

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3484	
GEF Agency project ID		7439	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		ADB	
Project name		PRC-GEF Partnership: Capacity and Management Support for Combating Land Degradation in Dryland Ecosystems	
Country/Countries		China	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Land Degradation	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		LD-SP1-Agriculture; LD-SP2- Forest; LD-SP3-Innovation	
Executing agencies involved		State Forestry Administration	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		None reported	
Private sector involvement		None reported	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		10/14/2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		1/26/2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		12/31/2012	
Actual date of project completion		10/31/2013	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		2.73	2.71
Co-financing	IA own	.2	Not given ¹
	Government	6	9.1
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		2.73	2.71
Total Co-financing		6.2	9.1
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		8.93	11.81
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		Not given	
Author of TE		Not given	
TER completion date		December 1, 2015	
TER prepared by		Laura Nissley	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Dania Trespalacios	

¹ It is unclear from the TE whether the co-financing from the ADB materialized.

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	NR	NR	NR	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	NR	NR	NR	ML
M&E Design	NR	NR	NR	MS
M&E Implementation	NR	NR	NR	U
Quality of Implementation	NR	S	NR	S
Quality of Execution	NR	S	NR	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	--	--	--	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective is “Reduced land degradation (LD) in dryland ecosystems in the western region of the People’s Republic of China” (PD pg. 7).² The western region of China is comprised of some of the driest and severely degraded land in the world. Unsustainable agricultural practices, overstocking of animals, deforestation, mismanagement of water resources, and inadequate understanding of ecological impacts have all contributed to the expansion of degraded areas. This is a growing threat to China’s biological diversity and is contributing to climate change through increased CO₂ emissions (PIF pg. 7). The project will therefore focus on introducing innovative sustainable land management (SLM) practices for improved agriculture, rangeland, and forest management (PD pg. 2).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective is “Strengthened capacity of the PRC-Global Environment Facility (GEF) Partnership to address and manage technical, policy, legal, and institutional barriers in combating [land degradation] of the drylands of the western PRC” (PD p. 7).

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

The Global Environmental Objective and the Development Objective did not change. However, Component 4 (*Institutional strengthening at the regional and provincial levels*) and Component 5 (*Project Management*) were dropped during program implementation, and replaced with a new component, *Strengthening coordination role for Central Project Coordination Office (CPMO) and Provincial Project Management Offices (PPMOs)*. It should be noted that the TE uses the original components and the revised component interchangeably in the report. This TER will assess the revised component, *Strengthening coordination role for CPMO and PPMOs*.

² The Global Environmental Objective and Development Objective are not referenced specifically in the PD. However, it appears from reviewing the results framework that the Global Environmental Objective is congruent with “Impact” and the Development Objective is congruent with the “Outcome.”

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
---------------	-----------------------------

The TE found the project to be “highly relevant to the implementation of national and regional priorities and plans” (pg. 8). This TER agrees and assigns an overall rating of **Satisfactory** for Relevance.

The project was consistent with GEF 4 long-term objectives for land degradation. The project sought to generate policy support for innovative SLM practices and strengthen regional and provincial institutions’ capacity for SLM, both of which contribute toward developing an enabling environment for mainstreaming SLM in development policy and practices (GEF 4 LD Strategic Objective 1). In addition, the project sought to extend pilot sites and replicate best practices in other locally funded programs, contributing to up-scaling SLM investments that generate mutual benefits for the global environment and local livelihoods (GEF 4 LD Strategic Objective 2) (TE pg. 2; PD pg. 2-4).

The project was also consistent with provisions to combat land degradation under the People’s Republic of China’s (PRC) 11th Five Year Plan (2006-2010), in particular “the New Countryside Program” which aims to “boost sustainable and modern agriculture, land management measures, develop new relationships between industry and agriculture, cities and countryside, and increase rural affluence” (TE pg. 18).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-------------------	--

The TE assessed the project as effective in achieving its key outcomes. This TER downgrades this rating due to moderate shortcomings in implementing all project components. Participating provinces and autonomous regions established institutional structures and improved systems for integrated ecosystem management (IEM) implementation. Furthermore, IEM plans and strategies have been incorporated into national and provincial laws and regulations. The participating provinces and autonomous regions have documented and tested sustainable land management (SLM) approaches. Plans for a comprehensive land degradation monitoring and assessment system have been developed, however the system has not

been implemented as expected. Moderate progress has also been made toward strengthening the coordination role of the Central Project Management Office (CPMO) and Provincial Project Management Offices (PPMOs), however this has not been fully achieved.

A summary of the achievement of results, by component, is provided below:

- **Component 1: *Strengthened management and implementation of integrated ecosystem management strategies and approaches*:** The TE assessed this component as successful. Expected results included the mainstreaming of IEM strategies at the provincial level; improved regulatory system; IEM pilot site development and expansion; and information sharing on IEM/SLM best practices (TE pg. 26-27). At the time of the evaluation, strategic plans had been mainstreamed into the 11th and 12th Five-Year Plans, leading to an increase of 36.5% in the number of IEM projects and 36.4% in total funding. Key outputs included the (1) formulation or revision of 21 laws and regulations, (2) enhanced communication and coordination between key sectors, (3) successful evaluation of 18 pilot sites, and (4) documentation of 18 SLM technologies and SLM approaches for scaling up. The TE does note that the up-scaling of IEM/SLM best practices has not been successfully implemented (TE pg. 18-21).
- **Component 2: *Policy support for innovative SLM practices*:** The TE assessed this component as highly successful. Expected results included cross-sector studies on land degradation control and vegetation carbon sequestration; and policy, regulatory, and planning frameworks that support SLM (TE pg. 27-29). At the time of the evaluation, cross-sectoral and thematic studies had been conducted on emerging SLM issues (carbon sequestration, cost-benefit analysis, payment of ecosystem services, and public-private partnerships), which have the potential to inform policy and decision-making in the PRC. In addition, three scientific articles on carbon sequestration were published in international journals. However, the TE notes that these studies must be “developed further, tested in the field (where possible), and taken to a stage where mainstreaming and up-scaling recommendations can be made” (TE pg. 3).
- **Component 3: *Comprehensive land degradation monitoring and assessment system*:** The TE assessed this component as moderately successful. Expected results included a review of the current LD monitoring and assessment system; completing a comprehensive land degradation assessment; and strengthening the capacity of provincial information centers (TE pg. 29-30). The TE notes the achievement of two key results: (1) an evaluation of national and international land degradation monitoring and assessment systems, and (2) a proposed land degradation and SLM monitoring and assessment indicator system for dryland ecosystems of the PRC (TE pg. 3-4). However, a unified monitoring and assessment system has not been established at the national level. In addition, the data available in the PRC-GEF Partnership database is incomplete (TE pg. 24-25).

- **Component 4: Strengthening coordination role for CPMO and PPMOs:**

The TE provides conflicting assessments of this component. The TE assesses this component as successful in one section of the report, whereas in another section it is rated as Moderately Unsatisfactory. This may be due to the fact that the TE uses the original components and the revised component interchangeably. Expected results included improved coordination and cooperation of the Partnership activities; a portfolio of multi-sectoral IEM investment projects developed and initiated; and an external evaluation report (TE pg. 30). A review of the PIRs reveals moderate achievements such as project coordination meetings, a workshop on the future development of the PRC-GEF partnership, a thematic study on the development of the Partnership, and an evaluation of the Partnership (2013 PIR, pg. 9-11).

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------	-----------------------------

The TE found that the project was “efficient in achieving its outcome and outputs” (TE pg. 9), and this TER concurs. The project experienced delays in project implementation, however this did not affect the achievement of project outcomes or sustainability.

The TE found that the CPMO and PPMO paid high attention to effective financial management and training of financial personnel (TE pg. 50). Furthermore, there were no delays in project disbursements for the GEF grant which affected project implementation (TE pg. 5).

As noted above, there were some initial delays that resulted in an extension of the project’s timeline. It took more time than anticipated to onboard new consultants, in particular for them to become familiar with the project’s objectives and implementation procedures. The TE also notes that there was a significant language barrier to overcome which contributed to delays in project implementation (TE pg. 7). The project completion date was therefore extended from December 31, 2012 to June 30, 2013, and again to October 31, 2013 (TE pg. 5).

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
--------------------	----------------------------------

The TE assesses the overall risk to sustainability as “low” (TE pg. 37). This TER, which uses a different scale, adjusts this rating to **Moderately Likely**.

Financial Resources - Likely

The inclusion of IEM/SLM approaches into provincial five-year plans increases the likelihood that funding will be available for future project and Partnership activities. In addition, the TE notes that there has been increased awareness around new, innovative sources of funding such as payment for ecosystem

services, carbon finance, and public-private partnerships. However, the SFA is unlikely to have the funds to sustain the same level of staff once the project ends. The TE does note that the SFA could support fewer, more qualified staff from its core funds, and still sustain project outcomes (TE pg. 37).

Sociopolitical - Likely

The TE does not reference any social or political risks that could undermine the sustainability of project outcomes. The TE found that there is strong ownership of the project at the local, provincial and central levels, and that key stakeholders continue to support IEM/SLM approaches (TE pg. 37).

Institutional Framework and Governance – Moderately Likely

The TE found the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures to be conducive to the IEM approach. However, capacity building is still needed at the local, provincial and central levels to implement complex IEM programs (TE pg. 37).

Environmental – Likely

The TE found no direct environmental risks which could undermine future environmental benefits. However, the TE did note generally that the rapid development of the PRC could create unforeseen risks such as the construction of new infrastructure on pilot sites (TE pg. 37).

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? 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 so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The actual co-financing from the PRC government surpassed expected levels by approximately USD \$3.1 million, or 152%. These funds were essential to the achievement of the project's outcomes, as they covered the office space and equipment, support staff, consultants' salaries, studies, and training and workshops (TE pg. 4). It is unclear from the TE whether the entirety of the expected co-financing from the ADB (USD \$200,000) came through, but appears that ADB funds were used to recruit two technical advisors: International Natural Resources Management Specialist and a National Resources Management Specialist (TE pg. 16).

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

There were delays in project completion due to challenges onboarding many new consultants to implement the project. The project's completion date was extended from December 31, 2012 to June

30, 2013, and again to October 31, 2013. However, it does not appear that these delays affected the achievement of project outcomes or sustainability.

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

The TE found there to be a high level of country ownership over the project. Not only did the PRC government contribute significant funds to the project, but the CPMO and PPMOs were tasked with carrying out the project activities and delivering on key outcomes. The TE notes that, “It is unprecedented in the PRC to have such high-level, cross-sectoral, and provincial-based institutional coordination mechanism, which indicated the high profile given to the Partnership within central and provincial government circles” (TE pg. 1).

6. Assessment of project’s Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-------------------------	--

The TE does not provide a rating for M&E design at entry. The project document provides a detailed design and monitoring framework that includes performance indicators, targets, data sources and reporting mechanisms, and assumptions and risks. The TE notes that the project has a clear intervention logic and that the outcome can realistically be achieved through the proposed outputs of the project (TE pg. 31). The indicators provided are also relevant to the project outcomes.

A separate budget for M&E was not included in the project design. The M&E system was designed to be folded into Component 3 of the project, *Comprehensive land degradation monitoring and assessment*. Under this component, a monitoring and assessment system for LD would be established, which would also include the “program results-framework for the Partnership” (PD pg. 3). Plans for the system included identifying appropriate LD monitoring indicators and assessment methodologies, and improving the capacity of provincial data centers to collect LD monitoring data. While sufficient for monitoring LD, this system is not sufficient for comprehensively monitoring project results and tracking progress toward achieving project objectives.

Terms of reference were provided in the project document appendix for short-term M&E staff, including a LD Monitoring and Evaluation Expert (for 5 months) and an Evaluation Specialist (for 3 months) (PD pg. 19). These short-term appointments are insufficient to cover M&E responsibilities throughout the life of the project.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Unsatisfactory
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for M&E implementation. As noted above, a comprehensive M&E system was neither designed nor implemented. The TE rated the LD monitoring and assessment system as moderately unsatisfactory, “as the project failed to apply the indicators it developed to establish a functioning monitoring system and Partnership database” (TE pg. 38). Furthermore, training on monitoring and assessment was provided during the first year of the project, including on the GEF’s LD Tracking Tool, but it was never applied. The TE also found that ratings provided in the Annual Project Implementation Reviews submitted to the ADB were inflated and unsupported by evidence (TE pg. 38).

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
--	-----------------------------

The implementing agency for this project was the Asian Development Bank (ADB). The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project implementation, and this TER concurs. Overall, the TE states that the “ADB provided timely guidance and support, and efficiently fielded review missions” (pg. 8). The GEF grants were administered by the ADB, as well as the Technical Assistance Special Fund (TASF). The TE found that all disbursements were made on time (pg. 5). In addition, the ADB commissioned an External Review of the Partnership by an independent international consultant in March 2013 and supported an international conference hosted by the SFA on “Sustainable Land Management Policies and Practices” in Beijing in May 2013 (TE pg. 4 & 17).

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
----------------------------------	--

The executing agency for this project was the State Forestry Administration (SFA). The TE assesses the quality of project execution as Satisfactory (TE pg. 8), which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory** due to poor M&E implementation. Although there were initial delays with on-boarding consultants that necessitated an extension of the project timeline, the delays did not impact the achievement of key project outcomes. The SFA successfully established a CPMO and PPMOs which carried out project activities and coordinated efforts across offices. A Steering Committee (SC), composed of both national legislative and executive branches from 12 ministries and agencies, was also established to guide and advise the implementation of Partnership activities (TE pg. 5-6). The TE also cites adequate accounting and recording systems as evidence of SFA's satisfactory execution of the project (TE pg. 8).

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE found that the project contributed to environmental change in two areas: addressing climate change and biodiversity protection. Forest-based natural conservation area was increased by 225,000 hectares, newly afforested area has increased by 60,000 hectares, and coal replaceable by developed new energies is 15,000 tons, totaling 705,000 tons of carbon sequestration. The TE does note that this figure is likely low, as it doesn't take into account carbon captured in the soil (pg. 36).

The Partnership has also implemented biodiversity sub-projects which have increased protected areas by 4,500 square kilometers and expanded habitats for 2,079 wild plant species and 679 wild animal species. In particular, *Ranodon sibiricus*, a primordial species of amphibian, has widened its natural habitat and increased in number. There has also been an increase in pure bred white yaks in the Gansu grasslands due to selective breeding programs (TE pg. 36).

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

18 IEM pilot sites were established in 2006 and continued to be developed under this project through ecological engineering and technical measures. The TE found that in addition to yielding important environmental outcomes, these sites continued to play an important role in livelihood improvement. 103 questionnaires were fielded with villagers who reported that more employment opportunities were available, income is increased, and farmers are more actively participating in the activities. On average, village farmers saw a net income increase of 103.4% between 2005 and 2010 (TE pg. 20).

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

Notable changes in capacity include the farmers and herdsman at the pilot sites who participated in the farmer-field schools. These farmers improved their production skills and increased their environmental awareness (TE pg. 20). The provincial project management offices also provided trainings on the IEM idea and approach, project design, project management, policy and regulations, and the use of information technology. However, the TE does note that there are still gaps in understanding at the provincial level on global environmental benefits and the interconnection between SLM, carbon sequestration, and ecosystems (TE pg. 25), which undercut some of the achievements in capacity building.

b) Governance

Revised laws and regulations at the provincial and national levels have created an enabling environment for integrated approaches to ecosystem management (TE pg. 37). IEM strategic action plans have been mainstreamed into the 12th Five-Year Plan which has led to improved communication and coordination between government sectors, including Forestry, Agriculture, Water Resources Management, Environmental Protection, as well as the Development and Reform Commission (TE pg. 19).

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

The TE does not cite any positive or negative unintended impacts.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

At the time of the evaluation, laws and regulations in support of IEM have been mainstreamed at the provincial level. However, the external review commissioned by the ADB found that, “upscaling of integrated ecosystem management/sustainable land management best practices has not yet been adequately addressed—though much has been achieved in ‘pilot sites’ or ‘demonstrations’” (TE pg. 21). The TE notes that a clearer strategy is needed for scaling up investments in SLM at all levels, as well as comprehensive LD and SLM monitoring and assessment system that can track impact (TE pg. 31).

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The key lessons as stated in the TE (pg. 13):

Experiences under the project show that it takes time to fully establish adequate project monitoring, evaluation, and assessment systems. The lack of systematic data collection from project pilot sites made it difficult to quantify the impact of the project as well as the Partnership that it coordinates. It is an urgent priority for the Partnership to continue its efforts to establish a stronger monitoring and assessment system to better track and document the impact of the Partnership.

There is enough evidence to suggest that considerable GEBs have been generated from the project's IEM and SLM practices. Yet, GEBs are poorly understood by members of the Partnership despite them being a fundamental element of GEF. As a result, GEBs have not been systematically monitored and measured under the Partnership.

Upscaling of IEM/SLM best practices has been established within the project boundary; however, upscaling and mainstreaming of these technologies and ideas beyond the confines of the pilot demonstration sites have been rather slow.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The recommendations as stated in TE (pg. 13-14):

Project Related: During the implementation of the project, it was acknowledged that there is still a need to (i) focus on replication and upscaling of the achievements of the Partnership, with a strong emphasis on investments at the provincial level; (ii) target capacity development and its linkage to demonstration and investment activities; and (iii) develop a broader financial resource mobilization strategy, taking into consideration government, private sector, and development partner resources, as well as innovative mechanisms such as eco-compensation programs. These activities will be addressed in a follow-up GEF-financed TA that is expected to be approved in the last quarter of 2014.

- **Institutional Set-up:** The SFA's CPMO has achieved much in terms of project management and administration, but it has been unable, as yet, to establish a comprehensive M&A system or to manage adequate cross-learning between projects. In the future, CPMO should function more clearly as a coordinating nexus, and be smaller and comprise of higher qualified staff. The SFA, as the executing agency, must ensure appropriate staffing. The PRC-GEF Partnership should have a stronger link with the PRC National Action Plan for the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and close alignment with the secretariat of the PRC National Committee for implementation of the UNCCD in the SFA.

- **Partnership database and monitoring & assessment (M&A) tracking system:** Data from the field must regularly and systematically be collected under a dedicated M&A system, and collated for analysis as evidence of impact. These data will include the area under specific IEM/SLM technologies and will measure environmental and socio-economic indicators against targets. The database must be regularly updated and gender aspects must be integrated.
- **Global environmental benefits:** GEBs should be better estimated using the data already available under the Assessment Report (2013) prepared by the SFA consultants, Li Zhou and Ke Shuifa, and through the establishment of a systematic M&A system. Priority must be given to estimating carbon sequestered through land brought under SLM practices.
- **Dissemination of project outputs:** The SFA through the CPMO should develop a strategy to ensure that the Partnership provides for exchange of ideas between agencies and between subprojects either through regular meetings and/or exchange visits. A number of useful and relevant publications have been produced under the Partnership. Thus, a clear publication and distribution policy needs to be established. There should also be a systematic use of international peer review for major documents. In addition, the various technical studies carried out under the Partnership must be developed further, tested in the field, and taken to the stage where firm mainstreaming and upscaling can be undertaken.
- **Upscaling of IEM/SLM best practices:** A strategy and plan of action needs to be urgently developed to encourage upscaling of IEM/SLM best practices through extension and achieve wider adoption of these practice beyond the pilot sites. Complementary approaches could involve further mainstreaming of successful practices into land use planning, as well as mobilization of new and innovative sources of funding through, for example, carbon financing, PES, and PPPs.

General: The PRC-GEF Partnership is an innovative and sound initiative which has a firm institutional foundation. As such, a plan of action is required to more firmly document the Partnership's impact, and to address specific areas that need to be improved to enhance effectiveness. Likewise, the pioneering programmatic approach of the Partnership should be further developed and enhanced through a strategically designed continuity phase with a broader regional scope, and mainstreamed for far-reaching benefits.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report [i.e. the Project Completion Report] satisfactorily assesses the outcomes and impact of the project.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent and provides sufficient evidence to substantiate its ratings.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report satisfactorily assesses sustainability in terms of financial risks, socio-political risks, institutional framework and governance risks, and environmental risks	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned and recommendations satisfactorily address the deficiencies noted in the TE and are supported by evidence.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report provides actual project costs (by component) and partial co-financing. The report doesn't indicate whether co-financing from the ADB materialized.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report doesn't adequately assess the quality of M&E at the design phase or during implementation. It is vague as to the details of the M&E system.	MU
Overall TE Rating		S

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

There were no additional sources of information used for the preparation of this TER.