1. Project Data

GEF Project ID	1353
IA/EA Project ID	GEL-2328-2740-4822
Focal Area	Multi-Focal
Project Name	Nature Conservation and Flood Control in the Yangtze River Basin
Country/Countries	China
Geographic Scope	National
Lead IA/Other IA for joint projects	UNEP
Executing Agencies involved	Foreign Economic Cooperation Office (FECO) of the Ministry of Environmental Protection
Involvement of NGO and CBO	Among the executing agencies
Involvement of Private Sector	No- Not Involved
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	OP 12: Integrated Ecosystem Management; Global Benefits under Biodiversity, Climate Change, and Sustainable Land Management
TER Prepared by	Joshua Schneck
TER Peer Review by	Neeraj Negi
Author of TE	Xiangyang Fang and Peter Whalley
Review Completion Date	
CEO Endorsement/Approval Date	6/30/2005
Project Implementation Start Date	1/1/2006
Expected Date of Project Completion (at start of implementation)	10/1/2010
Actual Date of Project Completion	12/30/2011
TE Completion Date	3/1/2012
IA Review Date	
TE Submission Date	8/30/2012

2. Project Financing

Financing Source	At Endorsement (millions USD)	At Completion (millions USD)
GEF Project Preparation Grant	0.35	0.35
Co-financing for Project Preparation	0.19	0.19
Total Project Prep Financing	0.54	0.54
GEF Financing	3.65	2.45
IA/EA own	0.25	0.25
Government	20.01	27.89
Other*	2.49	2.57
Total Project Financing	26.40	33.16
Total Financing including Prep	26.94	33.71

*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

3. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF Evaluation Office TE Review
Project Outcomes	S	HS	HS	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	L	L	L
Monitoring and Evaluation	S	S	S	S
Quality of Implementation and Execution	N/A	S	S	S
Quality of the Evaluation Report	N/A	N/A	S	MS

4. Project Objectives

4.1. *Global Environmental Objectives of the project:*

According to the Project Proposal submitted for CEO endorsement (ProDoc), the project's overall objective is "to reduce flood impacts by conserving and enhancing ecosystem functions in the Yangtze River basin."

As further described in the ProDoc, the project's focus on protecting and enhancing ecosystem functioning is expected to provide global environmental benefits including conservation of biodiversity, enhanced carbon sequestration, and sustainable land management.

No changes in the project's Global Environmental Objectives were noted in the project's Terminal Evaluation (TE) or Project Implementation Reports (PIRs).

4.2. *Development Objectives of the project:*

According to the ProDoc, the broad development objective of the project is "to initiate a process leading to integrated ecosystem management in Ecosystem Function Conservation Areas (EFCAs) in the upper basin of the Yangtze River." In addition, the project will "build the necessary capacity to assess and plan the location of future EFCAs, design and implement a system to monitor environmental values, and to demonstrate integrated ecosystem management aimed at multiple environmental benefits in EFCAs."

The project logframe included in the ProDoc defines the following four principle expected project outcomes:

(1) Fully developed institutional mechanism for assessment of ecosystem functions and planning for Ecosystem Function Conservation Areas in the upper Yangtze basin;

(2) Established ecosystem-function-based Monitoring and Early Warning System (MEWS) in the upper Yangtze basin;

(3) Demonstrated efficiency and effectiveness in achieving global environmental benefits and local environmental and socio-economic benefits by taking an Integrated Environmental Management (IEM) approach in the Baoxing demonstration site;

(4) Demonstrated efficiency and effectiveness in achieving global environmental benefits and local environmental and socio-economic benefits by taking an IEM approach in the Laojunshan demonstration site.

No changes in the project's Development Objectives were noted in the project's Terminal Evaluation or Project Implementation Reports.

4.3. *Changes in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities:*

Criteria	Change?	Reason for Change
Global Environmental Objectives	No	
Development Objectives	No	
Project Components	No	
Other activities	No	

5. GEF EO Assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

5.1. *Relevance* – **Satisfactory**

Project outcomes focused on developing tools and methodologies for providing an integrated ecosystem approach for managing degraded and threatened ecosystems along the Yangtze River in China. The project also tested this approach in two large-scale demonstration sites. As such, the project is highly relevant to GEF-3 Operational Program 12: Integrated Ecosystem Management; Global Benefits under Biodiversity, Climate Change, and Sustainable Land Management.

As reported in the TE, project outcomes were highly relevant to the Government of China, and project activities were prioritized by local authorities associated with the project. TE notes that "the TE mission heard frequent reference to the interest taken to the Project's activities at senior levels within the Government of China, including Vice Premier Li Kequiang" (TE, pg 18). This assessment is also supported by the high level of co-financing provided by the Government of China for the project.

5.2. *Effectiveness* – **Satisfactory**

According to the TE, the project has been highly sucessful in achieving all of the expected outcomes defined in the ProDoc. In particular, the project (1) developed methodologies to promote the sustainable use of natural resources in areas critical to flood control, and that provide globally-significant conservation value; (2) developed methodologies and tools to assess the health of ecosystem services including carbon sequestration, water retention, and other services; (3) developed a system for monitoring and providing an early indication of declines in ecosystem health and functioning (MEWS); and (4) demonstrated the impacts of an IEM approach and the MEWS system in the project's two demonstration sites.

Key achievements of the project include:

* An integrated assessment of the distribution of relevant ecosystem function, threats and root causes of degradation in the upper basin of the Yangtze river, as called for in the ProDoc. TE notes that this will provide a solid basis for decision making and implementation measures going forward (TE, pg 9).

* A fully functioning MEWS system in the project's two demonstration sites, and integration of the MEWS system in IEM planning documents, as called for in the ProDoc.

* Measurable improvements in stakeholder incomes and ecosystem health at the project's two demonstration sites;

* Incorporation of the IEM approaches developed by the project into Baoxing County's 12th five year plan (TE, pg 20).

The GEF EO rates project effectiveness Satisfactory, below the HS rating given by IEG, because the project did not deliver on a key expected output:

* Proposals for additional EFCA sites were developed as called for in the ProDoc, but "failed to be delivered and approved by the authorities so far" (TE, pg 109). TE notes this outcome was too ambitious, but that assessment does not detract from the project's failure to deliver upon an important output called for in the ProDoc;

5.3. *Efficiency* – **Moderately Satisfactory**

The project outcomes were achieved with a delay of some 14 months. While part of this was attributable to factors outside the control of the project - the Sichuan earthquake in particular - other delays were linked to problems with inadequate financial reporting that substantially delayed the release of GEF funding. As reported in the TE, only 10 percent of GEF funding had been transferred as of the project's mid-term review (TE, pg 22). TE also notes that the PMO had to devote a substantial amount of time to addressing the reporting deficiencies.

The TE provides insufficient information for assessing the quality of the outputs delivered by the project.

Efficiency of the project is rated as Moderately Satisfactory, as assessed by the TE.

5.4. *Sustainability* – **Low/Moderate Risks**

Sustainability is assessed on the following four parameters:

* Financial sustainability - TE notes that the China State Council and Ministry of Environmental Protection are planning to invest 1.8 billion RMB (~$290 million USD) on county-level monitoring in over 2500 countries throughout China using the MEWS approach (TE, pg 23). TE

also notes that the project has demonstrated the positive return on investment, through ecotourism and alternative cropping systems, that will encourage future investment in the project's IEM approach.

* Socio-political sustainability - TE notes that support is strong for the project's approach among a wide range of local and national stakeholders. This includes support from Vice Premier Li Kequiang, who reportedly gave direction that EFCA's should continue to be implemented by the MEP, and the 11th Five Year Plan (2005-2010) emphasized the importance of IEM. TE also notes support among local famers and stakeholders who have seen added income from implementation of project activities, and the project's demonstration efforts were effective in spreading awareness about the benefits of ecosystem services.

* Institutional sustainability - TE notes that the project has successfully integrated and, in doing so, strengthened key institutions involved in the project. This includes the Chinese Academy for Research on Environmental Science, Chinese Institute of Science, and other academic institutions. TE says there were indications that the PSC and Local Steering Committees established for this project would continue within the Provincial EPBs (TE, pg 24). TE also notes that some PMU staff within the regional government structures received promotions as a result of their work on this project, lending support for the idea that the project's approach will continue to receive support going forward.

* Environmental sustainability - the main threats to project gains appear to come from increased hydro-electric development along the Yangtze.

Risks to sustainability are assessed as low - moderate.

6. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

6.1. *Co-financing*

6.1.1. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by co-financing well integrated into the project?

Reported co-financing was substantial, well integrated, and essential to the achievement of GEF objectives in this project. TE notes that co-financing payments were necessary to keep project activities on-track when GEF funding was held up because financial reporting requirements set forth in the ProDoc had not been met. The Nature Conservancy helped ensure their expertise was included in planning for the PA in the Laojunshan demonstration site.

6.1.2. If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Actual co-financing was some 33 percent higher than anticipated in the ProDoc. TE notes that additional co-financing led to additional outputs that have promoted the benefits of the IEM approach. Additional outputs listed in the TE are:

* Two reports associated with the Baoxing Country demonstration sites: Land Utilization Assessment Report and Social and Economic Evaluation Report;

* TE notes that EFCA tools were applied to support the post Wenchuan earthquake recovery (TE does not describe how this was accomplished);

* Ecosystem function monitoring reports for the two demonstration sites were produced.

6.2. Delays

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

The project required an extension of some 14 months to achieve expected outcomes. Part of this was due to the earthquake in Sichuan Province, which, according to the TE, resulted in project execution delays of approximately 8 months due to staff being diverted to relief operations and the redirection of local budgets and priorities to reconstruction (TE, pg 20). The balance of project delays were attributable to difficulties in financial management of the projects, with the PMO failing to meet the requirements for disbursement of GEF funds in a timely manner. Reporting concerns were apparently addressed, funding shortages were made up by local governments, and the delays were not reported in the TE to have had any affect on the project's outcomes or sustainability (TE,pg 21-22).

6.3. Country ownership

6.3.1. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

Country ownership appears to have been high for project outcomes. This assessment is supported by a current program of China's Ministry of Environmental Protection for identifying potential EFCAs; the high level of government investment in the project, particularly in implementing the two demonstration site activities which were extensive, and the strong involvement of national stakeholders in the PSC and LSCs, as assessed by the TE (TE, pg 30). The high level of country ownership appears to have been essential to the execution of the demonstration projects, especially given that GEF funding was delayed for much of the project, and country-funds had to be used to cover temporary shortfalls in funding.

7. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

7.1. *M&E design at entry* – **Moderately Satisfactory**

As assessed in the TE, the project was designed with appropriate indicators and M&E systems, complete with sufficient oversight through the PSC/LSC to enable establishment of needed baselines. However, the ProDoc failed to separately budget M&E measures in.

7.2. *M&E implementation* - **Moderately Satisfactory**

M&E plan implementation is satisfactory. The project undertook the expected reporting and supervision of progress through half-yearly reports, annual project reviews, and PSC meetings, with an exception that no PSC was held in 2010. According to the TE "despite requests from the Task Manager a PSC was not organized in 2010. The PMO reasoned that there had been sufficient meeting of the SAG to oversee the technical elements of the project..." (TE, pg 33). A number of other shortcomings relating to insufficient tracking of project progress are noted in the TE, including the assessment that they were addressed towards the end of the project. A clear breakdown for the budget for M&E activities was not provided to the TE. The project is therefore rated as Moderately Satisfactory in terms of M&E Implementation.

8. Assessment of project's Quality of Implementation and Execution

8.1. *Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution* - **Moderately Satisfactory**

8.2. *Overall Quality of Implementation* - **Moderately Satisfactory**

The project benefited from a well conceived project design, including targets and indicators that were measureable, achievable, and time-bound. However, from the TE and PIRs, it appears overall supervision from UNEP could have been stronger. Project's MTE stated that UNEP staff had not had sufficient time to supervise the project or to participate in field visits (TE, pg 32). Project also experienced substantial delays in funding due to inadequate financial reporting that UNEP supervision should have addressed early on.

Overall quality of implementation is rated as Moderately Satisfactory.

8.3. *Overall Quality of Execution*- **Moderately Satisfactory**

Project achieved all of its expected outcomes, which is of primary importance. Minor shortcomings include (1) difficulty in meeting expected financial reporting, which delayed the project's funding and completion date, and (2) failure to report on M&E expenditures.

Project appears to have demonstrated good adaptive management in the following instances:

* Production of additional reports related to the MEWS systems, as recommended by the SAG and MEWs team;

* Incorporating a model from Stanford University into the MEWS work;

* Keeping project activities on-track during project periods where substantial delays in GEF funding were occurring;

* incorporating a EFCA visualization tool to allow for non-experts to better understand and utilize project outputs.

Weaknesses in execution were the failure to adequately report financial expenditures as set forth in the ProDoc, which resulted in substantial delays in allocation of GEF funding. This was addressed satisfactorily by project's end. And project failed to report on M&E expenditures.

Overall quality of execution is Satisfactory.

9. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

Criteria	Rating	GEF EO Comments
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	**Moderately Satisfactory**	The report does a fine job of presenting a listing of the relevant outputs and outcomes achieved by the project. What is missing is a deeper analysis on how those outputs and outcomes were achieved, the factors that led to those achievements, and whether there were any negative impacts from the project, and if not, how this was achieved.
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	**Moderately Unsatisfactory**	The report lacks sufficient evidence to support many of the findings, and fails to provide context that would help the reader better understand how the project was implemented and executed. For example, the project suffered from reporting difficulties that substantially delayed transfer of the GEF grant. This item is mentioned in the PIRs but barely touched upon in the TE. How was it possible that this did not affect project outcomes? - the reader is left guessing. It's also not clear from the TE what the impact of the decision by local authorities to close down numerous mining operations near the Yangtze river, what impacts this had on the workers in those plants. This decision was clearly linked to the project, and should have been addressed by the TE as an clear case of the potential short-term costs of acting upon project recommendations/information. The degree to which the project's approach has effectively improved stakeholder livelihoods is therefore difficult to fully assess. There is also very little information conveyed on the quality of outputs. In particular, the MEWS system. How does it work? Are there differences in capacity in the areas where it's been implemented? Again, the reader is left guessing. This is particularly important as little of the project's knowledge outputs are available online or have been translated to English, so the reader is very reliant upon the TE.
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	**Moderately Satisfactory**	The report mentions three indications of project sustainability: support from Vice Premier Li Kequiang; a plan by the Chinese government to invest in additional funds in country-level monitoring; and some evidence that the project has strengthened key institutions in China. However, little context is provided that would help interpret these claims and provide a stronger sense for how significant they are. Also the threats to project sustainability from hydro-electric development is only mentioned in passing.
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	**Moderately Unsatisfactory**	Lessons and recommendations, while straightforward, are of a general nature, and don't really delve into the lessons that should have arisen from a project of this size and complexity. Little was said about the challenges experienced by the project, in particular the challenges in meeting the reporting requirements which substantially delayed funding for the project.
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	**Satisfactory**	Yes. Although little information is provided on why co-financing is substantially higher than planned. Report also fails to show budgeting for M&E although TE notes that this breakdown was unavailable.
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	**Moderately Satisfactory**	A fuller discussion of methodology underlying assessments of project impacts, how baselines were established, and what kinds of surveying approaches were used to assess the project impacts would have been helpful. Also, there was no in-depth discussion of the what kinds of reporting challenges were faced in reporting on financial expenditures of the project, or why the monitoring indicators where changed during the project.

10. Other issues to follow up on

11. Sources of information

Annex I – Project Impacts as assessed by the GEF Evaluation Office

Did the project have outputs contributing to knowledge being generated or improved? Yes

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO KNOWLEDGE BEING GENERATED OR IMPROVED?

According to the TE, the project has produced the following outputs that have contributed to knowledge generation:

* Four reports on accessing ecosystem functions relevant to nature conservation and flood control in the Yangtze River basin;
* Three reports assessing threats to, and root causes of, degradation of ecosystem functioning, as well as an economic assessment report on ecosystem valuation in the Yangtze River basin;
* One integrated assessment report on ecosystem function in the upper reaches of Yangtze River was produced, and a software platform on Ecosystem Service Assessment;
* An assessment report recommending the construction of new Ecosystem Function Conservation Areas in the upper reaches of the Yangtze River;
* Studies were undertaken to define the environmental baseline of the two demonstration sites in the project.
* A report detailing the status of protected areas in Baoxing County, and recommending the establishment of buffer zones and defining ecological corridors for connecting the individual protected areas;
* Surveys and analyses supporting the development of a new protected area at Laojunshan, and the use of Integrated Ecosystem Management in the management of this protected area, was undertaken with the Nature Conservancy.

Is there evidence that the knowledge was used for management/ governance? Yes

HOW WAS THIS KNOWLEDGE USED AND WHAT RESULTED FROM THAT USE?

According to the TE, knowledge generated through the project was used in the following way for management/governance:

* The Ecosystem Software platform on Ecosystem Service Assessment and integrated reports were applied to Dujiangyan Eco-City Planning and the Work plan for Post Three Gorge Project;
* The Ecosystem Function Conservation Area tools were also applied to support the post-Wenchuan Earthquake Reconstruction Plan for biodiversity and rapid assessment of ecosystem health;
* The Assessment report recommending the construction of new Ecosystem Function Conservation Areas in the upper reaches of the Yangtze River provided a basis for Payment for Ecosystem Services development in the project area;
* Recommendations from the report on Baoxing County protected areas, including establishment of buffer zones and corridors were put into place (TE, pg 15).
* Surveys and analyses undertaken at Laojunshan have been used to help design and strengthen a new National Park at Laojunshan with Integrated Ecosystem Managment elements, working with the Nature Conservancy in particular.

Did the project have outputs contributing to the development of databases and information-sharing arrangements?

Yes

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO INFORMATION BEING COMPILED AND MADE ACCESSIBLE TO MANY?

According to the TE, a series of thematic and integrated databases were produced that contain information related to the ecosystem functioning assessment and monitoring activities (Outcomes 1&2) in the Yangtze River basin.

Is there evidence that these outputs were used? | UA

TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THESE OUTPUTS BEEN USED?
WHAT HAS RESULTED FROM INFORMATION BEING MADE ACCESSIBLE TO OTHERS?

TE states that the *"database will provide the baseline assessment method and data for the catchment, and will promote the development of ecological compensation leading to a solid basis for decision making and implementing appropriate measures"* (TE, pg 9). To what extent this has happened is unclear from the TE or the PIRs.

Did the project have activities that contributed to awareness and knowledge being raised? | Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE BEING RAISED?

According to the TE, the project had the following awareness and knowledge generation activities:

* A series of training activities were convened to establish and improve capacity for using the Monitoring and Early Warning System (MEWS) at the two demonstration sites;
* At the Baoxing demonstration site, the project carried out 42 public awareness activities on IEM concepts and approaches, biodiversity, policies and laws, alternative livelihood, ecosystem monitoring, eco-tourism, community-based co-management, improved techniques for vegetable and fruit planting; released 10,000 copies of training materials; trained 500 staff, trained 5000 students, trained 22,000 farmers; and "increased" awareness among surveyed residents of ecological conservation values to 80% (although TE notes that no baseline value is available);
* At the Laojunshan demonstration site, the project trained more than 800 people directly and more than 10,000 indirectly. The project organized a series of replication efforts including publicizing the Laojunshan IEM rules; held discussions on the IEM and biodiversity conservation; exhibited the outcomes from the biodiversity conservation in the Northwest part of Yunnan Province; and disseminated the lessons from Laojunshan demonstration site;
* A socio-economic survey was convened by Renmin University of China to better understand the socio-economic results from IEM practice (TE, pg 9).

Was any ***positive*** change in behavior reported as a result of these activities? | Yes

WHAT BEHAVIOR (POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE) HAS CHANGED AS A RESULT?

As reported in the TE, the project achieved the goal of changing stakeholders' behavior with respect to environmental management. TE notes *"there are clear examples of local farmers and villagers moving from a destructive past with regards to the environment to protecting and preserving the environment. This has been achieved through improved awareness of the importance and value of the ecosystem and by demonstrating the significant economic benefits of alternative livelihoods practiced at the two demonstration sites"* (TE, pg 20). TE notes behavioral changes are also evident at the administration level in China.

Specific changes in behavior attributable to the project that are listed in the TE include:

* In Baoxing country 110 stone working industrial operations have been suspended, reducing ecosystem damage from destructive extraction techniques and pollution (TE, pg 21).
* In Laojunshun demonstration area, the installation of biogas plants, efficient stoves, and solar water heaters, along with awareness-raising activities has reduced the demand from wood by 12,889 m3 per year (equivalent to 750 ha of forest) (TE, pg 106).
* In Lashihai, over 1000 villagers are engaged in ecotourism which has increased family income by an average of 4,500 RBM/month. (TE, pg 21).

Did the project activities contribute to building technical/ environmnetal management skills? Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO ***TECHNICAL/ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SKILLS*** BEING BUILT OR IMPROVED?

The project had numerous training activities on ecosystem assessment and monitoring. These included:

* A series of training activities were convened to establish and improve capacity for using the Monitoring and Early Warning System (MEWS) at the two demonstration sites. This included training in GIS and information management;
* At the Baoxing demonstration site, training on IEM concepts and approaches, biodiversity, policies and laws, alternative livelihood, ecosystem monitoring, eco-tourism, community-based co-management, improved techniques for vegetable and fruit planting; including through the release of 10,000 copies of training materials.
* At the Laojunshan demonstration site, training on the Laojunshan IEM rules, IEM in general, and biodiversity conservation, as well as lessons from Laojunshan demonstration site.

Is there evidence of these skills being applied by people trained? Yes

HOW HAVE THESE SKILLS BEEN APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE TRAINED?

As reported in the TE, the MEWS and IEM information systems have been applied to IEM management practice at the project's two demonstration sites.

Did the project contribute to the development of legal / policy / regulatory frameworks? Yes

Were these adopted? Yes

WHAT LAWS/ POLICIES/ RULES WERE ADOPTED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

As reported in the TE,

* The Baoxing County IEM plan developed by the project was reviewed and approved by the Sichuan Province Local Steering Committee on December 2010 and released by the County Government for implementation by the relevant government authorities (TE, pg 14). This plan includes regulations on extractive mining activities in the project area, whereby industry will be required to comply with IEM-compliant mining procedures which include the installation of wastewater treatment facilities;
* The Plan on Laojunshan Ecological Management Rule and the Management Rules for IEM at Laojunshan Demonstration site were developed and released as official government files of the Yulong county Government, which requires that IEM is incorporated into the village-level rules and regulations, cross-sectoral management and broader participation for better IEM management (TE, pg 16).

Did the project contribute to the development of institutional and administrative systems and structures? Yes

Were these institutional and administrative systems and structures integrated as permanent structures? Yes

WHAT OFFICES/ GOVERNMENT STRUCTURES WERE CREATED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

The project helped establish two institutional bodies that manage IEM activities and planning at the two demonstration sites. As called for in the ProDoc, these two bodies were to become permanent "Integrated Ecosystem Management and Conservation Committees (IEMCCs) with the responsibility to guide and coordinate all programs that directly or indirectly affect the ecosystem functions in the EFCA. However, it is not clear from the TE whether this same institutional arrangement will take place following project closure. TE notes strong support for the project's IEM approach among key stakeholder. TE notes that there were indications that *"these bodies would continue within the Provincial Environmental Protection Bureaus"* (TE, pg 24). It should also be noted that the TE took place before project closure (about six months prior to the close of the project), meaning the TE's assessment on this point is speculative.

Did the project contribute to structures/ mechanisms/ processes that allowed more stakeholder participation in environmental governance?

Yes

Were improved arrangements for stakeholder engagement integrated as permanent structures?

UA

WHAT STRUCTURES/ MECHANISMS/ PROCESSES WERE SUPPORTED BY THE PROJECT THAT ALLOWED MORE STAKEHOLDERS/ SECTORS TO PARTICIPATE IN ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE/ MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES?

TE notes that IEM plans and activities at both of the project's demonstration sites were undertaken with broad stakeholder involvement, as called for in the ProDoc (TE, pg, 14). As to whether or not the broad stakeholder involvement extended into actual input and control over the decision-making process, no information is provided in the TE. TE notes only the numbers of participants that took place in training and awareness activities, and makes the general pronouncement that support for the project is high among all stakeholders. Quantified benefits to local stakeholders income detailed in the TE does lend support for the TE's assessment.

Did the project contribute to informal processes facilitating trust-building or conflict resolution?

UA

WHAT PROCESSES OR MECHANISMS FACILITATED TRUST-BUILDING AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION? WHAT RESULTED FROM THESE?

No information is provided in the TE or PIRs on whether the project's stakeholder consultation components included trust-building or conflict resolution processes.

Did the project contribute to any of the following:		Please specify what was contributed:
Technologies & Approaches	Yes	Development and promotion of an Integrated Ecosystem Management approach for the Yangtze River Basin, and a Monitoring and Early Warning System tracking key environmental indicators.
Implementing Mechanisms/Bodies	Yes	Implementing bodies managing the IEM approach at the project's two demonstration sites. These bodies are to continue after project close, as part of the local Environmental Protection Bureaus.

Financial Mechanisms	No	

Did r**eplication** of the promoted technologies, and economic and financial instruments take place? Yes

SPECIFY WHICH PLACES IMPLEMENTED WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH.

WHAT WAS THE RESULT IN THOSE PLACES (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

As reported in the TE:

* Sichuan Province Government is requiring other counties to replicate Baoxing IEM Models for ecological conservation purposes;
* IEM concepts and approaches were incorporated to Ecological Functional Zoning of Yunnan, the Biodiversity Conservation and Utilization Plan of Yunnan, The Biodiversity Action Plan in Northwest Yunnan, and "other key provincial environmental protection plans" (TE, pg 26);
* In addition to Luguhu Lake and Chenghai Lake, Yunnan government is planning on replicating the IEM information system in 7 plateau lakes of Yunnan (TE, pg 26).

Did **scaling-up** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place? Yes

SPECIFY AT WHAT ADMINISTRATIVE & ECOLOGICAL SCALE AND WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS ADOPTED.

HOW WAS IT MODIFIED TO FIT THE NEW SCALE? WHAT WAS THE RESULT AT THE NEW SCALE/S (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

According to the TE, China's Ministry of Environmental Protection (MEP) has started to develop an ecological assessment and monitoring approach for disaster prone areas based on the methodologies developed in this project (TE, pg 25). MEP is developing a new Management plan that will cover 2,058 counties at 29 provinces in China. TE notes that the plan's "...ecological function monitoring methodologies including water resource retention and soil stabilization under the Monitoring for disaster prone zones are developed on the basis of the MEWS from the Yangtze Project" (TE, pg 26).

Did **mainstreaming** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place? Yes

SPECIFY HOW (MEANS/ INSTRUMENT) AND WHICH ASPECTS OF THE TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS INCORPORATED INTO THE EXISTING SYSTEM. WHAT WAS THE RESULT OR STATUS (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

TE notes that IEM concepts and approaches developed in this project were "mainstreamed" into the Baoxing county development plan and thematic plans for 2011-2015 (TE, pg 26). What effect, if any, this may have is not stated in the TE.

Did r**emoval of market barriers** and sustainable market change take place? No

SPECIFY HOW DEMAND HAS BEEN CREATED FOR WHICH PRODUCTS/ SERVICES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO GEBs.

Based on most of the project's components and/or what it generally intended to do, what type of project would you say this is?

Combination	<--*dropdown menu*

If "combination", then of which types?

Knowledge & Information	&	Implementation Strategies	<--*dropdown menu*

*QUANTITATIVE OR ANECDOTAL DETAILS ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **PRESSURE HAS BEEN REDUCED/PREVENTED** OR ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **STATUS HAS CHANGED** AT THE DEMONSTRATION SITES AS A CONTRIBUTION/RESULT OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES. FOR SYSTEM LEVEL CHANGES, SPECIFY THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR ECOLOGICAL SCALES.*

Was stress reduction achieved? Yes

If so, at what scales? Please mark 'x' for all that apply

x	Local	x	Intended (local)		Unintended (local)
	Systemic		Intended (systemic)		Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained? x Measured | Anecdotal

Was there a change in environmental status? Yes

If so, at what scales? Please mark 'x' for all that apply

x	Local	x	Intended (local)		Unintended (local)
	Systemic		Intended (systemic)		Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained? x Measured | Anecdotal

Evidence of intended stress reduction achieved at the **local level**

Evidence of intended stress reduction at the project's two demonstration sites, reported in the TE include (TE, pg 21):

* 210,000 ha of natural reserves have been formed and resulting water retention increased. At the Baoxing demonstration sites it is estimated that water retention has increased by 260,000 m3 and that will have a positive impact on flood control;
* In Baoxing county 110 stone mining industrial operations have been suspended, thereby reducing damage from destructive extraction techniques and pollution;
* At the Baoxing demonstration sites, more than 1000 biogas digesters have been installed, reducing demand for coal and/or wood and decreasing CO2 emissions by 2000 tons/year;
* At the Laojunshan demonstration site, biogas plans and efficient ovens and solar heaters have reduced demand for firewood by 12,889 m3 per year, equivalent to 750 ha of forest (TE, pg 123). CO2 emissions at this site were reduced by 181 tons/year through a small hydroelectric power plant.

Evidence of intended stress reduction at a **systemic level**

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at the **local level**
*

TE reports that at the Laojunshan demonstration site:

* Forest coverage increased from 67.8% in 2005, to 74.7% in 2011;
* Counts of the endangered Snub-Nosed monkey increased from 80 in 2005 to 290 in 2011;
* Counts of water birds increased from 25,000 in 2005 to 100,000 in 2011.

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at a **systemic level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **local level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **systemic level**

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place during the project?

Environmental	Yes
Socioeconomic	Yes

To what extent were arrangements in place and being implemented during the project? Briefly describe arrangements.

Environmental and socioeconomic monitoring was a key part of the project, and extended through all four project components. Environmental monitoring was developed and used to inform the identification of Ecosystem Conservation Function Areas (Component 1); in the development and implementation of the Monitoring and Early Warning System (MEWS); and at the project's two demonstration sites. A socio-economic survey was convened by Renmin University of China to better understand the socio-economic results from IEM practice (TE, pg 9). Relevant baselines were also established as part of project monitoring.

To what extent did these arrangements use parameters/ indicators to measure changes that are actually related to what the project was trying to achieve?

Project indicators track some of the changes that the project has sought to measure, in particular water retention capacity. Final PIR notes that some logframe indicators assessing project outcomes were modified. Revised set of process and stress reduction indicators was developed by the consultants and the Project Management Office, which was reviewed and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee in 2009 (Final PIR, pg 32).

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place to function after the project?

Yes

To what extent were arrangements put into place to function after GEF support had ended? Briefly describe arrangements.

It's not entirely clear from TE or PIR who will be responsible for maintaining monitoring of environmental and socioeconomic impacts, but the TE gives a strong indication that monitoring will be maintained and expanded.

Was there a government body/ other permanent organization with a clear mandate and budget to monitor environmental and/or socioeconomic status?

For the project's duration, yes. Following project's closure, it's not clear from the TE what agency in China will be responsible for monitoring.

Has the monitoring data been used for management? Yes

How has the data been used for management? Describe mechanisms and actual instances.

Monitoring was used to inform demonstration activities, including restoration of degraded sites and location of protected areas and corridors connecting protected areas.

Has the data been made accessible to the public? UA

How has the data been made accessible to the public? Describe reporting systems or methods.

Training materials on the IEM approach were distributed at numerous events. However, it's unclear from the TE to what extent the project's reports and monitoring data have been made public. The project's website does not contain any of the project reports listed in the TE (Josh Schneck, accessed 2/10/2013).

"SOCIOECONOMIC" REFERS TO ACCESS TO & USE OF RESOURCES (DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS), LIVELIHOOD, INCOME, FOOD SECURITY, HOME, HEALTH, SAFETY, RELATIONSHIPS, AND OTHER ASPECTS OF HUMAN WELL-BEING .AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE, INCLUDE "BEFORE" AND "AFTER" NUMBERS, YEARS WHEN DATA WAS COLLECTED, AND DATA SOURCES.

Did the project contribute to **positive** socioeconomic impacts? Yes

If so, at what scales? Please mark 'x' for all that apply

x	Local	x	Intended (local)		Unintended (local)
	Systemic		Intended		Unintended (systemic)

			(systemic)		
How was the information obtained?	x	Measured		Anecdotal	

Did the project contribute to **negative** socioeconomic impacts? No

If so, at what scales? Please mark 'x' for all that apply

	Local		Intended (local)		Unintended (local)
	Systemic		Intended (systemic)		Unintended (systemic)
How was the information obtained?		Measured		Anecdotal	

Evidence on intended socio-economic impacts at the **local level**

As reported in the TE:

At the Baoxing County demonstration site:
* Average income for farmers has increased to 55,000 RMB/family/year as a result of an alternative plantation program;
* Through community ecotourism development, Yaoji Tibetan Township has secured 850,000 Mu of alpine grasslands;

At the Laojunshan demonstration site:
* An ecotourism project developed in Lashihai Township engaged 1,235 villagers, bringing in 2,860 Yuan per month.
* Income for 5 villages increased from 162 M RMB/year (2005) to 310 M RBM / year (2011) (TE, pg 11).

Evidence on intended socio-economic impacts at **systemic level**

Evidence on unintended socio-economic impacts at the **local level**

Evidence on unintended socio-economic impacts at **systemic level**

Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report

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

* Much of this project's success can be attributed to strong government support at all levels (Central, Regional and Local) for the project's outcomes;
* The project demonstrated the importance of a strong, dedicated and stable Project Management Office to achieving project objectives;
* The project benefited from the inclusion on the Project Steering Committee of members who had an inter-ministerial and inter-departmental role in Regional and Local governments. This ensured that relevant sectors were present in the planning of activities;
* The project benefited from strong technical oversight provided by the Scientific Advisory Group, as their input provided additional confidence on the validity of outputs and conclusions reached by the project;
* The project benefited from demonstration sites that were well designed and provided real-world testing of the IEM concepts promoted through this project. Project demonstrations allowed for clear linkages between IEM approaches and environmental and economic benefits to communities where these measures were implemented;
* Difficulties experienced by the project in meeting the financial reporting requirements established in the ProDoc could have been alleviated by having a dedicated financial officer within the PMO.

Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

Following is a summary of the recommendations provided in the TE:

* The project's achievements and approach should be of interest to the wider GEF community. Efforts should be made by the GEF to develop a mechanism for sharing project results between GEF focal areas;
* FECO/MEP should take the lead in partnership with UNEP to develop a future project capitalizing on the lessons and achievements of this project, and extending to encompass river basin management needs, including issues of excess nutrient load from storm runoff, as well as hydro-electric infrastructure impacts on river ecosystem services;
* PMO should update and maintain the project website in both Chinese and English as part of project closure.