

## 1. Project Data

|                                                                  |                                                                                           |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| GEF Project ID                                                   | 3309                                                                                      |
| IA/EA Project ID                                                 | TBD                                                                                       |
| Focal Area                                                       | International Waters                                                                      |
| Project Name                                                     | Participatory Planning and Implementation in the Management of Shantou Intertidal Wetland |
| Country/Countries                                                | China                                                                                     |
| Geographic Scope                                                 | National                                                                                  |
| Lead IA/Other IA for joint projects                              | UNEP                                                                                      |
| Executing Agencies involved                                      | Zhongshan University                                                                      |
| Involvement of NGO and CBO                                       | Not involved                                                                              |
| Involvement of Private Sector                                    | No- Not Involved                                                                          |
| Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives           | OP 8 - Waterbody-Based Operational Program                                                |
| TER Prepared by                                                  | Nelly Bourlion                                                                            |
| TER Peer Review by                                               | Neeraj Kumar Negi                                                                         |
| Author of TE                                                     | Francis Hurst                                                                             |
| Review Completion Date                                           |                                                                                           |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval Date                                    | 28/06/2007                                                                                |
| Project Implementation Start Date                                | 15/11/2007                                                                                |
| Expected Date of Project Completion (at start of implementation) | 01/11/2010                                                                                |
| Actual Date of Project Completion                                | 01/11/2010                                                                                |
| TE Completion Date                                               | 01/03/2012                                                                                |
| IA Review Date                                                   | 04/09/2012                                                                                |
| TE Submission Date                                               | 9/21/2012                                                                                 |

## 2. Project Financing

| Financing Source                     | At Endorsement<br>(millions USD) | At Completion<br>(millions USD) |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| GEF Project Preparation Grant        |                                  |                                 |
| Co-financing for Project Preparation |                                  |                                 |
| Total Project Prep Financing         | -                                | -                               |
| GEF Financing                        | 0.40                             | 0.40                            |
| IA/EA own                            | 0.12                             | 0.12                            |
| Government                           | 0.40                             | 0.40                            |
| Other*                               |                                  |                                 |
| Total Project Financing              | 0.92                             | 0.92                            |
| Total Financing including Prep       | 0.92                             | 0.92                            |

\*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         | S                      | S                           | S                               |
| Sustainability of Outcomes              | N/A       | ML                     | ML                          | ML                              |
| 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                           | HS                              |

### 4. Project Objectives

#### 4.1. *Global Environmental Objectives of the project:*

The Global Environmental objective of the project is “to create an environment at the regional level, in which collaboration and partnership in addressing environmental problems of the South China Sea, between all stakeholders, and at all levels is fostered and encouraged, and to enhance the capacity of the participating governments to integrate environmental consideration into national development planning.”

No changes in Global Environmental Objectives were reported in the PIR or in the Terminal Evaluation.

#### 4.2. *Development Objectives of the project:*

According to the project appraisal document, the long-term development objective of this project is “Reversing the environmental degradation trend of the South China Sea and the Gulf of Thailand”.

The immediate objective is “To demonstrate a set of stress reduction measures effective at the Shantou Intertidal Wetland ecosystem, i.e. an intertidal wetland near a rapidly developing urban area”.

The overall outcome is a demonstration of how a cross-sector participation scheme in the integrated management of a regionally significant wetland habitat can prevent further wetland ecosystem degradation and rehabilitate important habitats for migratory water fowls.

The SCS Project was to address, as one of its project components, habitat degradation and loss, in particular mangrove, coral reef, sea grass, and wetland habitats through a number of demonstration projects

The project log frame in the appraisal document lists the following immediate outcomes of the project:

- (1) "Area management improved through the establishment of cross-sectorial management body and the development and implementation of an integrated management plan"
- (2) "Conservation and rehabilitation of some wetland areas achieved"
- (3) "Environmentally friendly economic activities promoted"
- (4) "Education and public awareness raising on wetland conservation promoted"

No changes in Development Objectives or outcomes were reported in the PIRs or in the TE.

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*

The Project was developed within the framework of an earlier and much larger SCS project and was selected following a thorough and systematic approach identifying sites for demonstration projects. It sits firmly within the GEF Operational Programme 8, Water-based Operational Programme.

Furthermore, the protection and sustainable use of the project's focal species and habitats are supported by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). The importance of the site for migratory species is supported by a number of international agreements, including the China-Australia Migrant Bird Agreement and the China-Japan Migrant Bird Agreement, the China Agenda 21, 1994 China Biodiversity Protection Action Plan (CBPAP), and much wider, within the Ramsar Convention, amongst others.

The Project is also framed within the content of the wider social, economic and political changes that have been taking place in China in recent times. The importance of renewable natural resource governance and water management issues are increasingly emerging as challenges that need to be addressed quickly as demonstrated by the 2000 China National Wetland Conservation Action Plan (CNWCAP).

The Project Document shows the origins of the SIW Project to the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building which was agreed upon in 2005. By the time the SIW Project was designed there was an implicit recognition that integrated management of the wetlands requires a diversity of participation and that governance has to be more inclusive.

According to the TE "the SIW Project has relevance now, and at the time of its design and implementation, in that it was pushing for greater participation of all sectors of the

administration to become involved in, and to consider issues of, the management of the intertidal wetlands."

## 5.2. *Effectiveness – Satisfactory*

The effectiveness of the project is rated as satisfactory as realized project outcomes are similar to the expected outcomes. As described in the Terminal Evaluation, the key achievements in project outcomes and expectations are as follows:

Outcome 1: The efficient management of SIW was improved with the establishment of an integrated management structure.

For that policies and management were adapted. Management moved from short term target based planning to longer term planning. Government introduced payments for ecosystem goods and services, fiscal measures, and management plans including wetland ecological stress reduction measure.

Outcome 2: The protection of the MNR increased, a number of degraded areas were rehabilitated, and a plan for the nature reserve was developed.

This outcome was reached thanks to the development and enforcement of measures on solid and liquid waste disposal, on waste reduction, and on re-use and recycling. But also thanks to the adaptation of plans from the Municipality management Committee according to monitoring data, and finally thanks to the environmental monitoring data that were made publically available.

Outcome 3: The Introduction of a number of "technologies" or methodologies to reduce the impact of economic activity on the SIW and to provide alternative livelihoods.

To reach this outcome, technologies were introduced in pilot areas and adopted by most of the wetland users, and an ecotourism plan for SIW to reduce threats of inappropriate and unsustainable development was developed.

Outcome 4: Public awareness was raised and the understanding at a number of levels (institutional, civic and educational) of the importance of the SIW was improved.

This outcome was reached with some public debates, with the identification of municipalities with wetland conservation, with the promotion of greater sharing of knowledge from the municipalities, and finally with the development of NGOs and clubs.

These four elements were set out in the Project Document in order to reduce the stresses caused by the rapid economic growth and urbanization in and around the SIW.

According to the Terminal Evaluation, the Project's strategy provided a reasonable means to achieve the objective.

However, according to the Terminal Evaluation "measurable impacts at a globally significant level were not achieved within the project life span."

### 5.3. *Efficiency – Satisfactory*

According to the Terminal Evaluation, it is hard to judge the cost-effectiveness of the SIW Project for two main reasons. (1) the LFM indicators were a number of discrete "deliverables", and (2) the half yearly reports did not provide a narrative to measure, or indication of, whether the Project was encountering difficulties.

However, the SIW Project has been implemented with a high level of efficiency. Where problems have arisen, the Executing Agency, PMU and partners have moved swiftly to find a solution to ensure that activities have been carried out and targets have been met. There have been some delays in implementation but generally these have been dealt effectively with.

Much of the progress achieved by the Project in implementation is due to an institutional culture of "getting things done" and meeting targets. The TE has some reservations that such an approach might sometimes sacrifice process for expedience.

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

The sustainability of the project is rated as Moderately Likely.

The Project has put in place a number of mechanisms that have increased the likelihood of the outcomes being sustained after the Project ends, for example. the representation on the Municipal Management Committee, raised public awareness, involvement of Universities in the planning and management of the SIW, silvo-aquaculture, mangrove replanting and protection and improved status of protected areas. However, according to the Terminal Evaluation there are a number of external drivers such as continued water flows into the wetlands which have not been adequately addressed but could impact negatively on the ecosystem; and cross-sectorial management approaches are still not effectively implemented in the reality. Moreover, the legal basis to guarantee the importance status of this approach was not there.

Financial risks: Low

The support from the Municipality is likely to be continued.

Socio-political risks: Low

There is a larger political interest to conservation of the SIW but it is not clear if the mechanism will stimulate a broader local community support unless their participation in the decision-making is possible.

Institutional risks: Low

The Projects outcomes have been embedded in the Forest Bureau and there is now representation of SIW conservation management issues on the Municipal Management Committee. There is also the added advantage of the University of Zhongshan as a scientific and academic institution which can support the scientific basis of decision-making in the future.

Environmental risks: Moderate

Wetland protection and conservation should be included in the urban planning in the future and have a legal basis to guarantee its implementation. What is required, permitted and prohibited in wetland areas should be defined by a clear and legal basis, then wetland protection should be given higher priority. The SIW system is vulnerable to external factors such as river flows, etc.

## **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?

Government co-financing played an important role in the project and the components supported by co-financing were well integrated into the project.

Government's co-financing has effectively contributed to restore and conserve the wetland habitats in the four demonstration sites by establishing an integrated cross-sectoral management system, promoting environmental friendly economic activities, and improving the public awareness and education on wetland conservation.

Co-financing was also used by the Forest Bureau to avoid delays when the supervision from UNEP-GEF was poor at the beginning of the project.

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?

Unable to assess. The Project Terminal Report states that realized co-financing was US\$ 400,000 (cash) and US\$ 115,200 in-kind. However, the reporting on co-financing was poor and it is not possible to assess the level of co-financing but it is likely to exceed that which was promised. The additional funds that were leveraged during the Project's lifetime have not been reported. This possible additional co-financing has helped in the planning and execution, especially in limiting delays.

### **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 duration scheduled was three years (36 months) from November 2007 – November 2010, but finally completed in May 2011 having a project extension for a period of six months.

There have been some delays in implementation for example in the construction of a visitors center, this delay was due to the strict regulatory requirements on building contracts. However, these have generally been dealt effectively with.

There were also some delays in releasing project funds. The TE has been unable to find the reasons of this but notes that "rather than delaying the Project's overall implementation, it would appear that the project partners simply forged ahead with implementation of the components that were being co-financed".

### 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:

There has been a considerable degree of country ownership of the Project and its outcomes. The initial support for the Project appears to have come from the Zhongshan University (the Executing Agency) and according to the Terminal Evaluation this appears to have been taken up by other government agencies and institutions.

Moreover, the Terminal Evaluator thinks that "the prestige of being awarded a GEF project under the regional SCS project has created a strong institutional sense of responsibility and pride and that this has spread to other parts of government such as the Shantou City Municipality".

The municipality has been interested in the Project's implementation and progress, by supporting the implementation of the project in providing co-financing, hosting the PMC and PMU, and coordinating relevant local government agencies, and establishing local institutional arrangements for integrated area management.

The Ministry of Environmental Protection has been the designated focal institution of the SCS project with a responsibility to coordinate activities at the national level and has taken an important interest in the Project.

## 7. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

### 7.1. M&E design at entry - *Satisfactory*

According to the Terminal Evaluation, there were weaknesses in the Project's design, in particular in the Project's log frame matrix and the indicators selected for monitoring and evaluation. These were just re-stating the outputs or targets and not necessarily indicators that inform about the quality of the outputs or outcomes. More useful indicators might have provided some insight into the performance of the Cross-sectorial Management Committee for a range of wetland issues, particularly where these related to trade-offs between economic development and the continued provision of wetland ecosystem goods and services.

Half-yearly reports, a Mid-term Review Report, three PIR and a Terminal Report have been produced. However, these last substantial reports were produced following the appointment of a new International Waters Programme Task Manager in the regional office of UNEP in Bangkok.

The Terminal evaluators think that it appears to have been a "grueling selection process that probably resulted in compromises on many different aspects of the demonstration projects including the baseline information, overall project budgets and budgets for monitoring and evaluation there was inevitably an element of fatigue".

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

The first half of the Project was poorly reported on. However, the PMU and Executing Agency continued to implement the activities. In 2009, there was an improvement in the monitoring by the IWP. The PIR and the MTR provide an accurate analysis of the progress of the Project based upon the indicators provided in the Log Frame.

The roles and responsibilities for monitoring were clearly set out in the Project document. The Project has done what it was supposed to do, and produced the outputs, which is satisfactory. However, according to the Terminal Evaluation, this might not necessarily meet the challenging monitoring and evaluation requirements of GEF projects and adaptive management.

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

#### 8.1. *Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution – Satisfactory*

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

UNEP was the Project Implementing Agency through the UNEP International Waters Programme based in Bangkok. The Project Management Unit was comprised of the Office of the Shantou Nature Reserve and a Project manager was engaged from Zhongshan University. A Project Management Committee was established as the decision-making body for review of the project progress and evaluation of the outputs.

It appears that this arrangement has worked well and decisions have been made in a timely and effective manner and the EA and IA have performed well.

The project had two phases; (1) there was support from the Implementing Agency during the design phase of the Project, but following its inception in November 2007 it appears to have

had little if any support from UNEP resulting in a poor inception phase and weak reporting in everything (2) it was not until 2009 that support and guidance was once again provided by the IA.

This resulted in a poor inception phase however, the Project appears to have recovered from this thanks to the level of efficiency in the implementation that the TE refers as the management culture of “getting things done”.

### 8.3. Overall Quality of Execution – **Satisfactory**

The GEF Executing Agency of this project is the Zhongshan University, with the key partners: Office of the Shantou City Nature Reserve and the local communities of Hexi, Sanyuwei, Suaiwan, and Waisha.

According to the Terminal Evaluation, the Executing Agency did not fully understand the process of GEF project implementation and this seems to have carried through until the Mid-term Review when the Task Manager from the International Waters Programme has taken some ownership of the process and reporting, as well as the project process that improved in 2009. There were initial shortcomings in getting the Project going due to weak support to the Executing Agency and PMU. However, this appears to have been addressed by the midterm of the Project

Where problems have arisen, the Executing Agency, PMU and partners have moved swiftly to find a solution to ensure that activities have been carried out and targets have been met. The efforts of the Executing Agency to catalyze the project have been remarkable, according to the Terminal Evaluation.

The Executing Agency has managed successfully to bring other stakeholders into the process.

Finally, the GEF fund was supervised by the Financial Bureau and the Executing Agency that showed considerable diligence in ensuring that funds were disbursed in accordance with the agreed work plan and budget plan once the GEF funds were released.

## 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? | <b>Highly Satisfactory</b> | Assessment of project objectives and outcomes was good. The TE report provides the achievement of outputs in each component and an assessment of outcomes. It assesses results based on the objectives level indicators from the Project Document.                                                                         |
| To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? | <b>Highly Satisfactory</b> | The report was consistent and the evidence complete. The ratings for each component were provided and justified.                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?                                         | <b>Satisfactory</b>        | Sustainability issues were quite well discussed. Project sustainability is assessed along the major dimensions and good detail is provided to support the ratings. Clarifications for socio-political sustainability and governance structures under sustainability of institutional frameworks could be more detailed.    |
| To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?                                      | <b>Satisfactory</b>        | Lessons and recommendations are supported by the evidence provided from the project. Lessons were valid and provided prescriptive actions. Recommendations provided were practical. However, they could have been developed more. Only 2 lessons were given and one recommendation.                                        |
| Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?                                     | <b>Highly Satisfactory</b> | The report includes total costs, costs per outcome and co-financing as per the information available. The Terminal Evaluator reports that co-financing information was not available as needed to do a detailed assessment. However, given the information available the financial assessment was clear and comprehensive. |
| Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:                                                                       | <b>Highly Satisfactory</b> | The TE provides an assessment of M&E design at entry, of M&E implementation, and of the budgeting and funding for M&E activities. This assessment is well presented in the report, the shortcomings and strengths were explained in details with strong evidences.                                                         |

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

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

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO KNOWLEDGE BEING GENERATED OR IMPROVED?

Pilot activities for environmentally friendly aquaculture (silvo-aquaculture)

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

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

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

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

Construction of a training and information center; exposure visits, local website established and maintained by the University, National wetland conference convened.

Is there evidence that these outputs were used?

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

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

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE BEING RAISED?

Awareness campaigns and publicity related activities, Training and Education plan developed Training and Education center established and functional, Training and capacity building developed and implements, development and administration of a training program for government officials, scientists and project staff. A campaign was carried out and rubbish collection areas were built to clean up the Haojing River.

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

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

A change has been reported in the attitude of the local farmers towards the wetland related resources. They are reported to have stopped selling eggs of endangered birds in the market, they are now more proactive helping for the injured birds, and they report illegal poaching through the hotline to the executing agency.

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

Yes

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

The trainings of the project focused on building capacities of the local community and local government officials.

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

No

HOW HAVE THESE SKILLS BEEN APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE TRAINED?

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?

Integrated Management Plan for the Nature Reserve.  
Local regulations developed and law enforcement improved.  
Contracted experts compared the current local-level regulations with Provincial Laws and Shantou Municipality accepted any amendments.  
The new regulations provide a higher level of protection to the SIW and the enforcement of these increased.

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?

No

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

A Project Management Unit was established in Shantou within the Office of the Shantou City Nature Reserve with a Project Manager from Zhongshan University.  
 A Management Committee with 15 members was established to implement the Project and the overall management of SIW has been embedded in the existing Municipal Management Committee with 17 members.

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

No

Were improved arrangements for stakeholder engagement integrated as permanent structures?

No

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

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

No

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

Did the project contribute to any of the following:

Technologies & Approaches

Yes

Implementing Mechanisms/Bodies

Yes

Financial Mechanisms

Yes

Please specify what was contributed:

silvo-aquaculture

management plan for the MNR

nature-based tourism

Did **replication** of the promoted technologies, and economic and financial instruments take place?

No

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

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

There is little doubt that mangrove planting will be replicated. Additionally, the silvo-aquaculture appears to have been successful and given the benefits of this approach it would seem likely that this will be taken up by other areas. The executing agency reported that the silvo-aquaculture approach that was implemented in the demonstration sites have been replicated in Shenzhen and Zhanjiang in an aggregate area of 10 ha. However, replication did not fully take place yet, there does not appear to be a large scale farmer uptake of silvo-aquaculture yet. Silvo-aquaculture piloted in Sanyuwei has also been practiced in a non-demonstration site and it can be expected that there will be a reasonable delay between the demonstrations and farmers implementing this themselves.

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

No

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)?

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

No

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)?

Did **removal 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?

Implementation Strategies <--dropdown menu

If "combination", then of which types?

& <--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

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

How was the information obtained?

Measured   
  Anecdotal

Was there a change in environmental status?

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

15% reduction of pond area providing a 30% improvement in water quality  
 By the end of 2010, an area of 859.36 ha of wetland in Hexi enclosed seasonally and an area of 378.35 ha of wetland in Suaiwan enclosed permanently  
 At least 200 ha of mangroves in marshes achieved  
 The area of aquaculture with controlled wastewater increased by 20 ha  
 At least 20 ha of silvo-aquaculture area established and maintained  
 The government agreed to change the wetland usage to mangrove protection area and as a training center.

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

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

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  No

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

Participatory patrolling and monitoring system was established. A phone "hot-line" has been set up and has resulted in a number of arrests. Monitoring in this case refers to surveillance and reporting of illegal activity. Environmental monitoring scheme was established and implemented annually by Zhongshan University, the Executing Agency.

However, according to the Terminal Evaluator, it is important that increased protection of natural resources is broadly equitable and accepted by all stakeholders. The new regulations implemented will need time to be accepted, and they should be seen as fair.

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

The stress reduction indicators cover the outputs in terms of geographical area. However, they did not cover the qualitative aspects of the change as to the quality of management and protection. While the methodology to measure changes in the chosen indicators is clear and reliable, according to the Terminal Evaluation, measuring the net impact of GEF contributions is not easy.

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.

In Shantou some of the interventions have regular monitoring: for wetlands water quality change is a key indicator; for mangroves the satellite pictures provide a basis to access change; for sea grass is difficult to undertake because it is in relatively deep waters. Zhongshan University will be responsible for the implementation of the environmental monitoring in the future.

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

The organization that will monitor environmental status is the Zhongshan University; however there is no information about the budget allocated.

Has the monitoring data been used for management?

No

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

Has the data been made accessible to the public?

No

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

The Terminal Evaluator raises concerns about the transparency of the environmental monitoring, and thinks that it is important that scientific institutions are able to collect data on all aspects of the project and made this data easily available to anyone interested.

*“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?

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

Did the project contribute to **negative** socioeconomic impacts?

No



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

There are two main lessons reported in the Terminal Evaluation:

(1) It is necessary to make the wetland system (including the social, economic and ecological components) resilient to any future change. The system should be capable of adapting. Adaptation at this scale requires a broad participation of all stakeholders. The approach to developing a framework for participation at this scale should be made more explicit in a project's design. Therefore, when developing these projects it would be useful to use tools or methodologies such as institutional mapping that can provide a dynamic map of the relationships which can be tracked over time and used to develop specific strategies to influence the course of these relationships.

(2) GEF demonstration projects should have a Monitoring Officer. It is important that monitoring of interventions is carried out independently of project monitoring because there might be effectively a conflict of interests between project expedience and reporting success or failure. Therefore it would be useful for GEF projects, particularly those which are designed specifically as demonstration projects to include amongst the project staff a monitoring officer to design and implement monitoring programs for specific interventions.

Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The Terminal Evaluation makes only one recommendation:

*"UNEP, through the Regional Office of the International Waters Programme, should communicate with the Shantou Municipal Management Committee congratulating them on the satisfactory outcome of the SIW Project and stresses the importance of the Municipal Management Committee to follow up the SIW Project".*

The SIW project could be followed up by

- (1) Expanding the Committees function to other marine and coastal resources and not only focus on wetland resource,
- (2) Creating a legal basis to ensure that wetland conservation management is legally included within urban planning in the future,
- (3) Expressing the need for regular monitoring of environmental variables within the SIW and for clear and transparent sharing of this data.