



To Do

Projects

Reports

Administration

Help Logout

Terminal Evaluation Review - Entry Form

Quick Select: [Select](#)

[<< Back to Project Edit](#)

Collapse all sections

Project

GEF ID	<input type="text" value="956"/>
Project Title	PRC/GEF Partnership on Land Degradation in Dryland Ecosystems: Project I-Capacity Building to Combat Land
Project Type	Full Size Project
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Focal Area	Multi Focal Area
Agency	ADB
Country	China
Project Status	Project Completion
Duration	<input type="text" value="4"/> years
CEO Endorsement	<input type="text" value="05/25/2004"/>
Agency Approval	<input type="text" value="6/28/2004"/>
Project Effectiveness	<input type="text"/>
GEF Agency Execution Partners	<input type="text" value="(Select Execution Partners)"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Civil Society Private Sector Indigenous Community Other
If other, please specify	<input type="text"/>

Terminal Evaluation Staff

EO Staff

TE Author

TE Reviewer	<input type="text" value="Pallavi Nuka"/>
TE Peer Reviewer	<input type="text" value="Baljit Wadhwa"/>

 **Completion, Submission & Delays**

Project Completion

Project Expected Completion	<input type="text"/>
Project Actual Completion	<input type="text" value="3/12/2010"/>
Project Completion Difference	<input type="text"/> Months

TE Completion

TE Completion	<input type="text" value="12/31/2010"/>
TE Submission to EO	<input type="text" value="03/12/2012"/>
TE Submission to EO Difference	<input type="text" value="15"/> Months

TER Completion

TER Completion	<input type="text" value="03/10/2012"/>
TER Submission to EO	<input type="text" value="03/10/2012"/>
TER Submission to EO Difference	<input type="text" value="0"/> Months

Comments on Delays 

Project delay is 12 months. The Expected Completion Date of the project was Dec. 31, 2008. The expected project duration was 4 years. Due to a slow-start up in the first two years, the project was granted an extension from 31 December 2008 to 31 December 2009. The 1-year extension provided additional time for achieving quality outputs and envisioned objectives. All project outputs were completed as planned during the 1-year extension. The delay had no adverse effect on project outcomes or sustainability.


 **Funding and Co-Financing**

	Amounts at CEO Endorsement	Amounts at Completion	Ratios
GEF Amount (US\$)	<input type="text" value="7,700,000"/>	<input type="text" value="7,696,300"/>	<input type="text" value="99.95 %"/>
Cofinance Amount (US\$)	<input type="text" value="7,300,000"/>	<input type="text" value="7,912,069"/>	<input type="text" value="108.38 %"/>
Total Amount (US\$)	<input type="text" value="15,000,000"/>	<input type="text" value="15,608,369"/>	<input type="text" value="104.06 %"/>

Comments on Cofinancing 

GEF grant amount disbursed was USD 7.696 M. Cash co-financing from the government was USD 3.769 M and from the ADB USD 0.963 M (Technical Assistance Grant). In-kind co-financing from the government was USD 3.180 M. Government funds were mainly used for office operations, workshops, training and study tours, pilot project cost, and incremental staff costs.

 **Logical Framework**

Quality of Logical Framework 

Project Objectives -

This is the first project of a 10-year Country Programming Framework (2003-2012, approved by the GEF's council in Oct. 2002). The CPF seeks to combat land degradation, reduce poverty, and conserve biodiversity through capacity building investments and developing viable model investment projects.

The goal of this initial four-year capacity building project is to help the Government "establish an effective system of integrated ecosystem management to generate both global benefits from enhanced biodiversity conservation and carbon capture, as well as sustainable use and equitable benefit-sharing to reduce poverty.

The project's purpose is to strengthen the enabling environment and develop institutional capacity in six priority provinces and/or nationally and globally significant autonomous regions (Gansu, Inner Mongolia, Ningxia Hui, Qinghai, Shaanxi, and Xinjiang Uygur).

The project had six component outputs:

1. Policy, legal and regulatory framework improved
2. National and provincial institutional coordination strengthened
3. Operational arrangements at provincial/ autonomous region and county level improved
4. Improved institutional capacity
5. Monitoring and evaluation system operational
6. Country Programmatic Framework implementation arrangements established


Comment on Changes

There were no revisions to the GEO or DO during implementation. A review of the project was carried out during September–December 2004, which resulted in the revision and consolidation of outputs 2, 3, and 4 as an integrated planning package, given that their activities contributed to strengthening the links between macro-level and field-level strategic planning.

No data entered yet. Click -->  Add New Row... <-- to add new project objective component.












 **Project Performance**







[Copy Agency Review Ratings To GEFO Ratings](#) [Copy Agency Review Comments To GEFO Comments](#)

Overall Project Rating 

Comment








The project is relevant to the GEF multi-focal area program on integrated ecosystem management and to national priorities addressing drylands management. The project's purpose (or objective) has been effectively achieved through activities under the six component outputs. Actual outputs are commensurate with expected outputs, and project activities have been implemented efficiently.





Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Outcomes 	Last PIR:	5 - Satisfactory 	"Implementation of the project has effectively raised the national and local capacity in combating land degradation. "
	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory 	Rated as "Successful"
	Agency Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	Rated as "Successful"
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	The project was relevant to GEF objectives and national priorities. It was effective in achieving its outputs and objective of increasing national capacity and coordination for implementing IEM targeted to drylands management. The project was cost-efficient in completing all activities within the revised timeframe and with only a 4% increase over the original budget. Both Effectiveness and Efficiency are rated S.
Relevance 	Terminal Evaluation:	6 - Highly Satisfactory 	Rated as "Highly Relevant" "Overall, the project is assessed as relevant and its design as generally sound and adequate."
	Agency Review:	6 - Highly Satisfactory 	Rated as "Highly Relevant" "The project design and formulation is rated highly relevant. A detailed assessment of problems and opportunities was made during project preparation. The project design was consistent with the strategies of the government, GEF, and ADB. "
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	The project is consistent with the GEF OP-12 on Integrated Ecosystem Management and with the aims of the PRC-GEF Partnership on Land Degradation in Dryland Ecosystems . The project is relevant to the priorities of the government of PRC in combating land degradation in the six provinces and autonomous regions of the western PRC. The project design is also consistent with both national and local economic and social development policies as well as with government priorities on several environmental and natural resource concerns as stated in its 11th Five-Year Plan. It was also relevant and consistent with ADB's PRC country partnership strategy (2008-2010)a within the strategic areas of the agriculture and natural resources sector.
	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory 	Rated as "Effective" "The project was effective in achieving its outcome to strengthen the enabling environment and develop institutional capacity to combat land degradation in the PRC."
	Agency Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	





<p>Effectiveness </p>			<p>Rated as "Effective" The project was effective in achieving its overall outcome of strengthening the enabling environment and developing institutional capacity."</p>
	<p>GEFEO Review:</p>	<p>5 - Satisfactory </p>	<p>Based on the information in the TE report, project outcomes were effectively achieved, and actual outputs were commensurate with expected outputs. The project generated interest in, and acceptance of, the IEM approach to land degradation control among policy decision makers, planners, legislators, experts, and communities It was instrumental in the adoption of a bottom-up participatory approach in policy decision making, strategic planning, and legislation of laws and regulations through more increased interagency collaboration and cooperation. This facilitated the incorporation of investment projects in provincial SAPs and five-year plans. The project also provided a mechanism for establishing links with donor agencies, which has opened up new avenues for information exchange on IEM-related activities and opportunities for possible financing of IEM project proposals.</p>
<p>Efficiency </p>	<p>Terminal Evaluation:</p>	<p>5 - Satisfactory </p>	<p>Rated as "Efficient" "The project was efficient in achieving its outcome and outputs within the five-year implementation period...The project was able to achieve its outcome and outputs in a cost-efficient manner with all of the funds under the GEF grant utilized as intended. Project monitoring and evaluation, however, could have been more effective had there been a clearer delineation of responsibilities in monitoring arrangements among the CPMO and PPMOs. At project completion, the partnership produced 28 studies and guidelines on combating land degradation in the western PRC, held 211 workshops and seminars, and organized 122 training sessions and study tours. Relative to what was envisioned during appraisal, the total number of studies, workshops, and training sessions carried</p>
	<p>Agency Review:</p>	<p>5 - Satisfactory </p>	<p>Rated as "Efficient" "The project was efficient in the use of resources, achieving its outcomes and outputs."</p>
	<p>GEFEO Review:</p>	<p>5 - Satisfactory </p>	









The project achieved its all expected outputs with full disbursement of GEF funds. Total project costs were slightly higher than anticipated. Due to a slow start-up phase, the project closed almost one year later than was expected at appraisal. There was some re-allocation of funds between project activities during implementation. Integration of components 2, 3, and 4 resulted in some cost-savings relative to expected costs. The actual cost for Component 6 (Country Programmatic Framework implementation arrangements) was almost double what was expected. Based on information in the TE report this was largely due to higher than anticipated staffing and overhead costs (staff turnover, incremental staff, office operations). Nevertheless, the evidence on project results indicates that the project has delivered all expected outputs and achieved its objective in a timely and cost-effective manner.









Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Sustainability ⓘ	Last PIR:	4 - Likely ▼	<p>Rated as "L" for Low risk. Multi-sectoral coordinating mechanism at the national, provincial and county levels will promote effective implementation of the project activities. However enabling environmental improvement is a complex task and requires flexible approaches and responsive interventions.</p> <p>The capacity building of the project has generated both capacity and shifts in attitudes and growing enthusiasm for the project. These capacities, attitudes and the level of enthusiasm may now be affected if there will be no follow-up project in each of the provinces. Therefore implementation of the legal reform recommendations and strategy and action plans will also be more or less affected.</p>
	Terminal Evaluation:	4 - Likely ▼	"The project is likely to be sustainable. This is supported by the mainstreaming of IEM for land degradation control into central and provincial SAPs and in five-year plans, which demonstrated the acceptance of this approach by the government and other stakeholders."
	Agency Review:	4 - Likely ▼	"The project is likely to be sustainable given the substantial capacity within the provincial governments and the commitment to the partnership by the government, ADB, GEF, and other development partners."
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Likely ▼	No significant risks to sustainability were noted in the TE report.
	Terminal Evaluation:	4 - Likely ▼	


Financial 		"The mainstreaming of the IEM approach to combating land degradation into provincial and autonomous regional SAPs and five-year plans has ensured commitment of government funds, over the medium and long term, for projects geared to improve the management of the environment and natural resources, particularly those that mitigate human-induced land degradation problems. However, continued linking with development partners and donors needs to be sustained as this will open more opportunities for financing of investment projects on land degradation control in the PRC."
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess  No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Likely  Financial sustainability is likely as the IEM approach to drylands management has been mainstreamed into the five-year plans at the regional and central government levels, thus ensuring continued funding for activities. The project has also increased capacity among government agencies to build relationships with international donors and investment partners.
Socio-political 	Terminal Evaluation:	4 - Likely  "The integration of IEM for land degradation control into central and provincial SAPs and in five-year plans is an indication of the acceptance and ownership of this approach by the government and other stakeholders as an integral part of the PRC's medium and long-term plans and strategy for improved environmental management and overall economic development. At the community level, field demonstrations of IEM-driven practices for combating land degradation, together with implementation of public awareness campaigns, developed a common understanding of IEM principles and concepts among communities and encouraged greater participation and involvement in land degradation control and land-use planning. The adoption of a bottom-up multisectoral approach to IEM has ensured community participation, and interagency coordination and collaboration in policy and strategic planning on a sustained
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess  No rating provided.
	GEFEO	4 - Likely 



	Review:		<p>Socio-political sustainability appears likely based on the project's extensive engagement and consultation with stakeholders from central and regional government agencies. Over 500 officials were involved with the project, and outreach activities have raised general public awareness about the project's goals.</p> <p>The project is the first to bring together such a large number of agencies, including institutions of the highest level, to address land-related issues and problems. The TE report notes that there is a high level of political commitment to sustaining project outcomes.</p>
<p>Institutional and Legal </p>	Terminal Evaluation:	<p>4 - Likely </p>	<p>"The project has trained a significant number of technical experts, policy decision makers, legislators, private sector representatives, and communities on participatory IEM, which ensures that the IEM approach will continue to be integrated in provincial and autonomous regional plans. The strengthened capacity of involved agencies, sectors, and communities in land degradation control provided a strong foundation for an enabling environment for combating land degradation in the PRC and subsequently facilitated interagency cooperation and collaboration, and community participation. The monitoring system established, with the provincial IEM information centers playing a key role, has provided an important mechanism for sustained information collection, dissemination, and sharing among stakeholders and for further expanding the adoption of a participatory approach to IEM and planning in other provinces and autonomous regions in the PRC. Continued government support (i.e., financial or otherwise) at both central and provincial levels for applying the IEM approach for land degradation control, in policy decision making and planning, has ensured long-term sustainability of activities initiated under the project."</p>
	Agency Review:	<p>UA - Unable to assess </p>	<p>No rating provided.</p>
	GEFEO Review:	<p>4 - Likely </p>	



			There are no identified institutional or legal risk to sustainability. The project has successfully integrated the IEM approach to land use management into the five-year plans of the six regions. Local policies and regulations have been revised to support the IEM approach. The project has also institutionalized collaborative and multi-sectoral planning processes that will facilitate coordination of IEM activities.
Environmental 	Terminal Evaluation:	4 - Likely 	"There are no foreseen environmental risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes."
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Likely 	No environmental risks were noted in the TE

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
M&E 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided. "The project framework included details on performance indicators and targets. A comprehensive set of qualitative indicators and targets were provided at the goal (impact), objective (outcome), component (output), and activity levels. This structure allowed for the PCR's evaluation of attainment of each of the indicators. However, the absence of the quantitative indicators and targets makes it difficult to assess the degree of achievement of the results. The government's annual reports provided for this validation did not use the project logical framework to report on progress or performance. This validation also notes the PCR's recommendation
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	As M&E implementation is rated MS (4), overall M&E rating is also MS (4).
M&E Design 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided. "At project design, it was envisioned that the monitoring system developed under output 5 would feed into the project monitoring system, which would have served as basis for tracking the progress and monitoring results of the project as well as for assessing the impacts in relation to combating dryland ecosystem degradation."
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	





			The ProDoc's M&E plan includes a logical framework, an implementation timeline, and description of M&E activities (Appendix 8, pg. 60-61). The logical framework includes indicators, targets, and means of verification at the objective and component level. The log-frame does not differentiate 'outcomes'. As this is a capacity building project, most targets are qualitative. The description of M&E activities and parties responsible is brief, but reporting requirements are noted. There is no indication of a budget for project M&E activities.
M&E Plan Implementation 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided. "The project benefit M&E system must be operated in a more effective manner and used as a tool for monitoring and evaluating the progress of project implementation as compared with its activity targets, outputs, and outcome. It should also be used as a basis for making decisions for adjusting project scope and budgetary allocations as necessary, and in a timely manner, to maintain implementation within the intended time frame and budget. The project M&E system is likewise important for building institutional memory as well as for providing the required database and for assessing project outcome and impact."
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	Based on the little information in the TE report, the project's M&E system was not fully implemented or used as a management tool to guide project activities. The TE report also notes that project reporting and submission of PIRs/APRs was not consistent.
M&E Funding and Budget Utilization 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided. "The ADB's \$1.0 million TA covered the cost of international and national consultants, international and domestic travel, related reporting, office operations, and communication costs. The funds were utilized within the budgeted amount and within the time frame of project implementation."
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	Based on the TE report's assessment, M&E funding was utilized as intended.






Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	





<p>Quality of Implementation and Execution</p> 			<p>No overall rating provided. "Despite the high rate of turnover of CPMO staff, the project was implemented in a satisfactory manner and in line with the arrangements envisioned at appraisal."</p>
	Agency Review:	<input type="text" value="UA - Unable to assess"/>	<p>No overall rating provided.</p>
	GEFEO Review:	<input type="text" value="5 - Satisfactory"/>	<p>Both quality of implementation and execution are rated satisfactory.</p>
<p>Quality of Implementation - IA</p> 	Terminal Evaluation:	<input type="text" value="5 - Satisfactory"/>	<p>"Overall, ADB performed satisfactorily during implementation. It was quick in making adjustments for ensuring that project outputs and outcome are effectively achieved within the allocated time frame. During 2004–2010, ADB fielded a total of 13 project administration and review missions, comprising members with varied disciplines and specializations, to provide technical advice and monitor the progress of project implementation. During these missions, ADB discussed problems and issues encountered by SFA, CPCO, CPMO, PPCOs, and PPMOs, provided timely recommendations for their resolution, and ensured that these solutions met the requirements of SFA. ADB backstopping provided the necessary support and supervision for ensuring that all activities were completed within the time frame allowed. ADB carried out regular monitoring of the withdrawal, disbursement, and use of funds to determine how efficiently the project was progressing through review missions and annual reports."</p>
	Agency Review:	<input type="text" value="5 - Satisfactory"/>	<p>"This validation agrees with the PCR's assessment and assesses ADB's performance satisfactory."</p>
	GEFEO Review:	<input type="text" value="5 - Satisfactory"/>	<p>"This validation notes that the executing agency did not fully comply with covenants for submission of annual, midterm, and semi-annual progress reports, with regular annual and semi-annual reports being submitted only from 2008 onward. On balance, this validation rates the performance of the executing agency satisfactory."</p>
	Terminal Evaluation:	<input type="text" value="5 - Satisfactory"/>	<p>"SFA performed satisfactorily. It was able to establish an effective interagency coordination mechanism for the partnership. Through the CPCO, CPMO, PPCOs, and PPMOs, it was able to generate interest in the IEM approach among policy decision-makers, planners, legislators, experts, and communities. This ensured the adoption of IEM concepts and principles in provincial SAPs and subsequently in the provincial five-year plans. SFA was also able to establish links with donor agencies, which opened opportunities for possible financing of IEM."</p>
	Agency Review:	<input type="text" value="5 - Satisfactory"/>	
















Quality of Execution - EA 			"This validation notes that the executing agency did not fully comply with covenants for submission of annual, midterm, and semi-annual progress reports, with regular annual and semi-annual reports being submitted only from 2008 onward. On balance, this validation rates the performance of the executing agency satisfactory."
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	Based on the TE report project execution was satisfactory. The project team successfully engaged with the very large number of stakeholders involved and was able to ensure integration of the IEM approach in the policies of six different regional governments. Despite some turnover in project staff, the PMU did successfully deliver all outputs within the revised timeframe. Although the TE report does not provide detail on cost-shifting between project components, the project was compliant with ADB procedures regarding financial management and procurement.

 **Agency Specific Project Criteria**













Criteria	Document	Rating/Verification	Comment
Processes Affecting Attainment of Project Results			
Country Ownership / Driveness / Alignment to Country or Regional Priority 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided. "In the 1990s, land degradation control plans and programs achieved less than intended mainly because of a top-down approach in policy decision making and planning, which resulted in inefficient and uncoordinated efforts in tackling cross-cutting sector issues. A change in government strategy emerged in the early 2000s, which emphasized a bottom-up approach that integrated IEM concepts and principles in rural development and environmental protection. The government's commitment to sustainable natural resource and environmental management has been reflected in central and provincial SAPs, and five-year plans. The government's increased awareness and commitment to addressing environmental challenges have drawn support from the international community, which is keenly aware of the global implications of the PRC's size and potential."
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	6 - Highly Satisfactory 	

			<p>The project was closely aligned to national priorities regarding drylands management. Support for the project has been high among central and regional government leaders. This is reflected in the higher than expected level of co-financing provided and the financial commitments to ensuring sustainability.</p>
<p>Financial Planning </p>	<p>Terminal Evaluation:</p>	<p>UA - Unable to assess </p>	<p>No rating provided. "Following the review of the project, carried out during September–December 2004, a detailed project work plan was reformulated based on the consolidation of project outputs 2, 3, and 4 as an integrated institutions and planning package, given that their activities contribute to strengthening the links between macro-level and field-level strategic planning. A reallocation of GEF funds was made and the original project closing date was subsequently extended from 31 December 2008 to 31 December 2009 to provide additional time for achieving quality outputs and for ensuring that project objectives were met. The reallocation was budget-neutral and did not involve major changes in project scope or implementation arrangements. ADB carried out regular monitoring of the withdrawal, disbursement, and use of funds to determine how efficiently the project was progressing through mission reviews and annual reports. Financial reports and plans, as well as the conduct of annual audits, provided management with relevant information for making decisions regarding the budget and timely release of funds. This, in particular, facilitated the establishment of special accounts in project provinces to expedite withdrawal applications and remittance procedures to provincial implementation agencies to avoid further delays in implementation."</p>
	<p>Agency Review:</p>	<p>UA - Unable to assess </p>	<p>No rating provided.</p>
	<p>GEFEO Review:</p>	<p>4 - Moderately Satisfactory </p>	<p>The re-allocation of funds between project components and the high costs for Component (Output) 6 - Project management could perhaps have been avoided through more realistic budgetary analysis at the project design stage.</p>
	<p>Terminal Evaluation:</p>	<p>UA - Unable to assess </p>	

<p>Preparation and Readiness </p>			<p>No rating provided. "The western region of the PRC was identified as having the worst land degradation problems in the world, which threatens the quality of life of more than 285 million people. To address the land degradation problems affecting the region, ADB provided five TA projectsb between 2000 and 2003 to develop the PRC-GEF Partnership on Land Degradation in Dryland Ecosystems. These projects facilitated discussions at the central, provincial, and regional levels for determining land degradation control and management SAPs suitable to the western region. They subsequently provided the foundation for developing the CPF, which focused on six priority provinces and autonomous regions in the PRC's western region.c The CPF, in turn, served as basis for a PRC-GEF agreement to commit resources for implementing a phased set of priority activities over a 10-year period (2003-2012) to address the interlinked problems of rural poverty, vulnerability, land degradation, and biodiversity loss within the drylands of the western PRC through the promotion of an IEM approach."</p>
	<p>Agency Review:</p>	<p>UA - Unable to assess </p>	<p>No rating provided.</p>
	<p>GEFEO Review:</p>	<p>5 - Satisfactory </p>	<p>The project design was appropriate for addressing the need for greater coordination among regional governments with respect to drylands management. Greater attention during the preparation phase to the links between project activities as well as the implementation arrangements might have helped the project during the start-up phase.</p>
	<p>Terminal Evaluation:</p>	<p>UA - Unable to assess </p>	




Stakeholders Involvement 			No rating provided. "The ADB TA projects, implemented in preparation for the project, set the stage for extensive participation and stronger ownership among the relevant stakeholders during project formulation at all levels. The interest generated by the project on the IEM approach and wide acceptance of its concept and principles by policy decision makers, planners, legislators, the private sector, and local communities facilitated the mainstreaming of IEM for land degradation control into provincial SAPs and five-year plans. This participatory approach in strategic planning, and the key role of provincial governments and line agencies, ensured government, interagency, and multisectoral coordination, collaboration, and support for maintaining an enabling environment for combating land degradation on a sustained basis. This has solved the problem of divided interests among the stakeholders."
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	The project involved extensive outreach and participation by stakeholders across six different regional governments. The participation by stakeholders has generated a high level of ownership among central and regional government agencies.
Need for Follow Up 	Terminal Evaluation:	No 	Not mentioned in TE report.
	Agency Review:	Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	No 	Nothing in the TE report indicates a need for follow-up.
Gender Mainstreaming 	Terminal Evaluation:	No 	Not mentioned in TE report.
	Agency Review:	Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	No 	This is not addressed in the project design and it is not mentioned in the TE report.
Effects on Local Population 	Terminal Evaluation:	Unable to assess 	Not specifically assessed in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	Yes 	






Various project activities involving outreach and demonstration sub-projects can be construed as having had effects on local communities. The project formulated community-based and participatory, land degradation control plans at pilot sites. The project also initiated provincial public environmental education programs on IEM in all six provinces.








Criteria / Socioeconomic Nexus	Document	Verification	Comment
Poverty Reduction 	Terminal Evaluation:	Unable to assess 	Not specifically assessed in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	Unable to assess 	While the terminal evaluation report mentions that pilot projects on drylands management were implemented at pilot, there is insufficient detail to assess the results on poverty levels.
Crisis Prevention and Recovery 	Terminal Evaluation:	No 	Not mentioned in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	No 	This is not addressed in the project design and it is not mentioned in the TE report.
Democratic Governance 	Terminal Evaluation:	No 	Not mentioned in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	No 	This is not addressed in the project design and it is not mentioned in the TE report. While various project activities engaged local communities in developing ecosystem management plans, the focus was not on democratic governance.





 **Progress to Impact**





Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to Assess 	
----------------------	---	--













Progress to Impact 			No rating provided. "The project has made significant achievements in improving the enabling environment for combating land degradation. The impact is evident in the six western provinces and autonomous regions where the implementation of the project strengthened local legislation for land degradation control and the application of the IEM approach ahead of others in the country. The most apparent impacts are (i) improved interagency and intersectoral cooperation and collaboration, (ii) improved policy and planning for combating land degradation, and (iii) a functioning IEM data management and documentation system. The impact of the project was discussed in an ADB publication."
	Agency Review:	3 - Significant Progress 	"On balance, this validation rates project impact significant."
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Significant Progress 	The TE report notes "significant achievements in improving the enabling environment for combating land degradation." While the TE report does mention that the "impact is evident", it is not referring to GEBs, but rather to project outcomes. The project has effectively increased regional government capacity to implement an IEM approach to drylands management. In addition to improved policy, planning, and inter-agency cooperation, the project has put in place an information management system which will be critical for monitoring land use activity and progress towards GEBs.

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Foundational	Document	Verification	Comment
Information, Knowledge and Awareness 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	Not specifically assessed in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes 	Various project activities, including training workshops, study tours, development of guidelines and manuals, as well as a public environmental education program have served to expand knowledge and awareness. Additionally outputs such as the information management system, and a database on local and regional policies have made information more accessible.
	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes 	

Legal, Regulatory and Policy Frameworks 			"An enabling administrative, policy, and legislative environment to promote IEM has been established in the six project provinces and autonomous regions." A more coherent, consistent, and responsive framework of policies, legislation, regulations, and procedures, including incentives for investment in combating land degradation has been established.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes 	Project activities have resulted in revised policies, laws and regulations governing land use. Policies, laws and regulations supporting IEM have also been integrated into 11 agencies and harmonized across six regional governments. Local strategic plans for combating land degradation operations in six provinces and autonomous regions, including institutional arrangements, increased budgets, and participatory processes have been developed and mainstreamed into their respective development plans.
Implementing Structures and Arrangements 	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes 	Land-use decision making, land management practices, and strategies for poverty reduction now use stakeholder participation, and communitybased and sustainable approaches.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes 	The project has increased coordination among regional governments and agencies. A central legal and policy expert group has been established. The project increased the level of stakeholder and community involvement in land use decision making.

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Demonstrational	Document	Verification	Comment
Piloting / Demonstration of technologies and approaches 	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes 	Land degradation control following IEM approach in sample of communities and villages.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes 	Community land degradation plans and demonstration project were conducted at pilot sites in each province.

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Investment	Document	Verification	Comment
Financial mechanisms to facilitate adoption of the promoted technologies and approaches 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	Not specifically addressed in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	Insufficient information to assess.

Criteria / Causal Pathway	Document	Verification	Comment
Replication 	Terminal Evaluation:	N - No 	"The acceptance of the IEM approach by numerous government agencies, and their involvement in its application in land degradation control projects, provided a solid foundation for sustained integration of the approach into the policy and planning framework of the government and a framework for the replication of the IEM approach in other provinces in the PRC."
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	N - No 	There is no evidence of replication during the project's lifetime, although there is clear potential for replicating activities in other
Upscaling 	Terminal Evaluation:	N - No 	Not mentioned in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	Scaling-up of the project results is not addressed in the TE report.
Mainstreaming 	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes 	"The interest generated by the project on the IEM approach and wide acceptance of its concept and principles by policy decision makers, planners, legislators, the private sector, and local communities facilitated the mainstreaming of IEM for land degradation control into provincial SAPs and five-year plans."
	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes 	Based on information in the TE report, the project has successfully mainstreamed the IEM approach into central and provincial government policies and decision making processes.














Criteria / Evaluative Evidence	Document		









Environmental Stress Reduction	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.			
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.			
	GEFEO Review	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments
		Y - Yes	Demonstration Site		There is no explicit evidence in the TE report of environmental stress reduction. However, pilot projects on LD control have been conducted and these should result in stress reduction at the demonstration sites.
		Add New Row...			Edit Delete
Environmental Status Change	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.			
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.			
	GEFEO Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.			
Socioeconomic Status Change	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.			
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.			
	GEFEO Review	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments
		N - No			There is no evidence in the TE report of socio-economic status change.
		Add New Row...			Edit Delete
Arrangements for Impact M&E	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.			
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.			
	GEFEO Review	Visibility	Comments		
		Y - Yes	The project has developed a monitoring system to track environmental indicators		Edit Delete



















 Add New Row...

and measure the impacts of efforts to contro LD.

 **TE Report Quality**

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
TE Quality 	Agency Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	"The PCR was well prepared, generally clear, concise, and consistent with the PCR guidelines, Project Administration Instructions 6.07, and Independent Evaluation Department guidelines. The PCR has provided substantial and consistent documentation on the project to support the overall assessment, lessons, recommendations and ratings. The PCR could have better explained the costs associated with output 6, including a discussion of why costs almost doubled, from \$3.3 million at appraisal to \$5.8 million, to better explain the efficiency rating. Similarly, the PCR could have emphasized the importance of effective and timely implementation of the M&E framework. The PCR drew relevant lessons and pertinent recommendations. The
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	This is a well organized TE report which provides a solid picture of project achievement and implementation. The assessments are well supported by the evidence presented. The financial overview is clear, but as noted in the ADB validation report, some additional detail could have shed light on the cost overruns for Output 6. The main drawback to this TE report is the absence of an assessment of the project's M&E system and the logical framework. In all other aspects, this report should be considered a good practice
Outcome Assessment 	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	The TE report provides a clear and comprehensive assessment of outputs and objectives. Project performance on the panel of indicators is compared to targets.
Consistency 	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	There is insufficient information in the TE report to assess this parameter.
Sustainability Assessment 	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	Project sustainability is assessed along the major dimensions and good detail is provided to support the ratings.
Evidence-based	Agency Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	No rating provided.

Lessons and Recommendations 	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	The lessons and recommendations are pertinent and highlight critical factors contributing to the projects level of success. Additional lessons might include the importance of an M&E system, and the importance of ADB's technical assistance
Clear Financial Assessment 	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	The report provides a clear financial assessment including data on co-financing, and expenditures by component and activity.
M&E Assessment 	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	M&E implementation is briefly discussed and the TE report notes the need to integrate M&E into implementation. The report does not provide an assessment of M&E design at entry.

Agency-Specific Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Attainment of Results based on Indicators 	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	Project outputs and outcomes are measured against the indicators and targets indicated in the logical framework.
Consultation with Stakeholders 	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	There is insufficient information in the TE report to assess this parameter.
Compliance with Guidances 	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	Based on the agency review, the TE report is in compliance with ADB guidance for PCRs.
Compliance with UNEG Norms 	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	N/A
Addressing of ToR requests 	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	N/A
Independence of Report 	Agency Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No rating provided.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	Insufficient information to assess. It does not appear that an independent evaluator was retained to conduct the TE and prepare the

 **Lessons & Recommendations**



No data entered yet. Click --> [+](#) Add New Row... <-- to add new Lesson Learned.



No data entered yet. Click --> [+](#) Add New Row... <-- to add new Recommendation.

[<< Back to Project Edit](#)

A product of the Global Environment Facility