Report: Mid-Term Evaluation

Project: Mainstreaming Conservation and Sustainable Use of Medicinal Plant Diversity in Three Indian States

Report prepared by:

Mark Johnstad
546 Meadowlark
Bozeman, MT 59718 USA
Ph./Fax/Cell
Email: mjohnstad@igc.org

Dr. Ram Prasad
06, Aranya Vihar, Chunabhatti, Kolar Road,
Bhopal (M.P.) Pin – 462 016
Ph. +91-755-2424907, Mob. 09425608259
Email : drpresearchcenter@gmail.com

DRAFT DATE: **January 25, 2012**

Table of Contents

Acronyms

CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CCF	Country Cooperation Framework
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DFO	Divisional Forest Officer
DST	Department of Science and Technology
FGB	Forest Gene Bank
FRLHT	Foundation for the Revitalization of Local Health Traditions
GoI	Government of India
GSMP	Globally Significant Medicinal Plants
ICFRE	Indian Council of Forestry Research and Education
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
ISG	Implementation Steering Group
JFM	Joint Forest Management
JFMC	Joint Forest Management Committees
LMG	Local Management Group
MAP	Medicinal and Aromatic Plants
MoEF	Ministry of Environment and Forests
MoF	Ministry of Finance
MoHFW	Ministry of Health & Family Welfare
MoRD	Ministry of Rural Development
MPCA	Medicinal Plants Conservation Area
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NMPB	National Medicinal Plants Board
NPD	National Project Director
NSC	National Steering Committee
PISG	Project Implementation Steering Group
PMU	Project Management Unit
PRI	Panchayati Raj Institution
RCU	Regional Coordination Unit
SFD	State Forest Department
SMPB	State Medicinal Plant Board
STA	Senior Technical Advisor
TAG	Technical Advisory Group
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
VFC	Village Forest Committee

<u>Acknowledgement</u>

Part 1: Executive summary

1.1 Brief description of project

The project document states:

"India's medicinal plant resources have great National and global significance. India has some 8,000 medicinal plant species out of a world total of 40-50,000 and is the world's second largest producer of medicinal plants and herbal medicines. However, its medicinal plant resources, including globally significant diversity, are increasingly threatened by overexploitation to meet commercial demand. Over 95% of medicinal plants used by the herbal industry are harvested from the wild, primarily from India's forests, which are mostly owned and managed by the government. Despite this, wild harvesting is still largely uncontrolled and unmonitored. The objective of this project is to achieve the long-term conservation and sustainable use of India's medicinal plant diversity, particularly of its globally significant species, by mainstreaming these objectives into forest management policy and practice at the National, state and local level in three Indian states: Arunachal Pradesh in North-East India, Chhattisgarh in Central India and Uttarakhand North-west India, which provide a broad range of ecological conditions, and hence medicinal plant diversity as well a range of institutional arrangements relating to forest management."

1.2 Context and purpose of the evaluation

The purposes of this mid-term evaluation are to:

- Monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
- Provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
- Promote accountability for resource use; and
- Document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

This mid-term evaluation follows the specific guidance of UNDP/GEF by:

i) Identifying potential project design problems,
ii) Assessing progress towards the achievement of objectives,
iii) Identifying and documenting lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and,
iv) Making recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project.

The evaluation serves as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The evaluation provides an opportunity for project managers to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.

The mid-term evaluation took place during month 42 of a 60-month project.

1.3 Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

1.3.1 Main Conclusions

The overall rating of this project is "Moderately Satisfactory ".

Overall progress during the evaluated period was slow and inefficient. There is only modest progress towards the objective and four outcomes. None of the project's 26 outputs are yet delivered.

Nearly all of the project's challenges may be traced to two issues. First, the project did not establish a comprehensive management framework supported by international and national technical expertise as described in the project document. Second, the project did not follow the prescribed sequence of first completing national and state level MAP conservation strategies focused upon landscape-level, *in situ* practices and then implement activities such as the establishment of MPCA's and training programs within the context of these strategies. The project commenced with field-based implementation that continued approaches established under previous projects. In GEF parlance, the project maintains the established baseline. This may result in some good impacts, but the project is not moving towards the GEF alternative envisioned at the time of approval.

Mainstreaming the conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants into the productive forest sector requires the elucidation of national and state level MAP conservation strategies, policies, and regulations. These tools are the project's priority deliverables and the substantive achievements that will lead to the GEF alternative. Their design and implementation should provide context for the implementation of subsequent ground-level activity. Unfortunately, the project has made almost no real progress towards these priority outputs.

A simple review of the project budget as planned versus as executed reveals the inverted implementation approach. The Total Budget and Work Plan allocates US$ 700,000 to Outcome 1 (national strategy). Of this total allocation, over 70% (US$ 500,000) is to be used during project years one and two primarily to support development of a national MAP conservation strategy. As implemented, the project has spent approximately US$ 155,000 over four years of operation and made very little progress. The project only recently commenced the process of recruiting consultants to prepare relevant background "studies".

MAP management is spread amongst many players on state and national levels, including government, communities, NGO's, and private enterprise. Most stakeholders recognize that the current management regime is untenable and results in less than effective MAP conservation. Because responsibilities are spread broadly, it is difficult for one agency to take ownership for strategy development. This was one of the key issues (barriers) the project was designed specifically to address. The project - GEF funding - was intended to catalyze and guide the process of deliberating a strategy and provide international level expertise to accomplish this. This effort was to be facilitated by a strong national management framework and particularly the national PMU supported by international technical expertise.

There are, however, many hopeful signs. The project is well designed and adequately funded. The project concept remains relevant and enjoys widespread support. Project stakeholders and project management units are making a sincere effort. Much of the framework required for implementation is in place, including national and state level steering committees and full-time state level project management units. The Project Steering Committees on both the national and state levels have strong representation. Both UNDP and MOEF leadership are firmly vested in the project. Momentum has increased over the last few months. The project is certainly making progress towards the delivery of many state-level outputs.

Each of these positive signs indicates the potential for this to be a very good and innovative conservation project with substantial positive impacts exists. Unfortunately, there is not enough evidence of progress to date for evaluators to conclusively conclude that the project is "on-track". To reach this benchmark, the project must approve a dedicated management approach that is much more strategic and efficient, adopt substantial implementation course corrections, and

receive a no-cost extension. If these three basic elements are addressed, the project may yet reach the objective and supporting outcomes.

1.3.2 Recommendations

The evaluation recommends the following course corrections. Most are simple steps that will result in remedying the two primary impediments to progress: full-time management and a strategic implementation approach. A full description of findings, lessons learned and recommendations may be found in the report's Part 7.

1. Request a no-cost extension of at least one year

2. Establish comprehensive national project management regime that is based upon the direction of the original project document

3. Complete a comprehensive and detailed project work plan to guide implementation over the entire project period

4. Re-visit planned and on-going activities to better align these with the achievement of the project objective and outcomes with an emphasis upon improving strategic implementation that is both efficient and effective

5. Generate and implement a project implementation monitoring and evaluation strategy that considers both project progress and impact

6. Increase level and rigor of PMU reporting, including regular (monthly) electronic newsletter from PMU to update project stakeholders on national/state level activity

7. Align and track co-financing commitments to support achievement of project objective and outcomes

8. Increase number of regular project steering committee meetings from one per year to at least two scheduled per year and focus these meetings upon reviewing project progress relevant to the results framework and improved project implementation work plan

9. Complete working drafts of national and state level MAP (flora) conservation strategies within the next eight months of project operation

10. Analyze the MAP market relevant to conservation challenges and opportunities and seek out market-based conservation incentives and sustainable conservation funding opportunities

11. Adopt practices to improve both the efficiency and quality of consultant efforts

12. Hire at least four full-time technical staff to augment the National Project Management Unit with skill sets necessary for efficient outcome achievement

13. Build synergy between outputs and locations through better inter-state coordination and information exchange

14. Re-Orient the outputs of Outcome 4 (Replication) to be much more focused upon the effective capture and communication of results, lessons and successes

15. Complete an international level assessment of the conservation impact of MPCA/FGB complexes and provide recommendations for possible improvements

1.3.3   Summary of Lessons Learned

Following is a summary of lessons learned. A full description may be found in Part 6.

1.   *Follow guidance of the project document*
2.   *Monitor impact, not only revenue flow*
3.   *Implement Mid-Term Evaluations on time and as planned and begin recruitment one-year in advance.*
4.   *Full-sized Projects of five years or more should have the option of additional evaluations during implementation.*
5.   *Always require a detailed work plan at project inception*
6.   *Actively involve project designer/drafter in project inception/implementation*
7.   *Create by-laws to govern roles/responsibilities of Project Steering Committees*
8.   *Acquire necessary international-level technical assistance, including senior technical advisors*

1.4   Table summarizing main ratings received

Explanation of Ratings	
Highly Satisfactory	HS
Satisfactory	S
Moderately Satisfactory	MS
Moderately Unsatisfactory	MU
Unsatisfactory	U
Highly Unsatisfactory	HU

Ratings		
Category	**Rating**	**Comments**
Conceptualization/Design	S	The project is well conceived. Although somewhat haphazard in its organization, the original project document does correctly identify the main barriers and lays-out a well-reasoned approach to addressing these barriers. The approach builds upon the existing baseline by adopting best practices proposing improvements. The project was designed to have a strong management regime to ensure transparency, efficiency, effectiveness and quality.
Stakeholder participation in the design	S	Stakeholder participation in original design was reported as satisfactory. However, this project took an inordinate amount of time to move from concept to implementation. As a result of this delay, stakeholders who supported design where not ultimately responsible for implementation. This loss of "institutional memory and momentum" hampered implementation.
Implementation Approach	U	The project implementation has not been effective or efficient. The project has failed to follow the guidance of the Project Document, both in terms of priority of action and overall project management. Implementation is not

		strategic. For instance, the project has AWP but does not have a comprehensive and detailed work plan for all outcomes and/or project period. Until very recently, unreasonable delays, poorly allocated resources, and a failure to reach intended outcomes defined implementation. The project has disbursed substantial funds to less important outputs while not making substantial progress on priority outputs such as conservation strategies and policies. As a result, the project will need to greatly tighten it's approach in order to reach intended outcomes even with a "no cost" time extension.
Monitoring and evaluation	U	The project does not adequately track progress or impact. The results framework (logical framework) is relatively strong and M&E requirements clear, the project is not following rigorous M&E protocols and/or using the results framework. Project reporting to UNDP lacks substance. The mid-term evaluation took place during month 42 of a 60-month project. Beyond the scope of ATLAS, financial M&E is not well scrutinized with spending poorly aligned with achievement of project outcomes.
Stakeholder participation in the implementation	MS	The project has made good progress with this in the last year on the State Level. State Level authorities appear actively engaged. Local communities in several areas are benefitting from increased participation. However, national stakeholder participation has not been so effective. This is likely due to very little project effort to date toward achievement of Outcome 1 focused upon national mainstreaming. The only active national stakeholder networking seems to occur during the annual project steering committee meeting. Much of the failings relate back to the project's lack of strong, full-time management required to catalyze stakeholder participation.
Financial Planning	U	Financial planning is not strategic or well organized. This is a NEX project. Most financial planning/management responsibilities rest with the NPMU with further delegation to SPMU's. NPMU financial planning and reporting capacity is very low. Although only 20 – 30% of the project's GEF budget has been spent, the project has entered into poorly devised contracts that encumber additional amounts. Co-financing, which has the potential for being substantial, is not well identified, tracked, and/or maximized. During the evaluation, the NMPU required more than four weeks to produce a budget showing current expenditures, encumbrances, and remaining GEF funds.
Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of project objective	U	If current management performance continues, the project will likely complete a handful of

		outputs. The project is unlikely to meaningfully attain any of its outcomes. The project has four outcomes built upon twenty-six outputs. In nearly four years of implementation activity, the project has not fully achieved any outcome or output.

Part 2: Introduction

2.1   Purpose of the evaluation

This mid-term evaluation should assist GEF, UNDP, Project Managers and other stakeholders to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of project activities in relation to the stated objective.   The evaluation is an opportunity for project stakeholders to discuss and critically assess administrative and technical strategies, issues and constraints. The evaluation assesses progress in addressing the baseline, threats, and root causes.   The evaluation identifies any difficulties in project implementation and their causes. The evaluation provides general and specific recommendations to improve the project's potential to achieve expected outcomes and meet objectives within the timeframe. The evaluation provides an opportunity to consider "lessons learned" to date that may be shared widely to facilitate adaptive management globally.

The mid-term evaluation process provides all stakeholders with an opportunity step back from their daily implementation efforts to reflect upon and discuss the efficacy of project activity to date. The evaluation process serves as an important learning experience for all participants. The resulting report will ideally assist the project implementation team to: (1) assess and consider project success at achieving anticipated outcomes given current benchmarks and planned activities; (2) consider possible improvements/approaches to increase the likelihood of success; and, (3) ultimately, enhance both effectiveness (The project's demonstrated ability to produce the desired outcomes) and efficiency (The project's demonstrated ability to produce the highest value result for the lowest cost). A showing of effective action to rectify any identified issues hindering implementation should be a requirement prior to determining whether implementation should proceed.

Both the assessment process and resulting report should be considered as outputs of this evaluation.   The process and report should be used to (a) strengthen the adaptive management and monitoring function of the project; (b) ensure accountability for the achievement of the GEF objective, (c) enhance organizational and development learning; and (d) enable informed decision – making.

The mid-term report highlights key issues. These highlights indicate several areas where follow-up investigation and monitoring by project managers, MOEF, and UNDP are required.

2.2   Key issues addressed

The key issues addressed by the MTE were:

1. Is the project "Relevant", "Effective", and "Efficient"?
2. Is this project "on-track" to achieving the objective?
3. What actions should be considered increase the likelihood of success?

Project performance was measured based on the quantitative and qualitative indicators.   The evaluation considered issues related to management and substantive/technical implementation, including project delivery, implementation, and finances.   Particular attention was given to the strategic approaches taken relevant to achievement of project objectives.

Part 3. Project Background

3.1 Project start and its duration

The mid-term evaluation took place during project month forty-two (42) of the planned sixty (60) month project.

Approval, Start, Close, Mid-term	
Project Start	March 2008
Mid-Term Review	November 2011
Close Date	March 2013

Project Budget	
GEF Funding	US$ 4,935,000
Co-financing	US$ 6,479,121
Total Project Budget	U$ 11,414,121

Remaining GEF Funds as of (10/2011) ***	
Total GEF Budget	$ 4,935,000
GEF disbursed 2008	$ 2,585
GEF disbursed 2009	$ 566,918
GEF disbursed 2010	$ 322,054
GEF disbursed 2011	$ 233,884
Total GEF Remaining	**US$ 3,809,559**

*** Please Note: These figures are not confirmed.

3.2 Problems that the project seek to address

India's wealth of globally significant native and endemic plant species has important ecological, social, and economic value. Numerous globally significant species are threatened by many factors, including habitat degradation, invasive species, climate change and over-harvest.

Medicinal and aromatic plants (MAP's) are in high demand by India's large commercial and subsistence markets. Approximately seven hundred million Indians use MAP's for health care, representing a huge national market. More than 7,500 different plant species medicinal plants are used for health care in India. The nation is the world's second largest producer of medicinal plants and medicines after China. The business of medicinal plants generates hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Numerous multi-national companies use massive quantities of medicinal plants to produce health care products for both national and international consumers.

Most MAP's are wild harvested from India's forest-lands. However, the nation has yet to design and implement a coherent conservation strategy to protect these wild species and the ecosystems upon which they depend. The existing policy and institutional framework governing MAP conservation is poorly organized and poorly understood. The current MAP policy framework is nested in several deviating laws and regulations. A wide array of unconnected national, state, and community institutions exercise degrees of authority over plant conservation and use. Responsible institutions are located in disconnected agencies and with actions most often not well aligned. The GOI and other stakeholders do support many conservation and regulatory efforts. Without a clear framework to converge, prioritize and guide institutional action, both the efficiency and effectiveness of MAP conservation are limited. Plant harvest is still largely uncontrolled and poorly monitored. Commercial and subsistence harvest demands are presumed

to be outpacing conservation efforts. There is limited progress being made to monitor and maintain wild MAP diversity. This is particularly the case for *in situ* protection where implementation fails to encompass large ecologically meaningful landscapes as foreseen by the project document, instead focusing on isolated patches of remnant diversity.

As stated in the Project Document: "At least 200 species of Indian medicinal plants are known to be threatened, although the true number is likely to be much higher as the status of many species has not been assessed. There is a general consensus among many of the major stakeholders that current patterns of MAP harvesting and trade are unsustainable. However, there is no adequate policy framework for developing and implementing a comprehensive action plan for the conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants in India…. A key barrier to mainstreaming the sustainable use and conservation of medicinal plants into the productive forest sector is the lack of a focused strategy at the national and state levels that addresses the main threats to medicinal plants…. There is no adequate policy framework for developing and implementing a comprehensive action plan for the conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants in India. To date, different actors scattered around the country have been engaged in a variety of activities relating to different aspects of the sustainable use and conservation of medicinal plant conservation…"

Without national and/or state level conservation strategies to guide MAP management, the conservation of wild MAP's is neither efficient and/or highly effective. There is very little coordination. Rigorous and comprehensive monitoring/reporting regarding the status of wild species and associated ecosystems is limited. Relatively small MPCA's are being established, but almost no meaningful landscape level conservation effort is occurring. The understanding and regulation of wild species consumption is limited. Although market demand is presumed to be substantial, there are few incentives for commercial and subsistence markets to actively engage and invest in habitat conservation.

As stated in the Project Document: "Government programs emphasize cultivation and to a small extent, establishment of MPCAs. Productive forestlands, which harbor the vast majority of MAP diversity, and mainstreaming MAP diversity conservation objectives into productive forestland management, are largely overlooked…. Existing forest management policies with a specific bearing on MAPs are limited to regulating the harvest volumes of a very small number of MAP species. The species included on these lists and the volumes stipulated have no ecological basis. Nor is the purpose of these restrictions to promote the management of productive forests in ways that protect MAP diversity and habitat."

3.3   Immediate and development objectives of the project

Overall Goal: Conserve India's medicinal plant diversity

Project Objective: Mainstream the conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants into the productive forest sector of three Indian states, with particular reference to GSMPs

Pilot States: Arunachal Pradesh (North-East India)
                     Chhattisgarh (Central India)
                     Uttaranchal (North-West India)

3.4   Main stakeholders

The project's main stakeholders are those private, public, academic, development, and non-governmental organizations with an interest in conserving and utilizing India's MAPs.

Specific stakeholders identified during project design include:

National	
MoEF	- Take leadership in the overall implementation of this project. - Provide overall administrative locus to the project and ensure the regular monitoring and evaluation of project implementation. - Steer and facilitate the required changes in the policy directives for encouraging MAP conservation and sustainable utilization. - Facilitate changes in the JFM resolutions and guidelines to incorporate MAP conservation and sustainable utilization concerns. - Issue guidelines to the project states and other states to adopt and assimilate the experiences of the project implementation in to their forest management. - Provide the required co-financing and coordinate with other Ministries and Departments at central and state government levels to ensure that the committed co-finance, both reoriented baseline and in kind are made available in a timely fashion. - Coordinate smooth release of release of project funds from UNDP-GEF.
NMPB and Department of ISM & H, MoHFW	- Participate actively in capacity development initiatives, to develop their own and SMPBs capacities to fulfil their broader mandate. - Take leadership in the development of a National Strategy for the MAP sector. - Include the MAP species identified for cultivation in their programmes (especially GSMPs) and allocate the required funds for this purpose.
MoRD	- Adopt and assimilate the best practices resulting from the implementation of this project into livelihood related programmes of the MoRD, to promote cultivation and sustainable harvest of MAPs more widely.
FRLHT	- Lead technical agency guiding the implementation of this project at all levels. - Will play major role in capacity building at all levels - Will be closely involved with field research and monitoring activities.
State	
State Governments & State Forest Departments including: Principal Secretaries of State Government Principal Chief Conservators of Forest, District Forest Officers, SMPBs	- Provide the required leadership in the respective states to enable the efficient implementation of this project and ensure the development of state-specific strategies for the MAP sector. - Establish and manage the MPCAs/FGBs; develop norms for managing forests in wider area around MPCA/FGB complexes to promote maintenance of MAP diversity; mainstream MAP conservation and sustainable use objectives into forest policy and practice. - Contribute the committed In Kind and re-oriented baseline co-financing to the project. - Evolve and adopt a participatory mechanism for project implementation. - Incorporate the policy changes and the guidelines in to the state level policy and action as well as different processes of forest management. - Incorporate training for MAP conservation management within broader forest management into the training modules of relevant state agencies. - Participate in the capacity building initiatives of the project. - Mainstreaming of MAP within divisional working plans
NGOs	- Participate in the implementation of the various components of the project based on their respective areas of competence and expertise.
Community-based Organisations, representatives of different community-based institutions, including JFM Committees.	- Participate in the Local Management Groups (see Part III). - Participate in the capacity development initiatives of the project. - Take leadership in the management of the project at the demonstration sites, especially at the community-owned and managed sites. - Partner with SFDs in implementing the conservation, sustainable harvest and adaptive management of the MAPs. - -Participate in dissemination of lessons learnt and successful models to other forest areas - Identify local-level 'project champions' in project villages and constitute Task Teams for specific project activities - Constitution of biodiversity management committees

Gram Sabhas and other Panchayati Raj Institutions	- Partner in the implementation of community based components of this project. - Participate in the capacity building initiatives.
Arunachal Pradesh	
North Eastern Council	- Provide direction to the state agencies for mainstreaming the conservation and sustainable use of MAPs in development projects that are based on natural resource use.
Non-Governmental Forest owners (as in North-eastern states)	- Participate actively in MPCA/FGB establishment and management, develop/maintain community management norms and practices for conservation and sustainable use of MAPs in wider forest area around MPCA/FGB complexes.
Chhattisgarh	
Chhattisgarh Forest Department	- Assimilate the FGB/MPCA concept into the current PPA strategy, with special emphasis on MAP conservation and sustainable use.
Uttaranchal	
Van Panchayats	- MPCA/FGB establishment and management, develop and implement management norms and practices for sustainable use and conservation of MAPs.

3.5   Results expected

The project is organized around four (4) outcomes and twenty-six (26) outputs.

The first outcome aims to create a comprehensive national program for MAP conservation on forest-lands. Activities are directed towards the establishment of a national MAP conservation strategy supported by regulatory and institutional capacity building efforts.

The second outcome aims to create a state level program for MAP conservation on forest-lands. Activities are directed towards the establishment of a state level MAP conservation strategies and policies supported by regulatory and institutional capacity building efforts.

The third outcome aims to create local/community level programs for MAP conservation. These activities should be designed to compliment/trial project supported state and national level strategies. Although activities build upon some established programming, such as MPCA's, the project should result in much greater impact by generating MAP conservation across significantly broader landscapes than current programs effect.

The fourth outcome aims to develop methods and materials to support replication within the three pilot states and four additional states.   The project is to prepare and disseminate an array of replication materials to be professionally disseminated. The result will be a complete capture of lessons learned and on-going programmatic support for implementation and replication of best practices.

Outcome 1	An enabling environment for mainstreaming the conservation and sustainable use of MAPs into forest management policies and practices at the national level.
Output 1.1	A national strategy that addresses in situ and ex situ conservation, cultivation and sustainable use
Output 1.2	Revised national guidelines for JFM developed by MoEF with a stronger focus on the conservation and sustainable harvesting of medicinal plants, especially GSMPs.
Output 1.3	Legal mechanisms developed to protect traditional MAP knowledge
Output 1.4	Identification of medicinal plant species suited for cultivation
Output 1.5	Capacity of NMPB strengthened to function more effectively as an inter-sectoral

	coordinating body
Output 1.6	A long-term strategy and protocols for threat assessment and monitoring of the conservation status of MAPs
Output 1.6	A course module on the conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants developed for the Indian Forest Service training curriculum.

Outcome 2	Forest management policies in the three project states that promote and support the conservation and sustainable use of MAPs.
Output 2.1	Individual State Medicinal Plant Conservation & Sustainable Use Strategies
Output 2.2	Revised state forest policies that support the conservation and sustainable use of MAPs
Output 2.3	Revised state-level JFM Orders and Guidelines for the three project states
Output 2.4	State-level legal mechanisms to protect traditional knowledge
Output 2.5	Capacities of the SMPBs in each of the three project states strengthened
Output 2.6	Identification of MAP species suited for cultivation
Output 2.7	Revised forest division working plans
Output 2.8	Comprehensive baseline and M&E system, including standardized protocols, for monitoring the status of medicinal plant resources in each project state.

Outcome 3	Conservation and sustainable use of MAPs are mainstreamed at the local level into government and community forest management norms and practices at demonstration sites in the three project states.
Output 3.1	Demonstration of in situ and ex situ techniques and approaches to the conservation and sustainable management of medicinal plant diversity (especially GSMP) in state forests including the establishment of 5 MPCA/FGB complexes in each project state.
Output 3.2	Strengthened medicinal plants conservation management capacity within SFDs.
Output 3.3	Pilot demonstration sites for the in situ and ex situ conservation and sustainable management of medicinal plant diversity on community-owned or community managed forest land, including the establishment of 2 MPCA/FGB complexes in each project state.
Output 3.4	Strengthened community capacity for the conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants.
Output 3.5	Strengthened community capacity to enable communities to document and conserve their traditional knowledge related to the sustainable use of medicinal plants and Traditional Medicine and how to protect and benefit from their IPRs

Outcome 4	Materials and methods developed for replicating the successful models of conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants across other sites in the three states, and more broadly.
Output 4.1	A state-level strategy for the conservation and sustainable use of MAPs developed in each of the four replication states.
Output 4.2	Capacities of SMPBs in the four replication states strengthened by learning from the experience of the SMPBs in the project states to enable them to take the lead in coordinating activities in this sector in their respective states.
Output 4.3	Training module and other materials developed for SFD personnel in the project states adapted for use in the replication states.
Output 4.4	Demonstration of in situ and ex situ conservation and sustainable management of MAP diversity in productive forestlands in districts other than those covered by the project in the three states through exchange visits.
Output 4.5	Strengthened medicinal plants management capacity of SFD staff and selected local community groups in the four replication states.
Output 4.6	Revised forest division working plans that provide clear guidelines for the conservation management of MAPs in selected districts in replication states.

Part 4. Evaluation Methodology

4.1 Structure of the evaluation

The evaluation structure follows the guidance of UNDP and GEF, including UNDP's "Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results" and GEF's "Monitoring and Evaluation Policies and Procedures". The evaluation was guided by comprehensive terms of reference developed by the PMU and UNDP/India. These TORs defined the scope and framework for the evaluation's final report.

4.2 Methods employed

Two independent consultants were retained to conduct the evaluation. Dr. Ram Prasad served as the national consultant. Dr. Ram Prasad is an Ex. Indian Forest Service Officer. He has worked for over four decades in various positions within the Forestry Department and has supported a host of relevant project formulation and implementation issues. Mark Johnstad served as the international consultant. Mr. Johnstad has approximately two decades of global experience supporting the design, implementation and evaluation of GEF projects.

The evaluation commenced with a comprehensive desk review of all pertinent project documentation. This included an identification of preliminary focus topics/priorities and establishing the mission itinerary with the project management unit.

Over the course of three weeks, several site missions were conducted. Dr. Prasad visited the pilot states of Arunachal Pradesh and Chhattisgarh. Mr. Johnstad visited Uttaranchal. Both consultants visited Delhi and Bangalore.

Site visits included semi-structured interviews with primary stakeholders, beneficiaries, consultants, and implementation partners. This included meetings with state level project steering committees, community members, and representatives of key agencies (e.g., MoEF, FRLHT NMPB, State Forest Department, State Biodiversity Board, DFO's, SMPB, ecologists and botanists engaged in the project, etc.) In addition, site visits were conducted to inspect several MPCA's and remote community areas. Please see the annex for a copy of the mission schedule.

In most cases, evaluators interviewed small groups of stakeholders (3 – 10 persons) using a facilitated, round-table forum. Meeting agendas were organized according to topics of common interest to participants. Each 2 – 3 hour meeting was framed by a simple set of questions. This standardized approach maintained discussions on topic, quickly revealed answers required to satisfy key evaluation needs, and allowed adequate latitude to catalyze vibrant discussions and candid responses. Great effort was made to make certain all stakeholders were given equitable opportunities to express their thoughts. The articulation of contrary and innovative opinions was encouraged.

In addition to roundtable meetings, frank discussions were held with project staff, the PMU, NPD, MoEF (implementing agency) and UNDP/India (executing agency), and UNDP/RTA regarding progress, management, budget, and project design/implementation issues. UNDP staff frequently participated in the meetings. This was useful, allowing for immediate resolution of detailed project questions.

The mission closed with a formal presentation and discussion of preliminary findings/recommendations with MoEF and the Project Steering Committee.

Following the mission, a draft of this evaluation report was completed and circulated to all key project stakeholders with feedback used to strengthen findings/recommendations.

Part 5.   Findings

5.1   Project Formulation

5.1.1   Conceptualization/Design

The overall design of the original project is sound.

The **barriers analysis** creates the foundation of any GEF project. The project correctly identifies "forest habitat loss and degradation, and unsustainable exploitation of wild populations, including destructive harvesting and over-exploitation" as the principal threats to MAP diversity. The project considers the primary barrier to addressing this threat as a failure of national and state policies to promote a coordinated approach to *in situ* conservation.

The project document correctly describes the **baseline** as:

> "India's MAP management approach is still evolving, but can be said to be comprised of three main elements: increasing cultivation and related research, passive management of a small number of MAP species harvested as non-timber forest products in productive forests, and an emerging emphasis on *in-situ* conservation through MPCAs (Medicinal Plant Conservation Areas). While the approach recognizes the importance of *in situ* conservation of MAP diversity, Government programs emphasize cultivation and to a small extent, establishment of MPCAs. Productive forestlands, which harbor the vast majority of MAP diversity, and mainstreaming MAP diversity conservation objectives into productive forestland management, are largely overlooked."

The project was well designed to help India move beyond this baseline towards a realistic and useful **GEF alternative** that addresses barriers related to *in situ* conservation of globally significant plant species. The **outcomes and outputs** are well-reasoned to generate progress towards the desired project objective. The **project budget and time** allocated are ample to achieve project results. Substantial co-financing was harnessed.

The project is designed to follow-up nearly a decade's worth of previous experience gained through the implementation of major MAP conservation initiatives funded by DANIDA and subsequently by UNDP-India (CCF I and II). The project was designed to supplement established initiatives such as the creation of MPCA's by increasing conservation impact through linking these to wider, landscape level conservation and community development schemes. The project was designed to move lessons learned from these well-established initiatives to the next level by facilitating the creation of national and state level policy and regulatory interventions. Existing training programs were to be supplemented with best international principles and practices.

It should be noted that the project was designed specifically to depart from previous FRLHT activities by focusing effort not on cultivation but on in situ conservation of globally significant plant species. As stated in the project document, "After considering various alternatives, the present project has decided to focus on mainstreaming the sustainable use and *in situ* conservation of medicinal plants into the productive forest sector." The project is further designed to address the "demand side" of MAP. As stated in the project document, "It is also clear that the long-term sustainability of medicinal plants in the wild will require addressing the demand side of the trade in MAPs." This approach focuses upon the adoption and implementation of national and state level conservation strategies for globally significant plant species. These strategies are to result in a much more inter-sectoral approach to *in situ* conservation by involving stakeholders in addition to SFDs such as NMPB and SMPBs and by working in community-owned and/or managed forests.

The design recognizes that, although previous programs made some conservation progress, many presumptions still existed at the time of drafting regarding medicinal plant use and conservation. The project document clearly states that institutional, market, ecological and policy scenarios regarding MAP's in India are complex and poorly documented.

The project design addresses these gaps by creating an incremental implementation approach supported by a comprehensive management structure. This structure prioritizes the creation of national and state level conservation strategies for MAP's and, in particular, GSMP. The sequence described and captured in the project's outcomes/outputs may be summarized as:

1. Create MAP conservation strategies (National/State) to clarify threats and design appropriate interventions
2. Generate policies and a regulatory and management framework to support strategy findings
3. Support the implementation of the improved framework with "on-the-ground" conservation of MPCA's and FGB's
4. Build government field staff capacity necessary to implement policy framework based upon a comprehensive "Training Needs Assessment"
5. Build community capacity and incentives through FGB's, traditional knowledge support, and sustainable in/ex situ harvest technologies
6. Track results and indentify conservation needs with rigorous monitoring program
7. Upscale and replicate success

The project's **management scheme** was well designed. This is a NEX with the MoEF ultimately responsible for implementation and achievement of the project outcomes. The comprehensive management structure was specifically created to make certain that project implementation remains on-track, incorporates the necessary broad-range of stakeholder inputs required to alleviate un-necessary institutional and policy perplexity, and that products generated maintain a high-level of quality. The original management project conceived may be summarized as:

- Project Executive (MOEF – NEX)
- National Project Director (Joint Secretary, MOEF)
- National Steering Committee (Board of Directors)
- Project Implementation Steering Committee (Operational Level)
- Project Management Unit (full-time Project Manager, Officer, Admin Assist, Accountant)
- UNDP (Quality Assurance)
- Senior Technical Advisor (Part-time, international level quality assurance)
- Technical Advisory Group
- State-level Project Implementation Steering Groups
- State Project Management Units (nodal officer/two assistants)
- Local Management Group (each MPCA)

The **Logical Framework** (Results Framework) was fairly well designed to track and measure both impact and progress. Only one indicator, "Natural canopy cover as a measure of the overall ecological status of forests under active management or maintenance of MAP diversity", may have required revision as canopy may not necessarily be a good indicator for sustainable management of MAPs.

The project as designed does not benefit from an adequate analysis of **risks and assumptions**. Instead, the project presents broad stroke risks and assumptions without providing description of mitigation measures and/or a measurement of probability or impact.

5.1.2 Country-ownership/Driveness

This project concept benefits from strong national support. The concept flows from a variety of national environment and development interests. Medicinal plants are an important issue for India and the level of interest in their conservation and use is substantial. As a result, the national government, numerous NGO's, private sector, and donors are each enthusiastic about the project concept. However, implementation support has been limited. This is most visible in the failure to follow the project document's well-reasoned approach, including the creation of a full-time management unit and rigorous implementation and M&E regime. The project is better owned on the state level, where much more considerable implementation is occurring. Active state level project management units and project steering committees tend to show a sincere interest in achieving results. However, activity has been largely limited to activities related to Output 3.1.

5.1.3 Stakeholder participation in the design

According to interlocutors, stakeholders were fully briefed and engaged during the design of this project. The design process included substantial and substantive discussions with representatives of key organizations. Many of these organizations now sit on the project steering committee. The project was closely aligned with several on-going and proposed projects. However, this project took an inordinate amount of time to move from concept to implementation. As a result of this delay, stakeholders who supported design were not ultimately responsible for implementation. This loss of "institutional memory and momentum" has hampered implementation.

5.1.4 Replication approach

This project has a very well intentioned replication plan. Unfortunately, the project has been very slow to implement the proposed replication programming with almost no progress made to date. This reluctance may be traced to the project's slow progress with delivery of outputs and a failure to follow Project Document guidance regarding prioritized implementation and comprehensive project management.

The entirety of Outcome 4 (Materials and methods developed for replicating the successful models of conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants across other sites in the three states, and more broadly) is designed to establish a platform for replication. This includes calling for publication of outputs, training, web-based distribution of products, generation and dissemination of lessons learned from pilot projects, etc. Documentation is to include field reports, process documentation reports, technical manuals, films, media reports to proceedings of workshops and seminar. Replication efforts were to target potential replication sites within the three pilot states as well as a broad range of stakeholders within four additional states (Sikkim, Meghalaya, Himachal Pradesh and Jammu & Kashmir).

5.2 Project Implementation

5.2.1 Implementation Approach

(i) The use of the logical framework as a management tool

The project does not appear to be using and/or referencing the Logical Framework in any meaningful way. The framework is not being actively used to guide and/or monitor implementation. The national PMU is not tracking and/or reporting progress towards results (logical) framework indicators. This deficiency relates back to the inadequate management modality.

(ii) Other elements that indicate adaptive management

The project is not substantially tracking movement towards the objective and/or outcomes and analyzing how to improve implementation to reach the objective and outcomes. Rather, the project is focused upon implementing less challenging and well-established outputs. The project does not benefit from a comprehensive work-plan that strategically prioritizes activity, allocates responsibility, and makes certain that funding is being used efficiently and cost-effectively.

A comprehensive "Action Plan for All Components" was generated in late 2010. This is a very good step. However, this action plan omits any mention of Outcome 1. The activities proposed for other outputs seem to shift substantially from the intention of the project document. In addition, there appear to be substantial discrepancies between the AWP, Action Plan, and actual implementation.

Output 2.1 intends to generate "Individual State Medicinal Plant Conservation & Sustainable Use Strategies".

The project document states: "Individual State Medicinal Plant Conservation & Sustainable Use Strategies that build on national policies to address state-specific threats and barriers to the sustainable use and conservation of medicinal plants. The project will facilitate the inter-sectoral consultations and dialogue especially between important state government departments like Forests, Rural Development, Health and SMPB and key NGOs and research institutions and provide the required expert inputs to draft a state-level strategy. Local consultants will be used to review the related state-level policies and strategies and their reports will be important inputs into the strategy formulation. Workshops and seminars will be held at the state level to initially seek inputs and later on to discuss and finalize the state-level strategies."

However, the submitted Action Plan calls for "long term strategies for promoting production of MAPs through sustainable management in forest areas along with cultivation outside forests and their rational utilization, including trade and trade related practices."

Output 2.5 is designed to strengthen capacities of the SMPBs in each of the three project states.

The project document states: "Capacities of the SMPBs in each of the three project states strengthened to enable these to function inter-sectorally and fulfill their mandate in the respective states. Reviews of the existing capacities with the SMPBs will be carried out to determine the capacity development needs. Based on this needs assessment capacity development plans will be prepared. Training materials will be prepared for imparting the required training to the SMPB staff. The need for additional human resources will be assessed."

The 2011 AWP calls for both a strengthening of SMPB capacity and the development of a study to understand the market dynamics of at least one state. The 2011 Action Plan for Output 2.5 calls simply for a "strategy and action plan for cultivation and marketing of MAPs to meet the increasing demands from various sections of consumers" with no reference to improving the capacity of SMPB's.

Again, these deficiencies relate back to the implementation approach taken by the project and a failure to set in place a comprehensive project management regime. The project does not benefit from the services of a management team tasked with making certain implementation is innovative and adaptive. For instance, the full-time Project Management Unit, Senior Technical Advisor, Project Implementation Steering Committee, Technical Advisory Group called for and budgeted within the Project Document have not been recruited. Without having a full-time national project management unit tasked with monitoring and evaluating success and movement towards the project objective, it is very difficult for a project to practice adaptive and innovative management. Much of the burden for these tasks has fallen upon the UNDP with part-time support from FRHLT, the national and state level project steering committees, and state level PMU's which –

although very sincere and hardworking – lack the capacity, financial support, technical support, and national strategic vision required to practice adaptive management.

As a result, the project commenced with implementing activities such as training and creation of MPCA's based upon baseline activities, rather than following the sequential design established in the Project Document that begins national and state level strategies to identify action priorities and subsequently building programming to support those strategies. For instance, a number of activities such as identification of field sites for MPCA/FGB, sustainable harvesting areas, training of communities and forestry staff at all levels, and baseline surveys have been conducted in the three Project States.   However, these activities have not occurred within a strategic framework that first identifies conservation priorities and then spends resources on field level interventions. These baseline activities have not been fully analyzed to make certain that they are maximizing conservation impact and/or addressing newly emerging threats to globally significant plant species.

Capacity assessments required by the project document were not completed. For instance, training programs are not based upon a needs assessment. On their face, some appear to be a rehashing of existing programs with a few updates. One of the primary activities delivered to date is a series of village botanist courses. These courses were originally designed for Karnataka, Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh presumably with previous support fro UNDP or DANIDA funding.

Consulting firms are being contracted to generate independent studies, rather than to formulate strategies and policies as required by the project document. These studies, although quite expensive, are fragmented and disenfranchised without a clear dictum to generate a coordinated strategic approach to *in situ* MAP conservation across broad forest landscapes and subsequently build necessary implementation capacity.

The creation of MPCA's is another example. Much of the project activity to date revolves around establishing MPCA's in each of the pilot states. The Project Document pointed out that MPCA's may be useful, but that they should be re-evaluated (adapted) to make certain that they are maximizing *in situ* conservation and are part of a broader, landscape level conservation approach that encompasses the total forest area. The concept of MPCA has not been fully evaluated, peer reviewed or accepted as the best approach to achieve the forest wide conservation foreseen by the project designers. Rather than practice adaptive management to make certain MPCA's maximize conservation impact, the project seems to be moving forward using the same modalities applied for over a decade. This is not necessarily inappropriate, but it does not utilize adaptive management approaches to make certain that the use of GEF funds results in innovative conservation approaches that move India past the established baseline.

In the end, this reverse implementation approach may work, but its not the most strategic and/or efficient way to approach implementation and lacks a clearly defined method to insure quality and application of best international principles and practices.

(iii) The project's use/establishment of electronic information technologies

The project is not fully utilizing electronic information technologies. The project does not have a website and items such as training materials are not widely distributed electronically. The project does not generate an electronic newsletter to update and engage the project's wide array of stakeholders distributed throughout the country. The project does not have a communication strategy.

One of the pilot states, Arunachal Pradesh, is advancing some electronic communication. This was done independent of the MAP project. (http://arunachalpradesh.nic.in/med-plant.htm) The site offers a list of medicinal plants for cultivation.

FRLHT maintains a substantial website that has lists of endangered medicinal plant species, data on collection methods, several studies, etc. (http://frlhtenvis.nic.in/) The FRLHT site was created independent of the GEF project. FRLHT also generates an organizational electronic newsletter.

(iv) The general operational relationships between the institutions involved

Each of the involved institutions seems to have positive and productive bi-lateral working relations. Issues seem to be discussed candidly and resolved amicably. The project benefits from very capable national and state level steering committees. Although these committees generally meet only once per year, they have representation from a wide range of stakeholders and seem to work very well together. FRLHT has established good working relations with both national and state level institutions. UNDP has highly qualified staff dedicated to the project. These individuals have good access to relevant institutions and have strong working relations with each institution. Most importantly, communication between MOEF and UNDP is positive. The same collegial operational relationships permeate the state level. SPMU's have good operational working relationships with state level steering committees, UNDP, and FRLHT.

As we discuss later, institutional coordination regarding synergistic implementation is not strong.

(v) Technical capacities associated with the project

India has several very capable individuals and institutions with a high level expertise relevant to key MAP use and conservation issues. The project has identified and engaged many of the nation's most technically qualified individuals and institutions. This includes highly qualified UNDP staff. Both the program officer and recently hired UNV are well suited. There is especially solid project expertise concerning traditional knowledge and market species. Agencies and institutions such as FRLHT, NMPB, SMPB, and MOEF have worked on these issues for decades. Because these institutions are involved with project activities, the technical capacities associated with the project are reasonably strong. However, existing skill sets are not always strategically aligned to efficiently produce the project's outcomes.

The project relies upon the following tracks to supply technical support: existing local and state government institutions, state level PMU's, FRLHT and private contractors. The project has not, as directed in the project document, identified an international Senior Technical Advisor and/or a Technical Advisory Group to make certain the project is benefitting from highly skilled experts delivering technically savvy outputs and implementation support focused upon achieving the project's objective in a well coordinated manner.

Importantly, the project does not seem to have engaged the technical capacities necessary to: (1) effectively manage the project; and; (2) efficiently support and catalyze the creation of national and state level strategies and policies required to secure landscape-level conservation of globally significant plant species. Filling these two technical capacity gaps will be critical to project success.

Highly capable individuals staff many government institutions. These persons are well situated and generally motivated to support project implementation. However, they do not generally have the time to support all project functions nor do they have the resources required to drive key outputs such as the creation of national and state MAP conservation strategies.

For the most part, state level PMU's are staffed with highly sincere and motivated persons. However, the project is expecting them to complete outputs without consistently providing them with the financial and technical tools required to achieve these tasks. They need much more national level support in terms of coordination of effort and technical capacity building.

FRLHT has many very good staff persons and currently fills several project functions. The institution provides technical advice to the project, works as a consultant agency to implement project activities, and has been given responsibility for project management. As an organization, FRLHT appears to be highly skilled in terms of the identification and use of medicinal plants. Their staff has worked for years to support related training programs and the establishment of MPCA's. FRLHT, however, seems challenged when it comes to issues of strategic project management. This may be a reflection of the organizational structure and/or a failure of the project to support the identification of a full-time PMU within FRLHT.

The project has recruited a few national experts to support implementation of several activities. During the project evaluation, the evaluators met with representatives of at least three different contracted or to be contracted agencies. These persons seem to be qualified. However, the management of their services seems lacking. TOR's are broadly drafted with extended periods of time allocated to produce relatively straightforward deliverables. These experts are not given the direction necessary to efficiently produce high quality outputs focused upon the efficient achievement of the project objective. As a result, the work is not strategic nor does it always reflect best international principles and practices.

The production of Output 1.3 (Legal mechanisms developed to protect traditional MAP knowledge) provides one such example. Rather than focusing energy upon reviewing national level policies to provide substantive recommendations for improvement, the firm was allocated eighteen months and the entire output budget to engage in a five state study of traditional knowledge. None of these five states are included as project pilot states. Although the firm is technically qualified, it is unlikely that the effort will result in the timely development and/or adoption of necessary national legal mechanisms.

Again, the challenge is not a general lack of technical expertise. The project benefits from the involvement of very qualified individuals. For instance, the project's national and state level project steering committees each have highly qualified and motivated membership. The challenge is a lack of well-coordinated project management and implementation.

5.2.2 Monitoring and evaluation

i) Evaluate if the project has an appropriate M&E system

As noted, the project's design framework and logical framework are relatively strong. Also, as noted, the guidance of the project document was not followed. The result is the project does not have an appropriate M&E system. There is not a strong national PMU tasked with monitoring and reporting on project progress and/or impact. The result is little information generated regarding the project's conservation impact and/or best practices for replication. The national PMU was challenged to provide the mid-term evaluators with a concrete description of project financing, both in terms of co-financing harnessed and the allocation of GEF funds.

The project has followed standard GEF and UNDP monitoring modalities. The mid-term evaluation was delayed to approximately month 42 of a 60-month project. The project would have likely benefited from a mid-term evaluation conducted during project month 30. An earlier mid-term evaluation would have ideally identified the project's implementation challenges and offered recommendations for remediation, including catalyzing implementation reforms.

ii) Evaluate if appropriate M&E tools have been used

Project monitoring and evaluation is weak. This is due in part because the appropriate M&E tools are not being used. Most importantly, the project is not adequately utilizing the results framework. National and State level PSC's meet annually to review project progress. However, overall progress, budget and impact reporting is not adequately linked to the project's results

framework. For instance, the Annual Report for 2010 contains "indicators" for project results. These indicators link to the AWP, but neither the AWP nor the Annual Report seem to have indicators that match those provided in the Project Document's results framework.

The project submits Quarterly Progress Reports to UNDP. The evaluators were provided QPR's covering September 2010 to September 2011. The evaluators were not provided with copies of QPR's that included comments and analysis from the UNDP Program Officer. The QPR's provide only tertiary information regarding implementation and are not adequate to track project progress.

Project evaluators were provided with the annual Project Implementation Report (PIR) for 2010. This document finds that overall implementation is marginally satisfactory. The PIR finds that risks associated with selection of MPCA's are alleviated with more technical criteria for selection. The PIR states: "There has been good progress with regard to Outcome 1 and Outcome 3. Overall, the project is on track."

The document finds that: "Significant achievements so far include: a) culmination of technical consultations and securing agreement from both national and state level governments to draft important national policies such as the National Strategy for Conservation of MAPs; b) enhanced capacities of state and local level staff and communities on various aspects of MAPs conservation and documenting knowledge; and c) identification and securing agreements from community groups on management of government forests (15 MPCAs) and community forests (6 MPCAs) for conservation and management of MAP covering a total area of about 30,000 ha."

These are interesting conclusions. The evaluators saw little evidence of progress on national or state level strategies/policies. Capacity building has been limited to site visits and a few training programs. Most MPCA's cover no more than 200 ha, totaling approximately 5,000 ha cumulatively. This is well short of indicator targets.

The PIR also states: "The project is however encouraged to follow through with the actions identified in the PIR (see IP for more details) such as the need to institutionalize inter-sectoral coordination mechanisms at the state level and improving capacities of communities for management and monitoring of MAPs in their community forests during the latter part of 2010 in particular the efforts on coordination among the various agencies in the three states. It will also be important to capitalize on the momentum and agreements on the national strategy as soon as possible before staff turnovers in the Ministry results in loss of key champions. In addition it is recommended that the project initiate an analytical and systematic process to monitor the project's impact on: (a) the state of biological diversity and (b) contributions towards an integrated and improved way of managing natural resources. In this regard, it is encouraged that project bring forward the planned mid-term review that will enable the project to rationalize outputs, re-organize and distribute project resources to especially critical outputs and keeping in mind that much of the capacity development activities have been implemented through own resources. These need to be also picked as part of the adaptive management actions of the project management team."

The evaluators agree with these findings. However, there seems to have been limited uptake of these issues by the project.

iii) Evaluate if resources and capacities to conduct an adequate monitoring are in place

The project as designed provided for more than adequate funding and technical expertise to conduct comprehensive monitoring. However, this funding and expertise has not been harnessed during project implementation. Project and impact monitoring is a function of the PMU. There is an apparent lack of resources and capacity within FRLHT to carry out proper monitoring. Staff and financing dedicated with the project document have not been harnessed.

5.2.3   Stakeholder participation in the implementation

(i) The production and dissemination of information generated by the project

The evaluators saw very little evidence that knowledge products are being generated and/or disseminated in an aggressive, innovative, or effective manner relevant to the scope and scale of the project.

The project has created a few information products. These are primarily related to training. The evaluators were provided with the following: a template for conducting village botanist courses, a report on "Capacity Development of LMGs and FD Staffs of Chhattisgarh State on Documentation of Community Knowledge Register and Establishment of Home Herbal Gardens", botanical survey reports, and a report on "Training and capacity building in NTFP/MP management and Biodiversity and conservation". Many of these products seem to be based upon work conducted by FRLHT under previous projects.

One stand-out is the recent work conducted in Uttarakhand by the SPMU regarding traditional knowledge. Here, the project is actively identifying traditional practitioners, interviewing these practitioners, and collating information gathered so that it can be used to inform MAP conservation management, strategy, and policy. In addition, Uttarakhand has developed an informative brochure regarding the project and MAP conservation. Unfortunately, there does not seem to be a project level strategy for capturing these sorts of interesting knowledge products and disseminating them broadly to either national level stakeholders and/or stakeholders in other pilot states.

(ii) Local resource users and NGOs participation in implementation and decision making

The few target communities in all three Project States are aware of field activities. Most of these communities were selected because they were identified as regions of high MAP use. These communities are or will be receiving training regarding sustainable MAP harvest and conservation. Most of these sites have community harvest areas that existed previously and/or were identified and established through project support. The project has or will be facilitating the creation of Local Management Groups for each of these sites.

There is some concern that MPCA's are being established according to the priorities of Senior Forest Officers rather than communities. There is also some concern that training programs and other resource user outreach activities are not being presented using local languages. Language barriers obviously impact the ability of resource users to benefit from and actively engage in project activity.

The SPMU in Uttarakhand has a staff person who is responsible for community outreach and inclusion. Both communities that evaluators met with in Uttarakhand seem to have a sincere interest in the project and also appear to be highly involved with project activities. They did not have a clear understanding of the project's broader strategy and policy objectives, but project activity is rather new in both communities. They are interested in improving the commercial, conservation, and community health benefits represented by better MAP *in situ* management and cultivation. The overall impression of project effort in this state to facilitate local resource user participation was quite positive.

Participation by NGO's, other than FRLHT, was not apparent. The absence of meaningful participation by local NGOs may impact the long-term sustainability of programming.

(iii) Partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project

As a result of an overall disenfranchised implementation approach, the project has not effectively developed partnerships and collaborative relationships necessary to generate coordinated responses to complex and multi-faceted MAP conservation issues.

This is a project with many moving parts and many stakeholder institutions responsible for various aspects of MAP conservation and use. The project touches upon several national ministries, numerous institutions, state level government and agencies, communities, NGO's and private sector actors. One of the project's key functions is to catalyze coordination between stakeholders in order to mainstream efficient MAP conservation within broad forest management regimes.

The project has sponsored training programs that gather relevant institutions and the project is making progress with facilitating community level cooperation. For instance, the SPMU for Uttarakhand has worked with a number of communities to generate coordinated approaches to MAP conservation and use. These are both promising trends.

The project seems to be making little headway towards facilitating policy, operational, and/or implementation synergy between government institutions to improve landscape level conservation. Government institutions view MAP conservation as a priority and are generally supportive of the project concept. When these stakeholders gather, they tend to find ways to coordinate their efforts. The project's national and state level steering committees are very well conceived and organizations appear to be quite willing to work together. However, the project has provided very few opportunities for operational coordination to occur outside of the steering committee forum. Only a few individuals seem to perceive how project activities may or may not represent long-term, strategic, and coordinated progress towards MAP conservation. There does not appear to be broad awareness by these stakeholders regarding project activities.

Establishment of individual MPCA's involves individual communities and individual forests, but these conservation areas are not clearly part of a larger, landscape level strategy designed to coordinate the conservation approaches of disparate institutions. The project has yet to facilitate the completion of strategies and policy regimes designed to identify coordination gaps and promote more coordinated and collaborative approaches.

(iv) Involvement/support of governmental institutions in project implementation

In terms of implementing project activities, the overall involvement/support of governmental institutions on both national and state levels is satisfactory. This is indicated by very strong support for the project concept and a willingness to participate in and support project activity. For instance, State Forest Departments have implemented the project as conveyed and technically supervised by FRLHT.

In terms of project management, the involvement/support of governmental institutions seems to be improving substantially.

Momentum for state level support seems be building. Initial national level support for project management functions was slow to mature. As noted, the NPSC benefits from very capable and broad representation. However, management structures called for in the Project Document were not implemented. Improvement is indicated by support voiced for adoption of key preliminary recommendations presented during the mid-term evaluation. This included recognition that national project management and M&E capacity must be dramatically increased.

5.2.4 Financial Planning

(i) The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities

Please Note:

The project evaluators were not provided with actual project costs tabulated by objectives, outputs, and activities relevant to the initial Total Budget and Workplan contained in the Project Document.

The Project Document Total Budget and Work Plan reflects a seven year budget (2008 – 2014) for a five year project (2008 – 2013). This results in a rather heavy budget for the planned final project year.

GEF Funds as of November 2011 (US$)

Outcome	2008 (USD)	2009 (USD)	2010 (USD)	2011 (USD)	2012 - 3/2013 USD	Total (USD)
Outcome 1: An enabling environment for mainstreaming the conservation and sustainable use of MAPs into forest management policies and practices at the national level.						
Total Project Budget in PRODOC	$218,330	$256,964	$128,196	$50,974	$46,267	$700,732
Annual Work Plan (as in Atlas)	$0	$102,330	$180,500	$90,000	-	$372,830
Disbursed	$0	$16,122	$112,239	$26,697	$0	$155,058
Remaining GEF Funds	$218,330	$240,842	$15,957	$24,277	$46,267	$545,674
Outcome 2: Forest management policies in the three project states that promote and support the conservation and sustainable use of MAPs.						
Total Project Budget in PRODOC	$59,887	$196,261	$221,523	$208,569	$254,428	$940,668
Annual Work Plan (as in Atlas)	$0	$345,881	$149,500	$166,000	-	$661,381
Disbursed	$2,096	$475,552	$59,606	$23,524	$0	$560,778
Remaining GEF Funds	$57,791	($279,291)	$161,917	$185,045	$254,428	$379,890
Outcome 3: Conservation and sustainable use of MAPs are mainstreamed at the local level into government and community forest management norms and practices at demonstration sites in the three project states.						
Total Project Budget in PRODOC	$21,345	$323,566	$427,033	$448,561	$607,495	$1,828,000
Annual Work Plan (as in Atlas)	$0	$345,881	$270,000	$160,000	-	$775,881
Disbursed	$0	$74,506	$28,884	$57,368	$0	$160,758
Remaining GEF Funds	$21,345	$249,060	$398,149	$391,193	$607,495	$1,667,242
Outcome 4: Materials and methods developed for replicating the successful models of conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants across other sites in the three states, and more broadly.						
Total Project Budget in PRODOC	$25,227	$16,305	$96,122	$180,871	$662,075	$980,600
Annual Work Plan (as in Atlas)	$0	$0	$21,000	$35,000	-	$56,000
Disbursed	$0	$0	$508	$4,344	$0	$4,852
Remaining GEF Funds	$25,227	$16,305	$95,614	$176,527	$662,075	$975,748
Project Management						
Total Project Budget in PRODOC	$37,698	$53,340	$73,657	$70,775	$249,530	$485,000

Annual Work Plan (as in Atlas)	$0	$85,698	$93,000	$104,000	-	$282,698
Disbursed	$489	$738	$120,817	$121,951	$0	$243,995
Remaining GEF Funds	$37,209	$52,602	($47,160)	($51,176)	$249,530	$241,005

Grand Totals						
Total Project Budget in PRODOC	$362,487	$846,436	$946,531	$959,750	$1,819,795	$4,935,000
Annual Work Plan (as in Atlas)	$0	$879,790	$714,000	$555,000	-	$2,148,790
Disbursed	$2,585	$566,918	$322,054	$233,884	$0	$1,125,441
Remaining GEF Funds	$359,902	$279,518	$624,477	$725,866	$1,819,795	**$3,809,559**

The project has the following outstanding (pending) contracts.

Agency/Individual	Outcome/Output	Contract Period (Month/Year)	Total Contract Amount	Total Paid to Date	Outstanding (to be paid)
Indian Institute of Forest Management	Output 1.2	12/2010 - 3/2012	$85,755	$32,832	$52,923
The Energy and Resource Institute	Output 1.3	12/2010 - 6/2012	$73,833	$28,615	$45,218
Enviro Legal Defence Firm Ltd.	Output 2.2,2.3, 2.4 (Arunachal Pradesh)	12/2010 - 12/2011	$73,878	$22,767	$51,111
		Totals (US$)	$233,446	$84,214	$149,252

(ii) The cost-effectiveness of achievements

Without adequate budget information, it is very difficult for the evaluators to review the cost-effectiveness of achievements.

The general impression is that this project has not been cost-effective.

As of November 2011, the project had spent approximately US$ 1,125,441 or 22% of the total GEF project budget the project. The project has encumbered another US$ 149,000 with pending contracts. The project, therefore, has approximately US$ 3,660,307 of GEF funds remaining.

Approximately US$ 244,000 or 23% of the project's expenditures to date were allocated for management. The project overspent the planned project management budget in both 2010 and 2011. While the project continues to make annual investments in project management, implementation progress is limited. The project has failed to use resources to make meaningful progress towards achievement of the project objective and/or outcomes. To date, the project has yet to satisfactorily complete any outputs. Very few of the planned activities have been implemented. However, the project does have ample resources remaining to achieve planned outcomes. This is in part due to the original project budget that spread funding over a seven – rather than five – year period.

Many of the implemented activities have been based upon templates that existed prior to project approval, e.g., training and MPCA creation. These activities tend to lack innovation and/or maximize conservation impact. They have not fully incorporated improvements described in the project document. Investments are not clearly directed towards achieving landscape level, in situ conservation of globally significant plant species. Investment oversight has benefitted from the comprehensive national technical and M&E support (e.g., STA, TAG) stipulated in the project

document. This saves the project money, but fails to set-in place necessary safeguards to insure efficient delivery of high quality and value outputs. Investments to date are not on-track to create a significant shift from the existing baseline towards the GEF alternative. As noted above, project allocations are not always clearly aligned with intended project results.

The evaluators are concerned that the push to implement field-level activity is occurring without the existence of frameworks (national and state MAP conservation strategies and policies) necessary to strategically focus investment upon addressing priority conservation barriers and challenges.

During the evaluation, several current and pending contracts were reviewed. The cost-effectiveness of these activities was judged as being low. TOR's are vague and do not require adequate benchmarks and/or reporting to make certain progress remains on-track. Timetables for delivery appear to be inexplicably long. High quality deliverables could very likely be efficiently and effectively completed in much shorter periods of time. Many deliverables do not seem to be strategically aligned to achieve the project's outcomes. Each of these factors drives up investment costs and risks.

Substantial co-financing commitments were described in the original project design. The project has benefitted from the support of a wide variety of government investments, both in terms of time and financial resources. This is very positive contribution to both project implementation and cost-effectiveness. In the future, the project will likely want to improve the tracking and quantification of this co-financing and seek ways to make certain co-financing investments are well aligned with project activity.

(iii) Financial management

Financial management of this project is not satisfactory.

The evaluators did not find evidence of inappropriate financial management. UNDP seems to be following standard protocols for budget oversight. However, the project management unit was not able to provide the evaluators with relatively simple budget summaries tabulating expenditures to date and pending contractual obligations. This included a failure to quantify expenditures for various activities. This is a very strong indication that financial oversight by the PMU is not highly rigorous.

One identified risk is that FRLHT appears to be entering into service contracts and possibly allotments to state level implementing agencies that encumber financing. These expenditure commitments do not seem to appear in the budget that UNDP uses to track allocations.

The Project Document's "Total Budget and Workplan" are detailed by extensive "Budget Notes". These notes describe basic budget items (e.g, international technical assistance for Outcome 3), and detailed descriptions of specific delivery benchmarks. Although the budget oddly describes a seven-year and not a five-year project, the budget and notes seem to be a fairly accurate portrait of implementation needs. The purpose of the budget and budget notes is to help make certain finances are well managed and directed towards the achievement of the project objective. It is not apparent that the project management unit is actually following these directions.

The project produces annual work plans with budget allocations. However, it was not apparent to the evaluators that these are being well followed. For instance, the 2011 AWP calls for the development of state level MAP conservation strategies under Output 2.1. This activity was to be nearing completion by the end of 2011 with a total budget allocation of approximately US$ 21,000. In reality, this did not occur and the activity was still pending at the time of the evaluation.

The evaluators were provided with the final audit report for fiscal year 2010. This independent audit report found numerous issues with financial management and reporting, many identified as either high or medium risk. The causes for these issues included: inadequate guidance/monitoring at UNDP country office level, inadequate guidance/ supervision at the project level, and inadequate supervision at project office level. The report also states that: "It is apparent from the above mentioned comparison that NPMU expenses have been substantially exceeded with the AWP budget allocation."

(iv) Co-financing

As noted, the project benefits from substantial national and state level government support. Much of this may be considered as co-financing. However, it is not quantified and/or necessarily strategically aligned to deliver the GEF alternative. The completion of national and state level MAP conservation strategies would help to align GEF funds and co-financing.

Co financing (Type/Source)	IA own Financing (mill US$)		Government (mill US$)		Other* (mill US$)		Total (mill US$)		Total Disbursement (mill US$)	
Grants	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Loans/Concessions (Compared to market rate)										
- Credit										
- Equity investments										
- In-kind support										
- Other (*)										
TOTALS										

5.2.5   Execution and implementation modalities

(i) Is project implementation being done in an efficient and effective manner?

The project is not being implemented in an efficient and effective manner.

The project has made little progress towards outcomes and has not followed important guidance and intent of the project document. This is particularly evident in the case of supporting comprehensive national project management and predicating project activity upon clear national and state level conservation strategies. The project is making progress in terms of Outcome 3 ground-level pilot state activities, e.g., establishment of MPCA's. The project is also beginning to recruit national experts to partially complete some elements of Outcomes 1 and 2. However, the quality/delivery of outputs is not efficient or highly effective. Outputs have been very slow to mature, they do not necessarily reflect best international principles and practices, and are not well aligned to efficiently achieve the project objective.

The project's basic outcomes and outputs are not complex and/or substantially challenging. However, the scope and intended impact of these outcomes/outputs is challenging. The project involves a large and diverse cohort of national, state, and community level stakeholders with relatively few inter-stakeholder linkages. The conservation and management activities of these parties are not well coordinated. Stakeholders and associated project activities are also spread over a broad geographic region.

The project was designed to build upon the existing baseline by integrating best international principles and practices to substantially improve the conservation effectiveness and impact. The project was designed to catalyze inter-agency cooperation. Conservation challenges were to be identified with disparate stakeholders agreeing to coordinated and strategic responses that effectively mainstream MAP conservation across the forests of three entire states. A key project indicator and GEF alternative is: Some 6,000,000 ha of diverse forest habitat actively managed in

ways that promote MAP diversity with beneficial impacts on other biodiversity, including globally significant diversity.

Catalyzing improved coordination between relatively unconnected institutions with varying mandates, positively effecting conservation across large landscapes, improving existing baseline activities, and monitoring and capturing lessons learned requires strong national project management and associated technical capacities. Because of these factors, the project was designed to benefit from a comprehensive management framework to provide for efficient and effective implementation. The project has not set in place these strong national project execution and implementation modalities.

The project has faced significant challenges with the establishment of a national project management structure.

A MOU was signed in July 2009 between MOEF and the Foundation for Revitalization of Local Health Traditions (FRLHT). This MOU essentially delegates all PMU and "technical" PMU responsibility to FRLHT. The MOU is fairly specific and detailed regarding FRLHT's implementation and execution responsibilities. The terms of the MOU specifically require FRLHT to carrying out functions such as hiring full-time staff to serve as the NPMU with officers located in New Delhi and Bangalore. The MOU requires the FRLHT to strictly adhere to the guidance of the project document in terms of project implementation. Any deviation requires written authorization from the NPD.

Specific MOU provisions require FRLHT to:

- "Serve as PMU and the Technical hub for overall programme and shall be responsible for actions as specified in the Project Document"

- "Host the NPMU… responsible for carrying out all obligations of project implementation in according (*accordance*) with the project document…"

- "Recruit the following staff for NPMU on contractual basis: (i) Project Manager; (ii) Project Administrative Assistant; (iii) Technical Officers/Program Officer (2 persons); (iv) Accounts Officer/data entry operator; (v) Office assistant…"

- "Project Manager, one Accounts Officer/Data entry operator, and one Office Assistant shall be posted at Delhi and shall assist NPD located at MoEF, New Delhi. The staff will be on contract basis and shall be full time…"

- "Place one Project Administrative Assistant and two Technical Officers/Program Officers at FRLHT, Bangalore to be part of the technical PMU located at FRLHT Bangalore and to provide full time technical guidance implementing the project across the selected states…"

- "Issuing purchase orders, and or entering into other obligations with foreign or domestic parties for the provision of project inputs as defined under the project document…"

- "Submit annual expenditure statement to NPD/MoEF… follow financial reporting, accounting arrangements and auditing procedures as per UNDP Programming Manual and the extent procedures of the Government…"

- "Channelize the funds in accordance with UNDP/GEF guidelines and the budgetary provisions as per the project document…"

- "Strictly adhere to component wise budgets attached to the project document for the provision of UNDP inputs, which may be revised only after written notice from MOEF in accordance with applicable procedures under the project document/MOEF/UNDP Policies…"

- "Coordinate policy research activities and other national level activities as PMU…"

- "Collect, collate and disseminate the project related information…"

- "Collate the (State Government) work plans and assist NPD to provide a Comprehensive Work Plan which would be approved by the PSC…"

The MOU was signed in July 2009, approximately a year after the project commenced. In February 2010, a national PMU was established within MoEF in New Delhi. Less than six months later the NPMU was shifted to FRLHT in Bangalore.

The established NPMU does not seem to conform to the project document and/or the MOU. Many of the detailed responsibilities do not seem to be carried out as intended. The project does not benefit from a full time NPMU staffed, located, and tasked according to the provisions of the MOU. Implementation has been very slow and consistently drifted from the project document's clear directions. Although the terms of the MOU have not been carried out, adequate action has not been taken by MOEF, UNDP, or the NPSC to hold FRLHT accountable and/or seek alternative implementation and execution modalities.

The following table compares the management framework as designed as implemented.

Management Framework as Designed	Management Framework as Implemented
Project Executive (MoEF – NEX)	The MoEF operates as the project's executing agency ultimately responsible for the effective achievement of the project objective, outcomes and outputs.
National Project Director (Joint Secretary, MOEF)	The NPD is in place. This is a highly capable individual fully supportive of the project concept.
National Steering Committee (Board of Directors)	The national project steering committee is established. Membership is quite strong. Relevant agencies are represented with qualified staff. NPSC has been convened four times since project inception. The first meeting was in August 2009 and the latest in November 2011 during the project mid-term evaluation. This infrequency limits the effective use and engagement of the NPSC as a management tool. The Project is implemented in forest areas under the overall guidance of forest and wildlife wing of MoEF. However, senior forestry officials are not represented in the National steering committee. This impacts implementation effectiveness.
Project Implementation Steering Committee (Operational Level)	This committee is not in place. The project document intended this committee to actively oversee project implementation. The idea was to have more operational representation from NSC member organizations to make certain implementation is well coordinated, efficient, and effective. There are some concerns with State Forest Departmental Heads-PCCF that it is not fully coordinated by them. In Uttarakhand the SMPB is under Horticulture Department and this is also creating

	misunderstanding with forest department.
Project Management Unit (full-time Project Manager, Officer, Admin Assist, Accountant)	FRLHT is intended to serve as PMU. The level of support for national level project execution and implementation is very weak. This is not a negative reflection upon any one individual. Rather, FRLHT as an organization has not set in place a comprehensive national PMU structure that follows the guidance of the project document. Instead, several FRLHT staff members appear to be working part-time to fill PMU functions.
UNDP (Quality Assurance)	UNDP is performing this role. UNDP oversees/tracks budgets and performs other quality assurance measures through their New Delhi office. The UNDP/GEF/RTA/Bangkok and UNDP/India management staff actively support quality assurance and are attentive to making certain the project is on-track and being implemented according to the signed project document. However, this is a NEX project. This limits UNDP's immediate management authority. Several UNDP staff members have served as program officer for this project. UNDP recently shifted the program officer responsibilities to a very well qualified and motivated staff person with a strong, international level background in biodiversity conservation, environmental law/policy, and traditional resource use. UNDP is fully supportive of this person providing substantial assistance to the project. This level of commitment is a very good indication of UNDP project support. UNDP and MoEF recently recruited a highly qualified and motivated UNV to support implementation functions. Again, this is a very good indicator of project commitment and improvement. In many ways, UNDP – and specifically the program officer – are filling PMU functions. This approach has very positive impacts in terms of project implementation and quality assurance, but demands resources and time well beyond the scope of responsibilities detailed in the project document.
Senior Technical Advisor (Part-time, international level quality assurance)	This person was not recruited. This person was to support strategic implementation and provide technical expertise for quality assurance and to make certain best international principles and practices are incorporated. The lack of international level expertise has stymied the achievement and limited the impact of project outcomes/outputs.
Technical Advisory Group	This group has not been convened. FRLHT is to some extent filling this role. However, this oversight does not reflect the intent of the project as designed for the TAG to promote more coordinated and synergistic conservation approaches. The project is setting in place working groups for some activities.
State-level Project Implementation Steering Groups	State level PSC have been organized. Membership includes most primary project stakeholders. Qualified and motivated staff members represent relevant organizations. The state level PSC's appear to be quite good with active and committed

	members. They seem quite dedicated to taking a committed role in overseeing management.
State Project Management Units (nodal officer/two assistants)	Each of the pilot states now has a SPMU. The staff members met with during the mid-term evaluation gave the impression of being quite motivated. They are trying to diligently implement project activities. However, the effectiveness of their efforts is somewhat hindered by the lack of substantial and regularized national PMU assistance in terms of capacity building and technical back stopping.
Local Management Group (each MPCA)	There are local management groups formed and/or being formed within each of the pilot states. This is a very positive indicator of progress. However, it is not clear that each of these management groups are closely linked with the management and conservation of proximate MPCA's.

(ii) Is there effective communication between critical actors in response to the needs of implementation?

Communication between critical actors in response to implementation needs is not satisfactory.

The national and state level project steering committees are quite good. However, they meet infrequently and reporting to them does not appear to be adequate. The national and state level PMU's do not have standardized communication strategies to coordinate responses. For instance, the project does not generate a monthly newsletter to inform critical actors of on-going and proposed activity. The project does not actively monitor and report on progress towards results framework indicators. UNDP does serve a critical communication function by informing institutions and other stakeholders regarding project activity and catalyzing necessary responses. However, this should not be the function of the UNDP.

The result is an *ad hoc* approach with project management and others communicating bi-laterally with stakeholders when particular needs arise. This approach works somewhat well on the state level where there are fewer stakeholders working in smaller bureaucracies. The approach does not work on the national level and/or on the national to state level. However, communication between critical actors cannot be fairly described as "effective" on either the state or national level.

(iii) Are the administrative costs of the Project reasonable and cost efficient?

The project evaluators were not provided with a budget providing adequate detail to assess whether the administrative costs of the project are reasonable and/or cost-efficient.

5.3.1   Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of project objective

Status Ratings

Achieved	*A*
Partially Achieved	*PA*
No substantive/measurable progress to date	*NSMP*
Not Commenced	*NC*

	Project Objective:		PA
	Mainstream the conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants into the productive forest sector of three Indian states, with particular reference to GSMPs.		

Outcome 1	An enabling environment for mainstreaming the conservation and sustainable use of MAPs into forest management policies and practices at the national level.	PA

Summary of progress to date:

There is a high level of concern that commenced and planned activity is not on track to deliver intended results and/or substantially contribute to outcome achievement.

The project has been very slow to gain traction with Outcome delivery. This outcome was intended to provide structure and context to the implementation of the entire project. Most effort to date is defined by the creation of TOR's to recruit national agencies. The approaches described require completion of long-term "studies". The amounts budgeted for these activities seem to be rather high compared to the investment return. This investment will not likely result in the adoption and implementation of strategies/policies. The tactics will not support mainstreaming prior to project close. The implementation approach does not fully incorporate the detailed guidance of the project document. This guidance remains relevant to current implementation.

Based in part upon the preliminary findings of the mid-term evaluation, the project intends to re-visit the outcome to refine methodologies in order to focus more directly upon delivery of mainstreaming tools rather than studies. This will ideally include incorporating international level expertise required to integrate best international principles and practices and catalyze coordinated responses by diverse government decision-makers and managers.

Output		Status	Summary of Activity
1.1	A national strategy that addresses issues relating to the *in situ* and *ex situ* conservation, cultivation and the sustainable use of medicinal plants, including the role of medicinal plants in the livelihoods of local communities, access of local communities to traditional medicine, protection of traditional knowledge and the trade in medicinal plants.	NC	No substantive/measurable progress to date. TOR's for study developed and distributed. This is the project's primary building block and should be defining the context for all project activity.
1.2	Revised national guidelines for JFM developed by MoEF with a stronger focus on the conservation and sustainable harvesting of medicinal plants, especially GSMPs.	NSMP	The project recently contracted IIFM, Bhopal to generate a "study" regarding revised guidelines. One national level consultative meeting was held to finalize the methodology; 4 regional consultative meetings were held to collect data, and revised guidelines given to focus on the methodology and quicken delivery. There is concern that the investment to date (generation of a "study") and proposed methodology will not result in revised guidelines.

1.3	Legal mechanisms developed to protect traditional knowledge specifically relating to the sustainable harvest, cultivation and use of medicinal plants within the guidelines of the Biological Diversity Act (2002) through the National Biodiversity Authority, the National Medicinal Plant Board and other sectoral agencies as appropriate.	NSMP	The project contracted TERI to complete a "study". Rough work-plan generated. No substantive reports/finding generated. This study is to take 18 months and focuses upon 5 states that are not part of the project's core pilot states. One national level consultative meeting was held to finalize the methodology and four regional consultative meetings were held to collect the data. Consultative meetings did not occur in pilot states. There is substantial existing national knowledge regarding the traditional practices. The output should be focused upon ways to mainstream international best principles and practices to legally protect this knowledge, not catalog this knowledge.
1.4	Identification of medicinal plant species suited for cultivation and inclusion in the list of plants used for afforestation and income generating programmers of the NAEB (MoEF) and the Ministry of Rural Development.	NSMP	Draft TOR's exist for this output. There is substantial existing national experience. Arunachal Pradesh has a website listing medicinal plants suitable for cultivation. MoEF, NMPB, SMPB, FRLHT and others would have the in-house knowledge required to complete output rapidly, including the creation of selection criteria and best practices.
1.5	Capacity of NMPB strengthened to enable it to function more effectively as an inter-sectoral coordinating body for the MAPs sector in India and to enable it to fulfill its mandate.	NSMP	The project has taken no action on this Output. Since project inception, the capacity of NMPB has increased dramatically. The NMPB now receives substantial financing and support from the government. There is some discussion about not implementing this output. However, the project should still conduct a formal review based upon the completed national strategy and then, as appropriate, assist NMPB to build necessary coordination capacity.
1.6	A long-term strategy and protocols for threat assessment and monitoring of the conservation status of MAPs	NSMP	Draft TOR's exist for this output. FRLHT has long experience with this and should be able to complete the task in short-order. In 2003, FRLHT completed a similar study for Arunachal Pradesh. This was then re-published under a 2010 date.
1.7	A course module on the conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants developed for the	PA	The project has made some progress with this output.

	Indian Forest Service training curriculum.		A meeting was organized with IGNFA to discuss the modalities of study. The course content was submitted for finalization. MoEF will sanction after receiving/reviewing expert comments.
			The evaluators are concerned regarding output effectiveness and strategic approach. Training does not seem to be based upon a rigorous assessment of capacity building needs relevant to conservation priorities. The training does not seem to be designed to fully incorporate the results of other outputs, particularly since most are not completed.

Outcome 2	Forest management policies in the three project states that promote and support the conservation and sustainable use of MAPs.	PA

Summary of progress to date:

There is a high level of concern that commenced and planned activity is not on track to deliver intended results and/or substantially contribute to outcome achievement.

Although more action has occurred with Outcome 2, findings are similar to Outcome 1.

The project has been very slow to gain traction with Outcome delivery. Most effort to date is defined by the creation of TOR's to recruit national agencies. The approaches described require completion of long-term "studies". The amounts budgeted for these activities seem to be rather high compared to the investment return. This investment will not likely result in the adoption and implementation of strategies/policies. The tactics will not support mainstreaming prior to project close. The implementation approach does not fully incorporate the detailed guidance of the project document. This guidance remains relevant to current implementation.

The current approach to completing outputs risks that the project will make large investments without reaching Outcome 2. This will, in turn, weaken the achievements of other project Outcomes designed to build mainstreaming capacity and replication.

State level policy/strategy activities are progressing along independent tracks. Although the states have some differences in regards to policy frameworks and conservation challenges, most of these issues are defined by similarities. The project's implementation approach does not seem to be building synergy and coordination between the state policy/strategy development process. This is not efficient or cost-effective. State level policies/strategies should ideally be built upon activities completed under Outcome 1. Completing three independent state level strategies/policies without strong national and inter-state convergence creates a risk that policies/strategies will not be well-coordinated.

As with Outcome 1, the project intends to re-visit the outcome to refine methodologies based in part upon the preliminary findings of the mid-term evaluation. This will ideally include incorporating international level expertise required to integrate best international principles and practices and catalyze coordinated responses by diverse government decision-makers and managers.

Output		Status	Summary of Activity
2.1	Individual State Medicinal Plant Conservation & Sustainable Use Strategies that build on national	NSMP	The project developed TOR's for "studies".

	policies to address state-specific threats and barriers to the sustainable use and conservation of medicinal plants.		These strategies should be a fundamental building block for project activity. They should be completed in synergy with national strategy. Completion should be a priority.
2.2	Revised state forest policies that support the conservation and sustainable use of MAPs	PA	The project developed TOR's for "studies". Arunachal Pradesh recently awarded a national consulting agency with a long-term contract to generate one such "study" of existing policies.
2.3	Revised state-level JFM Orders and Guidelines for the three project states that integrate and strengthen MAP conservation and sustainable use objectives within the overall JFM programmes and practices.	PA	Each pilot state has developed TOR's for the generation of studies, rather than facilitating the actual revision of guidelines. Arunachal Pradesh recently awarded national consulting agency with a long-term contract to generate one such "study". Other states have identified the consultants for similar studies and are awaiting for approval from the State Government.
2.4	State-level legal mechanisms to protect traditional knowledge relating to the sustainable harvest, cultivation and uses of medicinal plants through the respective State Medicinal Plant Boards and State Biodiversity Boards (when established) and Community Biodiversity Registers.	PA	Each pilot state has developed ToR and is commencing independent recruitment of national expertise for "studies". Arunachal Pradesh recently awarded national consulting agency with a long-term contract to generate a "study" of orders and guidelines.
2.5	Capacities of the SMPBs in each of the three project states strengthened to enable these to function inter-sectorally and fulfill their mandate in the respective states.	NSMP	Each pilot state has developed ToR and is commencing independent recruitment of national expertise for "studies".
2.6	Identification of MAP species suited for cultivation and inclusion in the species lists used for afforestation and income generating programmes of the NAEB and the MoRD at the state level and also in the afforestation programmes of the State Forest and Rural Development departments of each of the three states.	PA	Each pilot state has developed ToR and is commencing independent recruitment of national expertise for "studies". Chhattisgarh has awarded the study to Tropical Forest Research Institute; Arunachal Pradesh and Uttarakhand have finalized the consultants and pending for the approval. As noted, there is substantial existing national knowledge and capacity. This activity should be completed in a relatively short-time using existing capacity.
2.7	Revised forest division working plans that provide clear guidelines for the effective conservation	PA	Pilot study reported to have commenced in Chhattisgarh but it was not shown to have been fully revised incorporating MAP's

	management and sustainable use of medicinal plants in all project districts.		conservation and use practices in Working Plan. Other states did not report any action. It is connected to National Working Plan Code pending revision at MoEF level (By forestry wing while the project is been implemented by Environment Wing).
2.8	Comprehensive baseline and M&E system, including standardized protocols, for monitoring the status of medicinal plant resources in each project state.	PA	Uttarakhand has commissioned FRLHT to document and prepare database of medicinal plants resources. A database of resources already exists for Chhattisgarh. Arunachal Pradesh has a project website with resource database. However, none of these fully meet the M&E criteria of the output.

Outcome 3	Conservation and sustainable use of MAPs are mainstreamed at the local level into government and community forest management norms and practices at demonstration sites in the three project states.	PA

Summary of progress to date:

There is a medium level of concern that commenced and planned activity is not on track to deliver intended results and/or substantially contribute to outcome achievement.

The vast majority of overall project activity has focused upon this outcome. Most of the outcome level activity has focused upon the establishment of MPCA/FGB complexes.

The outcome was designed to promote the conservation of MAP's based upon a landscape level approach. Activity was to provide an incremental and coordinated system of MAP conservation across three layers:

1. Forest wide MAP conservation;
2. Forest Gene Banks (FGB) nested within sustainably managed forests; and,
3. Medicinal Plant Conservation Areas (MPCA) nested within FGB.

The end of project targets are 6,000,000 ha of sustainably managed forests within which 32,000 hectares are established as MPCA/FGB complexes.

The project has identified thirty-two (32) globally significant plant species. Botanical and ecological surveys have been initiated.

The project is moving forward with the creation of MPCA's. Approximately eighteen (21) MPCA's have been created. Three of these are within community-forests. Each MPCA is nested within a FGB of approximately 1,500 ha. The cumulative, three state landscape covered by MPCA/FGB is approximately 31,500 ha (4,000 hectares as MPCA and 17,500 as FGB). This exceeds the mid-term target and meets the end of project target: 32,000 ha.

The project is making very little progress towards substantially improving active MAP conservation within forests. The mid-term target is 2,000,000 ha sustainably managed. The final target is 6,000,000 ha. This can be attributed primarily to the slow progress under Outcomes 1 and 2. Capacity building effort for forest management is occurring with training programs implemented. However, these training programs are not building upon system-wide and forest-wide MAP conservation strategies, policies, and

regulatory guideline improvements. Without such improvements, the long-term sustainable management impacts of training will be limited. Most importantly, the project has committed to training without conducting the training assessment and capacity development plan called for in project document. This limits outcome achievement.

The concept of MPCA/FGB complexes is innovative and potentially highly useful as a part of larger, well-conserved landscape. They have the possibility to serve educational, scientific, and conservation functions. However, there is concern that the biodiversity conservation and community-based incentive impacts of the MPCA/FGB complexes being established by the project may not be reaching full potential. MPCA/FGB complexes are not being established to address conservation priorities identified in well-conceived national and/or state level MAP conservation assessments and strategies. The uniform size of MPCA/FGB does not seem to account for special/habitat requirements of different species and other variables such as climate and climate change, altitude, soil structure, moisture, etc. MPCA/FGB is not clearly functioning as *in situ* refuges nested within a large, landscape level MAP conservation areas. Policies and regulations do not fully define the role and function of MPCA's. The role and value of MPCA/FGB relative to other conservation areas, e.g., protected areas, is not well defined. The value of MPCA/FGB's in creating community-based conservation incentives is not apparently maximized, e.g., how does the creation of an MPCA/FGB create incentives for local resource users to improve harvest methods? As a result, the "new" MPCA/FGB models being created with project support do not seem to differ greatly from the "old" MPCA/FGB models being created prior to project commencement. They do not seem to represent a substantial improvement upon the baseline situation. There are issues of concern that the project will likely need to address prior to close.

The project is making progress with community capacity development. This has been slow to commence and there are issues such as language barriers, but all three states are moving forward. This is particularly the case with the village botanist courses being implemented. These are based upon training programs FRLHT implemented under previous DANIDA and UNDP supported projects in other states. As noted, Uttarakhand Pradesh is making progress with a very interesting village-level traditional knowledge program implemented with SPMU staff. These are positive steps. Achievement of the outcome would be strengthened if this community capacity building was taking place and prioritized within the context of well-reasoned national and state conservation strategies.

For reference, a primary outcome indicator is: "Ha of government forest actively managed for sustainable use of MAPs and maintenance of MAP diversity." The baseline at project start was: 0 ha sustainably managed for MAP's. The project target is: "At least 4 MPCAs/FGBs (established in each project state by Yr 4 (3 in state forest & 1 in community forest - 12 in total covering 18,000 ha) & 7 in total per project state by Yr 6 (5 in state forest and 2 in community forest – 21 in total or c. 32,000ha). Mid-way through the project and by the end of the project respectfully, an additional 2,000,000 ha and 6,000,000 ha of forest will be under active management for sustainable use and maintenance of MAP diversity."

Output		Status	Summary of Activity
3.1	Demonstration of in situ and ex situ techniques and approaches to the conservation and sustainable management of medicinal plant diversity (especially GSMP) in state forests including the establishment of 5 MPCA/FGB complexes in each project state.	PA	The project has invested substantially in this output. The project has yet to maximize "demonstration" aspects. No strategy/policies exist to provide conservation context. Completed activities include: • 32 Globally Significant Medicinal Plant (GSMP) species have been identified for conservation. • Established 200 ha each 5 MPCAs in Arunachal Pradesh, 7 in Chhattisgarh & 6 in Uttarakhand on forest department managed land.

			• Season-wise botanical survey in all the MPCAs is under progress.
			• 1,300 ha around each MPCA is established as Forest Gene Banks.
			• Selected 4 GSMPs and 2 sites in each state for developing sustainable harvest techniques.
3.2	Strengthened medicinal plants conservation management capacity within SFDs.	PA	The project has invested in this output. Training is not linked to and/or building capacity for the implementation of strategic conservation objectives. No strategy/policies exist to provide this context. Project has committed to training without conducting training assessment and capacity development plan.

Completed activities include:

• 4 Training programs on *in situ* conservation and sustainable use of MAPs at IAIM-FRLHT along with field visits for the project states. PCCFs, CCFs CFs, DCFs, ROs, Foresters and Forest Guards had attended totaling to 28 participants.

• A manual for sustainable harvesting techniques developed in English. |
| 3.3 | Pilot demonstration sites for the in situ and ex situ conservation and sustainable management of medicinal plant diversity on community-owned or community managed forest land, including the establishment of 2 MPCA/FGB complexes in each project state. | PA | The project has invested substantially in this output. The project has yet to maximize "demonstration" aspects. No strategy/policies exist to provide conservation context.

Further work on orientation of communities is yet to be started. The project is challenged to convince the communities about the advantages of these.

Completed activities include:

• 2 MPCAs/FGB in Arunachal Pradesh & 1 in Uttarakhand on community-managed land. Each 1,500 ha |
| 3.4 | Strengthened community capacity for the conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants. | PA | The project has invested in this output with the implementation of Village Botanist courses based upon previous Danida/UNDP project experience. Training is not linked to and/or building capacity for the implementation of strategic conservation objectives. No strategy/policies exist to provide this context. |

			Completed activities include:
			• Village Botanists Courses: One year distant education mode Village Botanists (VB) Course in all the 3 project states is in progress. 73 participants have enrolled for this course from 3 states. 2 levels of the VB course completed in all the 3 states and 3rd level was completed in Uttarakhand. 6 trainings (2 in each state) were organised on conservation and sustainable use of MAPs at the respective state. The trainings were represented by JFMCs, NGOs, LMGs, Folk Healers, SHG members, Knowledgeable Women, Traders, Teachers & Students, etc. A total of 212 community members have benefitted.
3.5	Strengthened community capacity to enable communities to document and conserve their traditional knowledge related to the sustainable use of medicinal plants and Traditional Medicine and how to protect and benefit from their IPRs	PA	The project has invested in this output with interesting results emerging, e.g., Uttarakhand traditional healer interviews. Next step will hopefully build capacity for community-based regulatory safeguards to assist protection of traditional knowledge. Next step should also link use of this knowledge to positive conservation effects. No strategy/policies exist to provide this context. Completed activities include: • 2 Training programmes each at Chhattisgarh and Uttarakhand were organized on documentation of traditional knowledge. Exposure visits were organized for learning documentation of traditional knowledge and establishment of home herbal gardens. 8 participants from Uttarakhand visited Udaipur in Rajasthan, 26 participants from Chhattisgarh visited Cuttack in Orissa and 24 participants from Arunachal Pradesh visited Sagar in West Bengal. The participants were from SFDs, JFMCs, LMGs, Folk Healers and Knowledgeable Women.

Outcome 4	Materials and methods developed for replicating the successful models of conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants across other sites in the three states, and more broadly.	NC

Summary of progress to date:

There is an extremely high level of concern that commenced and planned activity is not on track to deliver intended results and/or substantially contribute to outcome achievement.

The project has made no progress with this outcome. Outputs are designed to upscale and replicate project success more broadly within the three pilot states and across four identified replication states.

Each of Outcome 4 outputs rely upon the project innovating conservation success tools suitable for replication. In four years of implementation, the project has not evidently generated and proven one such tool. The priority strategy/policy/regulatory reforms described in the project document are not available to support replication of similar tools within the four-replication states. Some of the training modules may be useful, but it is not clear that they lead to conservation success worthy of additional investment. The same applies to the MCPA/FGB models.

The project is not generating and/or implementing a well-reasoned monitoring plan to determine whether project implementation is leading to measurable conservation impact. Lessons from on-going project work are not being systematically and/or professionally captured for dissemination and replication either within or outside of the pilot states. The project does not have a formal communication strategy to identify target audiences, key messages, and/or capacity building needs within pilot states and/or replication states.

Output		Status	Summary of Activity
4.1	A state-level strategy for the conservation and sustainable use of MAPs developed in each of the four replication states.	NC	No project activity.
4.2	Capacities of SMPBs in the four replication states strengthened by learning from the experience of the SMPBs in the project states	NC	No project activity.
4.3	Training module and other materials developed for SFD personnel in the project states adapted for use in the replication states	NC	No project activity.
4.4	Demonstration of *in situ* and *ex situ* conservation and sustainable management of MAP diversity in productive forestlands in districts other than those covered by the project in the three states through exchange visits	NC	No project activity.
4.5	Strengthened medicinal plants management capacity of SFD staff and selected local community groups in the four replication states.	NC	No project activity.
4.6	Revised forest division working plans that provide clear guidelines for the conservation management of MAPs in selected districts in replication states.	NC	No project activity.

5.3.2   Sustainability

Ratings	
Likely (L)	There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.
Moderately Likely (ML)	There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
Moderately Unlikely (MU)	There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

Unlikely (U)	There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

Please note:

These projections are based upon the current implementation track. If course corrections are adopted and existing institutional support for such corrections are maintained, the findings of the final project evaluation should be much more positive.

Sustainability Factor	Rating	Comments
Financial Resources	ML	The Government of India has increased investment in MAP conservation over the course of this project. These investments will likely continue to increase. However, the project has not yet provided a strategic platform to help improve the efficiency and effectiveness of these investments. MAP's generate substantial revenues for both the domestic and international market. The project to date has not done a very good job of capturing these opportunities to strategically direct revenue generated from the use of MAP's into the long-term *in situ* conservation of MAP's.
Sociopolitical	MU	Stakeholders strongly support the concept of MAP conservation. However, the project has yet to support building of the policy and institutional capacities required on national and/or state levels to capitalize upon this support and implement long-term community-based conservation solutions.
Institutional Framework and Governance	MU	The project must hasten the improvement of the strategy, policy and regulatory framework relevant to in situ MAP conservation. This is fundamental to achieving the project objective. Under the current scenario, this is unlikely to be achieved.
Environmental	*MU*	*See above.*

Part 6. Lessons learned

1. *Follow guidance of the project document*

The project document's basic analysis and described interventions are well reasoned. If the guidance of the project document regarding (a) implementation approach, (b) management regime, and (c) output process/expectations were being followed, this project would represent a much better GEF investment.

2. *Monitor impact, not only revenue flow*

If the rate of spending is not accompanied by strong quality assurance coupled with rigorous impact monitoring, spending will likely result in poor investments.

3. *Implement Mid-Term Evaluations on time and as planned and begin recruitment one-year in advance.*

There is a general hesitancy in projects with slow start-ups to delay the mid-term evaluation until a few results are realized. In addition, projects usually do not actively recruit independent evaluators more than 2 – 3 months in advance of the planned evaluation. This is not a very strategic evaluation approach. There are generally reasons for slow initiation that will likely be revealed and improved with a mid-term evaluation conducted earlier, rather than later. For instance, this project's mid-term evaluation should have taken place at least one year earlier as planned in the project document. If this had occurred, earlier course corrections would have likely resulted in better implementation and greater objective/outcome progress. Scheduling and planning mid-term evaluations at least one year in advance, regardless of project progress, would allow project management units to recruit qualified evaluators well in advance. Recruiting evaluators one year in advance would increase the likelihood of having a well-planned evaluation supported by a highly qualified international/national evaluation team.

4. *Full-sized Projects of five years or more should have the option of additional evaluations during implementation.*

For full-sized projects, GEF executing agencies should build in the option to call for at least one "urgent" evaluation during project implementation. This project would have benefitted from an independent evaluation at year two and a second independent "mid-term" evaluation at year four. If the option for such an independent "on-call" evaluation tool were available and integrated within the project's original budget, the ability of executing agencies to full-fill their quality assurance functions would be improved. This is particularly the case for NEX projects. The cost of such independent evaluations is relatively inexpensive compared to the potential costs of implementation delays and/or less than strategic investments that challenge objective and outcome achievement. If an "urgent" evaluation is not required prior to the planned mid-term, the budgeted costs for the urgent evaluation could be re-oriented during the mid-term to support other priority activities.

5. *Always require a detailed work plan at project inception*

Every project should generate a very comprehensive and detailed work plan during the inception phase. The work plan should cover the entire project duration. The work plan should be vetted with key stakeholders, including the implementing agency, executing agency, project steering committee, and other key stakeholders. The work plan should be

time bound and have solid lines of responsibility. The work plan should be linked to the project's logical framework (results framework) and show how the completion of activities and achievement of outputs will lead to achievement of success indicators and the overall project objectives/outcomes. The completion of a project workplan should be an executing agency's pre-requisite for the release of project implementation funds. The work plan should be reviewed and revised regularly during project implementation. The full project work plan should inform both the AWP and the PIR.

6. *Actively involve project designer/drafter in project inception/implementation*

These projects are usually developed with the assistance of international or national consultants, regional-technical advisors, or national agencies. Regardless of who assisted project design, the person who ultimately sat down to write the CEO Request/Project Document should be brought in during project inception to support implementation. This should include offering background information regarding design and expectations. The person should assist project management address any immediate implementation challenges, help make necessary adaptations and support the creation of a detailed work plan covering the entire implementation period.

7. *Create by-laws to govern roles/responsibilities of Project Steering Committees*

At project inception, it may be prudent for Project Steering Committees to draft and adopt simple by-laws to fully clarify their form/function following the guidance of the Project Document. Both the CEO Request and the Project Document contain boilerplate language regarding the roles/responsibilities of various management entities, including Project Steering Committees. This boilerplate language may not always provide adequate detail covering PSC functions such as review and advice on project outputs. Nor does the boilerplate language offer guidance regarding number of meetings, quorums and other basic functional guidance basic to the operation of any committee. Finally, the boilerplate does not provide clear directions regarding project management's reporting responsibilities to the PSC. The potential for conflict and misunderstanding between PSC's and management bodies rises without agreed guidelines, particularly if the project is implemented under NEX.

8. *Acquire necessary international-level technical assistance, including senior technical advisors*

Sourcing national level technical expertise to support project implementation has been a project challenge. This project would have benefitted greatly if an international STA had been secured from the beginning to provide short-term technical support at specific times throughout the implementation period. Having the support of a competent international STA would have likely helped the project to identify and respond to implementation issues early on and improved project effectiveness and efficiencies. This has hampered the initial implementation, design of a project work plan, adoption of adaptation measures, creation of terms of reference for technical advisors, and evaluation and technical support for the development and assessment of project activities and outputs. In addition, many of the project outputs would likely be stronger and reflect best international principles and practices if international technical assistance was recruited as detailed in the original project document.

Part 7. Conclusions and Recommendations

7.1   Conclusions

Overall Conclusion:

This project will require substantial course corrections and a no-cost extension of at least one year to reach the objective and supporting outcomes.

The mid-term evaluation took place during month 40 of a 60-month project. During the evaluated period, none of the project's 26 outputs have been delivered and little progress made towards any of the project's four outcomes.

The project's primary efforts and achievement to date have been within the context of Outcome 3: Conservation and sustainable use of MAPs are mainstreamed at the local level into government and community forest management norms and practices at demonstration sites in the three project states. State level activity includes the creation of numerous MPCA/FGB complexes, stimulating greater coordination through the state-level Project Steering Committees and PMU's, and preliminary advances with community-based initiatives such as recording of traditional knowledge.

The project has made very little progress with the national/state level strategy, policy, and regulatory improvements that are described in Outcomes 1 and 2. These Outcomes are fundamentally important to the project reaching its final objective of mainstreaming MAP conservation.

The project has made no measurable progress with Outcome 4: Materials and methods developed for replicating the successful models of conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants across other sites in the three states, and more broadly. The project has done almost no impact monitoring and/or capturing of lessons or successes that may be replicated.

The project's delivery challenges may be linked to two critical issues.

First, project implementation has not benefitted from the strong management support framework described in the project document. The project's National PMU has going through several permutations. A full-time PMU still does not exist. In addition, the project has not benefitted from an international level Senior Technical Advisor, national implementation steering committee, and/or national level technical advisory group. The project requires a strong national unit to provide the vision, leadership, and quality assurance needed to catalyze institutional and regulatory improvements.

Second, the implementation process has not followed the strategic approach described in the project document. Rather than commencing with drafting national and state level MAP conservation strategies to describe challenges and responses, the project moved immediately forward with allocating resources to implementing state-level activities (e.g., MPCA/FGB establishment and training programs) that flow from the baseline. Because these activities are not being used as tools to implement strategic visions, they are in danger of simply continuing the baseline without actually generating the intended GEF alternative. The project may become a "check-list" endeavor with implementers simply ticking off activities as they are completed without nesting these within a strategy to maximize innovation of best international principles/practices, conservation impact, and ultimate sustainability.

The project would have certainly benefitted from an earlier mid-term evaluation to assist management to identify challenges and propose alternative solutions. The project's pace is

picking up, but still activities occur outside a strategic framework. The project is running out of time to make and implement necessary adjustments.

On the positive side, project momentum has increased over the last few months. This includes moving forward with important parts of Outcomes 1 and 2. Although the strategic alignment of national expertise is not very strong, the project has identified qualified experts that could make valuable contributions. The project has very good national and state level steering committees. FRLHT has a good pool of knowledge and state level PMU's are in place and motivated. In addition, the project concept enjoys broad-based support from key national and state level stakeholders. Most interested parties clearly recognize the economic, social and ecological importance of MAP. Most associated parties see the urgency for conservation and realize that many of the challenges relate back to the need for more institutional convergence and guided by better strategy/policy. Both the implementing and executing agencies are well vested. Each of these agencies and associated individuals represent offer a strong knowledge base and a sincere interest in seeing the project succeed. Finally, the project is financially strong with both a substantial amount of GEF funds remaining and potential for very good national co-financing.

These are encouraging signs that certainly point towards the potential for steering a currently challenged project into a very successful one prior to close.

7.1.1   Relevance

Although designed more than five years ago, both the challenges and interventions described remain highly relevant.

MAP's – and particularly GSMP – are threatened from habitat loss and over-exploitation. Both the domestic and international markets for these species continue to expand. India benefits from very good experts and institutions sincerely concerned with conservation of these species. However, the strategic, policy, regulatory, and institutional structures lead to less-than efficient conservation. Large landscape approaches that are financially secure and support necessary *in situ* conservation are particularly lacking.

The project's implementation approach and outcomes are well reasoned to address these challenges. The project was designed to prioritize the generation of national and state level strategies, policies, and regulation to describe conservation challenges and align institutional responses. The project then provides support for strategic implementation within three pilot states and ultimate replication of success in four additional states. The project's results framework is very comprehensive. All aspects of the project are directed towards achieving conservation impacts across large landscapes, rather than isolated and fragmented habitats. The project has a more than adequate budget.

7.1.2   Effectiveness

This project has struggled to be effective. Little measureable progress has been made to date and the impact is limited. Substantial progress towards results indicators is not apparent. Most effort has focused upon supporting implementation of activities supporting Outcome 3. However, much of this progress may be described as a simple continuation of the baseline rather than achievement of the proposed GEF alternative. The project has yet to clarify the project document's original presumptions such as the need to: detail conservation challenges/priorities; conduct a market analysis to understand the extent of consumption, market demands and potential pathways for sustainable conservation financing; and, complete a thorough assessment of existing policy and institutional capacity gaps and needs. Organizing this knowledge within a conservation strategy would increase the project's effective use of GEF financing. This raises skepticism regarding the ultimate impact, sustainability and effectiveness of investments MPCA/FGB, training, and

planned legal reviews. For instance, the project is moving forward with training programs before conducting the training assessments called for in the original project design. The quality of products generated is perhaps acceptable, but they are not "exceptional and do not generally reflect best international principles and practices.

7.1.3 Efficiency

This project is not highly efficient. The project has benefited greatly from stakeholders eager to participate in project management and activities, including training and MPCA/FGB establishment. However, project investments are not linked to a comprehensive conservation strategy. The result is that both products and activity are not innovative and/or synergistic. For instance, each pilot state is progressing on separate tracks with little exchange of information and experience. This leads to potential cost duplications and greatly hampers efficiency. The project continues to allocate financing to management, while management has been too slow to formulate a plan, identify causes of delay/inefficiency and take adaptive responses.

7.2 Recommendations

Please note:
There are several ways that the project could improve the quality of project deliverables. However, the sustainability and impact of these investments will be very limited unless the project first takes steps to improve project management and strategic implementation. Therefore, recommendations tend to focus upon management and implementation improvements that will lead to improved investment impact.

1. *Request a no-cost extension of at least one year*

The project continues to be relevant. The project has substantial GEF funding remaining and opportunities for meaningful co-financing. The project is scheduled to end March 2013. The project should request a no-cost extension to at least September 2014. This would give the project adequate time to adopt and implement recommended course-corrections.

2. *Establish comprehensive national project management regime that is based upon the direction of the original project document*

The project document describes a very solid and comprehensive management regime, including a full-time PMU located in Delhi supported by an international level Senior Technical Advisor, Project Implementation Steering Committee, and Technical Advisory Group. This should include making certain that Senior Forestry Officials from the Forest and Wildlife Department of MoEF are adequately represented. These and the other national project management tools should be set in place as quickly as possible. Paramount is the establishment of a full-time and fully staffed national PMU supported by a Senior Technical Advisor with substantial international experience.

- Project Executive (MOEF – NEX)
- National Project Director (Joint Secretary, MOEF)
- National Steering Committee (Board of Directors)
- Project Implementation Steering Committee (Operational Level)
- Project Management Unit (full-time Project Manager, Officer, Admin Assist, Accountant)
- UNDP (Quality Assurance)
- Senior Technical Advisor (Part-time, international level quality assurance)
- Technical Advisory Group
- State-level Project Implementation Steering Groups
- State Project Management Units (nodal officer/two assistants)
- Local Management Group (each MPCA)

3. *Complete a comprehensive and detailed project work plan to guide implementation over the entire project period*

The national PMU, supported by state PMU's and other management units, should devise a comprehensive and detailed work plan. The plan should cover the entire project duration, be time bound, and assign responsibilities to specific parties to deliver required outputs. A major part of this work plan should be to make certain the project is adequately monitoring and reporting progress, including achievement of the results framework.

The exercise should assess and re-orientate planned and on-going activities so that all project activity is directed towards completion and implementation of reasoned and informed National and State Level MAP conservation strategies that enjoy broad based stakeholder participation and result in ecosystem level, in situ conservation of globally significant medicinal and aromatic plants.

The planning exercise should seek out ways for the project, and particularly the national PMU, to facilitate the generation of synergy between the three states, e.g., organizing policy/strategy meetings under a firm timeline that incorporate representation from each of the State's simultaneously. This will increase efficiency and promote the creation of stronger products that incorporate a broader range of opinions. Synergy should also generate more streamlined and compatible approaches with policies and strategies adopted by each state being more compatible. This will help with implementation, enforcement, monitoring, and the provision of national assistance for state level implementation.

The detailed work plan should reflect the guidance of the project document and follow the prioritized implementation approach described.

- Create MAP conservation strategies (National/State) to clarify threats and design appropriate interventions
- Generate policies and a regulatory and management framework to support strategy findings
- Support the implementation of the improved framework with "on-the-ground" conservation of MPCA's and FGB's
- Build government field staff capacity necessary to implement policy framework based upon a comprehensive "Training Needs Assessment"
- Build community capacity and incentives through FGB's, traditional knowledge support, and sustainable in/ex situ harvest technologies
- Track results and indentify conservation needs with rigorous monitoring program
- Upscale and replicate success

Consideration should be given to incorporating the project work plan within the National Working Plan Code.

4. *Re-visit planned and on-going activities to better align these with the achievement of the project objective and outcomes with an emphasis upon improving strategic implementation that is both efficient and effective*

Project management will need to revisit planned and on-going activities to make certain that these investments are organized to represent high-value investments that will efficiently lead to prioritized outputs. This will likely include the very real possibility of having to re-negotiate and re-draft pending and on-going activities such as the policy review and traditional knowledge exercises. This includes finalizing capacity assessments based upon strategically identified conservation needs to prioritize investments in activities such as training programs.

To make certain further expenditures are strategically aligned and cost-effective, the project may consider suspending allocations to programming until issues regarding the full-time national PMU are corrected and a suitable project work plan is completed.

5.   Generate and implement a project implementation monitoring and evaluation strategy that considers both project progress and impact

The project must generate and implement a clear monitoring and reporting strategy to measure the impact of investments. This should be linked to the project work plan. The national PMU should be tasked M&E responsibility. To insure quality and promote coordination, the national PMU should be responsible for submitting electronic quarterly reports to the PSC, UNDP, TAG and other stakeholders summarizing project progress relevant to indicator achievement. The priority should be making certain the project is adequately monitoring progress towards the achievement of indicators stated in the results framework. This might be further strengthened by an analysis of the conservation impact of training, MPCA/FGB, community-based activities and other project endeavors relevant to the national and state level conservation strategies.

Both the national and state level conservation strategies should describe how best to establish and/or strengthen MAP monitoring programs to inform implementation and adaptation of the adopted strategy/policy.

6.   Increase level and rigor of PMU reporting, including regular (monthly) electronic newsletter from PMU to update project stakeholders on national/state level activity

The national PMU should generate a list-serve of key stakeholders. The national PMU should then be required to provide this list-serve with a monthly electronic newsletter informing project stakeholders regarding planning and on-going project activity.

More rigorous monitoring and reporting should include regular and detailed analysis of expenditures, including ground inspections of allocations and purchases. This level of inquiry was beyond the scope of the mid-term evaluation.

7.   Align and track co-financing commitments to support achievement of project objective and outcomes

GEF is an incremental funding mechanism. Both National/State governments have committed funding and are providing funding to support this project. The national PMU should be tasked with coordinating this effort through the strategic project implementation work plan, monitoring these investments, collating the information, and providing regular reports to the project steering committees, MOEF, and UNDP.

8.   Increase number of project steering committee meetings from one per year to two per year and focus these meetings upon reviewing project progress relevant to the results framework and improved project implementation work plan

The project management regime and implementation monitoring would likely be improved if the national project steering committee convened at least twice each year. The national PMU should be tasked with presenting the PSC with a specific list of achievements and planned activities. The PMU should condense and circulate this information to PSC members at least two weeks prior to the planned meeting.

9.   Complete working drafts of national and state level MAP (flora) conservation strategies within the next eight months of project operation

As noted repeatedly in the evaluation, the project needs to deliver the national and state level conservation strategies described in Outcomes 1 and 2. These are designed to give context to project implementation. Completing these strategies should be the project's number one priority. Ideally, working drafts should be completed with the next eight months of project implementation.

These strategies should prioritize conservation challenges. The main body of the strategies should be no more than thirty pages. They should be streamlined with an emphasis upon bullet points that describe challenges and bullet points that describe prioritized interventions. strategies should support landscape level, in situ conservation of globally significant plant species across large landscapes. As the project document clearly states, this project is designed to improve plant conservation across all forestlands and encompass tens of thousands of hectares. They should reflect best national and international principles and practices. They should serve as a tool to coordinate institutional investment, approaches, and oversight. They should lead towards improved project implementation and flow towards the adoption of policies and regulations as described in the project document. The strategies should capture and reflect lessons from existing work, e.g., traditional knowledge, regulatory review, MPCA's, etc. The process of development should be inclusive, with opportunities for local communities, private enterprise, and local government to contribute meaningfully.

Part One of the strategies may detail the existing situation, including:

- Detail existing regulatory framework
- Clarify institutional responsibilities (MOEF, MOA, MOHFW, etc.)
- Coordinate programming (HRDA, JICA, UNDP, CDH, etc.)
- Assess current use/demand, including commercial and subsistence use
- Describe capacity building requirements

Part Two of the strategies may describe conservation need and prioritized approaches, including:

- Describe landscape approaches for MAP conservation (e.g., integration of MAP, FGB, national parks, forest reserves, etc.)
- Describe permit, certification, contract, community management, and other harvest access tools
- Define management objectives for cultivated and non-cultivated varieties
- Describe certification and other product tracking and value added tools
- Describe possible regulatory and administrative procedure improvements
- Describe data and information management regimes and protocols
- Etc.

10. *Analyze the MAP market relevant to conservation challenges and opportunities and seek out market-based conservation incentives and sustainable conservation funding opportunities*

As detailed in the project document, the project should finalize a rapid assessment of the existing MAP market, associated demands and revenue flows. This will help the project to design interventions that address extinction drivers, tailor responses accordingly, and identify opportunities for sustainable funding. The analysis should focus primarily upon MAP business in the three pilot states. As possible, the analysis should consider and summarize all aspects of the product chain: collection, refinement, distribution, etc. The analysis, as possible, should attempt to identify regulatory gaps, possible regulatory interventions and conservation opportunities, including pricing, certification, etc.

The medicinal plant industry in India is estimated to be worth hundreds of millions of dollars annually. This presents a very good opportunity for directing financing from the exploitation of medicinal plants into the conservation of medicinal plants. Part of the market analysis should be tasked with identifying these opportunities in a format suitable for inclusion within national and state level strategies and, ultimately, policies and regulations. The market analysis should support improved business planning for communities. The analysis should seek out opportunities for ecosystem based conservation that encompasses all forest lands, not only MPCA/FGB complexes. Finally, the market analysis should offer recommendations for financial sustainability as a project exit strategy.

11. *Adopt practices to improve both the efficiency and quality of consultant efforts*

The current approach of hiring agencies to conduct independent studies in each of the pilot states and then again nationally is not very efficient. The project should consider adopting several principles and practices to streamline delivery.

- Delivery time should be radically shortened. The current 18 months provided for several tasks is exceedingly long.

- If recruiting experts for the amount budgeted is difficult, the budget should not be increased. Rather, the task should be narrowed to deliver the precise items required to make progress towards the outcome.

- Reporting responsibilities, including periodic progress reports, needs to be addressed and reflected in TOR's.

- The project should be hiring individuals, rather than agencies. Nearly all project tasks do not require teams. They require qualified individuals. This would greatly increase effective and efficient delivery and lower costs.

- Technical oversight, e.g. TAG and STA, needs to be improved. Contracts should be consolidated so that one individual is responsible for supporting conservation strategies in all three states. This builds economies of scale, improves coordinated approaches, increases impact, and maximizes efficiency.

- As foreseen in the project document, many of the outputs would benefit from the support of experts with extensive international experience. This is particularly the case for strategy and policy development. These activities are fundamentally critical to project success. The project should have substantial support from a policy expert with at least 15 years of international experience. Having an expert with deep international experience would greatly increase both the efficiency and effectiveness of facilitating national and state level strategy/policy design exercises. This would likely be more cost-effective than the project's current "study" based approach. Most importantly, benefiting from international experience would likely result in policies and strategies that integrate and reflect best international *in situ* conservation principles and practices.

- Outputs should be addressing issues such as climate change and gender much more strongly. All project activities should be focused upon achievement of outcomes. Individuals hired for tasks should be made well aware of this and made responsible to contributing on this level.

12. *Hire at least four full-time technical staff to augment the National Project Management Unit with skill sets necessary for efficient outcome achievement*

The project needs full-time, streamlined, and focused technical support. For instance, this is a policy and strategy oriented project without full-time policy and strategy technical support. The project should consider hiring several UNV level experts to provide full-time technical and coordination support each specifically tasked with promoting the achievement of a distinct outcome. This would be far more efficient and cost-effective than the current approach of hiring agencies. On the national level, four UNV level experts need to be hired. Each should be tasked to support one of the project outcomes and associated activities: national policy, state policy, state and community pilots, and forest management planning to incorporate MAP issues, replication and communication. They would assist not only with supporting and coordinating implementation, but also with monitoring and reporting on project progress. The Senior Technical Advisor, the TAG, and necessary experts recruited on a short-term basis would each help to guide implementation and augment UNV technical capacity.

13. *Build synergy between outputs and locations through better inter-state coordination and information exchange*

A key element of the project's revised work plan should be the identification of ways to improve coordination of activities between key national, state and community level institutions. This should include describing pathways for shared learning and improving efficient/cost-effective delivery of outputs, e.g., bringing all three pilot states together for a national training workshop on best international MAP conservation principles and practices and to outline MAP conservation strategies. This should include using social media tools as a cost-effective way to support communication and information transfer.

14. *Re-Orient the outputs of Outcome 4 (Replication) to be much more focused upon the effective capture and communication of results, lessons and successes*

The project has made almost no progress on Outcome 4: Materials and methods developed for replicating the successful models of conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants across other sites in the three states, and more broadly.

The outputs under this activity should be re-aligned with a focus upon improving the capture and dissemination of lessons learned. This should include devising a communication strategy that encompasses all project activities. The effort should be to generate both electronic and print materials. Part of this effort would include project support for a project website that can eventually become a MAP website supported by State Governments. The website would provide updates regarding project activity, information regarding success and impact monitoring, reference tools such as strategies and policies, and contain syllabus for all training programs conducted. The site would include a special section detailing each of the MAP/FGB complexes and highlighting each of the communities that are covered by project implementation. An important element of this communication strategy and website should include a gathering of conservation success stories, particularly those related to traditional knowledge activities. Ultimately, this would reach Outcome 4 by creating a platform for success replication nationally.

This task would require hiring a full-time conservation communications specialist to be housed within the national PMU and tasked with supporting both national and pilot state efforts.

15. *Complete an international level assessment of the conservation impact of MPCA/FGB complexes and provide recommendations for possible improvements*

There are several issues regarding MPCA/FGB and whether these represent a high conservation return on investment. The project should commission an independent study to analyze these issues and provide improvement recommendations. The study should take no more than one month and requires recruitment of one national expert. A plant conservation expert with extensive international experience (10 years or more) and without affiliation or connection with

either the MOEF or FRLHT should lead this study. The study should assess for each of the pilot states whether the established MPCA/FGB complexes represent a strategic and ecologically meaningful tool to address primary MAP conservation challenges, e.g., direct harvest, habitat conversion, habitat degradation, etc. The study should propose ways to improve MPCA/FGB effectiveness, including their use as an educational resource, community conservation incentive tool, and refugia for globally significant plant species. This may be considered in light of the criteria used for site selection and size, habitat requirements for species, and role MPCA/FGB complexes play in making certain landscape level conservation objectives are maintained. The study should consider how the MPCA/FGB complexes promote achievement of the project objective/outcomes. The study should consider risks to MPCA/FGB effectiveness including genetic isolation and climate change. The study should provide series of recommendations for improving the effective use of MPCA/FGB complexes as conservation tool. These recommendations should provide a firm policy framework for the designation and management of MPCA/FGB complexes. Finally, the study should offer direction regarding the best approaches to monitoring long-term effectiveness.

16.   Complete an international level assessment of opportunities to help rural communities "grow diversity" and provide recommendations for possible improvements

MAP's are important to rural Indian communities as both a commodity and traditional medicine. The project should recruit an expert with extensive international experience (15 years or more) to lead the completion of a one or two-month consultancy to identify opportunities to increase MAP safeguards and generate community level conservation incentives. This assessment and accompanying recommendations would help create a firm technical platform for the implementation of the project's community-based activities (e.g., traditional knowledge, sustainable harvest, and marketing) and provide insights to help inform proposed institutional coordination, strategy, policy and regulatory improvements. The study would help to indentify how best to link ex situ and in situ conservation approaches, utilize MPCA/FGB complexes as an incentive to promote better community-based conservation, consider issues related to the equitable management of resource access and distribution, and propose improvements for community-based business planning and marketing for communities to ensure long-term financial returns and ecological sustainability.

Annexes

1. Evaluation of Results Indicators
2. Mission Schedule and Interlocutors
3. Terms of Reference

Annex One: Progress Towards Results Indicators

Objective	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Mid-Term Status	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Objective: To mainstream conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants including GSMP into the productive forest sector of three Indian states: Arunachal Pradesh, Chhattisgarh and Uttaranchal	Forest area actively managed for sustainable use of MAPs and maintenance of MAP diversity	0 ha. Criteria for what constitutes 'active management to favor sustainable use & maintenance of MAP diversity to be determined and agreed with key stakeholders such as State Forest Departments in Yr 1	c. 32,000 ha of forest in 21 MPCA/FGB complexes primarily managed for sustainable use & conservation of MAPs. A further 6,000,000 ha under management that favours maintenance of MAP diversity, including GSMPs	The field activities have begun. In some states (Chhattisgarh and Uttarakhand) the MPCAs / FGBs are in place. Communities and frontline foresters have received training inputs. In Arunachal Pradesh the field implementation is slow. There is no impact monitoring and evaluation system, the need for sharing information between partners is weak. The NPMU is not fully functional and therefore the objective even at the end of four years is still in preliminary stage.	Targeted biological and management surveys. Field visits, project M&E reports, forest management records	Significant global and national benefits secured by focusing mainly on supply side of MAPs production
	Natural canopy cover as a measure of the overall ecological status of forests under active management for	Bi-annual district wise data on canopy cover status is	Canopy cover maintained or increased as appropriate in each project site. Exact target will be set after baselines are updated for the forests in which the 21 FGBs/MPCAs are situated.	Baseline data is in the process of compilation. The indicators need to be revised as they are contradictory at places (natural canopy cover as a measure of overall ecological status of forests	Forest Survey of India Biennial Reports National	Continued national and state government commitment to achieving the project objective, particularly within MoEF, NMPB,

maintenance of MAP diversity.	available from Forest Survey of India		under active management for maintenance of MAP diversity is not always true.	Remotes Sensing Agency data

Sample monitoring plots in different habitat types for FGBs | SMPBs, SFDs. |
| Population status of selected MAP species including GSMP within FGB/MPCA complexes | Qualitative population status indicators for over 50 species known. For trees and shrubs density per unit area, data are not available, and will be monitored. Similarly, for herbs, areas of occurrence and qualitative assessment of population | Monitoring protocols with species specific plots including appropriate types of ecological indicators to be established in Yr 1.

Population stability of selected species maintained or improved over the years | Base line data is being collected from all MPCAs. | Ecological survey reports on abundance, density, distribution, germination and regeneration rates of target species during Yrs 1 & 3, 5 and end of project | MAP collectors and other forest user/owners from local communities continue to support project objectives

MAP distribution and status may be affected by events such as extreme weather conditions or other perturbations, such as forest fires, increase in herbivores that consume particularly species, etc. |

		status also will be monitored.				
	Population status of selected MAP including GSMP species in wider exploited forests surrounding FGB/MPCA complexes	Baseline as above.	Available generic protocols will be adapted to develop species specific protocols with appropriate types of ecological indicators for specific species established in Yr 1. Population stability of selected species maintained or improved as measured against baseline	This is in very preliminary stage.	Ecological survey reports Yrs 1 & 3, 5 and end of project	
	Number of MAP species including GSMP being harvested sustainably in demonstration sites	Sites where harvesting of GSMP populations takes place are known. Harvesting practices for some of the highly traded plants along with general impacts are broadly known, but	Sustainable harvesting of 5 heavily exploited GSMPs in place by end of project. Monitoring protocols developed for monitoring harvesting and being used annually	This has not been started in any place.	Ecological & social survey reports for baseline, mid and end of project and annual monitoring records as well as annual detailed assessment of impacts on regeneration levels, biomass levels, flowering and fruiting intensities of the 5 GSMP	

		comprehensive assessments are not available. Identification and definition of indicators of 'sustainable harvesting' & monitoring protocols to be defined in year 1				
	Increase in area under different MAP species cultivated by government programmes	Isolated examples of cultivation over limited area	At least 5000 ha of cultivation under different MAP species under private, common and marginal or degraded lands owned by various Govt Depts such as Forests, and private owners.	This is not visible in any project state. In Chhattisgarh *ex-situ* cultivation is done in 48 Acres of private land surrounding the MPCAs with the collaboration of SMPB.	Government records such as agriculture, revenue, NMPB and forest departments.	
	Increase in number of MAP species used in afforestation / cultivation programmes	10% of species are known to be cultivated sporadically in the	Based on the life history strategies of each species and habit, an additional 5 – 7 highly marketed species will be brought under cultivation. These may include herbacious rhizomatous species and species amenable for asexual	Species are reportedly known to FRLHT (also to SMPBs) but this is yet to be implemented on the ground. There is no systematic plan to do this. The Forest Management Plans are still being talked to be revised.	Government records	

		state.	propagation			

Outcome 1: National forest management enabling environment mainstreams MAP conservation and sustainable use

Outcome Output	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Mid-Term Status	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Outcome 1: An enabling environment at the national level for mainstreaming the conservation and sustainable use of MAPs into forest management policies and practices	National forest policy revised to favor sustainable use & conservation of MAPs	No specific focus on MAPs in national forest policy Eg JFM Guidelines do not address sustainable use or conservation of MAPs	Revised national JFM guidelines with stronger focus on conservation of MAPs	This work requires to be planned but so far nothing has been done. An agency ELDF in Arunachal Pradesh has been contracted by the SFD but so far they have not done any substantial work.. For National level JFM guidelines the work has been given to IIFM, Bhopal but the progress so far is far below the expectation in terms of methodology followed by them and the outcome so far. The time allowed is also too much.	The revised JFM guidelines	Key government stakeholders at national and state level are committed to intersectoral dialogue and action to bring about required cross-cutting changes in forest policy and practice and have full backing for doing so at highest political levels
	Strengthened capacity within NMPB to fulfill their mandate	Limited technical and institutional capacity to fulfil key parts of its mandate such as assessing supply of MAPs, actively managing supply and demand and	Capacity needs assessment of NMPB in inception phase. Targeted capacity development of key staff based on results of capacity assessment in Yrs 2 & 3.	The SMPBs are still not fully strengthened. They need additional man power for which they are seeking assistance from National PMU. The present institutional strength of SPMUs and SMPBs is not capable to implement the activities under	Capacity assessment reports Number and content of targeted trainings	Other government departments have sufficient interest in working with NMPB

		particularly for intersectoral national coordination	Mechanisms for assessing supply and demand of MAPs developed and adopted by NMPB by Yr 5. Mechanisms for intersectoral coordination developed and functionng effectively by Yr 3	this outcome. They may need to hire services of individuals rather than firms.	Number and role of trained officers NMPB reports, project reports and records Minutes of national intersectoral meetings
	Greater intersectoral cooperation at state level to achieve sustainable use and conservation of MAPs	No formal intersectoral cooperation in relation to MAPs to date. However, State and Central agencies involved with medicinal plants issues have been identified and committed themselves to provide their expertise for coordinating project components	An intersectoral technical coordination committee established and functioning in each of the project states by end of Yr 2 A National Strategy for the Sustainable Use & Conservation of MAPs signed off by at least 3 central ministries including MoEF and MoH by Yr 4 End of project policy and sector review	This aspect is missing both at National and State level. For example the Project in MoEF is being steered by Environment Department while the works are to be done by forestry personnel which can best be possible by collaborating with Forest and Wild Life Department of the Ministry. NMPB has also been complaining about their participation although they are expected to contribute to co-financing. NMPB is under Health Ministry but headed by CEO of Forest Service. Similarly, at state level there is lack of coordination between SFDs and SMPBs. There is virtually no collaboration with other departments and Ministries (Agriculture, Horticulture, DST, DBT , Rural Development etc)	Reports and minutes of Technical coordination committee meetings. Reports of different ministries/gov ernment departments The endorsed strategy is published Policy & sectoral review concluded with key

					revisions identified.	
	Strengthened and new legal mechanisms to protect community interests over MAPs, including IPR	Existing forest laws do not relate to medicinal plants.	Appropriate legal mechanisms and measures that build on existing mechanisms identified and developed in years 3 & 4 and adopted by end of project	This is yet to be started.	New regulations or laws Amendments to existing laws & regulations	There is sufficient political will at state and national level ratify and adopt new legal mechanisms and/or changes to existing mechanisms
Output 1.1 A national strategy for the conservation & sustainable use of MAPs	A comprehensive national strategy on MAPs	No such strategy exists.	A holistic national strategy paper which addresses conservation, cultivation, sustainable use and trade of MAPs and protection of associated traditional knowledge developed by Yr 3 and issued in the form of a policy guideline to the states by GoI by Yr 5.	This is yet to start	National strategy document and associated GoI notification of the strategy	
Output 1.2 Revised national JFM guidelines with a stronger focus on conservation & sustainable use of MAPs	The revised national guidelines for JFM	Current JFM guidelines do not address sustainable use or conservation of MAPs.	Revised national JFM guidelines with stronger focus on conservation and sustainable use of MAPs especially GSMPs are issued by GoI by year 3.	The work is being done by IIFM, Bhopal but so far their outputs have been below expectation in terms of methodology and outputs.	Revised JFM guidelines and the GoI notification associated with it.	
Output 1.3 Legal mechanisms to protect Traditional Knowledge on harvesting, cultivation & use	Legal mechanisms to protect Traditional Knowledge on MAPs.	There are no implementation strategies or regulations related to traditional ownership rights	Critical gaps in legal framework for protection of Traditional Knowledge, including IPR identified in Yr1. Regulations and legislation to safeguard	This has been contracted to TERI, Delhi. They have already been on the project for about a year but there is no output so far. They need to be exposed for methodological rigour and should be guided to follow certain work	Report on gaps in legal coverage. Proposed draft regulations &	

of MAPs			traditional knowledge developed by Yr 3 by central government and adopted by Yr 4	plan so that they collect information on three project states as well as other replication states. It appears that the team has limited capacity in respect of having vision, methodology and devotion.	laws or amendments to existing laws. The notification and adoption of the legal mechanisms by the concerned government agencies	
Output 1.4 Identification of MAPs suitable for cultivation & inclusion in afforestation & income generating programmes of the NAEB and MoRD	Field verified list of MAPs suitable for cultivation and inclusion in NAEB & MoRD afforestation & income-generating programmes	NMPB has identified and notified 32 species with regional prioritization for cultivation and augmentation, but the list is not based on field information .	Legally notified state specific and field verified species specific list of actions and interventions in place on rolling basis in each of project states in Years, 3, 4 and 5	These are being supported by NMPB for cultivation by farmers. However, lack of field level collaboration between SMPBs, other collaborative agencies and NMPB is resulting in to lot of misappropriation of funds.	Instructions issued by MoEF and MoRD and the respective state governments notifying the list of identified species. The official government notifications and the adoption of the identified species in the officially supported afforestation and income generating programmes.	

Output 1.5 Strengthened capacity of NMPB towards sustainable management and mainstreaming of MAPs	Intersectoral dialogue & cooperation at national level Technical assistance provided to states by NMPB	Currently NMBP has limited capacity to for or engaging in or leading intersectoral dialogue and coordination at national level and limited technical know-how on the sustainable management of wild MAPs	1. Increased instances of intersectoral dialogue and cooperation between relevant government ministries on MAPs conservation and sustainable use. 2. Increased requests by relevant State Government Agencies for technical assistance by NMPB 3.Enhanced fund flow to this sector from different ministries	There is a total lack of inter-sectoral collaboration between NMPB, SMPBs, SFDs and other line departments both at GoI level as well as State level.	Project reports on targeted capacity development provided to NMPB NMPB reports. Minutes of intersectoral meetings Survey feedback from state agencies on technical assistance provided by NMPB	
Output 1.6 Strategy and protocols developed for threat assessment and monitoring conservation status of MAPs	Threat assessment & conservation status monitoring strategy and protocols.	Currently methods for generating field information for assessment of threat and conservation status of MAPs, including GSMPS do not exist.	Scientifically developed and field tested threat assessment protocol for MAPs developed (building on existing rapid threat assessment methods) and published by Yr 4 together with overall MAP monitoring strategy. Strategy and protocols adopted by the project state governments in the management of MAPs by Yr 5.	(This study has been given to FRLHT. However so far no output was made available for evaluation.) The study is yet to start.	The monitoring strategy and threat assessment protocol and government orders mandating the adoption of it as a part of the management of MAPs.	

| Output 1.7 Course module on the conservation & sustainable use of MAPs developed for the Indian Forest Service curriculum | A course module on conservation and sustainable use of MAPs | Currently the syllabus for Indian Forest Service curriculum does not include a module on conservation and sustainable use of MAPs. | To develop the module by year 2 and have it included in the syllabus by year 5. | This work will likely be assigned to IGNFA, Dehradun responsible for training of Indian Forest Service Probationers and in service forest service officers from states. The proposal is under the scrutiny of MoEF/UNDP.

The proposal has been submitted by IGNFA to MoEF/UNDP. This is under scrutiny. | Adoption of the revised syllabus with the MAP course module in the teaching of Indian Forest Service officers and other field functionaries. | |

Outcome 2: Forest management policies for MAP conservation improved in three project states.

Outcome Output	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Mid-Term Status	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Outcome 2 Forest management policies in the three project states that promote and support the conservation and sustainable use of MAPs	State forest policies revised to favor sustainable use & conservation of MAPs	Limited focus on MAPs in key state forest policies, eg JFM Guidelines do not refer to MAPs & Forest Division Working Plans do not address conservation management of MAPs. Other opportunities for forest policy changes at state level to be identified by end of Yr 1.	Revised JFM orders/circulars with stronger focus on conservation of MAPs. Nature of required revisions to be determined based on policy analysis by Yr 1 Forest Division Working Plans in project districts revised	This is still in thinking stage. The National Working Plan Code is being finalized by MoEF. Once it is through then State Working Plans under revision can appropriately include MAPs management in the working circles with full prescriptions.	The revised orders/circulars Revisions to other relevant policy documents published The revised Working Plans	State governments are committed to goals of the CBD and see their relevance with respect to MAPs sector and hence need to modify existing forest policies accordingly

	Strengthened capacity within SMPBs to fulfill their mandate	Limited to non-existent capacity. Capacity needs of each SMPB to be assessed by Yr2/Q2	Over 80% of SMPB management and technical level staff to be sufficiently trained to deliver their mandate effectively by Yr 5	The SMPBs are in different stage of functioning. Lack of qualified staff, and also budget is making them less effective.	Individual State SMPB baseline and end of project capacity assessment reports Project records of targeted capacity development of key SMPB staff based on capacity assessment findings Reports of the SMPBs Verification by interviewing potential SMPB clients.	SFDs, SMPBs and other key sectors committed to intersectoral cooperation to effect policy changes that favour conservation and sustainable use of MAPs, preservation of Traditional Knowledge and protection of community-level IPR.
	Greater intersectoral cooperation to achieve sustainable use and conservation of MAPs	Minimal. No dedicated policy for MAPs although growing interest, eg Chhattisgarh & Uttaranchal declared as 'Herbal States'. Baseline studies by Yr 2/Q2 to include: a) Detailed analysis to establish extent of conflict and	State-level intersectoral & technical coordination committees established. Individual state strategies for the Sustainable Use & Conservation of MAPs signed off by at least 2 government departments in each	This is not seen anywhere.	Extent of change in intersectoral coordination and cooperation from baseline measured by numbers of meetings of state coordination	SFDs, SMPBs and other key sectors committed to intersectoral cooperation to effect policy changes that favour conservation and sustainable use of MAPs, preservation of Traditional Knowledge and protection of community-level IPR.

		cooperation and main requirements for effective consultation and intersectoral action; and b) A detailed review of state-level policies and key sectors to be undertaken to identify key areas for policy harmonization	state by Yr 6		committee, membership of committee, minutes and reports of committees and concrete MAP conservation measures implemented as a result of committee actions Project monitoring reports. Reports of different ministries/government departments Number of state departments that sign off on each state strategy	
Output 2.1 State Medicinal Plant Conservation & Sustainable Use Strategies for Arunachal Pradesh,	The state-specific strategies	No state-specific MAP conservation and sustainable use strategies other than in Uttaranchal State which has a plan, but	State-specific strategies addressing the conservation, cultivation, sustainable use and trade of MAPs and protection of	This has not been progressing so far.	Published strategies and notifications.	

Chhattisgarh & Uttaranchal.		that is not as comprehensives as the strategies to be developed through this project.	associated traditional knowledge formulated for Arunachal Pradesh by year 3 and Chhattisgarh and Uttaranchal by year 4 and notified by each of the three state governments by the following year.			
Output 2.2 Revised state forest policies that support conservation & sustainable use of MAPs.	Revised state forest policies	No specific focus on MAPs in forest policies of these three states.	Revised forest policies that favour sustainable use and conservation of MAPs formulated and adopted by the three project states by year 4.	This is not progressing at all.	Publication of the revised forest policies in the three states.	
Output 2.3 Revised state-level JFM Orders & Guidelines that integrate and strengthen MAP conservation and sustainable use objectives within overall JFM programmes and practices.	Revised state-level orders and guidelines for JFM	State-level JFM orders and guidelines do not address sustainable use or conservation of MAPs.	Revised state-level JFM orders and guidelines with stronger focus on conservation and sustainable use of MAPs especially GSMPs are issued by the respective state governments by year 4.	Arunachal has contracted ELDF. Other states have not finalized. The ELDF is a Delhi based firm interaction with whom have been disappointing in terms of methodology and output.	Copy of the revised state-level JFM orders and guidelines.	
Output 2.4 State-level legal mechanisms to protect traditional knowledge on harvesting, cultivation & use of MAPs.	Strengthened or new state-level legal mechanisms to protect Traditional Knowledge on MAPs including IPR.	Existing forest laws do not relate to medicinal plants. States are in the process of developing their own legislation to implement the National Biodiversity Act which has potential for helping	Legal gaps at state level identified by year 2 following national level analysis. Proposed mechanisms and/or amendments to existing laws and regulations to be based on changes to national level	This has again not been decided as to who will do this, the contractor or SMPBs. The latter have no capacity at present and contractors demand lot of money. Best way would be to identify individuals capable of doing this work.	The notification and adoption of the legal mechanisms by the concerned state government	

		communities protect their interests over MAPs	legislation and to be adopted by Yr 6..		agencies.	
Output 2.5 Strengthened capacities of SMPBs	Capacity of SMPBs to deliver their main mandate in relation to MAP conservation & sustainable use	Limited to non-existent capacity. Capacity needs of each SMPB to be assessed by Yr2/Q2	Over 80% of SMPB management and technical level staff to be sufficiently trained to deliver their mandate effectively by Yr 5	This is in the stage of planning and thinking. They require sanction which has been promised by NPMU.	Individual State SMPB baseline and end of project capacity assessment reports. Project records of targeted capacity development of key SMPB staff based on capacity assessment findings Reports of the SMPBs Verification by interviewing potential SMPB clients.	
Output 2.6 Identification of MAPs suitable for cultivation & inclusion in afforestation & income generating programmes of the NAEB & MoRD at the state level & SFDs & state Rural	State-level lists of suitable MAPs for cultivation in afforestation and income generating programmes of NAEB and MoRD, and SFDs & state Rural Development Boards	Currently no such state-specific field-verified lists of species exists.	Initial state-wise lists ready and notified by Yr 4 by relevant state government departments and final list notified by Yr 6.	The list of species is known to SMPBs. NMPB has drawn the list suitable for different states but it requires planning and collaboration which is so far missing.	The state government notifications and the adoption of the identified species in the government supported afforestation and income	

Development Boards.				generating programmes.	
Output 2.7 Revised forest division working plans that provide clear guidelines for the conservation management of MAPs in all project districts.	Revised forest division working plans in the project districts	Currently the forest divisions working plans do not focus on sustainable use of MAPs.	Revised forest division working plans incorporating the guidelines for the sustainable use of MAPs published in the project districts published and adopted in all the project districts through the course of the project depending on when the working plans are due for revision.	This is not being done. The matter also relates to MoEF (Forestry and Wildlife Wing)	The revised forest division working plans
Output 2.8 Comprehensive baseline and M&E system developed for monitoring the status of medicinal plant resources in each project state	Scientifically compiled comprehensive baseline on the status of MAPs in each of the project states.	Currently none of the project states have a specific information on the status of MAPs or monitoring protocols.	By year 5 the project states will have a dataset on the status of MAPs (i.e. species wise quantitative data on plant density and distribution in the FGBs and state-wide assessments of distribution and abundnce) and operational systems for MAP monitoring.	There is no M&E system available so far.	Project reports and reports of the state government agencies involved with the conservation and management of MAPs.

Outcome 3: Mainstreaming conservation and sustainable use within local government and community management norms

Outcome Output	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Mid-Term Status	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions

Outcome 3 Conservation and sustainable use of MAPs mainstreamed at the local level into government and community forest management norms and practices at demonstration sites in the three project states.	Ha of government forest actively managed for sustainable use of MAPs and maintenance of MAP diversity	0 ha. Criteria for "active management" to favor sustainable use & maintenance of MAP diversity and suitable ecological indicators to be determined in Yr 1	At least 4 MPCAs/FGBs (established in each project state by Yr 4 (3 in state forest & 1 in community forest - 12 in total covering 18,000 ha) & 7 in total per project state by Yr 6 (5 in state forest and 2 in community forest – 21 in total or c. 32,000ha). Mid-way through the project and by the end of the project, respectively, an additional 2,000,000 ha and 6,000,000 ha of forest will be under active management for sustainable use and maintenance of MAP diversity.	This is also not seen as per plan. Only MPCAs and FGB areas have been identified. Further activities in sustainable harvest areas are to be started following a detailed work plan of training of communities and frontline foresters. The targets fixed are far away from being fulfilled.	Government records & project M&E records	Local government & communities perceive value in conservation of MAPs and moving towards more sustainable harvesting of MAPs
	Numbers of SFD officers actively applying their training in conservation management of MAPs	0. Criteria for measuring this to be developed by Yr 2/Q2 at same time as when training module being developed.	To be established of Yr 2/Q3	Very difficult to measure as criteria for measuring this has not been developed so far.	To be determined, but to include field verification component and triangulation – eg results of ecological surveys combined with interviews with different stakeholder	

					groups	
Ha of community forest actively managed for sustainable use of MAPs and maintenance of MAP diversity	Minimal, Indicators to be established in Yr 1 along with criteria for what constitutes 'active management to favor sustainable use & maintenance of MAP diversity including suitable ecological indicators	Capacity gaps of communities, such as those for management and monitoring to be established by end of Yr 1 Subsequently developing monitoring protocols and management practices.	This is also only limited to identifying areas as is the case in Arunachal Pradesh where four MPCAs are located in community forests.	Field surveys, project M&E reports, key informant interviews	
Number of MAP species, including GSMP, for which sustainable harvesting techniques developed.	0	5 GSMPs per year from the Yr 3 onwards.	This has not been done. Nothing visible on the ground but these are activities which can easily be done. The backlog is intriguing	Species harvest protocols developed and implemented in selected Forest Divisions. Project records & Forest Division records	
Number of MAP collectors and other groups practicing sustainable harvesting	0	75% of MAP collectors and all JFM groups practice sustainable harvesting in forest divisions for which	Some training has been given to communities by FRLHT. However the SFDs are not very convinced about the methodology (use of local language as training	Project sample surveys Forest	

			sustainable harvesting protocols have been developed for target GSMPs by Yr 6	medium and outcome)	Division and JFM committee records.	
	Extent of documentation of Traditional Knowledge on MAPs	Documentation is minimal	Target values for mid and end of project to be determined during Yr 1	Documentation started in all the three states during late 2011.		
	Improved knowledge among MAP collectors and community forest users/managers about MAPs generally and about their legal rights, obligations and the requirements for maintaining MAP diversity and abundance	Documentation minimal	Target values for mid and end of project to be determined during Yr 1	Not started	M& E reports related adoption of protocols	
Output 3.1 Demonstration of in situ & ex situ techniques for the conservation management, including sustainable use, of MAP diversity, especially GSMP in state forests	MPCAs,,FGBs, sustainable harvesting practices, propagation and cultivation methods	No such techniques currently in use in project areas	At least 4 MPCAs/FGBs per project state by Yr 4 (3 in state forest and 5 by Yr 6 demonstrating sustainable management practices to target groups of stakeholders

Stable or increased population of target GSMPs as against baseline in state owned forest areas by end of project | These have been laid out in the field. However, further works are to be taken up. | Government records & project M&E records. | |
| Output 3.2 Strengthened MAP conservation | Numbers of SFD officers actively applying their | 0. | To be established by end of year 1. | Nothing to be seen as no criteria for measurement developed so far. | To be determined, but to include | |

management capacity within SFDs.	training in conservation management of MAPs.				field verification component and triangulation – eg results of ecological surveys combined with interviews with different stakeholder groups.	
Output 3.3 Pilot demonstration sites for the in situ & ex situ conservation & sustainable management of MAP diversity on community-owned or managed lands.	No. of pilot demonstration sites for in situ and ex situ MAP conservation & management on community lands	0	At least 1 MPCAs/FGBs established and functioning effectively in community forest in each state by Yr 4 and 2 in each state by Yr 5, with 6 in total by end of project. Additionally, pilot propagation and cultivation of MAPs in private home gardens and farmlands and community lands adjoining forest areas, with a target of 5,000 ha under such cultivation by end of project.	Plots have been laid out but activities are to be started after collecting baseline data, training, development of protocols for sustainable management etc.	Project monitoring reports, PIRs, MTE & TE reports	
Output 3.4 Strengthened community capacity for the conservation and	Proportion of MAP collectors & users practicing MAP conservation & sustainable use.	0	To be established by end of year 1.	Nothing concrete so far.	Targeted sample surveys in project sites	

sustainable use of MAPs.						
Output 3.5 Strengthened community capacity for documenting and conserving Traditional Knowledge relating to MAPS, including traditional medicine, harvesting techniques and how to protect their IPRs.	Extent of documentation of Traditional Knowledge on MAPs by the local communities in the form of documents like community biodiversity registers.	Currently none although the process was started under the National Biodiversity Act 2002	10 such registers to be produced every year in the villages around the FGBs (i.e. 1 per village) from year 2 onwards, with a total of 70 community registers/state produced by end of project	It is being of very preliminary type so far.	Community biodiversity registers and other community documents.	

Outcome 4: Replication and up-scaling of best principles and practices

Outcome Output	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Mid-Term Status	Sources of verification	Risks Assumptions
Outcome 4: Materials and methods developed for replicating the successful models of conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants across other sites in the three states, and more broadly.	Number of additional forest divisions in project states and in replication states adopting successful models. Precise criteria to be determined by mid-project. These could include policy changes, new	Baseline values where known, others to be established by end of Yr 1 Policies No state in India has dedicated strategies for	All targets to be determined by end of Yr 1	There is nothing so far to replicate. The states are known but nothing has started so far.	Government records Revised Policies Revised Working Plans Revised JFM Guidelines Records of number and	Forest owners, managers and users are interested in conserving MAPs and harvesting them sustainably and therefore receptive to adapting lessons and experience of project to their local circumstances and have capacity to do so

	policies, capacity development of SMPBs, SFDs, MAP collectors, community forest users/managers, increased sustainable harvesting of MAPs in state forests and community forests. Number of states developing strategies for Conservation & Sustainable Use of MAPs based on national and project state strategies. Revision of forest division working plans in at least 2 forest divisions in each of the 4 replication states. Training material and modules used and applied. Establishment of effective FGB/MPCA complex in each replication state	the sustainable use and conservation of MAPs Capacity of different stakeholder groups To be established mid-project Forest Working Plans Probably none that take MAPs into account but to be confirmed Training materials & course modules Probably none, but to be confirmed FGBs/MPCAs None in target replication states in either state or community forests			nature of exchange visits between project demonstration sites and other areas involving range of stakeholders	including sufficient funds at their disposal.
Output 4.1 State-level strategies for the conservation &	State-level strategies in 4 additional states	No such strategies currently exist.	State-specific strategies addressing the conservation, cultivation, sustainable	As above	Copies of the four state strategy documents	

sustainable use of MAPs developed in 4 replication states.			use and trade of MAPs and protection of associated traditional knowledge formulated, notified and adopted by four additional state governments by year 7.		and the state government orders notifying these.	
Output 4.2 Capacities of SMPBs strengthened in 4 replication states based on experience of SMPBs in project states.	Capacity of SMPBs in 4 replications states to fulfil their mandate in relation to MAP conservation & sustainable use	Limited to non-existent capacity but to be confirmed by replication states.	Capacity targets to be set in Yr 3 together with relevant state authorities	As above	Comparison of baseline and end of project capacity based on reports of the SMPBs	
Output 4.3 Training materials & module developed for SFD in project states adapted for use in replication states.	Adapted MAPs training materials and module	Currently no such materials available.	To have the state-specific training materials and module ready for the four replication states by year 5 and also have it accepted by the concerned state governments for use in the respective states.	As above	Project reports and published training materials and corresponden ce from the state governments accepting the use of these training materials.	
Output 4.4 Demonstration of in situ & ex situ methods and approaches to the conservation & sustainable use of MAPs through exchange visits	Number of exchange visits, number and type/affiliation of participants involved and techniques demonstrated	None	Targets to be set in Yr 3	As above	Government records & project M&E records.	

between project sites and new districts in replication states.						
Output 4.5 Strengthened capacity for conservation management of MAPs by SFD and selected local communities in replication states.	Increased awareness & knowledge about different options for improved MAP conservation and management, including in situ & ex situ techniques, potential policy changes, etc	Limited such awareness or knowledge	Specific targets to be established by Yr 3.	As above	Before and after capacity self-assessments of sample of SFD managers and community MAP collectors & users in replication states Government records & project M&E records.	
Output 4.6 Revised forest division working plans that provide clear guidelines for the conservation management of MAPs in selected districts in replication states.	Revised forest division working plans incorporating the guidelines for the conservation management of MAPs published in the selected districts of the replication states.	Currently the forest divisions working plans do not focus on conservation of MAPs.	Agreement by replication state governments by end of project to revise forest division working plans to incorporate principles for effective conservation management of MAPs when the working plans are due for their next revision.	As above	Eventual publication and adoption of the revised forest division working plans	

Annex 2:   **Mission Schedule and Interlocutors**

Day	Date	Activity
Thursday	27/10/2011	Review the documents
Friday	28/10/2011	Review the documents
Saturday	29/10/2011	Review the documents
Sunday	30/10/2011	Review the documents
Monday	31/10/2011	Review the documents and prepare for travel to Chhattisgarh
Tuesday	01/11/2011	Chhattisgarh Evaluation
Wednesday	02/11/2011	Chhattisgarh Evaluation
Thursday	03/11/2011	Chhattisgarh Evaluation and travel to FRLHT
Friday	04/11/2011	Meetings with FRLHT officials
Saturday	05/11/2011	Visit to site near Bengaluru (Savan Durga) and start travel to Arunachal Pradesh
Sunday	06/11/2011	Travel to Arunachal Pradesh
Monday	07/11/2011	Arunachal Pradesh Evaluation
Tuesday	08/11/2011	Arunachal Pradesh Evaluation
Wednesday	09/11/2011	Arunachal Pradesh Evaluation
Thursday	10/11/2011	Arunachal Pradesh Evaluation and travel to Delhi.
Friday	11/11/2011	Travel to Bhopal and visit IIFM to interact with Faculty on JFM study
Saturday	12/11/2011	Preparing the draft Report
Sunday	13/11/2011	Preparing the draft Report and travel to Delhi for meetings
Monday	14/11/2011	Meetings with MoEF, UNDP
Tuesday	15/11/2011	Meeting with Director MoEF, NPD and discussion with CEO NMPB
Wednesday	16/11/2011	Round Table Meeting with stake holders
Thursday	17/11/2011	Project Steering Committee
Friday	18/11/2011	Travel to Bhopal for Final Report writing
Saturday	19/11/2011	Draft Evaluation Report writing
Sunday	20/11/2011	Draft Evaluation Report writing
Monday	21/11/2011	Draft Evaluation Report writing
Tuesday	22/11/2011	Draft Evaluation Report writing
Wednesday	23/11/2011	Draft Evaluation Report writing
Thursday	24/11/2011	Travel to Delhi for meeting and collecting material for report writing.
Friday	25/11/2011	Draft Evaluation Report writing
Saturday	26/11/2011	Draft Evaluation Report writing
Sunday	27/11/2011	Draft Evaluation Report writing
Monday	28/11/2011	Draft Evaluation Report writing
Tuesday	29/11/2011	Draft Evaluation Report writing
Wednesday	30/11/2011	Draft Evaluation Report writing

Annex 3:   Terms of Reference

REQUISITE QUALIFICATIONS
The candidates should have at least PhD or MSc in Natural Resource Management or related fields along with 10 years of experience and should have adequate experience in evaluation of GEF project. The national consultant should have sound experience in the area of forestry and other natural resources law and policies in the country and neighboring countries. The candidates should be physically fit and be willing to walk and work in remote locations.

International consultant
1. Professional background in natural resource or related fields with experience and in-depth understanding of medicinal plants conservation approaches as well as community-based natural resource management. A minimum of 10 years of working experience is required;
2. Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes, and experience in evaluation of technical assistance projects with major donor agencies; previous evaluation experience of UNDP-GEF projects is an advantage.
3. Familiar with conservation approaches in Asia either through management and/or implementation or through consultancies in evaluation of conservation projects. Understanding of local actions contributing to global benefits is crucial;
4. Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distills critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;
5. Ability and experience to lead multi disciplinary and national teams, and deliver quality reports within the given time.
6. Writing and communication will be in English, and must have excellent communication skills in English. The consultant must bring his/her own computing equipment.

National consultant –
1. The consultant should have professional background in natural resources management, forestry, conservation and community development, and related fields with a minimum of 10 years of relevant experience; should also have sound understanding and knowledge of relevant laws and policies pertaining to natural resources and in particular forestry and NTFPs.
2. Demonstrated skills and experience in conservation project implementation and management.
3. Knowledgeable on conservation institutions and projects in the country, conservation issues and priorities, and related policies and legislations in particular in relation to biodiversity and medicinal plants;
4. Proficient in writing and communicating both in English. Ability to interpret to the international counterpart and also to translate necessary written documents to English;

Specific Tasks
In particular, the consultant will be responsible for:
Review of the project and suggest specific observations and recommendations with regard to future direction of the project. The consultant will also help identify suitable indicators to measure the success of project outcomes and outputs.

International Consultant/ Team Leader
The Team Leader will have overall responsibility for the work and operation of the evaluation team, including the coordination of inputs from the national consultant. The TL will also have overall accountability for the production of the agreed outputs. Additionally, the TL is responsible for the following:

(i)   Desk research of existing policies, strategies, management plans, survey/research/evaluation reports and database.
(ii)   Conduct fieldwork together with counterpart and interview stakeholders, extension agents and communities to generate authentic information/opinions.
(iii)   Write and compile reports.
(iv)   Make a presentation of key findings highlighting achievements, constraints and make practical recommendations to decision makers and stakeholders.
(v)   Finalise the evaluation report

National Consultant

(i) The national consultant will assist and collaborate with the team leader in all the tasks mentioned above including field work, desk based translation, report writing as agreed with Team Leader and assist with translation in the field.

1. PROJECT CONTEXT & BACKGROUND

Medicinal and aromatic plants (MAPs) are recognized as a major but increasingly threatened global resource. Between 40,000 to 50,000 plant species are known to be used in traditional and modern systems of medicine across the world. The World Health Organization (WHO 2002) estimates that the majority of the world's population, particularly in developing countries, relies on traditional health care based on medicinal plants. A conservative estimate of the annual value of the global medicinal plant trade by The World Conservation Union (IUCN) is in the range of $40 to $60 billion. China is the world's largest producer of medicinal plants and medicines, followed by India (Lambert *et al*. 1997).

A vast majority of medicinal plants are harvested from the wild, particularly from the tropical and subtropical regions of the world (where two-thirds of all plant species are found). Over 70% of the globally known medicinal plants occur in tropical forests (Shankar 1998) and there is growing international concern about the rates of local and global extinction (Klingenstein *et al*. 1997). There is no consolidated record of how many species of medicinal plants are threatened with extinction at present but extrapolations based on the Threatened Plants Database of the World Conservation Union (IUCN) and the NAtural PRoducts ALERT (NAPRALERT) database suggest that at least 20% of medicinal plant species are threatened globally (Farnsworth & Soejarto 1991; Leaman 1998).

India is a member of the Group of Like Minded Megadiverse Countries, a group of 17 countries which together hold more than 75% of the world's biodiversity. India is particularly rich in medicinal plant resources, which have been used in traditional (codified) Indian health systems like *Ayurveda, Sidhha, Unani* and the Tibetan system for millennia. These systems are still very much alive today. Ancient medical texts also bear evidence of the use of plants for veterinary purposes, treating agricultural crop diseases and manufacturing vegetable dyes, cosmetics and perfumes – uses that are still prevalent today. The All India Ethnobiology Survey carried out by the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF) in 1995 estimated that over 7,500 plant species are used by 4,635 ethnic communities for human and veterinary health care across the country.

In 1993, the Government of India (GoI) estimated that between 60-80% of India's population rely on medicinal plants for health care. Medicinal plants are particularly important to the rural poor, who are able to harvest these from the wild to meet their primary health care needs.

Low levels of subsistence-related medicinal plant harvesting generally do not pose a threat to the viability of harvested populations. There is, however, growing concern about the impacts on wild medicinal plant stocks of growing national and international demand for herbal products and the increasing commercialization of the medicinal plant economy. At least 10% of the 7,500 medicinal plant species used by local communities in India are also actively traded within India, with some 50 species also exported in the form of raw drugs and extracts (FRLHT 2003). In 1997, a National Consultation on Medicinal Plants organized by the MoEF revealed that over 95% of medicinal plants used by the herbal industry was harvested from the wild. Over 200 medicinal plant species in southern and northern India are classified as rare, endangered or threatened. The true number of threatened species, including globally significant species, is likely to be far higher, but the status of many species is insufficiently known.

Ninety percent of India's medicinal plants diversity is estimated to be found in its diverse natural forest habitats. The vast majority of such forests are owned and managed by state or Union Territory (UT) governments, mainly by the respective state forest departments (SFDs), although there is increasing community participation in the management of such forests through initiatives like the Joint Forest Management (JFM) Programme (see Annex 1). There are also forests owned by state revenue departments and, in a few areas, notably the north-east of India, there are also community-owned forests.

Despite the fact that most of India's medicinal plant stocks are found on government-owned land, harvesting is still largely uncontrolled and unmonitored (Leaman 1998). There is little systematic or

effective regulation or management of the commercial trade in MAPs by the government or self-regulation by traders and herbal medicine companies. In some parts of the country there are cooperative societies, particularly in tribal areas, which are meant to ensure a fair price to collectors amongst other things, but these are acknowledged to have been largely ineffective in meeting their stated objectives.

The commercial MAPs trade is also poorly understood or documented. There are many links in the supply and demand chain between the collector and the end users of medicinal plant products. Thus, collectors rarely know what are the end products of the plants they collect, where these are retailed (and at what prices) or the end users. Equally herbal product retailers higher up the market chain and herbal product manufacturers rarely know the original source of their materials or the environmental impacts that their demands may be having.

This project seeks to achieve the long term conservation and sustainable use of India's medicinal plant diversity, particularly of its globally significant species. The project will by mainstreaming conservation and sustainable use objectives into forest management policy and practices at the national, state and local level in three Indian states: Arunachal Pradesh in North-East India, Chhattisgarh in Central India and Uttarakhand in North West India. Together, these states represent a broad complement of India's MAP diversity, including numerous globally significant species and populations.

The project's **Objective** is as follows:

The overall goal of the project is to conserve India's medicinal plant diversity. The project objective is to mainstream the conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants into the productive forest sector of three Indian states, with particular reference to GSMPs.

The project aims to achieve its stated objective through the following five proposed outcomes:

1. An enabling environment at the national level for mainstreaming the conservation and sustainable use of MAPs into forest management policies and practices

2. Forest management policies in the three project states that promote and support the conservation and sustainable use of MAPs.

3. Conservation and sustainable use of MAPs are mainstreamed at the local level into government and community forest management norms and practices at demonstration sites in the three project states.

4. Materials and methods developed for replicating the successful models of conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants across other sites in the three states, and more broadly.

5. Effective project monitoring and evaluation, lessons learning and adaptive management

The Project administration is through National Project Management Unit (NPMU) and 3 state project management units (SPMU). MoEF has designated IAIM-FRLHT, Bengaluru as NPMU. The team comprises a National Project Manager (NPM), Dr Abdul Kareem, Assistant Director, IAIM-FRLHT. The present NPM has been there since September 2010. The National Project Director is from the Conservation and Survey Division of the Government of India's Ministry of Environment and Forests.

The Project M&E system includes bi-annual project steering committee meetings at the national and state levels, annual project implementation reviews, periodic field visits by the NPMU and UNDP, mid-term evaluation, terminal report and terminal evaluation. Furthermore, independent annual financial audits are also conducted.

2.   OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The mid-term project evaluation is a UNDP-GEFrequirement for all GEF full size projects and is intended to provide an objective and independent assessment of project implementation and impact, including lessons learned to guide future conservation efforts.

The mid-term evaluation is intended to identify potential project design and implementation problems, assess progress towards the achievement of planned objectives and outputs, including the generation of global environmental benefits, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP-GEF projects and other UNDP projects), relevance of existing components and strategies and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve project design, implementation and the sustainability of impacts, including recommendations about replication and exit strategies. The MTE is also expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from regular project monitoring. The mid-term evaluation thus provides a valuable opportunity to assess signs of ultimate project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments in project design and management. UNDP also views the mid term evaluation as an important opportunity to provide donors, government and project partners with an independent assessment of the status, relevance and performance of the project with reference to the Project Document.

3.   SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The MTE should cover the following broad areas:

1. Project conceptualization, design and implementation approach, including execution modalities and the organogram of the NPMU and the state PMU.

2. Project relevance, i.e. are the project's outcomes consistent with the GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy and country's national priorities?

3. Ownership of the project at the national and local levels; appropriateness of the project being placed in the existing division within the Min of Environment and Forest

4. Stakeholder participation, including gender differences in participation and influence in the project

5. Project effectiveness – progress achieved to date against planned outputs and sub-outputs and likelihood of achievement of planned objectives

6. Sustainability of project achievements and impacts, including an assessment of planned replication and exit strategies

7. Financial planning and sustainability, including the timely delivery and use of co-financing (see Annex 3)

8. Cost-effectiveness, including impacts of delays in project start-up

9. Monitoring and evaluation and the application of adaptive management principles (including effective use of logframe, UNDP risk management system, the annual Project Implementation Reviews, and other monitoring tools and mechanisms as appropriate)

10. Lessons learnt and mid-course corrections needed, if any

Special Issues to be Considered

Additionally, the evaluation should address the following issues that are of particular relevance to this project:

1. The evaluators should particularly consider the structure, including composition, terms of reference, and effective functioning of the NPMU & SPMU, which are critical to the success of the project.

2.   The sustainability of the project as envisaged in the original project design hinges on the establishment of the Long-term funding mechanism. The evaluators should a) assess progress towards the establishment of such a mechanism including the planned feasibility study; and b) assess whether this is still the best option for financial sustainability and/or whether there are now alternative options

that might be more effective given the difficulties encountered with the operationalization of many conservation trust funds.

3. There have been many developments in JFM and other policies related to conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants at national and state level since this project was originally designed. Given this situation, the evaluators are requested to particularly consider whether and how the present project design and strategy (including logframe) need to be adapted. In doing so, the evaluators should consult the findings and recommendations of a stakeholder consultation workshop held in 2008-09 in Chhattisgarh to initiate this process of internal review. The evaluators must also ensure that any changes recommended to project design and strategies are in line with national, GEF and UNDP policy, priorities and requirements.

4. While the GEF Tracking Tools for SO1 and SO2 projects are not currently required for projects that pre-date GEF3, the evaluators should nonetheless determine their usefulness as a monitoring tool for the project.

5. The GEF, UNDP and other donors are paying particular attention to risk analysis and management. UNDP has developed a risk management system within ATLAS and guidance on using this system, which is also now incorporated in the annual PIR. The evaluators are requested to determine how effectively the risk management system is being used as an adaptive management tool. Risks may be of a financial, socio-political, institutional, operational, environmental (or other) type.

6. Considering that UNDP is concerned about poverty reduction, local governance and promotion of gender equity, the review will be required to look at these cross cutting issues.

a. Poverty reduction: How has the project contributed to poverty reduction of communities living in and around the park?

b. Governance: How has the project facilitated the participation of the local communities in natural resource management and decision making processes?

c. Promotion of gender equity: Has the project considered gender sensitivity or equal participation of man and women and boys and girls in decision making processes?

d. The impact of the activities undertaken in the project influencing state and national policy related to conservation, cultivation and sustainable use of medicinal plants.

e. The impact of the project on the mainstreaming efforts towards conservation of biodiversity in general and medicinal plants in particular.

4.   PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION

The main products expected from the evaluation are:

- an interim draft report with findings and clear recommendations for mid-course correction;
- presentation(s) to and consultation with the key stakeholders on the findigs
- a final comprehensive mid-term evaluation report
- project brief with revised indicators

1. At least one, and possibly two, verbal presentations will be made to all major stakeholders on conduct of the MTE and its preliminary findings either in New Delhi and/or Bengaluru, Itanagar, Raipur and Dehradun. Attendance at the presentations will include representatives of local communities, local and state government, project team, the PSC members, relevant NGOs, other local and national stakeholders as well as representatives from MoEF and UNDP.

2. Reporting: The main final output of the evaluation will be an independent and comprehensive Mid-Term Evaluation report with annexes as needed. However, the main report should not exceed 50 pages. The minimum requirements for the content of the final MTE report are given below:

Executive Summary
    a. Brief description of project
    b. Context and purpose of the evaluation
    c. Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

Introduction
    a. Purpose of evaluation
    b. Key issues addressed
    c. Methodology of the evaluation
    d. Structure of the evaluation

The project and its development context
    a. Project start and its duration
    b. Problems that the project seeks to address
    c. Immediate and development objectives of the project
    d. Planned outputs and sub-outputs
    e. Main stakeholders
    f. Results expected

Findings and Conclusions
    1. Project formulation
     - Implementation approach
     - Country ownership/Driveness
     - Stakeholder participation
     - Replication approach
     - Cost-effectiveness
     - UNDP comparative advantage
     - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
     - Any new components or activities to be added to the project for enhancing its effectiveness in terms of achievements of results
     - Indicators
     - Management arrangements
    2. Implementation
     - Financial planning
     - Monitoring and evaluation
     - Execution and implementation modalities
     - Management by UNDP country office
     - Coordination and operational issues
    3. Results
     - Attainment of planned objectives & outcomes
     - Sustainability of impacts (including policy impact and evidence of mainstreaming conservation approaches into sustainable development strategies and programmes)
     - Contribution to national capacity development

Recommendations
    a. Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
    b. Suggestive revision in Terms of reference of the studies commissioned
    c. Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
    d. Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

Lessons learned
    - Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

Annexes
    - TORs

- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaires used and summary of results
- Co-financing and Leverages Resources (see Table 1 attached)

The basis i.e. evidence for the evaluators main conclusions must be clear and the methodology clearly documented.

Recommendations will be based on clearly substantiated findings and stated in operational terms. They will address all issues identified by the evaluation Mission including changes in modalities, processes and ways of working and, in particular the purposes or the evaluation, i.e.:
- the future work plan;
- the need and potential for expanding project activities and a set of criteria for selecting the areas for future expansion; and
- additional support to the project, if any.

3. If considered useful, a tracking tool for GEF SO1 and/or SO2 as appropriate should be completed to the extent possible together with the Project Team.

5. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION & RESPONSIBILITIES

The MTE mission for Medicinal Plants project will include an international and two national consultants. The international consultant, who will have in depth understanding of UNDP and GEF projects including evaluation experience, will be the team leader and will have the overall responsibility for developing the evaluation methodology, leading the evaluation and delivering the key products expected from the evaluation, including coordinating the inputs from the national consultants. The national consultants will provide both technical inputs as agreed with the team leader and assist with translation. The qualifications required for each position are given in Annex 4.

The National Project Director, National Project Manager and his staff, SPMU as well as UNDP India and the UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor in Bangkok, will facilitate the work of the evaluation team.

The Evaluation Team will ensure that there is adequate consultation of all key stakeholders, including Ministry of Environment and Forest, New Delhi, State Forest departments, Government of Arunachal Pradesh, Chhattisgarh & Uttarakhand, State Medicinal Plant Boards, experts engaged in the project, local communities and other relevant local stakeholders such as Vaidyas (local folk healers), drug manufacturing industry in the states, relevant NGOs, UNDP India, UNDP-GEF Regional Coordination Unit Bangkok.

The consultants will sign an agreement with UNDP India and will be bound by its terms and conditions set in the agreement.

6. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation methodology will be determined by the evaluation team, guided by the requirements of GEF and UNDP as articulated in various guidelines, policies and manuals on the conduct of evaluations for GEF projects as well as key project documents such as the approved GEF project brief, the final UNDP project document, the inception workshop report, the project logframe and annual budgets and workplans, the annual Project Implementation Review, Project Steering Committee and TPR minutes as available, earlier PDF-B reports, and other technical reports and documents as relevant. A list of key documents is given in Annex 1. These will be shared with the evaluators by UNDP India.

The evaluation methodology should be clearly documented in the evaluation report including comprehensive details of the following:

- Documents reviewed

- Interviews conducted

- Consultations held with all key stakeholders

- Project sites visited

- Techniques and approaches used for data gathering, verification and analysis

7. CONDUCT OF THE EVALUATION

Under the leadership of the Team Leader, the Evaluation Team will work independently but will liaise closely with UNDP, the Ministry of Environment and Forest, the state nodal agencies and the NPMU. The evaluation mission will also liaise periodically with the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor (RTA) at the UNDP Regional Centre in Bangkok to ensure that UNDP-GEF and GEF requirements are being met including a telephone briefing with the Team Leader at the start of the evaluation. The UNDP-GEF RTA may attend the presentations to stakeholders as well as the meetings with UNDP in Delhi.

The team will visit the project sites at Arunachal Pradesh, Chhattisgarh and Uttarakhand, the NPMU at Bengaluru and Delhi to ensure adequate consultation with all key stakeholders. Towards the end of the field evaluation period, at least one verbal presentation will be made to all key stakeholders either in New Delhi and/or in Bengaluru, Itanagar, Raipur and Dehradun depending on logistical considerations, ie whether it is more practical for local stakeholders including local community representatives and or for key stakeholders to travel to New Delhi and/ or to Bengaluru.

The evaluation team will make a verbal presentation to stakeholders towards the end of the evaluation. After the presentation the team will take note of verbal and/or written responses to its presentation and consider these in preparing an interim draft evaluation report that will be provided to UNDP-India before the team leaves India for distribution to stakeholders. UNDP will circulate the draft report to all stakeholders requesting written feedback which should be sent directly to the evaluators within 10 days of receipt of the draft. The MTE report including all annexes should be finalized within another 10 days of the deadline for receiving comments on the first draft.

While the evaluation team is free to determine the actual layout of the final evaluation report, this must include the minimum content requirements mentioned earlier. The Team Leader will forward the final report by e-mail to UNDP–India and the UNDP-GEF RTA in Bangkok for onward distribution to all stakeholders. The evaluators will be responsible for the contents, quality and veracity of the report.

Tentative Schedule for the MTE

The mid-term evaluation field mission is scheduled to begin around fourth week of August 2011 with the departure of the international consultant from home base. The tentative broad programme is given below. A more detailed schedule is under development.

Date	Day	Location	Activity
11/03	Thurs	Int'l Travel	Arrive Bangalore
11/04	Fri	Bangalore	FRLHT Bangalore
11/05	Sat	Bangalore-Delhi	Visit MPCA Savan Durga in the morning and leave for Delhi by flight in the evening
11/06	Sun	Delhi-Uttarakhand	Morning train travel to Uttarakhand and late afternoon travel to sustainable harvesting site
11/07	Mon	Uttarakhand	Uttarakhand Evaluation
11/08	Tues	Uttarakhand	Uttarakhand Evaluation
11/09	Wed	Uttarakhand	Uttarakhand Evaluation
11/10	Thurs	Uttarakhand	Uttarakhand Evaluation
11/11	Fri	Uttarakhand	Meeting with Officials Uttarakhand (PCCF,

			CEO SMPB and other staff)
11/12	Sat	Delhi	Draft report and finalise recommendations
11/13	Sun	Delhi	Draft report and finalise recommendations
11/14	Mon	Delhi	Discussions with MoEF and UNDP
11/15	Tues	Delhi	Indicators meeting in Delhi
11/16	Wed	Delhi	Project Steering Committee meeting
11/17	Fri	Delhi	De-briefing with MoEF, UNDP
		Int'l Travel	Depart Delhi: 11:35 pm
11/18	Sat	Int'l Travel	
11/19	Sun	Home base	Final Report writing
11/20	Mon	Home base	Final Report writing
11/21	Tues	Home base	Final Report writing
11/22	Wed	Home base	Final Report writing

A tentative list of people to be consulted is given in annex 2. This will also be further refined in consultation with the evaluation team and other key project partners.

Focal persons

MoEF: Dr. Nilarantna, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India. Email:
Ms. Sanchita Jindal, Director, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India. Email:

NPMU: Dr. Abdul Kareem, Assistant Director, IAIM-FRLHT, Bengaluru
email: abdul.kareem@frlht.org

UNDP: Dr. Ruchi Pant, Programme Analyst (Environment)
email: ruchi.pant@undp.org

UNDP Regional Centre in Bangkok: Mr. Doley Tshering, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor (Biodiversity)
email: doley.tshering@undp.org

Annex 1: List of Key Background Documents for the Evaluation

1. Medicinal Plants Project Document
2. GEF approved project brief
3. Annual Project Implementation Review (PIR) 2009 – 2011 (3 PIRs)
4. Minutes of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting 2008-2011 (3 or 4 sets of minutes)
5. Annual financial audit reports
6. Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs)
7. PDF-B related reports
8. GEF Monitoring & Evaluation Policy 2006
9. The Evaluation Policy of UNDP 2006
10. GEF Focal Area Strategy Paper 2007
11. GEF Tracking Tools for Strategic Objective 1 and Strategic Objective 2

Annex 2: Tentative list of key people to be consulted during the evaluation field mission

1. Arunachal Pradesh

   Mr. B.S. Sajwan, IFS, Principal Chief Conservator of Forests, Arunachal Pradesh
   Mr. T. Gapak, CEO, State Medicinal Plant Board
   One Divisional Forest Officer
   One representative of the community

2. Chhattisgarh

   Mr. Dhirendra Sharma, Principal Chief Conservator of Forests, Chhattisgarh
   Dr.A.A.Boaz, CEO, State Medicinal Plant Board,
   Mr. O.P.Yadav, Conservator of State Medicinal Plant Board.
   One Divisional Forest Officer
   One representative of the community

3. Uttarakhand

   Dr. R.B.S. Rawat, Principal Chief Conservator of Forests, Uttarakhand
   Mr. G.S. Pande, CEO, State Medicinal Plant Board
   One Divisional Forest Officer
   One representative of the community

4. Bengaluru

   Mr. D.K. Ved, Advisor, IAIM-FRLHT, Bengaluru
   Dr. K. Haridasan, Joint Director, IAIM-FRLHT, Bengaluru
   Dr. Abdul Kareem, Assistant Director, IAIM-FRLHT, Bengaluru

3. Delhi

   1. Mr. Hem Pande, Joint Secretary, and GEF OFP, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India
   2. Dr. Nilaratna, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India
   3. Ms. Sanchita Jindal, Director, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India
   4. Ms. Caitlin Weisen, Country Director, UNDP, New Delhi
   5. Ms. Alexandra solovieva, Deputy Country Director (Programmes), UNDP, New Delhi
   6. Mr. Srinivasan, Head, Energy and Environment Unit, UNDP, New Delhi
   7. Dr. Ruchi Pant, Energy and Environment Unit, UNDP, New Delhi

8. Mr. Doley Tshering, Regional Technical Advisor, Environment & Sustainable Development Group, UNDP Asia Pacific Regional Centre, Bangkok