

GEFM&E Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		8/16/05
GEF ID:	95		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants	GEF financing:	\$4.57	\$4.57
Country:	Sri Lanka	Co-financing:	\$0.5	\$0.8
Operational Program:	3	Total Project Cost:	\$5,07	\$5,37
IA	WB	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:		Work Program date		05/01/97
		CEO Endorsement		11/05/1997
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		05/08/1998
		Closing Date	Proposed: 06/30/2003	Actual: 06/30/2004
Prepared by: Antonio del Monaco	Reviewed by: Aaron Zazueta	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 5 years	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 6 years	Difference between original and actual closing: 1 year
Author of TE: Robert Crown		TE completion date: 12/15/04	TE submission date to GEF OME: 3/9/2005	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 3 months

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

GEFME Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEFME Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A). Please refer to document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. OED)	GEFME
2.1 Project impacts	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2.2 Project outcomes	S	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	Satisfactory
2.3 Project sustainability	N/A	Likely	Likely	Likely
2.4 Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	N/A	N/A	Moderately Satisfactory
2.5 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	Satisfactory	Satisfactory

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why? Yes, the section of sustainability was very thorough.
--

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

- **What are the Global Environmental Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

To conserve globally and nationally significant medicinal plants, their habitats, species and genomes and promote their sustainable use in Sri Lanka.

- **What are the Development Objectives? Any changes during implementation?** No development objectives were presented in the project document.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

The OED evaluation summary indicates that a new National Policy on Sri Lanka Systems of Indigenous Medicine and an action plan to implement it was completed, however it is still undergoing review by the government. The government's increased the budget allocation for commercial scale cultivation of medicinal plants which was a sign a financial commitment. The OED summary also indicates the following outcomes:

- The government recognized that medicinal plants and their indigenous use was an issue of intellectual property rights and legislation regulating this subsector was approved by the Cabinet but awaits enactment by Parliament after an agreement is reached on which ministry will be responsible.
- A national database on indigenous medicinal plant resources and traditional records compiled from the project's surveys and research was established at the Bandaranaike Memorial Ayurvedic Research Institute.
- Four Medicinal Plant Conservation Areas (MPCA) were established covering 74,000 ha (vs the 12,000 ha planned).
- Village Action Plans for 39 villages led to increased adoption of sustainable conservation practices covering principally, an agenda related to zoning, forest protection, medicinal plant cultivation, transformation and processing of medicinal plants.
- Conservation Area Management Committees proved to be viable and plans are underway to register them as nonprofit making enterprises.
- The Ministry of Indigenous Medicine was strengthened and is able to provide consistent support for community cultivation and conservation.
- The Department of Ayurveda's ability to cultivate and conserve medicinal plants was significantly strengthened with 2 new and 3 rehabilitated existing nurseries for the collection and conservation of germplasm and plant materials, which succeeded in collecting and protecting about 1,800 species.

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes and impacts

Are the project outcomes and impacts as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes and impacts (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)?

Rating: S

The ICR indicates that the project has had a satisfactory outcome in achieving most of its original objectives, which remain today are relevant to and hold the potential of contributing more to both Government of Sri Lanka and the GEF objectives of improving environmental protection and reducing poverty.

The OED evaluation summary also found that the project objective was substantially achieved but that a coherent sector strategy still needs to be developed.

The Bank agreed to extend project closing by one year to allow further time to complete field activities that were slowed due to the security situation in the Bibile Medicinal Plant Conservation Area (MPCA) and the severe drought that prevailed in the project areas.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of project sustainability based on the information presented in the TE.

A Financial resources

Rating: 5 L

The government's increased the budget allocation for commercial scale cultivation of medicinal plants, nurseries and research which can increase the financial sustainability of the project.	
B Socio political	Rating: 5 (L)
The ICR indicates that the project established the boundaries of MPCAs with the agreement of the villagers and developed operational practices for assuring sustainable use of the natural habitat. Forestry officers began to engage villagers as partners in implementing conservation practices (fire breaks, stream bank protection, non-destructive use of plants and trees, abandonment of destructive practices such as culling bean poles, replacement planting), rather than as intruders. While MPCAs were identified in the context of medicinal plants conservation, their relevance to the broader issue of biodiversity conservation has been recognized and their continued management is consistent with the mandates of the Forestry Department and Ministry of Environment. As a result, the MPCA concept and the participation of communities is likely to survive in practice.	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: 4 (ML)
OED found that the government was ambivalent about the importance of indigenous medicine and project ownership was jeopardized by frequently changing ministerial affiliations (five ministries and five ministers) and a high turnover of counterpart staff. As a result, a professional managerial culture and lines of recognized authority were not fully developed and there is not yet a coherent strategy for the sector. The substitution of NGO expertise to mitigate the Department of Ayurveda's managerial flux and weak technical expertise in biodiversity failed to build the department's capacity and reduced local ownership. However, the ICR indicates that in spite of issues of ambivalence regarding the project's ownership during implementation, the achievements of the project are likely to be sustained because several agencies are expected to absorb and maintain various practices and physical products of the project that are consistent with their own mandates, rather than having a single institution continue implementing project activities in their entirety. The Ministry of Indigenous Medicine has completed a new "National Policy on Sri Lanka Systems of Indigenous Medicine" and a proposed action plan to continue the initiatives of the project under their management.	
D Ecological (for example, for coffee production projects, reforestation for carbon sequestration under OP12, etc.)	Rating:
N/A	
E Examples of replication and catalytic outcomes suggesting increased likelihood of sustainability	Rating: 5 L
The Ministry of Environment which oversees the Forestry Department is implementing community forestry following the model developed in the project and is preparing additional applications. In addition to incorporating selected project activities into the regular work programs of the Bandaranaike Memorial Ayurvedic Research Institute, the Ministry of Indigenous Medicine has decided to create an additional unit to coordinate and further develop its strategic role of stewardship and support for the practice of Ayurvedic medicine. The project management team began to plan for the sustainable follow-on of project activities early in the implementation period. Following the Mid Term Review, work began on a strategy for turning project activities over to village organizations and institutionalize findings.	

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

A. Effective M&E systems in place: What were the accomplishments and shortcomings of the project's M&E system in terms of the tools used such as: indicators, baselines, benchmarks, data collection and analysis systems, special studies and reports, etc.?	Rating: 3 (MU)
OED found that monitoring and evaluation was biased towards social sustainability (i.e., institutional development) and covered the environmental aspects of the project inadequately.	
B. Information used for adaptive management: What is the experience of the project with adaptive management?	Rating: 5 (S)
Appraisal appears to have been too idealistic with insufficient attention to the realities of implementation for a project that cut across several established sectors and required high rates of	

local participation. For example, the number of MPCAs was reduced from 5 to 4 because of inter-agency conflict over territorial jurisdiction. In part this was the result of inadequate consultation during project appraisal to identify needed cross-support from other agencies. This appears to have been corrected after mid-term review. Also, during project implementation, it became clear that villagers were less concerned for conserving medicinal plants per se than raising incomes and addressing community needs, even though it was understood that conservation and sustainable use of the forests could contribute to these broader goals. Therefore, after the Mid Term Review, the Project Management Unit re-focused its approach and adopted a participatory village/community development model as a framework in which promoting the sustainable use of plants from the wild played a part. This change of focus was an appropriate response and eventually enriched the development impact of the project, was well documented and discussed, and did not require a formal legal amendment. This was a good indication of adaptive management to enhance the achievement of the project objectives.

Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? No

4.4 Quality of lessons

Weaknesses and strengths of the project lessons as described in the TE (i.e. lessons follow from the evidence presented, or lessons are general in nature and of limited applicability, lessons are comprehensive, etc.)

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?

- Conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants will be more strongly influenced by factors affecting the conservation and sustainable use of forestry resources in general than by specific efforts targeted on medicinal plants themselves.
- It is important to build a broad national constituency for biodiversity conservation projects that cut across traditional ministerial boundaries before project approval. This becomes imperative when some elements - such as medicinal plants - may appear irrelevant to western-oriented health agencies.
- Paying inadequate attention to building and sustaining in-country capacity undermines project ownership and adversely affects outcomes.
- The project management team began to plan for the sustainable follow-on of project activities early in the implementation period. Following the Mid Term Review, work began on a strategy for turning project activities over to village organizations and institutionalize findings. This had the beneficial effect of raising sustainability and the ownership of the project's results.

4.5 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 the "Criteria for the assessment of the quality of terminal evaluation reports" in the document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

4.5.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings

In some cases the GEF Office of M&E may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office of M&E. If substantial independent information has been collected, then complete this section with any comments about the project.

N/A

4.5.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report

A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? Yes, the achievements and shortcomings were properly assessed

Ratings

5 (S)

B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated? yes	5 (S)
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The ICR presents a very complete discussion of sustainability and transitional arrangements.	6 (HS)
Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? There were some good lessons, but others were rather obvious. Some key lessons were missed in the lessons section of the ICR such as the first lessons above.	4 (MS)
D. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? Yes	5 (S)
E. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? Yes	5 (S)

4.6 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended? Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.

Yes: X

No:

Explain: There have been four other GEF projects on medicinal plants. An assessment of this project in a cluster with these projects could lead to some valuable lessons and insights. The projects are: Ethiopia - Conservation and Sustainable use of Medicinal Plants, Ghana - Northern Savannah Biodiversity Project, Jordan - Conservation of Medicinal and Herbal Plants Project, Mongolia - Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plants; each has drawn on GEF support for their biodiversity aspects of developing traditional medicine and traditional knowledge.

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

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

OED evaluation summary, ICR and project document