surveillance system for reporting malaria cases was implemented at community levels”, which reportedly increased local engagement, since the information was only aggregated at provincial or departmental levels before the project. “Nowadays, there is a good quality surveillance system at the community level, which will allow evaluating the impact in the long term” says the TE.</li> <li>• “The most important advances of the information system have been given at the GIS development. In Guatemala, Costa Rica, Mexico, Nicaragua, El Salvador and Panama, the regional, national and local staff has achieved useful applications to take decisions (baseline diagnosis, monitoring interventions). These applications [demonstrated the importance of the GIS for M&amp;E]. Therefore, it is evident the capability that the vector and the epidemiological staff have reached to make epidemiologic analysis, helped by the maps made in GIS.”</li> <li>• Pointing that the TE could have provided a more appropriate quantification of data and the issuing of monitoring practices (reports, field inspections, etc.), the positive aspects related to M&amp;E implementation, especially with regard to the GIS development allow for an M&amp;E implementation rated as moderately satisfactory.</li> </ul>

#### 4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

<p><b>a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): 5</b></p>
<p><b>b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): U/A</b></p>
<p>Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.</p> <p>Unable to Assess:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The TE provides contradictory information with regard to UNEP performance: Firstly, it mentions that “the start of the project delayed more than one year because of UNEP’s delay in authorizing two extensions.” Right after, it mentions that “UNEP approved changes in time, particularly the approval of the two extensions.”</li> <li>• The TE says that “thanks to PAHO and UNEP permanent relation, the problems were identified in time and, except for the unsuccessful elimination of DDT stockpiles, there were no serious problems with implementation. [...] PAHO staff has provided useful support and advice to the project at both country and local levels, and UNEP staff intervention at these levels was not necessary.” The TE closes M&amp;E implementation evaluation affirming that “according to Regional Interviewees, UNEP support improved from 2007. One of the problems was the lack of feedback to the quarterly reports, only one time in 16 reports (E1R).”</li> <li>• Considering the inexact character of the information provided by the TE, quality of implementation is then unable to assess.</li> </ul>
<p><b>c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies<sup>1</sup> (rating on a 6 point scale): 5</b></p>
<p>Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and</p>

<sup>1</sup> Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.

Satisfactory:

- According to the TE, “in order to maintain the political and financial support, PAHO has advocated before the regional Ministries of Health for their consent to state the eradication of malaria as a medium-term goal in Mesoamerica.”
- The TE also evaluates that PAHO could still do more: “PAHO could still design new projects to replicate the strategy in other areas of high incidence of malaria transmission and maintain the surveillance of localities where malaria transmission was stopped. The Mesoamerican Health System (Plan Puebla Panama) is a great opportunity to replicate the strategy in other areas.”
- The TE explains that “for the coordination and management of the Project, PAHO hired and based a regional coordinator in Guatemala, and seven national coordinators (NAPs) located at PAHO’s national offices (except for Costa Rica, where the duties were undertaken by an international consultant from SDE/PAHO upon decision from national authorities). Each country had a national focal point for this project, appointed by the executing ministry. NAPs solved the effects derived from the instability from institutional national focal points and provided continuity to the Project. They also provided technical cooperation to the countries to develop community participation, harmonized the linkage among institutions and supervise, implement and evaluate the demonstration projects in their country. The project organization took advantage of the influence, leadership and infrastructure from PAHO into the Ministries of Health and the Environment in the Region.”
- The TE also explains that “the regional coordinator was located in the headquarters of the Institute of Nutrition of Central America and Panama (INCAP), which served as PAHO’s center in Guatemala. Regional management was based on the principles of management and development of administration, focusing on organization, planning, execution, monitoring, and evaluation. Management was highly participative and including, prioritizing joint decisions with the highest degree of consensus among the eight countries.”
- Considering that no shortcomings were mentioned about PAHO’s execution of the Project, although it was remarked that it could still do more, quality of execution is rated as satisfactory.

## 5. PROGRESS TOWARDS IMPACT

### a. What is the outlined outcomes-to-impact pathway?

Briefly describe the logical sequence of means-to-end linkages underlying a project (Outcome to impact pathways are the means-ends relationships between project outcomes and the intended impacts – i.e. the logical results chain of activity, output, outcome and impact)

Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Intermediary States	Impacts
<p>To Promote and Ensure community intervention against malaria, despite the lack of resources during the 2008 financial crisis</p> <p>To Implement, Evaluate, Demonstrate and Disseminate Projects regarding alternative strategies of malaria vector control without use of DDT</p> <p>To Strengthen national capacities of malaria risk assessment, development of laboratory infrastructure, community participation and training regarding malaria vector control and pesticide management</p> <p>To Coordinate and Manage</p>	<p>Scientific studies and the systematization of experiences gave the project a scientific authority and credibility to influence the formulation of malaria policies and governmental decisions</p> <p>Many documents were edited and published to support the training, exchange and dissemination programs as part of the strategy to strengthen local institutional capabilities for malaria vector control without using DDT</p> <p>Regional Coordination</p>	<p>All countries have adopted technical alternatives of vector control at the demonstrative areas (without DDT or other persistent insecticides)</p> <p>Malaria combat (without DDT or other persistent insecticides) declared a public health priority in all</p>	<p>One of the four project components – elimination of DDT reserves – is yet to be accomplished</p>	<p>Human health and the environment is improved in Mexico and Central America by the promotion of new approaches to malaria control, as part of an integrated and coordinated regional program (without the use of DDT and other persistent insecticides)</p> <p>GEB: Methods for malaria vector control without DDT or other</p>



through a regional coordinator and eight national coordinators, under terms of reference established by the steering committee  To Eliminate DDT in six of the eight participating countries	provided an accurate and permanent technical communication among those involved in managing and implementing the project, as well as in verifying the flow of communication to all the participating communities	participating countries		persistent pesticides are replicable, cost-effective and sustainable, thus contribute to prevent reintroduction of DDT and other persistent insecticides in Mesoamerica
--	--	-------------------------	--	---

**b. What are the actual (*intended or unintended*) impacts of the project?**

Based on the assessment of outcomes [4.1.1] explain to what extent the project contributed to or detracted from the path to project impacts and to impact drivers (Impact drivers are the *significant factors* that, if present, are expected to contribute to the ultimate realization of project impacts and that are within the ability of the project to influence

Considering the assessed outcomes and presented impacts, it is inferable from this project that impact drivers were:

- **Institutional capacity and coordination:** According to the TE, “all countries developed institutional capacity through the following activities: i) training of national and local personnel, as well as the delivery of equipment, ii) formulation and implementation of guidelines for malaria control, iii) constitution of Steering Committees, National Committees and Local Committees. The local committees were inserted in the structures of the Ministry of Health, using technical and management experience of the malaria control programs. There was an appropriate inter- and intra- institutional coordination.
- **Clear methodology:** The project uses the so-called Echo Health method, with five characterizing elements: i) Prevention and integral control, emphasizing Integral Vector Control as recommended by the WHO; ii) multidisciplinary and multi-sectorial approach. iii) community participation as the central axis of the controlling activities; iv) equity, with priority in areas with the following characteristics: rural, predominance of indigenous population, critical poverty and malaria persistence. The methodological structure of the implementation was proper and allowed a methodology of follow-up not only of operative actions but also expected results. The rapid impact achieved at the start of the project allowed that the model had a wide support from the community and local workers. The evidence generated by scientific studies and the systematization of experiences gave the project a scientific authority and credibility to influence the formulation of malaria policies and decision makers.
- **Substantial relevance:** As mentioned before, the project was reported to have contributed to achieve Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the Roll Back Malaria goal, and there is the possibility to eliminate the malaria in these territories. Additionally, the project has a high compliance among the community and families and impact on other health problems.
- **Capacity building:** According to the TE, “payment of workshops, meetings, supervision and community support represent the highest amount of the total inversion. There was no inversion in human resources because the project employed existing structures and resources. [...] The general agreement among the civil servants and health workers, who had experience using insecticides in control of malaria vectors, is that the cost-effectiveness of the strategy was highly superior to spraying. [...] Although community participation could be expensive at the beginning, the cost would diminish during the intervention. [...] Implementing methods of vector control activities through community mobilization (cleaning house and patios, control of shelters and mosquito breeding sites) were proved to be cost-effective and resulted in savings.”

**c. Drawing on the assessment of the likelihood of outcome sustainability[4.2], what are the apparent risks to achieved impacts being sustained and likely impacts being achieved?**

Considering the assessed likelihood of outcome sustainability, it is inferable from this project that the apparent risks to impacts were:

- **Financial uncertainties:** As mentioned before, according to the TE, in the second half of 2008, Guatemala, Panama and Costa Rica had the strategies executed without the proper financing of the project – due to the international financial crisis – but communities are reported to have continued with the malaria interventions as they had already become routine for them. Floods in September 2008 and January 2009 were reported to have constituted a real test for financial sustainability.
- **Potential political instabilities:** The TE reports a disseminate perspective among communities according to which the outcomes of the project did not depend of socio-political factors, though at the regional level, as

well as in Mexico and Costa Rica, it is believed that sustainability could be affected by presidential elections that could change public health policies. In Guatemala, the general opinion is that as the strategy has a health promotion basis, the outcomes and impact will probably be independent of changes in government. In most cases, people working in vector control have job stability and awareness about the subject, and they continue attending meetings even after the project had finished.

- **Weak institutions and governance:** The TE affirms that “in the majority of the places (8/9) the interviewees think that there is a completely likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for, the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained”. The TE also affirms that “all the interviewees consider that the systems for accountability and transparency and the required technical know-how were completely in place.” However, as in many other aspects, the TE does not clarify which facts exactly base the interpretations of these interviewees.
- **Risk of natural disasters:** According to the TE, “the most threatening aspect to environmental sustainability is the risk of natural disasters, consequent from hurricanes, tropical storms and floods, which are frequent in the demonstrative areas.”

**d. Evidence of Impact**

Question	Yes	No	UA
i. Did the evaluation report on <i>stress reduction</i> <sup>2</sup> at the <u>local level</u> (i.e. at the demonstration-pilot level, etc)?		X	
ii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope <sup>3</sup> of such reductions given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
iii. Did the evaluation report stress reduction at the broader <u>systemic level</u> ?	X		
iv. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of such reductions given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
Yes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Guatemala, Costa Rica and Panama, health services and communities reacted very well against the effects of tropical storms determining that until January 2009 no outbreaks or epidemics occur. These threats were controlled without use of any kind of insecticides.”</li> </ul>			
v. Did the evaluation report change in the <i>environmental status</i> at the local level (i.e. at the demonstration - pilot level, etc)	X		
vi. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
Yes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Among the impacts mentioned in the TE, “the reduction of common flies, the improvement of community safety, basic environmental sanitation and the [cleanliness of] streets.”</li> </ul>			
vii. Did the evaluation report change in the environmental status at the broader systemic level?		X	
viii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of such change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
ix. Did the evaluation report change in the socioeconomic status at the local level?	X		
x. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
Yes:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engaged participation of stakeholders: According to the TE, “there is high empowerment of the health workers of the local levels and of community leaders. In all the levels, there was a very engaged participation of stakeholders through national, local committees and community working groups.”</li> </ul>			
xi. Did the evaluation report change in the socio-economic status at the systemic level?		X	
xii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			

<sup>2</sup> Stress = Pressure on the environment caused by human activities; Reduction=decrease of this pressure

<sup>3</sup> Scope refers to the broadness of results against original objectives,

<p>xiii. Did the evaluation provide evidence of any negative impacts (on drivers toward the projects intended impact, environmental status, socioeconomic status)? Describe the impacts that were documented and how severe were these impacts?</p> <p>No negative impacts were reported.</p>			
<p><b>e. Monitoring of impacts</b></p>			
<p>i. Are arrangements/institutions in place to monitor stress reduction/improvement in the environment and/or socio-economic conditions at the local level after project completion?</p>		X	
<p>ii. Are arrangements/institutions in place to monitor stress reduction/improvement in the environment and/or socio-economic conditions at the systemic level after project completion?</p>		X	

## 6. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

### a. Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects

Following is the summary of the lessons listed in the TE:

- It is possible to control and even eliminate malaria with the environment-friendly methods and without the use of persistent insecticides through inter-sectorial and community participation.
- Control of mosquito breeding sites and mosquito refuges are strategies of easy adoption by local communities, constituting a means for the community to change their conception about malaria and the empowerment of malaria control activities. The personal education in every house in priority localities and the Situation Room is the better strategy to educate, involve and empower communities.
- Malaria control requires a multi-methodological approach with the combination of interventions related to: diagnosis and complete treatment (compliance), elimination of reservoir plasmodium (active search for asymptomatic and febrile persons), control of mosquito breeding sites with physical and biological methods (fishes), control of mosquito refuges (cleaning houses and yards), barriers mosquito-persons (Insecticide Impregnated Bed Nets).
- The design of a new demonstration project requires the development of comprehensive protocol before execution on: systematization of experiences, impact assessment, evaluation of cost-effectiveness and M&E system adapted to the strategy.
- In Mesoamerica, most of the cases of malaria are concentrated in few localities; the methodology of stratification developed by Mexico and Guatemala allow carried out interventions in few communities and reaches high cost effectiveness. This situation was also identified by the evaluator in the Andean area, and it is possible that this situation was similar in other continents.
- Regarding the elimination of DDT stockpiles, although PAHO has handled the component (including all difficulties) very well, a more experienced organization with this typical and highly specialized activity would have been more efficient. FAO is the UN entity with comparative advantage and experience to deal with these specific activities.

### b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

Following is the summary of recommendations listed in the TE:

- PAHO and UNEP have to make advocacy with Ministries of Health to declare the eradication of malaria as a medium-term goal in Mesoamerica to avoid reducing the political and financial support. PAHO could help countries to design new projects to replicate the strategy in other areas of high incidence of malaria transmission and hold the localities where it has been able to eliminate the indigenous transmission. National Malaria Control Programs have to keep track of the areas and towns as a strategy of long-term impact evaluation. It is important to homogenize and improve surveillance, monitoring and evaluation systems of the Mesoamerican countries.
- UNEP, PAHO and country partners have to identify the strategies, as well as the national and regional sources of funding that could support the countries in the Americas and throughout the world to expand the model in other areas with high levels of transmission.
- UNEP and PAHO have to continue the promotion and dissemination of the Project's achievements and experiences with regional and global reach. The publication of scientific papers is an important task in that

- sense.
- PAHO and UNEP should fund a new study to assess the impact of the project strategy used, correcting problems identified in the evaluations.
- For future complex and multi-country projects, the duration of the project should be six years, considering one year for organizational and institutional arrangements, four for implementation and one for evaluation and preparation of final reports.

**7. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

**7.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.**

With regard to the UNEP EOU Assessment of project ratings and performance (Commentary):

- The information gathered by UNEP EOU is very thorough and objective, presenting the main findings with regard to the evaluation of whole project.
- UNEP EOU agrees with most of the ratings of the TE Report, but downgrades its outcomes from highly satisfactory to satisfactory, and its M&E from satisfactory to moderately satisfactory.

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 terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

<b>7.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<p><b>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b> One of the four project components – elimination of DDT reserves – was not accomplished at all, although external factors – legal constraints by the European Union – were hold responsible by the TE. The report, however, does not contain a thorough assessment of why this objective component has not been achieved.</p>	MS
<p><b>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps?</b> The TE is excessively subjective. It is widely based on the opinion of interviewees instead of verifiable facts. Some positive ratings in the TE (such as “adequate” or even “highly satisfactory”) have questionable base on substantial fundamentals.</p>	MU
<p><b>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> The good aspects of institutional and governance sustainability are not ranked higher than moderately likely because the report assesses project sustainability criteria through excessive subjectivity – i.e. opinion of interviewees.</p>	MS
<p><b>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b></p>	S
<p><b>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b></p>	S
<p><b>e. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&amp;E systems?</b> The insufficient coverage of the role of executing agency, the lack of explanation for reasons behind delays, and the inadequate analysis of the M&amp;E system, among other factors, all diminish the overall quality of the TE.</p>	MU

**8. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.**

UNEP EOU Assessment of project ratings and performance (Commentary).