Terminal Evaluation Report

2017

Version: 20170929 final

CBPF: Strengthening the effectiveness of the protected area system in Qinghai Province, China to conserve globally important biodiversity GEF Project ID: 3992

UNDP PIMS ID: 4179

Country:	China
Region:	Asia and the Pacific
GEF Replenishment Cycle:	GEF-4
Strategic Program:	Biodiversity
Implementing Agency:	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
Executing Agency:	Qinghai Finance Department, Qinghai Provincial Government

Prepared by: **Professor** Li Jiao, National Consultant **James Lenoci**, International Consultant / Team Leader

Terminal Evaluation Opening Page:

PROJECT DETAILS:

Project Name:	CBPF: Strengthening the Effectiveness of the Protected Area System in Qinghai Province
Project ID:	GEF Project ID: 3992 UNDP PIMS ID: 4179
Country:	China
Region:	Asia and the Pacific
Focal Area:	Biodiversity
Funding Source:	GEF Trust Fund
Strategic Programs:	GEF-4 Biodiversity Strategic Program 1: Strengthening terrestrial PA networks
Implementing Agency:	United Nations Development Programme
Implementation Modality:	National Implementation Modality (NIM)
Executing Agency:	Qinghai Finance Department, Qinghai Provincial Government
Other Implementing Partners:	Qinghai Forestry Department
FINANCIALS:	
Project Preparation Grant:	USD 100,000
GEF Project Grant:	USD 5,354,545
Cofinancing Total:	USD 18,349,000
GEF Agency Fees:	USD 535,454
Total Cost:	USD 23,803,545
PROJECT TIMELINE:	
Received by GEF:	23 April 2009
Preparation Grant Approved:	15 October 2009
Concept Approved:	31 March 2010
Project Approved for Implementation:	05 April 2012
State Date:	14 September 2012
Project Closed (planned):	30 November 2017 (this is the closure date indicated on the GEF website)

TERMINAL EVALUATION DETAILS:

TE Timeframe: Reporting Language: Evaluators:

June-September 2017 English

James Lenoci

li Tiao

Professor Li Jiao International Consultant / Team Leader National Consultant

The terminal evaluation (TE) team would like to acknowledge the feedback provided by the interviewed stakeholders, including the national project director, the project director, the project manager, chief technical advisor, PMO staff members, QFD officials, as well as officials from other provincial departments, local government officials, PA management staff, experts contracted by the project, and local people in the demonstration villages visited during the TE mission. Special thanks are also extended to the UNDP CO portfolio manager, programme assistant, and UNDP-GEF regional technical advisor.

Table of Contents

Ex	Executive Summaryi		
Ab	breviati	ion and Acronyms	х
1.	Intro	duction	. 1
	1.1.	Purpose of Evaluation	1
	1.2.	Evaluation Scope and Methodology	1
	1.3.	Structure of the Evaluation Report	2
	1.4.	Ethics	3
	1.5.	Audit Trail	3
	1.6.	Limitations	4
	1.7.	Evaluation Ratings	4
2.	Proje	ect Description	. 5
	2.1.	Project Start and Duration	5
	2.2.	Problems that the Project Sought to Address	5
	2.3.	Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project	6
	2.4.	Baseline Indicators Established	8
	2.5.	Main Stakeholders	8
	2.6.	Expected Results	9
3.	Findi	ngs	10
	3.1.	Project Design / Formulation	10
	3.1.1.	Analysis of Project Design and Logical Results Framework	10
	3.1.2.	Assumptions and Risks	13
	3.1.3.	Lessons from other Relevant Projects	13
	3.1.4.	Planned Stakeholder Participation	14
	3.1.5.	Replication Approach	14
	3.1.6.	UNDP Comparative Advantage	14
	3.1.7.	Linkages between Project and other Interventions	15
	3.1.8.	Management Arrangements	15
	3.2.	Project Implementation	15
	3.2.1.	Adaptive Management	15
	3.2.2.	Partnership Arrangements	15
	3.2.3.	Feedback from M&E Activities used for Adaptive Management	16
	3.2.4.	Project Finance	16
	3.2.5.	Monitoring & Evaluation	19
	3.2.6.	Implementing Agency (IA) and Executing Agency (EA) Execution	24
	3.3.	Project Results	26
	3.3.1.	Overall Results (Attainment of Objective)	26
	3.3.2.	Relevance	39
	3.3.3.	Efficiency	40
	3.3.4.	Country Ownership	41
	3.3.5.	Mainstreaming	41
	3.3.6.	Sustainability	42
	3.3.7.	Catalytic Role	45
	3.3.8.	Impact	45
4.	Conc	lusions, Recommendations, Lessons, Good Practices	46
	4.1.	Conclusions	46
	4.2.	Recommendations	48
	4.3.	Good Practices and Lessons Learned	49

5. Annexes

Annex 1: TE Mission Itinerary

- Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix
- Annex 3: List of Persons Interviewed
- Annex 4: List of Information Reviewed
- Annex 5: Summary of Field Visits
- Annex 6: Matrix for Rating Achievement of Project Objective and Outcomes
- Annex 7: Cofinancing Table
- Annex 8: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form
- Annex 9: Terms of Reference
- Annex 10: Signed TE Final Report Clearance Form

List of Exhibits:

Exhibit 1:	Project summary table
Exhibit 2:	Evaluation rating table
Exhibit 3:	Recommendations table
Exhibit 4:	SMART criteria
Exhibit 5:	Rating scales
Exhibit 6:	Protected area system of Qinghai Province at project entry
Exhibit 7:	List of project stakeholders and their envisaged roles and responsibilities
Exhibit 8:	SMART analysis of strategic results framework
Exhibit 9:	Analysis of project risks
Exhibit 10:	Breakdown of project budget and financing
Exhibit 11:	Breakdown of project budget and actual expenditures
Exhibit 12:	Top five valued contracts under Component 3
Exhibit 13:	Distribution of expenditures over time, 2013-2017
Exhibit 14:	USD:CNY exchange rates Sep 2012 – Jul 2017
Exhibit 15:	Summary of management responses to MTR recommendations
Exhibit 16:	Summary of biodiversity survey results in the Suojia-Qumahe unit of SNNR, 2014-2016
Exhibit 17:	Increases in operational expenditures from 2014 to 2016 for 5 nature reserves
Exhibit 18:	Number of illegal incident cases, 2011-2016
Exhibit 19:	New protected areas gazetted during the timeframe of the project
Exhibit 20:	Grazing closure areas in counties of the SNNR demonstration blocks from 2014-2017
Exhibit 21:	Basic information of 12 demonstration villages and 6 extension villages
Exhibit 22:	Relevance of the project according to the GEF-4 Biodiversity focal area strategy
Exhibit 23:	Gender involvement during project implementation
Exhibit 24:	Climate change trends in Qinghai Province, 1962-2012
Exhibit 25:	Analysis of project impacts

Executive Summary

Project Title: CBPF: Strengthening the effectiveness of the protected area system in Qinghai Province, China to conserve globally important biodiversity				at endorsement (USD million)	at completion (USD million)
GEF Project ID:		3992	GEF financing: 5.355 5.188		
UNDP Project ID:		4179	IA own: 0 N/A		
Country:		China	Government: 18.500 23.225		
Region:		Asia and the Pacific	Other: 0 N/A		
Focal Area:		Biodiversity	Total co-financing: 18.500 23.225		23.225
Operational Programme:		SO-1, BD-1	Total Project Cost: 23.855 28.413		
Executing Agency:		Qinghai Finance Department, Qinghai Provincial Government	Prodoc Signature (date project began):		14 Sep 2012
Other Partners Ir	volved:	Qinghai Forestry Department, Project Management Office	(Operational) Closing Date: Proposed: Actual: 30 Sep 2017 30 Nov 2017		Actual: 30 Nov 2017

Exhibit 1: Project summary table

Note: Total expenditures based upon figures through 30 June 2017.

Project Description

As the fourth largest province in China, with a total area of 720,000 km², Qinghai serves as a significant store of the national biodiversity, exhibits some unique high altitude grassland, mountain, wetland, desert and forest ecosystems, and serves as a significant controller of the Asian monsoon system that affects the climate of 3 billion people. The province includes the headwaters of three of Asia's major rivers – the Yellow, Yangtze and Mekong rivers.

Although Qinghai lists 11 nature reserves totaling an impressive 31% of the territory, the existing protected area (PA) system lacked adequate balance at project entry – it showed significant gaps in ecosystem coverage and contained extensive overlap with other interests such as road construction, water diversion plans and herder community tenure rights. It also included areas exhibiting serious land degradation resulting from a combination *inter alia* of overgrazing, engineering damage and climate change. Other problems facing the PA system included illegal gold mining and poaching, livestock fences interrupting wildlife migratory pathways, and aggressive pest control programmes aimed at small burrowing mammals but that also harm many collateral species.

The project was designed to directly target barriers through a series of steps that aimed to enhance PA system effectiveness. The global and national biodiversity significance of Qinghai's PA system, its vital role as the catchment area for three major rivers, the nature and severity of ongoing threats to the PA system and the persistence of important barriers limiting its effectiveness.

The project **goal** was to strengthen the effectiveness of the PA system in Qinghai Province, China to conserve globally important biodiversity. The project **objective** was to *catalyze management effectiveness of Qinghai's PA system to fulfil its purpose of conserving globally important biodiversity*, by removing the barriers with three inter-related outcomes. The focus of the project was to strengthen the PA system in Qinghai to better protect a representative sample of its unique biodiversity and more effectively manage this PA network as a whole.

Terminal Evaluation Purpose and Methodology

This terminal evaluation was conducted to provide conclusions and recommendations about the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and impact of the project. The evaluation also aimed to identify lessons from the Project for future similar undertakings, and to propose recommendations for ensuring the sustainability of the results. The evaluation was an evidence-based assessment and relied on feedback from persons who have been involved in the design, implementation, and supervision of the project, review of available documents and records, and findings made during field visits.

Summary of Conclusions

In the 5 years since implementation of the project was initiated, there have been significant improvements in the protected area (PA) system under management by the Qinghai Provincial Forestry Department (QFD). The PA system is **more representative**, **better funded**, and **under improved management** compared to the baseline circumstances in 2011. These advancements have occurred during a time when biodiversity conservation has been mainstreamed into central and provincial government development planning in China. The principle of eco-civilization is a core part of the national 13th 5-year plan, and the central government has initiated pilot implementation of a national park system, with the Three Rivers Source national park (NP), which covers 5 of 18 blocks of the Sanjiangyuan national nature reserve (SNNR) and the entire Kekexili national nature reserve, approved in 2015 as the first NP pilot in the country. Kekexili's designation as the World Heritage Site in July 2017 further strengthens the PA system.

The selection of the SNNR as the focus of the project was also highly relevant, not only because of the NP pilot, but due to the fact that it is a globally significant site for biodiversity conservation, harboring several endangered and vulnerable species, including, but not limited to the snow leopard (*Panthera uncia*), wild yak (*Bos mutus*), black-necked crane (*Grus nigricollis*), but also because it delivers globally important ecosystem services, being the source of three major rivers in China and neighboring Asian countries: the Yangtze, Yellow, and Mekong Rivers.

Through consistent and proactive involvement by the QFD, the project facilitated improvements in management effectiveness of the SNNR, as well as other PA's within the QFD's portfolio, and also strengthened the enabling conditions within the province for cross-sectoral collaboration towards mainstreaming biodiversity conservation. The project was effective at adapting to changed circumstances, e.g., assisting the newly created NP administration in preparation of the draft NP regulation which was approved in June 2017. A substantive proportion of the GEF funds were expended under Component 3, which focused on developing functional collaborative management arrangements with Tibetan herder communities situated within the SNNR. End targets have mostly been achieved, including scale-able models of community collaborative management arrangements demonstrated in 12 villages within the SNNR.

Ownership by the QFD has been strong and consistent. For example, nearly USD 3 million in cash cofinancing was contributed, directly deposited into the PMO's bank account and used to support specific project activities, including infrastructure related investments for eco-tourism, water supply systems for some of the local communities, in addition to funding the salaries of many of the PMO staff, including the three component managers.

Establishment of the Three Rivers Source NP pilot enhances the sustainability of the project results, as funding, staffing, and other resources are likely to increase in coming years. The QFD's portfolio of PA's has expanded during the lifespan of the project, with 10 newly established wetland parks and 4 desert parts. Moreover, there remain 8 nature reserves under QFD management, and the Qilian Mountains provincial nature reserve has recently (June 2017) been approved as a cross-provincial NP pilot, together with neighboring Gansu Province. Although management arrangements are unclear at this time for the Qilian Mountains NP, it is likely that the State Forestry Administration (SFA) will be the lead agency at the central government level; both the QFD and Gansu Forestry Department report directly to the SFA; thus, it seems probable that management responsibility will remain within the QFD, although this is uncertain.

The significant changes to the institutional landscape in Qinghai Province have resulted in certain transitional uncertainties. For instance, the institutional capacity and influence of the QFD have been partly diminished, with the two largest nature reserves formerly under their management, SNNR and Kekexili NR, shifted into the Three Rivers Source NP Administration. It will likely take a few years before the institutional arrangements among the agencies responsible for PA management will be sorted out.

Another factor that presents short to medium term challenges to the sustainability of project results is the operationalization of the Eco-Position Programme, which has been recently formed through consolidation of earlier social welfare programmes aimed at providing employment opportunities for lower income persons. The eco-positions are now under direct management by the NP administration and the QFD. Though now managed by conservation oriented agencies, poverty alleviation remains the core objective of the programme. The Three Rivers Source NP pilot, for example, has more than 10,000 eco-positions allocated. One person from each household in specific villages is provided with an eco-position and they are tasked with assisting the NP and/or NR in patrolling and monitoring activities. These activities are similar to the collaborative management arrangements facilitated in the 12 project demonstration villages; however, the approach is quite different. The project delivered a bottom-up approach, empowering local village representatives to identify particular issues that were important to their communities; whereas the eco-position programme is more top-down, with instructions being administered from NP

and NR administrative stations. And, integrating more than 10,000 people, mostly who are Tibetan herders, into the PA system will take time too.

Although the co-management activities delivered by the project were participatory and larger in scale than some of the efforts made prior to the project, there is room for improvement for genuine collaboration on PA management. Communities were trained in providing assistance in patrolling and monitoring tasks, and locally relevant conservation zoning was facilitated by the project and more integrated into village level regulations. However, local people are not yet meaningfully participating in PA management decisions. For instance, the results of biodiversity surveys are not fully shared with local people, e.g., to show them how their conservation efforts are leading to increased wildlife populations. Decisions regarding grassland recovery and livestock management remain at the provincial level, specifically under the Agriculture/Animal Husbandry Department, with no evidence of consultations with local communities beforehand. Many of the interviewed local herders stressed interest in the apparent increasing trend in wildlife populations, how these wild animals are competing for grassland resources and also in the increasing number of human-wildlife conflicts.

There are also uncertainties associated with the sustainability of the knowledge management system (KMS) developed by the project. The KMS is technically impressive but requires further development, e.g., some of the annual datasets only run up to 2012, and the field applications for remote transfer of patrolling monitoring data are not yet fully functional. Maintenance of the system also will require resources, including support from specialized IT experts. QFD management stressed commitment towards ownership of the KMS after project closure, but the NP administration indicated that they will develop a separate system for the Three Rivers NP, which now encompasses the SNNR, which was the focus of the project and where the field applications were trialed. Moreover, the environmental protection sector in the province is maintaining its own information management system with some overlapping content. Long-term plans of developing a large integrated sky-earth system were mentioned to the TE team, but in the short to medium term, biodiversity information management will likely be rather fragmented among the key stakeholders in the province, especially considering the context of inertial forces of segmented sector management, long-term knowledge barriers, as well as technical challenges.

Evaluation Ratings

Evaluation ratings are tabulated below in Exhibit 2.

Criteria	Rating	Comments
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	(M&E)	
M&E Design at Entry	Satisfactory	The M&E plan was reasonably well put together using the template for GEF- financed projects. PIR reports contained feedback from key stakeholders and provided detailed summaries of project performance. Constructive adjustments
M&E Plan Implementation	Satisfactory	were made following recommendations made by the midterm review. The PSC convened annually and provided constructive feedback to the project team. There were a few shortcomings with respect to monitoring and evaluation, starting with the lack of critically reviewing and adjusting certain baselines. There
Overall Quality of M&E	Satisfactory	were a number of inconsistencies in the tracking tool assessments, indicating insufficient quality control and lack of inclusive participation in the assessment process.
2. Implementing Agency (IA) a	nd Lead Impleme	enting Partner (Executing Agency - EA) Execution
Quality of IA (UNDP) Execution	Highly Satisfactory	Constructive support has been delivered by the QFD as executing agency and by UNDP as the implementing agency. Strong continuity of PSC members enhances the overall quality of IA-EA execution. Project management and advisory support were consistently good. Reporting

Criteria Rating Comments was timely and informative, work planning was appropriate, and funds were managed prudently. The project facilitated cross-sector involvement among provincial agencies, but Highly Quality of EA Execution there were shortfalls with respect to stakeholder engagement, most notably with Satisfactory respect to the Agriculture / Animal Husbandry Department. Highly **Overall IA-EA Execution** Satisfactory 3. Assessment of Outcomes The project has managed to satisfactorily achieve the majority of intended outcomes. **Overall Quality of Project** Satisfactory The advances made with respect to mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into Outcomes sector plans and technical regulations provide long-lasting guidance to provincial stakeholders. The project is relevant across a number of criteria, including with respect to national and provincial strategies, GEF BD strategic objectives, and priorities of the UNDP CO. With the principle of eco-civilization integrated into the national 13th 5-year plan, conservation has been elevated to one of the pillars of socioeconomic development in China. The Qinghai provincial 13th 5-year plan reflects this. The project was well-aligned with the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) for the period 2011-2030, and also with the Qinghai BSAP (2016-2030), approved in October 2016. The importance of biodiversity and ecosystem functions in Qinghai province, particularly within the SNNR, continues to be Relevance Relevant represented in national and subnational priorities. The Three Rivers Source National Park (NP) pilot was the first to be approved nationally, and this NP is providing a functional framework for other NP's in the country. The project was consistent with Strategic Objective No. 1, "to catalyze sustainability of protected area systems" of the GEF-4 Biodiversity Strategy. And, the project was aligned with the objectives set out in the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for the period 2011-2015, specifically Outcome 1.2, "Policy and implementation mechanisms to manage natural resources are strengthened, with special attention to poor and vulnerable groups". Outcome 1: Mainstreaming PA management into provincial Satisfactory development and sector planning process Outcome 2: Increasing PA management effectiveness Satisfactory Effectiveness Satisfactory through strengthened institutional and staff capacities Outcome 3: Demonstration of effective PA management through community involvement in the Sanjiangyuan Satisfactory National Nature Reserve (SNNR The GEF funding addressed most of the key barriers that were constraining effective and financially sustainable management of the PA system. The project has managed to satisfactorily achieve the majority of intended outcomes within the allocated budget and timeframe. Local capacity was efficiently utilized and strengthened in implementation of the project. And, materialized cofinancing Efficiency Satisfactory exceeded the sum committed at project endorsement. The value for money of the investment made in the KMS was relatively low, in the opinion of the TE team; further development is required and there seems that biodiversity information management will be further fragmented in coming years, with the NP planning on developing their own system. 4. Sustainability Overall likelihood that The advances made in biodiversity mainstreaming enhance the likelihood that benefits will continue to be Moderately project results will be sustained after GEF funding ceases. The regulatory and delivered after project Likely technical guidelines adopted (and under review) should also have long-lasting closure effects, by reducing threats associated with infrastructure development.

Exhibit 2: Evaluation Rating Table

Criteria	Rating	Comments
Financial dimension	Likely	The establishment of the Three Rivers Source NP pilot greatly enhances the likelihood for sustaining project results. Additional PA funding is expected as a result, and the importance of biodiversity conservation in Qinghai Province has been further elevated among central governmental stakeholders.
Socio-Economic dimension	Moderately Likely	The increased awareness among the demonstration villages and replicable models of community collaborative management arrangements further enhance sustainability. Capturing traditional ecological knowledge and involvement of religious leaders further enhance sustainability. The participatory approach
Institutional Framework and Governance dimension	Likely	promoted by the project provided an opportunity for local people to have a stronger voice on those issues that are important to them, and environmental stewardship increased as a result. There are a few factors that diminish the outlook of sustaining project results. The QFD is in a transition period as a result of the establishment of the Three Rivers National Park Administration. Shifting management responsibility of the two largest NR's out of QFD's portfolio reduces institutional capacity and also
Environmental dimension	Likely	influence over the short term. PA management authorities are also grappling with the integration of more than 10,000 temporary staff, as part of the Eco-Position Programme. The training demands for such a large number of people are significant, and it will take time to achieve widespread participatory involvement in PA management. The project made substantive contributions to the understanding of potential impacts to climate change, and the resilience of local demonstration communities in coping with consequences of climate change has also been enhanced through participatory natural resource management. There are risks associated with high degree of uncertainty and the irreversibility of many of the forecasted impacts of climate change.
5. Impact		
Environmental Status Improvement	Minimal	Based on baseline surveys made in 2014 and follow-up assessments in 2015, 2016, and 2017, populations of selected indicator species within the three SNNR blocks where the project supported collaborative management arrangements with local communities have shown stable or slightly increasing trends. <u>Suojia-Qumahe block</u> : Tibetan wild ass (<i>Equus kiang</i> ; IUCN:LC), Tibetan gazelle (<i>Procapra picticaudata</i> ; IUCN: NT), Tibetan antelope (<i>Pantholops hodgsonii</i> ; IUCN: NT). <u>Zhaling-Elinghu block</u> : bar-headed goose (<i>Anser indicus</i> ; IUCN: LC), ruddy shellduck (<i>Tadorna ferruginea</i> ; IUCN: LC), brown-headed gull (<i>Chroicocephalus brunnicephalus</i> ; IUCN: LC). <u>Makehe block</u> : rhesus macaque (<i>Macaca mulatta</i> ; IUCN: LC), blue eared pheasant (<i>Crossoptilon auritum</i> ; IUCN: LC), alpine stream salamander (<i>Batrachuperus tibetanus</i> ; IUCN: VU). An impact rating of minimal is applied. Ecological status of these species in the surveyed areas has been steady or slightly improving; the results are representative of the surveyed geographic areas within 3 of the 18 SNNR blocks, and the timeframe from baseline was limited to 3 years.
Environmental Stress Reduction	Minimal	There have also been verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems; a minimal rating is applied for this aspect. The number of illegal incidents recorded by the Qinghai Forest Police has decreased in recent years; administrative cases have reduced from 1,980 in 2011 to 937 in 2016. The number of criminal cases has, however, increased over this time period, from 34 to 80, respectively. Reductions in stress have also been achieved through closure of grassland areas for grazing; a cumulative land area of 143,412 ha (1,434 km ²) have been closed for grazing in the years 2014-2017, in the Zhiduo, Qumalai, Maduo, and Banma counties and in the Makehe Bureau. These closures were often accompanied with erecting fencing, as this is standard practice implemented by the Animal Husbandry sector, for grassland recovery interventions, which is counterproductive with conservation objectives of freeing up wildlife migration routes.

Exhibit 2: Evaluation Rating Table

Criteria	Rating	Comments
Progress towards stress/status change	Significant	With respect to progress made towards stress/status change, a rating of significant is applied. The project facilitated collaborative management arrangements facilitated in 12 +6 villages covering a cumulative land area of 34,746 km ² . The management effectiveness of 5 key NR's significantly increased; e.g., for the 152,300 km ² SNNR, the METT score increased by 39 percentage points, from 32% in 2011 to 71% in 2017.
		The financial sustainability, measured by the GEF4 financial scorecard, of the PA system managed by the QFD, covering a cumulative area of 216,294 km ² improved from 23.64% in 2011 to 40.89% in 2017. PA financing has also significantly increased in this timeframe, with total governmental funding in 2016 exceeding USD 8 million, which is more than USD 1.5 million greater than the estimated system level financing required for basic management, and closing the gap with regard to the USD 13.5 million estimated optimal management scenario.
		Progress towards status/stress change has also been advanced through gazettement of 110,277 ha (1,103 km ²) of new protected areas, including 10 wetland parks and 4 desert parks, and improved representativeness of the PA system in terms of vegetation type.
6. Overall Project Results	Satisfactory	The project was successful in generating a number of global environmental benefits. The PA system under management by the QFD is more representative, better funded, and more effectively managed compared to baseline circumstances.

Exhibit 2: Evaluation Rating Table

Recommendations

TE recommendations are summarized below in Exhibit 3.

Exhibit	3:	Recommendations	Table
---------	----	-----------------	-------

No.	Recommendation	Responsible Entities			
Corre	ctive actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project				
1.	Certain infrastructure interventions observed during the TE field mission require corrective action and record documentation. For example, the gates of some of the bear-proof fences were not sufficiently secure and supports were not adequately finished, and the water supply line to one of the public shower houses improperly fitted. Prior to project closure, it would be advisable to have sub-contractors make warranty reparations and prepare record documentation of the completed infrastructure interventions, not only for the examples indicated here.	РМО			
Action	ns to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project				
2.	According to annual incident records provided by the Qinghai Forest Police Bureau, the number of criminal cases has steadily increased over the past 5 years. An assessment of the root cause(s) of this increase should be made prior to project closure, providing guidance for QFD and National Park Administration officials for focusing their enforcement efforts.	PMO, QFD			
3.	The knowledge management system (KMS) requires further development and continued professional operational and maintenance support moving forward, in order for it to be a functional and integrated platform. A work plan should be prepared, itemizing the specific development requirements along with associated cost estimations, and outlining estimated operation and maintenance support required over the next 2-3 years.	PMO, QFD			
4.	There are a few technical regulations and guidelines that have not yet been approved. A work plan of follow-up actions should be prepared, indicating responsibilities, estimated timeframes, and method of confirmation once actions have been fulfilled.	PMO, QFD			
Propo	Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives				
5.	Local people in the 12 demonstration villages have provided collaborative management support to the SNNR Administration, in terms of assistance with patrolling and monitoring. Whilst the project has done a good job with facilitating participatory involvement, it was apparent based upon TE field interviews that there has been some shortcomings with respect	QFD Village Co-management committees			

Exhibit 3: Recommendations Table

No.	Recommendation	Responsible Entities
	to communication on certain issues, including results of biodiversity surveys, estimated wildlife carrying capacities of the ecosystems, PA management objectives regarding wildlife populations and habitats, and data regarding trends in terms of human-wildlife conflicts. The PA management plans should be further developed incrementally, providing increasing levels of participatory management involvement, beyond patrolling and monitoring support.	
6.	Grassland management in Qinghai Province needs to be better synergized with conservation objectives. The Agriculture/Animal Husbandry and Forestry sectors are not effectively collaborating with respect to deciding upon grazing closures, livestock reductions, etc. A comprehensive grassland management programme should be developed that balances production goals with conservation objectives.	QFD, Agriculture/Animal Husbandry Department
7.	Integrating the Eco-Position Programme into the PA management objectives of the province poses a formidable challenge. A training and integration programme should be developed based upon a specific strategy for this large number of eco-positions.	QFD, NP Administration
8.	Qinghai Province has implemented a progressive revision to the key performance indicator (KPI) programme for some local governments, e.g., adopting conservation as a primary KPI in lieu of economic performance. It would be prudent to further develop this approach, e.g., formulating eco-compensation contributions according to conservation results.	QFD, NP Administration, Provincial Government
9.	Based upon interviews held during the TE mission, it seems that there is an opportunity to more efficiently utilize the service of volunteers in PA management. Guided by the Three Rivers Source National Park Management Rule for Volunteers and the Three Rivers Source National Park Regulation, the National Park Administration and/or the QFD should develop a volunteer programme for assisting with PA management, including activities on biodiversity monitoring, guiding tours, community outreach, environmental education, etc. The volunteer programme should include recruitment procedures, qualification criteria, health and safety measures, and intellectual property considerations.	QFD, NP Administration
10.	Progress towards PA business planning objectives fell short of the performance targets. PA business plans should be developed for the Qinghai Province PA's, under a framework that recognizes the ecological goods and services provided by the PA's. Generating revenue and financial inputs for the PA's as a means to improve PA management, fulfilling financial, ecological, and social sustainability objectives.	QFD, NP Administration

Good Practices:

The project has prepared an impressive compilation of case studies and good practices achieved over the course of the project. These achievements have been shared across the portfolio of GEF projects in China and also provide meaningful input for GEF global programmes. A few of the good practices on the project are summarized below.

Empowering local communities

More than half of the project budget was spent under Component 3, implementing collaborative management arrangements between local communities situated in 3 of the 18 blocks of the SNNR. Several innovative practices were implemented, e.g., jointly developing local conservation zoning maps with local communities, establishing several small protection units that enabled broad participation and effective spatial coverage of patrolling and monitoring activities.

Demonstrated use of remote upload of monitoring data to KMS (albeit, further development is required)

The project was innovative in developing and demonstrating field application of electronic data forms being filled out in the field by local herders and uploaded to the knowledge management system (KMS) using applications programmed onto tablet computers.

Involving religious leaders and traditional knowledge in village communities

The project team astutely facilitated involvement of religious leaders from local monasteries in village comanagement committees. Local people highly respect these leaders, including monks who are actively involved in conservation issues. Traditional ecological knowledge was also integrated into the community co-management arrangements; e.g., identifying holy sites, which often coincide with higher levels of biodiversity.

Project management structure, e.g., component managers

The project management office was well staffed, e.g., with three separate component managers, funded by the governmental cofinancing contributions, supporting the project manager. The PMO also provided experienced services in human resource management, financial management, procurement, and IT systems.

Efficiently utilized and strengthened local capacity

There were many opportunities for involvement of local and national service providers, including biodiversity professionals from research institutes and consultancies, civil society (during first half of the project), media experts, IT experts, and construction companies. Setting up local PMOs at the townships and forest bureaus where the field interventions also was a good way to build local capacity and provide entry points for local service providers to participate.

Lessons Learned:

Linkages with other initiatives should be fully worked out at design phase

Linkages with other initiatives were not fully worked out, for example, with grassland recovery programmes. There are contradictory approaches being advocated between the animal husbandry sector and the conservation sectors, including the QFD. Through the grassland recovery programme, the agriculture/animal husbandry sector is building fences to restrict livestock grazing, allowing grasslands to regenerate naturally. At the same time, the project was promoting removal of fences erected along lands held by herders. Working out some type of collaborative approach, e.g., voluntarily agreeing to temporary grazing closure without erecting fences might have improved chances of implementing measures to enable achievement of conservation objectives.

Assigning a performance indicator associated with fence removal requires thorough consultation and planning at the project preparation phase

Plans involving removal of fences in Qinghai grasslands needs to be prudently worked out at the project preparation phase. Relevant issues like herders' property rights and traditional practices should be sufficiently taken into considerations along with practical technical guidance and financing requirements.

Stakeholder engagement with certain stakeholders should be sufficiently detailed at design phase

Stakeholder engagement was not sufficiently detailed for certain stakeholders, including agriculture/animal husbandry and local governments. Assigning specific implementation activities, for example for the agriculture/animal husbandry sector, might have enabled improved stakeholder engagement from that sector. In response to community consultations held during the early phases of implementation, the project ended up being involved in more infrastructure related activities than originally planned. Issues such as waste management, water supply, and bear-proof fences fall under the sphere of local government. Although there was involvement with local governmental stakeholders during project implementation, detailing a more systematic involvement plan, including transfer of assets, defining operational and maintenance responsibilities, etc., would have enhanced the likelihood that the built infrastructure systems would be sustained after project closure.

Infrastructure type activities need to be supported by robust design, inspection, and record documentation

Infrastructure type activities should be supported by robust design, field inspection, and record documentation. It is essential that the designs for infrastructure, such as water supply systems, are sufficiently detailed and record drawings are prepared following construction. Construction management is an important, integral part of the process, and sufficient resources should be allocated to ensure that contractors are realizing the plans according to specifications and any deviation from the design is properly assessed and recorded. If any problems arise after project closure, such best management practices would better ensure that issues can be assessed and resolved accordingly.

Socioeconomic conditions should be adequately characterized

The effects of protected areas on human well-being are complex. Compiling sufficient baseline information is important to enable monitoring and evaluation beyond project's lifespan. The herder communities were situated on the Qinghai grasslands long before the nature reserve was established there, for example. The government has implemented a number of measures over the years to address these communities, including ecological migration/resettlement, eco-compensation initiatives, livestock control measures, land tenure laws and policies, grazing closures, etc. In order to better enable assessment of a particular intervention on the well-being of these communities, it is important that sufficient baseline information is collected, such as basic situations of the village (geography, populations and labor force, historical significant events), biodiversity and natural resources status

(wildlife, grass, forest, wetland, water resources), social economy and public service (herders' production and living, income and living standard, poverty population analysis, cooperative, seasonal calendar, community tradition and knowledge, public service), differentiating the impacts of the various interventions including specific changes in ecological status. Some of this information was collected as part of the participatory rural appraisals completed in 2014 during the early stages of project implementation; however, there were no subsequent or terminal assessment made to allow for evaluation of assessment of socioeconomic impacts.

Gender aspects among Tibetan communities should be analyzed at the project preparation phase

In order to meaningfully integrate gender inclusion objectives into the project design, a thorough gender analysis should be made at the project preparation phase. And, analysis of gender issues within the Tibetan communities should be made by experienced practitioners, through culturally sensitive consultations.

Filling out tracking tools should be an inclusive process supported with adequate quality control

Preparation of tracking tools and capacity development scorecards should be more inclusive and reviewed thoroughly. There were many inconsistencies among the tracking tools at each stage, including the baseline, midterm, and endpoint assessments. The process of filling out tracking tools should be reconsidered. For example, more emphasis should be placed during the project inception phase at validating the baseline tracking tools that were approved at CEO endorsement. This process would enable the project management team to become more familiar with the details before implementation kicks off. Outsourcing the midterm and endpoint tracking tool assessments is a sensible approach, but the process should be inclusive. For example, a focus group arrangement, involving PA management, project management staff, NGOs, and other relevant stakeholders, is recommended as a way to openly discuss the information provided in the tracking tools. Adding supporting information to each separate entry is also important, in order to provide sufficient documentary evidence of the assessments made.

Allocation of field equipment

Assigning field equipment, such as cameras, binoculars, GPS units, tablet computers, etc., to local PMOs, which then distributed the equipment to village co-management committees was a way to demonstrate trust and foster ownership among the local communities. In hindsight, however, it might have been more prudent to allocate all of the equipment to the nature reserve administration and then the reserve would be responsible for distributing to local herders and communities. The nature reserves are inherently better positioned to manage the equipment, creating a trackable inventory, for example, and have professional staff properly maintain the units. At project closure, the fate of the distributed equipment is fairly uncertain, with the increasing role of eco-positions and unsure mentorship for the community patrolling and monitoring structures demonstrated by the project.

Abbreviation and Acronyms

Exchange Rate on 30 June 2017: Chinese Yuan (CNY) : United States Dollar (USD) = 6.78319

- ADB Asian Development Bank APR Annual Project Report AWP Annual Work Plan ΒD Biodiversity BSAP **Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan** CAS **Chinese Academy of Sciences** CBD **Convention on Biological Diversity** CCA Community conserved area CCICED China Council for International Cooperation on Environment and Development CDR **Combined Delivery Report** CEPF Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund CHM Clearing House Mechanism (under CBD) CI **Conservation International** CITES Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species CNY Chinese yuan COP Conference of Parties (e.g. of CBD) CPAP **Country Programme Action Plan** CSP **Conservation Stewardship Programme** CTA **Chief Technical Advisor** EΑ **Executing Agency** EBA **Endemic Bird Area** ECBP **EU-China Biodiversity Programme** EIA **Environmental Impact Assessment** EPB Environmental Protection Bureau (under MEP) EU European Union FAO Food and Agriculture Organization of United Nations GDP **Gross Domestic Product** GEF **Global Environment Facility** GIS **Geographical Information System** GOC Government of China IA Implementing Agency IPCC Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change IUCN International Union for the Conservation of Nature IUCN Red List Categories (version 3.1): EX: Extinct; EW: Extinct in the Wild; CR: Critically Endangered; EN: Endangered; VU: Vulnerable; NT: Near Threatened; LC: Least Concern; DD: Data Deficient M&E Monitoring and evaluation MEP **Ministry of Environmental Protection**
- METT Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool
- MoA Ministry of Agriculture
- MoF Ministry of Finance
- MoU Memorandum of Understanding
- MTEF Medium Term Expenditure Framework
- NBSAP National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
- NGO Non-Governmental Organisation

- NR Nature ReservePA Protected Area (with 6 categories of PA under IUCN, including Nature Reserves)
- PMO Project Coordinating Unit
- PIMS Project Information Management System
- PIR Project Implementation Review
- PIU Project Implementation Unit
- PM Project Manager
- PNR Provincial Nature Reserve
- PPG Project Preparation Grant (for GEF)
- PSC Project Steering Committee
- QDF Qinghai Department of Finance
- QFD Qinghai Forestry Department
- QPR Quarterly Progress Report
- SEA Strategic Environmental Assessment
- SECP Sanjiangyuan Ecological Construction Programme
- SFA State Forestry Administration
- SBAA Standard Basic Assistance Agreement
- SGP (UNDP-GEF) Small Grants Programme
- SGREPA Snowland Great Rivers Environmental Protection Association
- SLM Sustainable Land Management
- SMART Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound
- SNNR Sanjiangyuan National Nature Reserve
- SO Strategic Objective
- SP Strategic Programme
- SRF Strategic Results Framework
- TBD To Be Determined
- TOR Terms of Reference
- TNC The Nature Conservancy
- UN United Nations
- UNCCD United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
- UNDP United Nations Development Programme
- UNFCC United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
- UNCBD United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity
- UNDAF United Nations Development Assistance Framework
- UNEP United Nations Environment Programme
- USD United States dollar
- WWF World Wide Fund for Nature

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Purpose of Evaluation

The objectives of the evaluation were (1) to assess the achievement of project results, with the following purposes:

- ✓ To promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose the extent of project accomplishments;
- ✓ To contribute to the overall assessment of results in achieving GEF strategic objectives aimed at global environmental benefit;

and (2) to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming:

- ✓ To synthesize lessons that can help to improve the selection, design and implementation of future GEF financed UNDP activities;
- ✓ To provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the UNDP portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues;
- ✓ To gauge the extent of project convergence with other UN and UNDP priorities, including harmonization with other UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF).

1.2. Evaluation Scope and Methodology

The terminal evaluation (TE) was an evidence-based assessment and relied on feedback from persons who have been involved in the design, implementation, and supervision of the project, and also review of available documents and findings made during field visits.

The overall approach and methodology of the evaluation followed the guidelines outlined in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects¹.

The evaluation was carried out by a team of one international consultant/team leader and one national consultant, and included the following activities:

- A TE mission was carried out from 8-21 July 2017; the itinerary is compiled in Annex 1;
- As a data collection and analysis tool, an evaluation matrix was adapted from the preliminary set of questions included in the TOR (see **Annex 2**). Evidence gathered during the fact-finding phase of the TE was cross-checked between as many sources as practicable, in order to validate the findings;
- Key project stakeholders were interviewed for their feedback on the project. A list of interviewed persons is included in **Annex 3**;
- The TE team completed a desk review of relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project progress reports, financial reports, midterm review, and key project deliverables. A complete list of information reviewed is compiled in **Annex 4**;
- During the TE mission, visits were made to 4 of the 12 demonstrations villages within the SNNR. A summary of the interviews made with village committee leaders and individual herders is presented in **Annex 5**;
- The project logical results framework was also used as an evaluation tool, in assessing attainment of the project objective and outcomes (see **Annex 6**);
- Reported cofinancing that has been realized during the lifespan of the project, from 2013 through June 2017, is summarized in the cofinancing table presented in **Annex 7**;

The project was approved under the GEF-4 replenishment cycle; tracking tools under Objective 1 of the GEF-4 Biodiversity Strategy were assessed at CEO endorsement (baseline), midterm, and project closure (terminal evaluation). The UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard was also used as one of the performance indicators.

Evidence gathered during the fact-finding phase of the evaluation was cross-checked between as many sources as practicable, in order to validate the findings.

The rationale for implementing the utilized evaluation methodology is described as follows:

¹ Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects, 2012, UNDP.

- Component 1: The aim of this component was to mainstreaming PA management into provincial development
 and sector planning. The methodology used to evaluate progress made included interviewing representatives
 the relevant provincial sectors, as well as senior PA system management. Project deliverables were reviewed
 to support the evaluation of this component; documents included the provincial 13th 5-year plan, the Qinghai
 provincial biodiversity strategy and action plan (QBSAP), approved sector plans, and technical regulations.
 During the field mission, the evaluation team also made note of evidence of implementation of the some of the
 approved technical regulations, e.g., with respect to road construction.
- Component 2: This component focused on improving PA management effectiveness and strengthening institutional and staff capacities. The methodology used to assess progress under this component included reviewing management effectiveness tracking tools and UNDP capacity development scorecards, as well as other key deliverables, including PA management plans, training records, PA system staffing records, etc. The evaluation team focused on the sustainability of the results achieved, e.g., reviewing trends in PA financing and for evidence of sustained support after closure of the GEF project.
- Component 3: This component was centered on demonstrating effective PA management through community involvement in the SNNR. The methodology used to assess progress made under this component included visiting representative sites and communities, interviewing village leaders, herders, and other stakeholders involved in implementing the community collaborative management activities. The evaluation was also supported with desk review of project deliverables, progress reports, village regulations, co-management agreements, and other relevant information.

1.3. Structure of the Evaluation Report

The evaluation report starts out with a description of the project, indicating the duration, main stakeholders, and the immediate and development objectives. The findings of the evaluation are broken down into the following sections in the report:

- Project Formulation
- Project Implementation
- Project Results

The discussion on **project formulation** focuses on how clear and practicable were the project's objectives and components, and whether project outcomes were designed according to SMART criteria (see **Exhibit 4**).

Exhibit 4: SMART criteria					
S	Specific: Outcomes must use change language, describing a specific future condition				
М	Measurable: Results, whether quantitative or qualitative, must have measurable indicators, making it possible to assess whether they were achieved or not				
Α	Achievable: Results must be within the capacity of the partners to achieve				
R Relevant: Results must make a contribution to selected priorities of the national development framework					
т	Time- bound: Results are never open-ended. There should be an expected date of accomplishment				
Source: Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects, 2012, UNDP					

Project formulation also covers whether or not capacities of the implementation partners were sufficiently considered when designing the project, and if partnership arrangements were identified and negotiated prior to project approval. An assessment of how assumptions and risks were taken into account in the development phase is also included.

The report section on **project implementation** first looks at how the logical results framework was used as an M&E tool during the course of the project. Also, the effectiveness of partnerships and the degree of involvement of stakeholders are evaluated. Project finance is assessed, by looking at the degree of cofinancing that was materialized in comparison to what was committed, and also whether or not additional or leveraged financing was secured during

the implementation phase. The cost-effectiveness of the project is evaluated by analyzing how the planned activities met or exceeded the expected outcomes over the designed timeframe, and whether an appropriate level of due diligence was maintained in managing project funds. Cost-effectiveness is not only based on how judiciously the funds were managed, but also examines compliance with respect to the incremental cost concept, i.e., the GEF funds were allocated for activities not supported under baseline conditions, with the goal of generating global environmental benefits.

The quality of execution by both the implementing agency and the lead implementing partner (executing agency) is also evaluated and rated in the project implementation section of the report. This evaluation considers whether there was sufficient focus on results, looks at the level of support provided, quality of risk management, and the candor and realism represented in the annual reports.

The project implementation section also contains an evaluation and rating of the project M&E system. The appropriateness of the M&E plan is assessed, as well as a review of how the plan was implemented, e.g., compliance with progress and financial reporting requirements, how were adaptive measures taken in line with M&E findings, and management response to the recommendations from the midterm review.

In GEF terms, **project results** include direct project outputs, short- to medium-term outcomes, and longer term impact, including global environmental benefits, replication efforts, and local effects. The main focus is at the outcome level, as most UNDP supported GEF financed projects are expected to achieve anticipated outcomes by project closing, and recognizing that global environmental benefit impacts are difficult to discern and measuring outputs is insufficient to capture project effectiveness.

Project outcomes are evaluated and rated according to relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency:

Relevance:	The extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational
	policies, including changes over time. Also, relevance considers the extent to which the project is in line
	with GEF Operational Programs or the strategic priorities under which the project was funded.

- Effectiveness: The extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.
- **Efficiency**: The extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible; also called cost effectiveness or efficacy.

In addition to assessing outcomes, the report includes an evaluation of country ownership, mainstreaming, **sustainability** (which is also rated), catalytic role, mainstreaming, and impact.

With respect to **mainstreaming**, the evaluation assesses the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

In terms of **impact**, the evaluator assessed whether the project has demonstrated: (a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, (b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or (c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.

Finally, the evaluation presents **recommendations** for reinforcing and following up on initial project benefits. The report concludes with a discussion of **good practices** and **lessons learned** which should be considered for other GEF and UNDP interventions.

1.4. Ethics

The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators, and the TE team members have signed the Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement form (**Annex 8**). In particular, the TE team ensures the anonymity and confidentiality of individuals who were interviewed and surveyed. In respect to the UN Declaration of Human Rights, results are presented in a manner that clearly respects stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.

1.5. Audit Trail

As a means to document an "audit trail" of the evaluation process, review comments to the draft report are compiled along with responses from the evaluator as an annex separate from the TE report. Relevant modifications to the report have been incorporated into the final version of the TE report.

1.6. Limitations

The evaluation was carried out in July-August 2017; including preparatory activities, field mission, desk review, and completion of the evaluation report, according to the guidelines outlined in the Terms of Reference (**Annex 9**).

There were no limitations with respect to language. The project deliverables were prepared primarily in Chinese, with progress reports and work plans in English. Considering that the team consisted one of national consultant and one international consultant, there were no limitations with respect to language.

Among the 12 demonstrations in the SNNR, 4 were visited by the TE team, two in the Makahe block and 2 in the Suojia-Qumahe block. During the mission to Zhiduo County, the administrative seat for the Suojia-Qumahe block, representatives from 4 village committees participated in TE interviews. This means that interviews were held with a total of 6 of the 12 village representatives, and the TE team feels that the information obtained in the field was representative of the total set of demonstration villages.

1.7. Evaluation Ratings

The findings of the evaluation are compared against the targets set forth in the logical results framework, and also analyzed in light of particular developments over the course of the project. The effectiveness and efficiency of project outcomes are rated according to the 6-point GEF scale, ranging from Highly Satisfactory (no shortcomings) to Highly Unsatisfactory (severe shortcomings). Monitoring & evaluation and execution of the implementing and executing agencies were also rated according to this scale. Relevance is evaluated to be either relevant or not relevant. Sustainability is rated according to a 4-point scale, ranging from Likely (negligible risks to the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends) to Unlikely (severe risks that project outcomes will not be sustained). Impact was rated according to a 3-point scale, including significant, minimal, and negligible. The rating scales are compiled below in **Exhibit 5**.

Exhibit 5: Rating scales						
Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, IA & EA Execution:	Sustainability Ratings:	Relevance Ratings:				
6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency	4: Likely (L) Negligible risks to sustainability	2. Relevant (R)				
5: Satisfactory (S): There were only minor shortcomings	3. Moderately Likely (ML): Moderate risks to sustainability	1. Not relevant (NR)				
4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were moderate shortcomings	2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): Significant risks to sustainability	Impact Ratings:				
3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project had significant shortcomings	1. Unlikely (U): Severe risks to sustainability	3. Significant (S)				
2. Unsatisfactory (U): There were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency		2. Minimal (M)				
1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): 1. Negligible (N) The project had severe shortcomings 1. Negligible (N)						
Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)						

2. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

2.1. Project Start and Duration

Key project dates are listed below:

PIF Approval:	15 October 2009
PPG Approval Date:	15 October 2009
Approval Date:	17 March 2010
CEO Endorsement Date:	05 April 2012
Prodoc Signature by Ministry of Finance of China:	24 August 2012
GEF Agency Approval Date (Prodoc Signature by UNDP):	14 September 2012
Project Inception Workshop:	25 January 2013
Midterm Review:	June-July 2015
Terminal Evaluation:	July-August 2017
Project completion (planned)	30 November 2017

The project concept (project identification form) was approved on 15 October 2009, the same day the USD 100,000 GEF project preparation grant was appropriated. The project document was endorsed by the GEF CEO on 05 April 2012, and later that year the Ministry of Finance of China agreed to project document, on 24 August, and the UNDP signed the document on 14 September 2012, considered the official start date of the project. The project manager was hired in January 2013, and shortly afterwards, on 25 January 2013, the project inception workshop was held. The planned completion date is 30 November 2017.

2.2. Problems that the Project Sought to Address

Although Qinghai lists 11 nature reserves totaling an impressive 31% of the territory, the existing protected area (PA) system lacks adequate balance. The system shows significant gaps in ecosystem coverage and contains extensive overlap with other interests such as road construction, water diversion plans and herder community tenure rights. It also includes areas exhibiting serious land degradation resulting from a combination *inter alia* of overgrazing, engineering damage and climate change. Other problems facing the PA system include illegal gold mining and poaching, livestock fences interrupting wildlife migratory pathways, and aggressive pest control programmes aimed at small burrowing mammals but that also harm many collateral species.

The project design outlines the following barriers that were preventing the establishment of an effectively managed and sustainable PA system in Qinghai:

Barrier 1: Disconnect between PA planning and management and provincial development and sectoral planning process

Effective PA management in Qinghai had been hindered by a lack of mainstreaming of the PA system and its objectives in the province's development and sector planning process. Coordination and cooperation between different government agencies was also almost non-existent; for example, with government agencies responsible for agriculture, livestock, environmental protection, and water resources operate inside PAs alongside the local prefecture and county governments. These institutions tended to operate independently from PA management authorities, such as QFD. Sub-provincial governments also planned and implemented work inside PAs without due coordination or consideration for biodiversity conservation.

Barrier 2: Inadequate resources, and weak institutional and staff capacities for PA management

Qinghai Forest Department's institutional capacity to oversee multiple PAs and to plan and manage a large PA like Sanjiangyuan NNR with many residents, which in fact requires landscape management beyond PA boundaries, was inadequate. Also, though considerable sums of government financing has been extended to PAs, the vast majority of this amount has been allocated to infrastructure such as roads and buildings, with limited funds spent on conservation work such as patrolling and afforestation, often without proper planning.

One of the underlying causes for the insufficient financing of the PAs are a lack of understanding of actual management needs and management costs, insufficient appreciation for the economic value of the PAs' varied ecological services.

At the sub-provincial level, on-the-ground PA management is the primary responsibility of field staff provided by local governments (prefecture and county). Such staff has almost no specific training in PA management.

There was also a serious geographical representational gap in the Qinghai PA system; for example the system includes only 13 out of the province's 30 vegetation types; excluding Qilian Mountains PNR and Qaidam *Haloxylon* Forest PNR, which at the time of project design were "paper PAs", having no clearly defined boundary, management structure or staff.

Barrier 3: Limited participation and capacity of local communities in PA management

As in other parts of China, Qinghai's PAs are composed of state and community managed lands. Much of the pasture lands have been allocated to local households on long-term contracts for management and use. Effective PA management, therefore, depends on sustainable management of land by local communities. As many of the PAs were established on pre-existing community rangelands, there are potential conflicts between traditional land use rights and conservation objectives. Finding solutions to this inherent inconsistency associated with user rights and governance remains a key challenge of the province.

2.3. Immediate and Development Objectives of the Project

Qinghai Province, with a total area of over 720,000 km², is the fourth largest province in China. It is surrounded by Gansu, Sichuan, the Tibet Autonomous Region and Xinjiang provinces. Named after one of the largest inland saltwater lakes of the world (and the largest lake in China), Qinghai is largely a plateau with an average altitude of 3000 meters above the sea level. The province is one of the least developed in the country, with about 46% of the province's total 5.5 million people are classified as ethnic groups, with 54 ethnic groups represented. Qinghai's natural population growth rate of almost 10% is one of the highest in the country.

As outlined in the project document, most of Qinghai is covered by grasslands (57% of the province); followed by high altitude deserts (29%), forest ecosystems (6%), wetlands (6%) and agricultural lands (around 1%). At least three WWF Global 200 Ecoregions fall inside Qinghai; including 1) the upper sections of the Mekong River, 2) sources of the Salween River and 3) Tibetan Plateau Steppe. Part of the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund's (CEPF) biodiversity hotspot "Mountains of Southwest China" also falls in Qinghai. The province's extensive grassland ecosystems support significant populations of globally threatened species such as the Wild Yak, Wild Ass, Tibetan Antelope, Przewalski Gazelle, Cervus albirostris, and the Snow Leopard. Wetlands in the province include rivers, flooded grasslands, freshwater and saline lakes. These are key habitats for migratory birds, and large populations of Black Crane, Grus grus, Cygnus cunus, Larus brunnicephalus, and Sterna hirundo tibetana depend on them. The Qinghai Lake, Zhaling Lake and Eling Lake are listed as Ramsar Sites. The Qinghai Lake area is a key habitat of the Przewalski Gazelle and the Sanjiangyuan protected area is the breeding habitat of the endemic Tibetan Antelope. The Province harbors more than 10% of the higher plant and vertebrate species recorded in China; with a total of 3000 higher plant species and 465 vertebrate species (including 56 fish, 16 amphibians and reptile species, 290 bird and 103 mammal species). There is a high level of endemism in the area: more than 50% of plant species found here are endemic to China as well as several fish and bird species. Birdlife International, for example, has identified Qinghai Mountains as one of the high priority endemic bird areas of the world and Northern Qinghai Tibetan Plateau as a "secondary area" for endemic birds.

One of the most valuable assets of the province is its ecological services, specifically in the form of water catchment and regulation and climate regulation. The Qinghai plateau is the headwaters of three major rivers: the Yellow River, Yangtze, and Mekong (called Lancang in China). However, these services are largely unpaid for by the many wealthier downstream communities and sectors (industry, hydro-power, irrigation and urban water users).

Livestock herds suffered severe losses in the early 1990s due to land degradation, severe winters and disease, and in some places still have not recovered to those former levels. Even so, the pastures show evidence of severe degradation as a result of over-grazing (either present or former) and it is estimated that herd levels are currently (or were until recently) about 30% higher than sustainable levels. Degradation poses threats to biodiversity, local livelihoods and the important ecological services delivered by the province.

In order to conserve its biodiversity and ecological functions, Qinghai has established a network of protected areas (PAs), comprising five National Nature Reserves (NNRs) and six Provincial Nature Reserves (PNRs). NNRs cover

202,524.9 km² and PNRs cover 49,140 km² of the province, jointly accounting for approximately 35% of the provincial area (251,665 km²).

Of the 11 existing PAs, Sanjiangyuan NNR is the largest and most important in terms of biodiversity and the vital ecosystem services it provides, as it encompasses the source area of 3 major rivers: the Mekong, Yellow and Yangtze. The 152,300 km² reserve covers more than 60% of the whole PA system in the province and is the second largest NR in China. It comprises six isolated sections (blocks) and falls within 14 different counties; in total, it has 18 units (or conservation areas), each with its own set of core zone, buffer zone and experimental zone. The Sanjiangyuan NNR has an estimated 420,000 herding Tibetan residents in and around the NR, with 52 towns between or near its 18 conservation areas (units). The reserve is of great importance for wildlife, wetlands, water catchment functions, and cultural values. Given the huge expanse of the reserve, different units include different habitats, wildlife and other features.

The Qinghai PA system at project entry is illustrated in below in Exhibit 6:



Note: Protected areas shaded in blue.

Title	National / Provincial	Counties	Area (km²)	Year of gazette	Human population	International designation
1. Qaidam Haloxylon Forest *	Р	Delingha City	37,345	2005	0	Part of IBA
2. Golmud Populus euphratica	Р	Golmud City	42	2000	0	
3. Kekexili	N	Zhiduo County	45,000	1995	0	
4. Keluke Lake -Tuosu Lake	Р	Delingha City	1,150	2000	No data	
5. Longbao wetland	N	Yushu County	100	1984	~200 families	
6. Mengda	Ν	Xunhua Salar Autonomous County	173	1980	No data	
7. Qinghai Lake (Bird Island)	Ν	Gonghe, Gangcha and Haiyan counties	4,952	1975	Several hundred	IBA, part is Ramsar site
8. Sanjiangyuan	N	Zhiduo, Yushu, Nangqian, Chengduo, Zaduo, Qumalai, Jiuzhi, Banma, Maqin, Maduo, Zeku, Henan, Xinghai, Tongde, Geermu (Tuotuohe)	152,300	2000	Several tens of thousands	IBA, Ramsar sites
9. Datong Beichuan	Р	Datong	1,079	2005	No data	Part of IBA
10. Qilian Mountains*	Р	Qilian, Menyuan, Tianjun, Delingha	8,344	2005	No data	
11. Nomuhong	Р	Dulan	1,180	2005	0	

Note: * indicates NRs that are listed but have no boundary or management structure at all.

(Source: CSIS, 2010 and QFD 2010)

Exhibit 6: Protected area system of Qinghai Province at project entry²

² Source: Project Document

2.4. Baseline Indicators Established

Baseline indicators included the following:

- Provincial development and sector plans did not address linkages with PA management and did not include specific measures for biodiversity conservation.
- There were no procedures in place to address infrastructure developments that were incompatible with biodiversity conservation.
- Allocated funds for PA financing did not reach basic management requirements, and limited proportions of the available funds were spent on field operations.
- > There was no monitoring system in place to assess the status of biodiversity within the PA system.
- Several of the declared PA's within the system were only "paper parks"; thus, the baseline PA system was not representative of the ecosystems and vegetation types in the province.
- Livestock management practices were contributing towards degradation of grassland ecosystems and hindering movement of certain wildlife species, e.g., as a result of increasing construction of fencing.
- > Local communities were not actively participating in management of the PA system.

2.5. Main Stakeholders

The main stakeholders involved on the project are the Qinghai government and provincial sector departments, particularly the Forestry Department, the main agency managing PAs in Qinghai Province. Other key stakeholders include the local communities within and near the protected area system, including in the 12 pilot villages under Outcome 3 of the project.

Project stakeholders and their roles and responsibilities are tabulated below in Exhibit 7.

Stakeholder	Roles and Responsibilities
Qinghai Governor's Office	Leadership and coordination for implementation of the project
Qinghai Province Development and Reform Commission	Coordination and implementation of Qinghai's Development Plan and Sanjiangyuan Ecological Conservation Programme
Qinghai Department of Finance	Responsible for the management of dedicated account and funds of the project, including compilation and submission of budget requests, oversight of spending, supplying of commitment of co-finance, signing of the donation agreement with the Ministry of Finance on behalf of provincial government. Supervision of the implementation and management of the assets of project.
Qinghai Forestry Department	Day-to-day operational execution of the project. Management of nature reserves, wetlands and wildlife.
Qinghai Environmental Protection Bureau	Coordination of environmental issues, pollution, and CBD implementation and reporting.
Management bureaus of major NNRs (Sanjiangyuan, Kekexili, Qinghai Lake)	Protection and management of NNR, visitor control and environmental education/awareness.
Qinghai Forest Inventory & Planning Institute	Studies and planning within the forestry sector.
Qinghai Bureau of Agriculture / Department of Animal Husbandry	Responsible for grassland utilization, health and management of domestic livestock, pest control programmes, also management of aquatic products (including fisheries).
Qinghai Department of Land and Resources	Supervision and promotion of exploration and the development of Qinghai's mineral resources. Also responsible for land use planning.
Qinghai Meteorological Bureau	Monitoring of climatic factors, models of climate change, effects on vegetation, etc.
Qinghai Water Resource Department	Water security (quantity, seasonality and quality) with particular interest in safeguarding the catchments areas of the Yellow, Yangtze and Mekong rivers.
Qinghai Environmental Monitoring Center	Monitoring of environmental conditions in the province.
Qinghai Fishery Environmental Monitoring Center	Monitoring of aquatic resources in rivers and lakes.
Northwest Plateau Institute of Biology, CAS	Multi-disciplinary studies of Tibetan plateau ecosystems, including Qinghai Lake, Sanjiangyuan and Kekexili areas. Sub-contracted assistance for biodiversity baseline studies.
Qinghai Academy of Social Sciences	Multi-disciplinary studies in socio-economic development, policy analysis, culture.
Academic institutions (e.g., universities)	Sub-contracted research, specialist training workshops, post-graduate courses and programs.
Local target communities / project partners	Traditional management of grassland/rangeland, wetland and forest ecosystems. Co- management and environmental monitoring in several parts of NRs.

Exhibit 7: List of project stakeholders and their envisaged roles and responsibilities

Stakeholder	Roles and Responsibilities
Other local communities	Traditional management of grassland/rangeland, wetland and forest ecosystems. Not formal partners in co-management, but communities with institutions from which the project can learn (e.g., forms of community governance, traditional use of biodiversity, pastoralism, etc.).
NGOs in Qinghai Province (e.g., SGREPA, Plateau Perspectives)	Concerns for the environment, biodiversity, and/or the welfare of local communities.
Other NGOs (e.g., Shan Shui, WWF, FFI, WCS, TNC, etc.)	Concerns for the environment, biodiversity, and/or the welfare of local communities.

Exhibit 7: List of project stakeholders and their envisaged roles and responsibilities

2.6. Expected Results

The project **goal** is to strengthen the effectiveness of the PA system in Qinghai Province, China to conserve globally important biodiversity. The project objective is **to catalyze management effectiveness of Qinghai's PA system to** *fulfill its purpose of conserving globally important biodiversity*, by removing the barriers mentioned above with three inter-related outcomes. The focus of the project is to strengthen the PA system in Qinghai to better protect a representative sample of its unique biodiversity and more effectively manage this PA network as a whole. With GEF support, interventions at the level of Qinghai PA system will:

- i. Mainstream the PA system and its objectives into provincial development and sector planning framework, develop a comprehensive PA system plan with climate change adaptation strategies, and establish a knowledge management system to support biodiversity-sensitive decision-making in various sector activities and PA planning and management, strengthen the enabling legal framework, incentives and participative mechanisms, and mobilize necessary investments to support the expansion and effective management of the PA network;
- ii. Strengthen the institutional and human resource capacity to establish and maintain an effectively managed PA system over the long term and support the cost-effective and sustainable management of PAs by building up their operational capacities, and engendering necessary investments to manage threats to biodiversity. This implies directing provincial strategic planning, policy-making, legislation, funding, tools and incentive structures towards active biodiversity management of the Qinghai PA system, and linking PA development priorities toward optimizing the true value of PAs in the socio-economic development of the province and beneficiary downstream provinces.
- iii. Promote and upscale models of community co-management in PAs in selected demonstration areas/communities within Sanjiangyuan NNR. Co-management activities would support enhancement of PA effectiveness through increased community participation and co-ownership of natural resources and their sustainable utilization, improved data collection storage and analysis, and development of appropriate compensation plans for continued or enhanced provision of ecological services.

3. FINDINGS

3.1. Project Design / Formulation

3.1.1. Analysis of Project Design and Logical Results Framework

Focusing on the SNNR in the project design was a sensible decision, as this nature reserve is among the national priority areas for biodiversity conservation; it also supports globally significant biodiversity, and provides ecosystem functions, including headwater protection to three of the main river systems in Asia.

Component 1 focuses on mainstreaming biodiversity conservation within provincial level sectoral plans and the upcoming 13th 5-year plan. The second component was designed to facilitate improvements to management effectiveness and financial sustainability of the PA system, which at the time of project development included 5 national level nature reserves (NRs) and 6 provincial level NRs. Among the 11 NRs, 10 of them are administered under the Qinghai Forestry Department, while the 11th is managed by the Provincial Environmental Protection Bureau. More than half of the implementation budget, 52% to be exact was allocated for the activities under the third project component, which includes facilitating community-driven, collaborative PA management in select pilot villages.

The project design had a good balance of institutional strengthening, regulatory reform, and field interventions. The field interventions were designed within the three main types of ecosystems represented in the SNNR, i.e., grasslands, wetlands, and forests. The substantive focus on demonstrating collaborative management arrangements among local minority communities is another positive aspect of the project design.

There were a few shortcomings with respect to project formulation. Firstly, the important linkage between the agriculture/animal husbandry sector and the conservation/forestry sector was not fully worked out at the project design phase. For example, it might have been advisable to incorporate an implementation role for the agriculture/animal husbandry sector.

There was also room for improvement with respect to formulating a stakeholder engagement strategy with local governments, something that is critical for sustaining the project results after GEF funding ceases.

The strategic results framework was analyzed using SMART criteria (S: specific; M: measurable; A: achievable; R: relevant; T: time-bound). The results summarized in **Exhibit 8** and discussed below. For GEF-financed projects, objective and outline level targets for performance indicators are designed to be achievable within a project timeframe. The end of the 5-year project is assumed to be the timeframe for achieving each of the project targets.

Objective-Level Indicators and Targets: The first two objective level targets are based upon results of the UNDP Financial Sustainability scorecard and the GEF-adapted Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT). Baseline scores were established for the year 2011, and specific, numeric targets are set for end-of-project achievement. The third objective level indicator is based upon selected indicator species exhibiting stable or increasing populations as compared to baseline conditions. The baseline surveys were made late, in 2014, so it is doubtful that an assessment can be made at the end of the project in 2017 showing statistical differences in population size or structure.

Outcome 1 Indicators and Targets: The indicators and targets under Outcome 1 were mostly found to be compliant with SMART criteria. For indicator 1.2, the target for infrastructure standards includes a statement indicating that the developed standards should include "clear rehabilitation/offset mechanisms". It does not seem practicable to establish rehabilitation/offset mechanisms in each standards; it might be more relevant to develop a guidance document for biodiversity rehabilitation/offsets for infrastructure projects in the province. Considerable project resources are being used to develop a knowledge management system (KMS) and the KMS will likely be one of the tangible legacies of the project. There was no performance indicator developed to capture the added value of the KMS.

Outcome 2 Indicators and Targets: With respect to PA staffing, the end targets under this outcome are 360 permanent and 150 temporary staff for the PA system by the end of the project. The relevance of this target is questionable, as it does not address potential uneven hiring patterns, i.e., staffing might increase in one or two of the NR's, but remain unchanged in others. Similarly, the target of achieving the basic level of PA financing of USD 6.6 million per year by the end of the project, also does not distinguish differences in funding among the NR's. For example, the situational analysis included in the project document indicates that the bulk of PA funding is extended to 2 of the 11 NR's. There are also measurability concerns with respect to Indicator 2.5, as access to official statistics on illegal incidents is limited and there were no baseline figures provided. For indicator 2.6, regarding diverting income from eco-compensation agreements to PA management will be difficult to achieve if the funds from the Sanjiangyuan Ecological Construction Plan is excluded, as the government has consolidated all ecological compensation programs in recent years.

Outcome 3 Indicators and Targets: With respect to Indicator 3.1.1, the baseline for domestic grazing closure is unclear, making the end target questionable. For Indicator 3.1.2, establishing 500 km² of open corridors is not particularly measurable the open grassland landscapes characteristics of large parts of the PA system. Improvement in management effectiveness of the SNNR due to co-management arrangements is the focus of Indicator 3.3; the SNNR covers a vast area (152,300 km²), and the demonstration collaborative management structures are being piloted in 3 of the 18 blocks of the reserve. It is questionable whether these pilot demonstrations can influence the management effectiveness of the entire nature reserve. For Indicator 3.5, participatory rural appraisals (PRAs) were completed in the pilot villages, but the term "positive attitude towards PA conservation" was not specifically surveyed. It would, therefore, be difficult to measure improvements by the end of the project. Also, the relevance of such an attitude survey needs to be carefully considered; e.g., there should be a sufficient gap in time between asking the similar questions to the same people.

No.	Indicator	End-of-Project Target	S: Specific	M: Measurable	A: Achievable	R: Relevant	T: Time-bound
Project Ob biodiversit	j ective: To catalyze management effectiveness of Qinghai's P y	A system to fulfil its purpose of conser	ving glo	bally in	nportan	t	
	Financial sustainability score (%) for national systems of protected areas:						
Ob 1	Component 1 – Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks	30% (baseline 15.4%)					
	Component 2 – Business planning and tools for cost- effective management	50% (baseline 11.5%)					
	Component 3 – Tools for revenue generation	40% (baseline 8.5%)					
Ob 2	METT scores for different PAs: SNNR Mengda Kekexili Qinghai Lake Golmud Poplar forest	70% (baseline: 33%) 65% (baseline 54%) 65% (baseline 50%) 75% (baseline 58%) 50% (baseline 22%)					
Ob 3	Selected indicator species that are rare and threatened show stable or upward trends in numbers (including INTER ALIA wild yak, wild ass, Tibetan antelope, snow leopard, Pallas' cat, musk deer, white-lipped deer, black- necked crane, etc.)	Key wildlife populations maintained or increasing; appropriate population structure					
Outcome 2	L: Mainstreaming PA management into provincial developme	nt and sector planning process					
	PA system and its management mainstreamed within the provincial sectoral and development planning framework at the provincial level: indicated by clear inclusion of due consideration and concrete measures	At least 3 sectoral plans integrate consideration of PAs and of biodiversity conservation measures					
1.1	for biodiversity conservation and PA development, as well as ear marked budget in the sectoral development plans at provincial I evels and in the (national) 13th 5- year plan.	13 th 5 year-Plan recognizes clear linkage between PAs and provincial development, and includes PA- and biodiversity- related targets and budgets					
1.2	Threats to PAs from infrastructure placement (roads, dams) and other adverse forms of land use avoided, mitigated or offset, leading to more effective conservation in Qinghai's PA system covering 251,665km ² .	Official standards for infrastructure development and operation within the PAs are developed and operationalized, with clear rehabilitation/offset mechanism.					
Outcome 2	2: Increasing PA management effectiveness through strengthe	ened institutional and staff capacities					
2.1	Capacity development scorecard (%) for the protected area system.	60% (baseline 35.5%)					

Exhibit 8: SMART analysis of strategic results framework

Exhibit 8: SMART analysis of strategic results framework

No.	Indicator	End-of-Project Target	S: Specific	M: Measurable	A: Achievable	R: Relevant	T: Time-bound
2.2	Strategic plans prepared for PA institutions and procedures and investment, and PA staff numbers dramatically increased	Strategic Plan developed and adopted					
	Permanent Staff Temporary Staff	360 (baseline 160) 150 (baseline 5)					
2.3	Province's system level PA financing increased to close the existing annual financing gap of US\$ 4.6 million for basic expenditure scenario (tracked with PA financial sustainability scorecard)	USD 6.6 million per year (baseline USD 2 million per year)					
2.4	Ratio of total PA budget spent on field operations raised to narrow spending gap	>30% of PA revenue spent on field operations (baseline <10%)					
	Deduction in illegal incident acces within the NDs	Functioning policing records system with links to police/ court cases and an enhanced policing mandate of NR staff.					
2.5	poaching, illegal harvesting, illegal-grazing, etc.	Routine report forms designed for numerical analysis.					
		Incidents reduced to 50% of the baseline level.					
2.6	Annual income diverted to PA management from eco- compensation agreements (excluding funds arising from the Sanjiangyuan Ecological Construction Plan)	>USD 1.0m (baseline 0)					
2.7	More representative PA system approved with most of 'major vegetation types' represented (>5% coverage) in the NNR's	22 of 30 habitats (addition of desert and Qilian montane habitats, with an overall increase of 18,000,000 ha in the provincial PA system)					
Outcome 3	Demonstration of Effective PA management through comm	nunity involvement in the Sanjiangyua	n Natio	hal Natu	ire Rese	erve (Sl	NNR)
3.1.1	Extent of area (ha) closed from domestic grazing	4,000 km ² (baseline 1,000 km ²)					
3.1.2	Area of open corridors	500 km ² (baseline 0)					
3.1.3	Area within the PA under community co-management	8,886 km ² (baseline 2,440 km ²)					
3.2	Increase in the key species number and distributions in target co-management community sites (up to 12 community field sites)	Key wildlife populations maintained or increasing in co- management areas					
3.3	Management effectiveness increased in SNNR due to co- management arrangements using the METT tracking tool	70% (baseline 33%)					
	Number of private-NR or of community co-management agreements:						
3.4	Private enterprise management agreements Informal, non-binding, agreements Formal, legally binding, agreements	At least 1 >10 agreements >2 agreements					
3.5	Awareness surveys among communities show increased positive attitude towards PA conservation	Baseline + 50% positive attitude					
<u>Note</u> : The o	color coding is described as follows: Green indicates that the able compliance with SMART criteria: and Red indicates that	indicators and targets are SMART-com the indicator and/or target are not cor	pliant; ` npliant	rellow i with SN	ndicate	s that tl iteria.	here

3.1.2. Assumptions and Risks

The assumptions outlined in the strategic results framework were indeed relevant, including the following:

- The government remains committed to strengthening the PA system and to an incremental growth in the funding allocation to finance the protected area network;
- The government continues to be committed to provide eco-compensations;
- The Provincial Government continues to be committed to the establishment of co-management options and genetic corridors;
- Distributional data of threatened native species is updated and maintained at provincial level;
- Stakeholder institutions constructively engage in the identification of the most cost effective institutional and governance arrangements for the PAN;
- The individual PA institutions maintain a clear mandate and unequivocal authority to fulfil local oversight and management obligations for the protected area network;
- Information to support the planning and management of the PAs is made available by government and institutional data holders;
- Government policy remains favorable to greater involvement and responsibility of local communities in comanagement of grasslands, forests and wetlands;

For the most part, the assumptions made were fulfilled by relevant governmental stakeholders

Project risks outlined in the project document are listed below in **Exhibit 9**, along with an analysis of the relevance of the risks at project closure and what mitigation measures were taken during project implementation.

Risks identified at entry (from project document)	TE Commonte			
Description	Risk Rating	TE Comments		
Mainstreaming biodiversity into sectoral policies will be hindered by lack of incentives for other sectors and poor enforcement of agreed priorities and plans.	Medium	The project was able to mitigate this risk by facilitating cross-sectoral coordination in the development of sector plans that mainstream biodiversity conservation.		
Severity of climate change impacts will undermine conservation efforts promoted by the project through changes in biodiversity distribution and changes in community resource use intensities.		This risk remains relevant at project closure. The project did support climate change studies and helped increase the resilience of the 12 demonstration villages. But, the high degree of uncertainty regarding the potential impacts of climate change pose unpredictable threats to biodiversity on the Tibetan-Qinghai plateau.		
After 2013, China will launch a new round of government institutional reforms to mainstream the people's livelihood-related issues (such as increasing incomes, regional equality, and health) into the agenda of governments. This may reduce the focus on environmental protection (including PA system strengthening), disproportion the national and provincial investment and budget on PA planning and management, thereby hindering the process of achieving biodiversity conservation objectives.	Low to medium	The principle of eco-civilization is embedded into the national 13 th 5-year plan, and conservation has been mainstreamed as one of the main pillars of socioeconomic development in the country.		
Even under co-management, economic development interests of communities will override conservation priorities, leading to continued loss and degradation of biodiversity.	Low	There remain pressures associated with economic development, but overall development in Qinghai Province is now underpinned by a concerted focus on conservation.		

Exhibit 9: Analysis of project risks

The risk analysis did not address risks associated with sustaining project results after GEF funding ceases; for example, associated with the need for continued capacity building among local communities in the SNNR.

3.1.3. Lessons from other Relevant Projects

The project design took into account certain lessons learned from earlier interventions in Qinghai Province, including collaborative management with local communities in Qinghai Province, as part of the EU-China Biodiversity Programme (ECBP), which ran from 2007-2010, and as part of initiatives managed by NGOs. As outlined in the project

document, earlier efforts were mostly small in scale, and conservation benefits across the vast landscape expanses that wildlife species migrate across in the province were limited. The generally low level of awareness and capacity constraints of local communities were other barriers restricting scaling up of co-management approaches. Substantive resources were allocated to Component 3 of the project to address some of the lessons learned from earlier work.

Another lesson indicated in the situational analysis of the project document was the low information of nongovernmental organizations and the business sector in supporting conservation efforts. Specific targets were set for business sector participation, and NGOs were recruited to support the implementation of the project field interventions.

3.1.4. Planned Stakeholder Participation

The project stakeholder involvement plan included the following statement:

"The project will focus stakeholder engagement at two levels of intervention: (i) working with national and local public institutions and agencies in order to strengthen their capacity to consolidate, expand and effectively manage the PAN and to align project activities with government's strategic priorities; and (ii) working directly with civil society organisations, formal and informal resource users (rights holders), private landowners and individuals to mitigate impacts and optimise benefits of project activities."

With respect to the first level, working with national and local public institutions and agencies, the stakeholder involvement plan included a list of relevant provincial agencies and institutions; there were no national level agencies, e.g., the State Forestry Administration, listed. And, there were no explanations of how the indicated stakeholders would be involved in the project. For instance, the Department of Agriculture / Animal Husbandry is an important stakeholder, as they are responsible for grassland and livestock management. It would have been advisable to more clearly define the role of this department and other stakeholders in the project.

At the second level, involving civil society, formal and informal resource users, and private landowners, the specific roles of these stakeholders were not described in sufficient detail. For instance, under the title of "Roles and Responsibilities" for NGOs in Qinghai province, the following entry was made:

"Concerns for the environment, biodiversity, and/or the welfare of local communities"

In summary, the stakeholder involvement plan was a bit too general, with limited specifics indicated for broad and inclusive stakeholder engagement during project implementation.

3.1.5. Replication Approach

The replication approach outlined in the project document was generally lacking in specifics.

The following statement in the project document summarizes the replication approach:

"Several activities for capturing best practices and cultural knowledge will be used in the project to help promote replicability, including UNDP's Learning and Knowledge Sharing electronic platform."

One of the lessons described from earlier community co-management was the difficulty in replicating across broader landscape scales. The replication strategy for upscaling the village demonstrations under the third component of the project was fairly weak, and there were unclear sustainability structures built in for ensuring stakeholder involvement, e.g., from the SNNR Management Bureau following project.

3.1.6. UNDP Comparative Advantage

The UNDP comparative advantage as the GEF implementing agency was based on their extensive experience working in China, with in-country operations, their favorable standing among national stakeholders, their collective experience in supporting GEF biodiversity projects in China and elsewhere globally, as well as their institutional expertise in leading initiatives focused on broader human development issues, such as gender mainstreaming, social inclusion, and governance. UNDP's comparative advantage extends beyond providing management support during the implementation; the country office and regional center staff also provide technical / strategic support and timely back-stopping on key issues to the project.

3.1.7. Linkages between Project and other Interventions

One of the measures designed to facilitate linkages between the project and other interventions was the proposed establishment of a Leading Group, comprising representatives from key staff from relevant provincial agencies, local governments, and selected PA's.

As addressed under the discussion of planned stakeholder participation in the project document, there were limited specifics regarding linkages with complementary interventions. For instance, it would have been advisable to outline a detailed strategy on how the project would interact with the grassland recovery and livestock management programs in the province, mostly of which are managed by the Department of Agriculture / Animal Husbandry.

3.1.8. Management Arrangements

The project is run under the national implementation modality (NIM), in line with the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between the UNDP and the Government of China, and with the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP).

The implementation agency for the project is the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) China Country Office, and the Qinghai Provincial Government functioning as the executing agency and the sole cofinancing partner. The Ministry of Finance of China (MoF) is the national GEF Focal Point for the project, and the national project director (NPD) is the deputy director of the Qinghai Forestry Department (QFD). Day-to-day execution duties are delegated to the Qinghai Forestry Department (QFD), specifically the Project Management Office (PMO) which coordinates implementation of international donor projects for the department.

Strategic guidance is provided by the Project Steering Committee (PSC), which is comprised of representatives from MoF, UNDP, QFD, and representatives from related provincial departments.

Through experience with other donor projects, the PMO was an established and experienced entity at project entry. Supporting funding, staff, and facilities of the QFD further bolstered the management arrangements.

3.2. Project Implementation

3.2.1. Adaptive Management

Significant advances in terms of biodiversity conservation were made in Qinghai Province, and in China as a whole, during the course of the project, and the project team did a good job at adapting to changed circumstances. One example of adaptive management is the assistance the project delivered to the newly formed Three Rivers Source National Park Administration in developing the regulation for the national park. The regulation was approved in June 2017 and is scheduled to enter into force in August 2017.

Through community consultations with the demonstration villages, the project also adapted to the key issues identified by local people, e.g., improvements to waste management, water supply, defense systems regarding human-wildlife conflicts, and women's health.

As forestry part of the Sanjiangyuan Ecological Construction Programme was transferred to the PMO, the project also supported provincial and local level administrations in demonstrating how to engage local communities in providing co-management services, including patrolling and monitoring.

The project team also proactively responded to the recommendations outlined in the midterm review, including engaging with the provincial Land Resources Department, mainstreaming gender and social inclusion objectives into the project results framework, and facilitating better cross-component collaboration.

3.2.2. Partnership Arrangements

At the institutional level, the project was successful in facilitating linkages between relevant agencies of the Qinghai Provincial Government, resulting in mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation into the provincial 13th 5-year plan and 8 separate sector plans.

At the local level, the partnership arrangements outlined in the community collaborative management agreements were important in formalizing the participating of local communities in PA management. The co-management agreements were signed off by three parties, including the village coordination committees, the PMO, and the SNNR Administration. The involvement of the SNNR Administration significantly increases the likelihood that the partnership arrangements will be sustained after GEF funding ceases.

Local governments, the townships and counties where the demonstration villages are located, were also involved, to varying degrees, in the project. There were certain gaps in formal partnership arrangements with local governments.

For example, involving local governments through written agreements regarding roles and responsibilities associated with community waste management would have enhanced the sustainability of these interventions supported by the project.

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were involved in the first half of the project through contractual partnership arrangements under Component 3. There were certain challenges associated with this type of NGO involvement, resulting in a strategic shift in the second half of the project to discontinue the NGO arrangements and relying rather on local government partners to guide the community co-management activities.

3.2.3. Feedback from M&E Activities used for Adaptive Management

The main feedback mechanisms from M&E activities were the annual project implementation review (PIR) reports and the project steering committee (PSC) meetings. Both of these mechanisms were used effectively for implementing adaptive management measures.

The PSC has convened on an annual basis, and the national project director (NPD), the chairperson of the PSC, has proactively guided the committee members in reaching decisions that enabled uninterrupted implementation of the project and focused on achieving the intended project results.

Project reporting has been highly satisfactory, including timely completion project implementation reviews (PIRs) and annual progress reports (APRs). These reports were sufficiently detailed, with input provided by key implementation stakeholders, including the regional technical advisor (RTA), UNDP Country Office programme analyst, and the project coordinator.

3.2.4. Project Finance

The project implementation budget is USD 5,354,545 (GEF grant), as shown below in **Exhibit 10** broken down among the three outcomes and project management.

Exhibit 10: Breakdown of project budget and financing					
	GEF Grant	Committed C	Committed Cofinancing		
Component	Prodoc Budget	Source	Value		
	% of Total	Jource			
Outcome 1: Mainstreaming PA management into	USD 550,000	Government, Cash	USD 2,000,000		
provincial development and sector planning process	10%	Government, In-Kind	USD 990,000		
Outcome 2: Increasing PA management effectiveness	USD 1,510,000	Government, Cash	USD 6,060,000		
through strengthened institutional and staff capacities	28%	Government, In-Kind	USD 1,037,100		
Outcome 3: Demonstration of Effective PA management	USD 2,764,000	Government, Cash	USD 5,820,000		
National Nature Reserve (SNNR)	52%	Government, In-Kind	USD 1,114,000		
Project Management	USD 530,545	Government, Cash	USD 722,900		
	10%	Government, In-Kind	USD 756,000		
Total:	USD 5,354,545	Total:	USD 18,500,000		
Source: Project Document	Sub-total Gove	rnment Cofinancing, Cash	USD 14,602,900		

Sub-total Government Cofinancing, In-Kind USD 3,897,100

The total amount of pledged cofinancing was USD 18,500,000, committed by the Qinghai Provincial Government, and including USD 14,602,000 in in-kind contributions and USD 3,897,100 in cash.

Financial Expenditures

According to expenditure records documented in the combined delivery reports provided by the UNDP CO, USD 5,188,464, or 97% of the USD 5,354,545 GEF implementation grant had been incurred through 30 June 2017, leaving a balance of USD 166,081 (see **Exhibit 11**).

Exhibit 11: Breakdown of Project Budget and Actual Expenditures				
	GEF Grant	Actual Expenditures*		
Component	Prodoc Budget			
	% of Total	% of Total		
Outcome 1	USD 550,000	USD 528,407		
	10%	10%		
Outcomo 2	USD 1,510,000	USD 1,260,820		
	28%	24%		
Outcomo 2	USD 2,764,000	USD 2,929,499		
Outcome 5	52%	56%		
Droigst Management	USD 530,545	USD 428,846		
Project Management	10%	8%		
Unrealized Loss	N/A	62,992		
Unrealized Gain	N/A	-22,101		
Total:	USD 5,354,545	USD 5,188,464		

Source: Project Document and CDRs

*Actual Expenditures reported for the period 01 Jan 2013 through 30 Jun 2017

Spending under Component 1 (USD 528,407) and Component 2 (USD 1,260,820) stand at 96% and 83%, respectively of the indicative amounts outlined in the document. On the other hand, spending under Component 3 (USD 2,929,499) has been 6% more than the indicative budget of USD 2,764,000 allocated at the project preparation phase. Component 3 expenditures represent 56% of spending of the GEF implementation grant.

The largest contracts concluded under Component 3 include CNY 2,349,217 (USD 346,329) for construction of 76 bear-proof fences for residential dwellings in Qumahe and Suojia townships, and CNY 804,000 (USD 118,528) for construction of 12 communal waste transfer stations (see **Exhibit 12**):

Activity	Service Provider	Contract Value
Built up 76 sets of anti-bear fences: 36 sets in Qumahe	ilt up 76 sets of anti-bear fences: 36 sets in Qumahe Qinghai Xingchen Water Conservancy and Hydropower	
township, 40 sets in Suojia township	Ltd. Company	(USD 346,329)
Built up 12 communal waste transfer stations	Qinghai Ruijian Engineering Construction Corporation	CNY 804,000
		(USD 118,528)
Publications of Book named "My home is in the three	People's Education Bublish house	CNY 250,000
river sources"	reopie's Education Publish house	(USD 36,856)
Compilation of Book named "My home is in the three	Fuqun Environmental Research Institute (Future	CNY 239,200
river sources"	generations)	(USD 35,264)
uilt up 4 vaccination stations in Suojia township, Zhiduo	Animal husbandry and veterinary workstation of Zhiduo	CNY 200,000
county	county, Yushu Prefecture	(USD 29,485)

Note: Information provided by PMO. USD:CNY exchange rate = 6.78319 (30 Jun 2017, <u>www.oanda.com</u>).

Project management costs have totaled USD 428,846 through 30 June 2017, or 8% of the total amount spent through 30 June 2017. Cash cofinancing from the QFD has shored up project management costs, e.g., salaries of the component managers are covered by cofinancing.

In looking at the distribution of project expenditures over time, the highest level of spending occurred in 2016, with USD 1,767,390 spent that year and USD 1,418,775, or 80% expended under Component 3 (see **Exhibit 13**).



Comparing actual expenditures to annual work plan budgets, financial delivery has been consistently high and improving year on year: 88.5% for fiscal year 2013, 89.84% for 2014, 91.18% for 2015, and 92.35% for 2016.

Two independent financial audit reports³, for calendar years 2014 and 2015, were assessed as part of the TE desk review. The reports indicate that combined delivery reports presented fairly the expenditures occurred in the subject years, and were: "(i) in conformity with the approved project budgets; (ii) for the approved purposes for the project; (iii) in compliance with the relevant regulations and rules, policies and procedures; and (iv) supported by properly approved vouchers and other supporting documents.

The 2015 audit report includes a statement of assets, indicating a cumulative gross value of CNY 2,213,810.90 (USD 356,150.13). The assets include equipment and devices procured to support the PMO staff and community comanagement teams. The asset lists comprises more than one thousand items, including IT equipment, communication equipment, two-way radios, GPS units, binoculars, compasses, etc.

Cofinancing

A cumulative total of USD 18.5 million of cofinancing from the Qinghai Provincial Government was confirmed at CEO endorsement: USD 14.6029 million in in-kind contributions and USD 3.8971 million in cash contributions (refer to the cofinancing table compiled in **Annex 6**). The actual amount of cofinancing materialized by July 2017, as reported by PMO, is USD 23.2246 million, exceeding the confirmed sum by 25%. The actual cofinancing contributions include USD 20.2391 million of in-kind contributions and USD 2.9855 million in cash contributions.

The in-kind contributions were for programmes and initiatives funded by the provincial government in the areas where the project focused on, e.g., desertification control, black soil beach recovery, wetland protection, and afforestation projects in Zhiduo, Qumalai, and Maduo Counties, as well as in the Makehe area.

The amount of in-kind cofinancing realized by midterm was greater than the amount reported at project closure: USD 21,490,642 at midterm and USD 20,239,130 at closure. In consultation with the Qinghai Provincial Finance Department, the PMO reassessed the realized cofinancing, and decided it was more appropriate to include those investments that were made in the specific counties where the project supported field interventions, rather than within the SNNR or the province as a whole. The TE team concurred with this adjustment.

The cash cofinancing contributions are commendable, as the Qinghai Government deposited these funds into the PMO's bank account and the money was used for direct support of project implementation. The cash contributions were used to help finance development of the knowledge management system (KMS), to support trainings, to fund ecotourism development plans, and to support the co-management activities under Component 3. The cash financing

³ The financial audits for calendar years 2014 and 2015 were carried out by Marazs Certified Public Accountants.

was also used to pay the salaries of several of the PMO staff members, including the component managers, and to finance the running costs for keeping the PMO office operating.

The discrepancy in the actual and confirmed cofinancing sums (actual in-kind contributions exceeded the confirmed sum, whereas the cash contributions were less than the confirmed tally) might be partly a result of currency exchange fluctuations over the course of the project (see **Exhibit 14**).



USD/CNY 1825 Day History

Exhibit 14: USD:CNY exchange rates Sep 2012 – Jul 2017

3.2.5. Monitoring & Evaluation

Overall Quality of Monitoring & Evaluation is rated as: Satisfactory

Supporting Evidence:

- + The monitoring and evaluation plan was reasonably well prepared, using the standard template for GEFfinanced projects.
- + PIR reports contained feedback from key stakeholders and provided detailed summaries of project performance.
- + Constructive adjustments were made following recommendations made by the midterm review.
- + The PSC convened regularly and provided constructive feedback to the project team.
- Some of the baselines in the strategic results framework had not been validated by the time of the terminal evaluation.
- There were a number of inconsistences in the tracking tool assessments.
- Allocated funding for monitoring and evaluation was a bit low, at USD 114,000 or 2% of the GEF implementation grant.

Monitoring and Evaluation design at entry is rated as: Satisfactory

The M&E plan was developed using the standard template for GEF-financed projects. The indicative budget for the M&E plan was USD 114,000, excluding PMO and UNDP staff time and travel expenses. This sum is approximately 2% of the USD 5,354,545 GEF grant; which in the opinion of the TE team, is a bit low. The majority of the M&E cost covered the midterm review and terminal evaluation; at USD 40,000 for each evaluation, respectively. Another USD 4,000 was allocated for independent financial audits. And, only USD 10,000 was allocated for Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Purpose Indicators. A number of baseline activities needed to be carried out at the start of project implementation, including biodiversity baseline surveys and participatory rural appraisals. This amount of money was clearly insufficient to cover these baseline activities.

The project results framework largely contains indicators with quantifiable targets, meant to be achieved and measurable within the timeframe of the project. There were some uncertainties with respect to baseline conditions and certain assumptions were made that these would be sorted out during project inception.

Implementation of Monitoring and Evaluation Plan is rated as: Satisfactory

As pointed out in the midterm review (MTR), there were discrepancies within the project document, e.g., some information recorded in the strategic results framework do not match with data included in the baseline GEF tracking tool file, which was also part of the project document. Whilst the PMO worked to sort out some of the discrepancies following the MTR, the TE team found that several inconsistencies remain.

There was room for improvement with respect on results-based management. Certain baseline figures were not sufficiently validated, including information contained in the tracking tools. There was also inadequate quality control on the midterm and endpoint tracking tool assessments carried out be contracted consultant teams.

The majority of the recommendations from the midterm review were implemented by the project, as summarized below in **Exhibit 15**.

	Midterm review recommendation	Status at terminal evaluation
1.	The MTR team recommends the modifications to the strategic results framework, as outlined in the separate table below. The recommended changes are to the indicators and targets; the project objective and outcomes remain the same. These recommended modifications should be reviewed and approved by the project management team, the UNDP CO, the RTA, and finally by the Project Steering Committee (PSC). Upon approval by the PSC, the modified strategic results framework should be the official version used for the remainder of the implementation timeframe and for the terminal evaluation.	The majority of recommended modifications to the strategic results framework were implemented, approved by the PSC during the October 2016 meeting.
2.	 The following actions are recommended to improve inter-linkages between project components and communication/coordination among national and international consultants: 2a: Create a project website, primarily for internal purposes, and assign one of the PMO staff members responsible to update the site at least on a monthly basis. A working area should be established, where national and international consultants can provide concise information/feedback. Comments should be translated on a regular basis; 2b: Deliverables produced by national and international consultants should include an executive summary that is translated from Chinese to English or English to Chinese. These deliverables, with translated executive summaries, should be uploaded to the project website within one month from finalization; 2c: Opportunities for collaborating across project components should be discussed on a weekly basis in project management meetings, including the project manager and component managers. 2d: Component managers should prepare annual monitoring and evaluation plans for their respective outcomes, using the strategic results framework as a guideline, but also developing interim performance indicators and targets to assist them in assessing the progress of work. Quarterly progress reports on the monitoring and evaluation plans should be prepared, translated to English, and uploaded to the project website. 	A project website was created, for both internal and external users. There was evidence apparent to the TE team of improved cross- component collaboration, but there were some inconsistent with respect to results based management.
3.	A mentoring program should be designed and implemented to strengthen the capacity of provincial and sub-provincial stakeholders in biodiversity conservation strategic planning and management implementation. A specific group of provincial and sub-provincial staff from QFD and other departments responsible for PA management should be selected for the mentoring program. The design of the program should be adaptive, e.g., responding to opportunities for interaction as part of assignments carried out by national and/or international consultants.	The project continued to support substantive training sessions, reaching out to several stakeholder groups. Certain mentoring opportunities were missed; e.g., there was only limited involvement of forestry staff with biodiversity expert teams hired by the

Exhibit 15: Summary of management responses to MTR recommendations

Midterm review recommendation		Status at terminal evaluation
		project to carry out regular biodiversity surveys.
4.	A plan should be developed and implemented to increase gender/minority inclusion in the collaborative management arrangements and activities piloted under component 3. The targets of this plan should be integrated into the updated strategic results framework, which is outlined below in Recommendation No. 5.	The recommended gender/minority inclusion revisions to the results framework were implemented, and, in general, gender/minority inclusion was improved during the second half of the project.
5.	A thorough assessment should be made of the each of the tracking tools, for both the baseline and midterm figures. The indicators and targets of the strategic results framework should be then reformulated and/or reconciled.	There were some adjustments made to certain baseline figures among the tracking tools, but others remain uncertain at project closure.
6.	A knowledge management strategy should be developed, including (1) defining the roles and responsibilities for interpreting information inputs; (2) formulating a strategy for developing management responses to ecosystem perturbations; (3) outlining roles/responsibilities and processes for interpreting PA management effectiveness; and (4) describing how PA management results and lessons learned will be disseminated. In addition to the KMS strategy, a value-for-money analysis should be carried out, comparing the costs and benefits of having an information management system hosted by the QFD to the option of expanding the existing information management system operated by the Qinghai Environmental Monitoring Centre.	The KMS continued to be developed during the second half of the project, and trainings were delivered to QFD staff to facilitate sustainability of the system after project closure. Further development of the system is required, and resources will need to be allocated to maintain operation and updating of the KMS.
7.	The QBSAP should be strengthened by including: (1) actions addressing potential climate change impacts to biodiversity, (2) an itemization of the major ecosystem services and some approximate economic values, and (3) actions associated with improving the PA staffing and funding shortfalls within the Qinghai PA system.	The QBSAP was further developed during the second half of the project and approved by the Provincial Government in October 2016. A separate report on ecosystem service valuation was prepared, and the establishment of the Three Rivers Source National Park pilot has bolstered PA staffing and funding.
8.	 The MTR team recommends the following actions to strengthen the biodiversity mainstreaming efforts: 8a: Summarize results of the comprehensive review of provincial regulations into a written report, indicating which regulations were reviewed, and what steps were taken to remove conditions and/or entire regulations that are not conducive biodiversity conservation. 8b: Work with the Provincial Land Resources Department in updating the Provincial Land Use Plan by indicating the key conservation areas highlighted in the QBSAP. 8c: Work with at least one County Land Resources Department, in one of the areas where the pilot villages are located, and assist them in developing their county Key Ecological Function Area Plan. This county plan should make reference to the village level conservation zoning areas. 8d: Identify linkages between provincial departments and academic institutions to facilitate applied research, e.g., the effects of the pylon structures used for electrical transmission developments. The project should try to fund some preliminary research as a means of operationalizing the partnerships. 8e: Prepare a running tally of (1) specific activities added to sectoral plans that have been operationalized (approved budget and implementation started); items/activities that have 	The PMO prepared a report summarizing how biodiversity conservation has been mainstreamed into provincial sector plans. Involvement with the Land Resources Department was initiated during the second half of the project. There has been limited time for implementation of the technical regulations and guidelines prepared with project support; thus, there has been no tracking of how these regulations have been implemented.

Exhibit 15: Summary of management responses to MTR recommendations
Exhibit 15: Summary of management responses to MTR recommendations

Midterm review recommendation	Status at terminal evaluation
already been considered for the 13th 5-year plan. 8f: Develop specific inspection protocols for each of the new regulations and guidelines being developed and invite inspection stakeholders to	
participate in the process.	
8g: Establish a tracking register for the new regulations and guidelines that are being developed, in order to document how the regulations and guidelines are being implemented in practice. The register should include a brief description of the activity/investment, the timeframe, investment value, photograph documentation, etc. The register should also include a list of environmental impact assessments that have used the guidelines in assessing biodiversity impacts and recommending appropriate mitigation measures.	
regulations/guidelines, as many of the communities among the pilot villages in Outcome 3 have complained of poor waste management as part of infrastructure development projects.	
 9. Based upon the findings of the MTR mission and recommendations included in reports prepared by national and international consultants, the following actions are recommended for the second half of the project in terms of strengthening the sustainable financing capacity of the PA system: 9a: Establish a task force with relevant provincial and sub-provincial stakeholders for formulating a system for reviewing ecological compensation programs and making recommendations of how the funds are allocated. The system should include tracking how the funds are actually disbursed. 9b: Identify a few key revenue generation options, identified in the PA financing report, and pilot them, preferably at least one in each of the nature reserves. Lessons learned from the pilot results should be consolidated into a series of case studies. 9c: Facilitate development of a regional plan for implementing policy reforms that would lead to a more systematic and strategic approach to improving 	Establishment of the Three Rivers Source National Park pilot did improve the financial sustainability of the PA system in Qinghai Province. PA financing options were not piloted during the project, and there was no evidence of activities focusing on PA revenue generation in response to the PA financing report prepared during the first half of the project. There were infrastructure investments in ecotourism services for local communities, to promote alternative livelihood opportunities, and an ecotourism development plan was
financial sustainability, especially for ecotourism and payments for ecosystem services.	prepared for the Makehe region.
10. The project should develop and implement a site level pilot of a collaborative arrangement between the government run Public Service Program and community co-management structures as means of addressing shortfalls in PA staff needs.	The PSP has consolidated and expanded, now termed the eco- position programme. There are more than 10,000 eco-positions for the Three Rivers Source National Park pilot and others for the NRs under QFD management.
 11. The following actions are recommended to strengthen the nature reserve management plans: 11a: The plans should include biodiversity assessment protocols, building upon what was accomplished through the baseline surveys sponsored by the project. 11b: The Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) should be considered to be integrated into the management plans, as regular management tool. 11c: The process of compiling and reporting on the monitoring and patrolling data from the community driven collaborative management 	The project supported a total of 9 management plans. The plans are rather general, but are appropriate as a first step through systematic management planning. The plans reference the monitoring framework prepared by the project for the entire PA system, but there are no specific linkages to the biodiversity surveys
arrangements in the pilot villages should be described in the plans. 11d: Each management plan should include a specific activity that is consistent with the PA system strategy of increasing the capacity and number of PA staff on a system scale.	that were made for the targeted 3 SNNR blocks. Also, the METT was not integrated as a management tool.

	Midterm review recommendation	Status at terminal evaluation
	11e: The plans should also indicate how the monitoring and patrolling information obtained through the Public Service Position (PSP) activities, a Government-sponsored collaborative management program.	
12.	The MTR team recommends creating a task force or advisory committee, including but not limited to the following stakeholders: representatives of the provincial focal agency for the PSP program, the QFD, the SNNR Administration, and the project management team. The task force (or advisory committee) should develop a plan for linking the top-down PSP program with bottom-up project model.	Addressing the top-down approach of the PSP, now termed the eco-position programme, remains an issue at project closure.
13.	 A sustainability strategy should be developed for Outcome 3 and include, but not limited to, the following: 13a: Assist the collaborative management coordination committees in obtaining legal status (community based organization) by end of project; 13b: Negotiate partnership arrangements for collaborative management coordination committees after project closure (e.g., with SNNR); 13c: Consider adjusting the flow of financial and material support extended to the coordination committees, by having the SNNR Administration disburse the funds and assets to the communities rather than the PMO. This would require an agreement between the SNNR Administration and the PMO; 13d: Facilitate the acknowledgement of village conservation areas, through the village regulations and possibly also county land use plans; 13e: Support the communities and the SNNR administration in preparation of annual NR management reports, thus creating a replicable model that could be continued after project closure; 13f: Prepare simple operation and maintenance instructions for equipment provided. The instructions should be also be available in Tibetan language. 	Two of the three target SNNR blocks are now part of the Three Rivers Source National Park pilot, and the third, Makehe, is also under management by the National Park Administration. Although the PMO has consulted with the National Park Administration about maintaining the collaborative management arrangements demonstrated by the project, there is no evidence that the specific co-management agreements will be extended. Involvement of local communities will likely continue under the eco-position programme. The community patrol and monitoring teams were trained on the use of the field equipment, and the instructions were prepared in Tibetan language and disseminated to the pilot villages in 2015. The long-term maintenance of this equipment is questionable.
14.	 A few additional actions recommended to strengthen the results under Outcome 3 include the following: 14a: A cumulative work plan should be prepared for Outcome 3, extending to the end of the project. The actions outlined under the sustainability strategy recommendation should be incorporated in the plan, and allocation of resources should be carefully examined to ensure that the available funds are optimally utilized; 14b: Livestock (and property) loss due to wildlife attacks are expected to increase under enhanced biodiversity conservation. Compensation for villagers for these losses is a type of ecological compensation, but such compensation has not been sufficiently disbursed, even though there are regulatory frameworks in place. In the pilot villages, the project should work with County officials in developing a replicable model for facilitating fair compensation arrangements; 14c: Burning of plastic waste should be prohibited, as toxic gases and residuals have adverse health and environmental impacts. County waste collection and disposal companies should be engaged in developing waste management solutions for the pilot villages; 14d: Based upon the surveys made with herders in the visited communities, cooperative herding is a common arrangement. Development of alternative livelihood opportunities, e.g., by trading dairy products or handicrafts, or by supporting ecological tourism development, should be considered using these existing cooperative arrangements. The 	The PMO has made several consultations with provincial and local stakeholders, to enhance the likelihood that project results are sustained after project closure. However, there is no specific sustainability plan in place. The project supported infrastructure investments associated with human- wildlife conflicts, e.g., bear-proof fences. The project did not focus on supporting reform of regulatory frameworks on compensation of loss or damage associated with wildlife. The PMO worked with the provincial office of legislative affairs to evaluate the barriers associated with the "Qinghai Compensation Regulation for Key Terrestrial Wildlife Damage to Persons and Properties", from late 2016. The evaluation report was reviewed by a panel in April 2017, and the recommendations of the

Exhibit 15: Summary of management responses to MTR recommendations

	Midterm review recommendation	Status at terminal evaluation
	 cooperative herding arrangements could also to address improved collaborative ecosystem management, e.g., through agreeing to remove fences, protection of water springs, etc.; 14e: For the cooperatives being considered in the pilot villages, supply chain analyses should be carried out to determine existing barriers, such as distance to market, storage capacities, etc., so that development support can be better focused. Also, a value chain analysis of yak wool products might be sensible, as it seems that such production is uncommon in the targeted grassland ecosystems. 	evaluation being considered in the amendment to the regulation, expected by the end of December 2016. The project disbursed substantive resources towards community waste management infrastructure, including continued burning of wastes. The project also supported modest investments in alternative livelihood infrastructure, including dairy processing equipment. Administrative support was also provided for establishing cooperatives; however, the cooperatives are not functioning at project closure.
15.	Traditional knowledge on conservation of biodiversity and cultural resources should be captured in one or more case studies (knowledge products) and disseminated to a broad spectrum of relevant stakeholders.	The project supported the preparation a compilation of traditional knowledge among Tibetan communities in the demonstration villages. And, an environmental education storybook was prepared and disseminated to local primary schools and other beneficiaries.
16.	A separate division should be formed within the QFD for dealing with collaborative management and community relations issues.	This was a long-term recommendation, aimed at mainstreaming co-management approaches within the QFD. The newly approved regulation for the Three Rivers Source National Park promotes community level co-management, and QFD management stressed their continued commitment in maintaining and expanding co-management among the PA system under their management.

Exhibit 15: Summary of management responses to MTR recommendations

3.2.6. Implementing Agency (IA) and Executing Agency (EA) Execution

Overall IA-EA Execution: Highly Satisfactory

Supporting Evidence:

- Strong continuity of key stakeholders throughout the entire project.
- Consistent guidance provided by senior level QFD and UNDP officials.
- Constructive project steering committee meetings.
- + Highly effective project management, well-staffed PMO, and highly qualified CTA.
- Intended outcomes have been mostly achieved, within the allocated budget.
- Annual progress reports and project implementation reviews generally contain candor accounts of project performance.
- Involvement of international experts tapered off during the second half of the project.

- Some shortfalls in quality control.

Overall, considering the proactive and constructive management and guidance delivered by the QFD, PMO, and UNDP, a highly satisfactory rating is applied.

Quality of Implementing Agency (UNDP) Execution is rated as: Highly Satisfactory

The UNDP Country Office in China has acted as implementing agency for a number of GEF-financed biodiversity projects, and has a wealth of global experience to draw from. With respect to gender mainstreaming, more strategic support would be advisable from the UNDP, to assist the PMO in integrating gender and minority development objectives into the implementation program.

The Environment and Energy program of the UNDP CO is well staffed, and has provided administrative and strategic support to the executing agency and the project management team. The Environment and Energy program manager has attended the inception workshop and steering committee meetings, and provided regular ad hoc support to the project manager and other members within the PMO. Procurement of international consultants is managed by the UNDP CO, and financial expenditures are collected and entered into the Atlas system by CO staff.

The UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisors (RTA) have provided strategic guidance (e.g., sharing best practices) to the project management team, including one visit during selection of the sites/villages to focus on in Outcome 3.

As this project falls under the China Biodiversity Partnership and Framework for Action (CBPF), there seems to have been some cross-project sharing of experiences, e.g., the PMO staff attended a CBPF workshop hosted by Ministry of Environmental Protection in Jiangsu Province on 22-24 September 2013. The staff made a presentation describing the Qinghai project. In general, however, there has been insufficient consolidation of lessons learned among CBPF projects, e.g., with respect to biodiversity mainstreaming. The project also shared experiences with UNDP-GEF MSL Wetland Programme, especially training course in Anhui Province in 22-23 September 2015.

Quality of the Executing Agency Execution is rated as: Highly Satisfactory

The project was run under a national implementation modality (NIM). The executing agency is the Qinghai Provincial Government, while technical level execution is managed by the Qinghai Forestry Department (QFD), and specifically the Project Management Office (PMO) of the QFD which also administers other international donor supported projects. The national project director (NPD), the deputy director of the QFD, has provided consistent and constructive guidance to the project, chairing the project steering committee and supporting implementation as needed. The project director (PD), the director of the PMO, has also provided consistent leadership, delivering support to the PMO on a day-to-day basis.

The project manager (PM) was hired in January 2013, about a week before the inception workshop, and has remained on board since that time. The PM is highly qualified, with extensive work experience in biodiversity conservation in China, including in Qinghai Province and also the Tibetan Autonomous Region in China. In addition to the PM, the GEF grant covers the salaries of three other members of the PMO, including the Chief Technical Officer (CTA), project interpreter/translator, and the project financial officer. There are eight other members of the PMO, including three component managers, who are paid through the governmental cofinancing contributions.

When the project first started, a different CTA was in place; a Canadian national who had been in Xining for more than 15 years working on biodiversity conservation issues. He was extensively knowledgeable of the challenges facing PA management in the province and the underlying socio-economic challenges facing the local communities. After the first year of implementation, the contract for the CTA was not extended, presumably for reasons associated with difficulties in obtaining an updated visa for working in the province, and particularly for traveling to the Tibetan communities among the pilot villages.

The current CTA was hired in 2014, after the first CTA, a Canadian national, completed his one year tenure. The CTA is a nationally recognized biodiversity expert and staff member of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, and has worked roughly 25% time, i.e., 5 days per month on average. He sits on a number of national level advisory boards and, hence, he is able to provide updated feedback on central government priorities and strategies.

During the first half of the project, five international consultants were involved on the project on various thematic areas, including training needs assessment, community engagement, information management, and biodiversity conservation. There was no evidence of continued involvement in the second half of the project. Although the main focus in the last 2 years of the project has been on field interventions, the imbalance of national-international is considered a missed opportunity to fully benefit from the available GEF grant funding.

The TE team also observed some shortfalls with respect to quality control. Some of the completed interventions in the field were found to be poorly finished, e.g., bear-proof fences in Zhiduo County and shower houses in Makehe. There was also insufficient quality control with respect to the completed tracking tools, for baseline, midterm, and endpoint assessments.

3.3. Project Results

3.3.1. Overall Results (Attainment of Objective)

Project Objective: To catalyze management effectiveness of Qinghai's PA system	Attainment of Objective:
to fulfil its purpose of conserving globally important biodiversity	Satisfactory

The objective-level performance indicators were designed to capture the key added values of the project. The first performance indicator at the project objective level is associated with improvements in the sustainability of financing for the PA system in the Qinghai province, as measured by the GEF financial scorecard included in the GEF-4 biodiversity tracking tool. Component 1 of the financial scorecard is associated with the legal, regulatory, and institutional frameworks required for creating the enabling conditions to facilitate sustainable PA financing. For this component, the endpoint assessment reported a score of 47.78%, which exceeds the end target of 30%; however, the baseline figure in the tracking tool file is 34.44%, not 15.4% as recorded in the strategic results framework. Considering that 47.78% is more than 13 percentage points greater than the 34.44% baseline, the TE considered the end target achieved.

The second component of the financial scorecard covers business planning and tools for cost-effective management. The endpoint assessment reported a score of 38.98%, which is short of the 50% target. There are also inconsistencies with respect to the baseline figure for this component; the strategic results framework indicates a baseline of 11.5%, whereas the tacking tool reports a baseline of 13.56%. After reviewing the first draft of the endpoint assessment, it was apparent to the TE team that the consultant hired to make the assessment did not fully understand the term "business planning". In fact, there was no evidence available of business plans developed for the nature reserves under management by the QFD. Whilst there has been improvements reported in the score of this component, the TE team considers that the end target will not be achieved by project closure. This is understandable, as business planning is not a primary mandate of the QFD for the nature reserves under their management. A similar conclusion was drawn in review of the endpoint score reported for Component 3 of the financial scorecard. The endpoint score was reported at 36.11%, slightly short of the 40% target, but, again, there are inconsistencies with the baseline figures. The strategic results framework indicates a baseline of 8.5%, whereas the tracking tool has a baseline figure of 18.06%. Only 2 or 3 of the 10 nature reserves are collecting revenue, and there is no evidence of the QFD developing tools for revenue generation.

Indicator: Financial sustainability score (%) for national systems of protected areas Component 1 – Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks Component 2 – Business planning and tools for cost- effective management Component 3 – Tools for revenue generation					
Baseline End Target Status at TE TE					
	Component 1: 15.4%	30%	47.78%	Achieved	
Value:	Component 2: 11.5%	50%	38.98%	Unlikely to be achieved	
	Component 3: 8.5%	40%	36.11%	Unlikely to be achieved	
Date:	2011	Sep 2017	Jul 2017	Jul 2017	

Management effectiveness is the measure of performance towards the second indicator at the project objective level, measured by the GEF-adapted management effectiveness tracking tool (METT) for 5 nature reserves managed by the QFD. The most significant improvement was recorded for SNNR, with an increase of 39% in the METT score from the baseline to endpoint assessment. This is logical, considering the focus of Component 3 of the project was on the SNNR, and also due to the fact that the Three Rivers Source National Park has been recently established, further bolstering the importance and support for the SNNR and the Kekexili NR.

Indicator: METT scores for different PAs					
	Baseline	End Target	Status at TE	TE Assessment	
Value:	SNNR: 33% 32%	70%	71%	Achieved	
	Mengda: 54%	65%	73%	Achieved	
	Kekexili: 50% 40%	65%	67%	Achieved	
	Qinghai Lake: 58% 53%	75%	76%	Achieved	
	Golmud: 22% 23%	50%	55%	Achieved	
Date:	2011	Sep 2017	Jul 2017	Jul 2017	

Note: Changes made after midterm review and approved in PSC meeting minutes 2016 October.

The third performance indicator at the project objective level is the stable or increasing trends in the populations of selected indicator species in three units (or blocks) of the SNNR. Two different sub-contractors were hired by the project to establish baseline levels and to conduct annual surveys until project closure. One of the sub-contractors was responsible for the Suojia-Qumahe block, and the second sub-contractor designed and led the surveys for the Zhaling-Elinghu and Makehe blocks.

Based upon review of the summary report of biodiversity surveys in the Suojia-Qumahe block and interviews by the TE team of the sub-contractor who led these surveys, the selected indicator species, including the Tibetan wild ass (*Equus kiang*) and the Tibetan gazelle (*Procapra picticaudata*) have been more or less stable over the period of 2014 July until 2016 July (see **Exhibit 16**). Baseline surveys were completed in 2014, a year after project inception, thus reducing the total number of years for comparison to four. A final survey is scheduled to be completed in July of 2017.

	Tibetan wild ass		Tibetan gazelle			
Period	Groups	Individuals	Individuals / km	Groups	Individuals	Individuals / km
2014/Jun-Jul	145	999	0.55	105	273	0.15
2014/Aug-Sep	54	272	0.46	37	150	0.25
2015/Jul	267	982	0.64	146	364	0.24
2016/Jul	149	727	0.55	96	230	0.18

Exhibit 16: Summary of biodiversity survey results in the Suojia-Qumahe unit of SNNR, 2014-2016

Source: Wildlife survey on the Qinghai-Tibet Plateau, 20 June 2017, Xinhai Li, CAS

Biodiversity survey results in the other two blocks also reported stable trends. At Zhaling Lake, the sub-contractor who led the surveys informed the TE team that the estimated populations of the bar-headed goose (Anser *indicus*) and brown-headed gull (*Chroicocephalus brunnicephalus*) reduced to 2,000-3,000 in 2015 from the baseline estimation of 10,000-11,000, as a result of poaching. The populations increased to approximately 8,000 in 2016 and the result of the 2017 survey indicates near recovery to the 10,000-11,000 baseline figures. The sudden drop as a result of poaching does highlight the sensitivity to some of these species to particular threats.

The performance indicator was expanded upon as a result of the midterm review recommendations, by adding a criterion of including biodiversity assessment protocols in the management plans for these particular blocks of SNNR. The management plans facilitated with project support do make reference to monitoring protocols, also developed under the project; however, the particular species that were surveyed over the course of the project and the specific monitoring techniques, e.g., transects, are not specified in the plans. This prohibits direct evaluation of the status of the populations of these species after project closure. With the establishment of the Three Rivers National Park pilot, it is also likely that a unique monitoring plan will be developed for the national park.

Indicator: S	Indicator: Selected indicator species that are rare and threatened show stable or upward trends in numbers					
	Baseline	End Target	Status at TE	TE Assessment		
Value:	Baseline survey of selected indicator species at outset of project, in three target units of the SNNR (Suojia- Qumahe, Zhaling- Elinghu, Makahe)	Key wildlife populations maintained or increasing; appropriate population structure. Biodiversity assessment protocols are included in the management plans for the national NRs.	Biodiversity survey reports indicate stable or slightly increasing populations.	Achieved		
Date:	2011	Sep 2017	Jul 2017	Jul 2017		

Note: Changes made after midterm review and approved in PSC meeting minutes 2016 October.

Outcome 1: Mainstreaming PA management into provincial de	Achievement of Outcome:	
sector planning process	Satisfactory	
Indicative budget in project document: Actual cost incurred on this Outcome through 30 June 2017:	USD 550,000 USD 528,407	

The first performance indicator under Outcome 1 is associated with mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into provincial sector and development planning frameworks. The provincial 13th 5-year plan, approved in 2016, was prepared over the course of the implementation of the project. Through regular cross-sectoral coordination meetings, the project helped facilitate mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation considerations into this plan, as well as in the following 5 sector plans, exceeding the target number of 3 sector plans:

- 1. Provincial Development and Reform Commission
- 2. Forestry Department
- 3. Animal Husbandry Department
- 4. Environmental Protection Department/Bureau
- 5. Hydrologic Water Management Department

Some examples of how biodiversity conservation is mainstreamed into these plans are summarized below:

- Forestry Department: to strengthen wild fauna and flora conservation and NP construction; to strengthen NP infrastructure construction and personnel capacity building; to launch NNR construction project, and advance construction of National Demonstrative NRs including Kekexili, Mengda and Qinghai Lake.
- Environmental Protection Department: to improve NRs integrated management; with the guidance of Three Rivers Source National Park Regulation, to create and explore new PA management system; to compile and implement Qinghai Provincial NR Development Plan (2016-2025); to establish Integrated Sky-Earth Monitoring System, in order to strengthen remote sensing monitoring and field inspection on human activities in NRs, and to strictly supervise ecological influences of construction projects upon NRs; to strengthen NRs standardization, to improve law enforcement and supervision, and conduct management effectiveness evaluations.
- Hydrologic Water Management Department: water ecology conservation and restoration: to improve protection in key ecology conservation area, water conservation area, river source area and wetlands in Sanjiangyuan, Hehuang, Qinghai Lake and Qilian Mountain; to advance water ecological restoration in ecologically fragile rivers, lakes, and regions.

The project also supported the Provincial Government in finalizing the Qinghai Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (QBSAP), which was approved in November 2016.

One of the recommendations made as part of the midterm review was to increase involvement by the Provincial Land Resources Department, and the first indicator was expanded by aiming to have the key conservation areas identified in the QBSAP represented in the Provincial Land Use Plan. According to testimonial evidence obtained during interviews made as part of the TE, this expanded target seems to have been achieved.

Indicator 1.1: PA system and its management mainstreamed within the provincial sectoral and development planning framework at the provincial level: indicated by clear inclusion of due consideration and concrete measures for biodiversity conservation and PA development, as well as ear marked budget in the sectoral development plans at provincial levels and in the (national) 13th 5-year plan

	Baseline	End Target	Status at TE	TE Assessment
Value:	No sectoral plans integrate PA objectives. Development plans include no vision and development plan for PAs and no link is made between the PAs and development, nor no	At least 3 sectoral plans integrate consideration of PAs and of biodiversity conservation measures. 13th 5 year-Plan recognises clear linkage between PAs and provincial development, and includes PA- and biodiversity- related targets and budgets.	Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed in 13 th 5-year plan and sector plans of the Provincial Development and Reform Commission; Forestry Department; Animal Husbandry Department; Environmental Protection Department; and Hydrologic Water Management Department	Achieved
	concrete measure for biodiversity conservation	The Provincial Land Use Plan includes key conservation areas identified in QBSAP.	The Provincial Land Use Plan is consistent with the key conservation areas identified in the QBSAP	Achieved
Date:	2011	Sep 2017	Jul 2017	Jul 2017

Note: Changes made after midterm review and approved in PSC meeting minutes 2016 October.

Indicator 1.2 is associated with reducing threats posed by unsustainable infrastructure development. The end target for this indicator was enactment of official standards with clear rehabilitation/offset mechanisms.

According to available documentation evidence and interviews with Provincial Government and PMO staff, five safeguard regulations have been developed and approved, and three other ones have been drafted and are awaiting approval.

The approved ones include the following:

- 1. Qinghai Transportation and Traffic Infrastructure-construction Environmental Protection Regulation.
- 2. Qinghai Infrastructure-construction Environmental Protection Regulation and Guideline of State Grid Qinghai Company.
- 3. Qinghai Green Building Development and Promotion Regulation.
- 4. Qinghai Management Regulation in House Construction and Municipal infrastructure Operation on site.
- 5. Qinghai Grassland Warden Regulation.

The following regulations have been drafted, but not yet enacted.

- 1. Animal Husbandry Sector: Three regulations on (invasive species control, (2) grassland resting and closure, and (3) management regulation on balancing livestock and pastureland.
- 2. Animal Husbandry Sector: Pest Control Operational Manual in SNNR.
- 3. Water Resource Sector: Sand Extraction Management Regulation. Because this regulation includes a fee to be levied on organizations applying for sand extraction permit, there is an extended public consultation required.

Although there are a few minor shortcomings with respect to achievement of the Indicator 1.2 results, e.g., some of the safeguard regulations have not yet been approved and there is no evidence of clear rehabilitation/offset mechanisms in the regulations, the contributions the project has made towards improving cross-sectoral collaboration with respect to biodiversity conservation is commendable and one of the main strengths of the project.

Indicator 1.2: Threats to PAs from infrastructure placement (roads, dams) and other adverse forms of land use avoided, mitigated or offset, leading to more effective conservation in Qinghai's PA system covering 251.665 km²

0					
	Baseline	End Target	Status at TE	TE Assessment	
Value:	No procedure in place to deal with incompatible developments	Official standards for infrastructure development and operation within the PAs are developed and operationalised with clear rehabilitation/offset mechanism.	Five technical regulations have been approved, and three are pending. Rehabilitation/offset mechanisms are not explicitly represented in these technical regulations.	Expected to be achieved	
Date:	2011	Sep 2017	Jul 2017	Jul 2017	

Indicator 1.3, regarding the knowledge management system (KMS), was added as one of the midterm review recommendations. Substantial resources were invested in the KMS. The system was built by a team of experts at CAS and incorporates available biodiversity and biophysical information for the PA system managed by the QFD. The GIS based system is robust and includes a number of advanced graphic and data management capabilities. Annual data sets for certain aspects only extend up through the year 2012; updating the baseline information in the database will need to be done after project closure. Further development of the KMS is also necessary. For example, the project has trialed the application of using tablet computers to upload patrolling and monitoring data collected by local communities directly to the KMS. The computerized forms were built using templates outlined in the PA system monitoring plan; however, there were some problems encountered with the functionality of the forms.

As described in the midterm review recommendation, the KMS should be more than a sophisticated database, i.e., a strategy should be developed that outlines how the system will be used to support PA managers and other decision makers in assessing progress towards management objectives and making adaptive adjustments in light of new information. A draft 4-page long document was attached to the 2016 October project steering committee meeting that outlines the responsibilities for maintaining the KMS; but there remain uncertainties regarding the sustainability of the KMS, both in terms with financing further development, but also supporting the maintenance and operation of the system in years to come.

Indicator 1.3: PA management is supported through a cross-sectoral knowledge management system that builds upon lessons learned and facilitates decision-making processes for implementing strategic management actions

	Baseline	End Target	Status at TE	TE Assessment
Value:	Knowledge management system not in place	A knowledge management strategy that is informed by a functional PA system- wide environmental information management system is approved by the PSC	KMS has been developed, training delivered. Further investment required in development and maintenance.	Expected to be achieved
Date:	2011	Sep 2017	Jul 2017	Jul 2017

Note: This indicator was added after midterm review and approved in PSC meeting minutes 2016 October.

Outcome 2: Increasing PA management effectiveness through strengthened institutional and staff capacities		Achievement of Outcome:
		Satisfactory
Indicative budget in project document: Actual cost incurred on this Outcome through 30 June 2017:	USD 1,510,000 USD 1,260,820)

The first performance indicator under Outcome 2 is associated with strengthening the institutional capacity of the QFD to deliver effective PA management, measured by the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard. The endpoint assessment reported a score of 66.7%, exceeding the 60% end target and an increase of more than 30 percentage points from the 35.5% baseline for year 2011. The 66.7% score is slightly lower than the first version of the scorecard and is based upon discussions between the TE team and project manager. Indicator 3 of the scorecard is a measure of the existence of stakeholder groups. Initially, full score was allocated for this indicator; however, based on further

consideration, certain stakeholders, including the civil society, are not actively represented in decision-making processes regarding the provincial PA system.

Indicator 2.1: Capacity development scorecard (%) for the protected area system.					
	Baseline	End Target	Status at TE	TE Assessment	
Value:	35.5%	60%	66.7%	Achieved	
Date:	2011	Sep 2017	Jul 2017	Jul 2017	

Indictor 2.2 also addresses institutional capacity, specifically in terms of strategic planning and PA staffing. With respect to the envisaged strategic plan, interviewed stakeholders informed the TE team that a PA system wide plan strategic plan is not something that has been prepared in the past and there was apparently insufficient validation of this target when reviewing the project document. Project progress reports indicate a PA system monitoring plan as a response to this target. Although the TE team agrees that the monitoring plan is a valuable contribution, it is not a valid substitute for the envisaged strategic plan.

In terms of PA staffing, large increases in the permanent and, particularly the temporary contingent were made between the midterm and endpoint. The number of permanent staff reported by the PMO, based upon inputs provided by each of the individual 11 nature reserves, was 626, as of July 2017. This figure significantly exceeds the adjusted end target of 389. In terms of temporary staff, the reported figure as of July 2017 is 10,568, which are mostly made up of the large number of eco-positions that have recently been shifted under the auspices of the QFD and the Three Rivers Source National Park Administration.

One of the additions to the strategic results framework made in response to the midterm review recommendations was that at least 25% of the new hires are women or minorities. Based on information shared by the Three Rivers Source National Park Administration, 67.2% of the new permanent staff members are minorities and 26% are women. For the temporary, eco-positions, essentially 100% of these are filled by Tibetan minorities.

Indicator 2.2: Strategic plans prepared for PA institutions and procedures and investment, and PA staff numbers dramatically increased.					
Value:	Baseline	End Target	Status at TE	TE Assessment	
	No strategic plans	Strategic plan developed and adopted	Strategic plan has not been developed. The project has facilitated a PA system-wide monitoring plan; however, the TE team does not consider this plan a substitute for the envisaged strategic plan.	Unlikely to be achieved	
	Permanent staff: 160 142	360 389	626	Achieved	
	Temporary staff: 5	150	10,568	Achieved	
	Information on women and minority staff unavailable.	At least 25% of new hires are women or minorities.	New Minority Staff (SNNR-NP): 67.2% New Women Staff (SNNR-NP): 26%	Achieved	
Date:	2011	Sep 2017	Jul 2017	Jul 2017	

<u>Note</u>: Changes made after midterm review and approved in PSC meeting minutes 2016 October.

Indicator 2.3 addresses PA financing, aiming to narrow the gap in basic management financing requirements estimated during the project preparation phase. The reported expenditures for financing the Province's PA system in 2016 was USD 8 million, exceeding the USD 6.6 target, which is the estimated funding required to meet basic management requirements. The USD 8 million per year is short of the USD 13.5 million estimation of optimal PA system financing, indicating that there remains room for improvement. In the opinion of the TE team, this is a realistic representation of the situation. The midterm tracking tool included updated estimations of basis and optimal financing requirements – which drew inquiry by the MTR team, as the estimations were significantly higher than the USD 6.5 million and USD 13.5 million figures recorded at project entry. The updated estimations were reportedly made as a result of a project consultancy on PA financing; however, the figures do not seem to have been fully vetted.

Indicator 2.3: Province's system level PA financing increased to close the existing annual financing gap of US\$ 4.6 million for basic expenditure scenario (tracked with PA financial sustainability scorecard).					
	Baseline End Target Status at TE TE Assessment				
Value:	USD 2 million per year USD 2.88 million per year	USD 6.6 million per year, and at least 25% increase for each national NR	USD 8 million	Achieved	
Date:	2011	Sep 2017	2016	Jul 2017	

Note: Changes made after midterm review and approved in PSC meeting minutes 2016 October.

The end target of Indicator 2.3 was amended as a result of the midterm review recommendations. In order to avoid the situation of having the majority of financing gains in one or two PA's, a qualifier was added, aiming for at least a 25% increase for each of the national NR's. In discussion during the TE mission, the TE team suggested that the PMO report increases in PA financing for operational expenditures at the 5 nature reserves that are the focus of management effectiveness improvements. Firstly, there is limited baseline information for the individual PA's, and secondly, some of the investments in infrastructure distort the distribution of PA financing over the past few years. Increases in operational expenditures from 2014 to 2016 for the 5 NR's, as summarized below in **Exhibit 17**, range from 26% for Qinghai Lake to 1468% for the SNNR. With respect to the SNNR, the extraordinary large increase is attributed to the establishment of the Three Rivers Source National Park, which has included a significant increase in PA staffing.

Exhibit 17: Increases in operational expenditures from 2014 to 2016 for 5 Nature Reserves

No.	Name of NR	Operational Expenditures in 2014, USD	Operational Expenditures in 2016, USD	Increase in Operational Expenditures from 2014-2016	Remarks
1	SNNR	125,000	1,959,500	1468%	Due to the establishment of The Three River Sources National Park, the permanent staff number of SNNR increased from 13 in 2014 to 354 in 2016.
2	Mengda	379,941	1,030,882	171%	Since transferring funds for natural forest protection increased in 2016, additional finances were used for increasing eco- positions staff.
3	Kekexili	544,118	1,497,794	175%	Since applying for the World Natural Heritage, increased funding was used for management improvement and preparation of applying for the World Natural Heritage.
4	Qinghai Lake	544,559	688,382	26%	Qinghai Lake is a popular tourist destination.
5	Popular Forest	89,265	152,206	71%	Since transferring funds for natural forest protection increased in 2016, eco-positions and science research increased in 2016.

Note: USD:CNY exchange rate of 6.8 applied in converting operational expenditures available in CNY terms.

Source of Information: PMO, compiling expenditure figures provided by the individual NR's.

Indicator 2.4 is also associated with PA financing, aiming to allocate more of the available funds on field operations compared to overhead and infrastructure related expenditures. The term "field operations" was not defined in the project document, making assessment of performance difficult. Evaluating the reported PA financing breakdown for the year 2016, recorded in the financial analysis in Part 1.2 of the GEF financial sustainability scorecard, USD 6.8 million of the USD 8 million total were for operational budget (salaries, maintenance, fuel, etc.). The terminology does not exactly match with "field operations", but the TE team concludes that the >30% has been achieved.

Indicator 2.4: Ratio of total PA budget spent on field operations raised to narrow spending gap.						
	Baseline End Target Status at TE TE Assessment					
Value:	<10% of PA revenue spent on field operations	>30% of PA revenue spent on field operations	>30%	Achieved		
Date:	2011	Sep 2017	2016	Jul 2017		

Indicator 2.5 is a measure of improvement in law enforcement, aimed at reducing threats to biodiversity associated with illegal hunting, poaching, and other illegal actions. The QFD Forest Police Bureau maintains records, converse to what is indicated as baseline circumstances; however, access to these data is restricted. Incident forms were integrated into the knowledge management system (KMS), although there was no evidence that this part of the system is operational, i.e., linked to the Forest Police Bureau's system. The KMS should be a more integrated platform across relevant sectors and other key beneficiaries.

Indicator 2.5: Reduction in illegal incident cases within the NRs – poaching, illegal harvesting, illegal-grazing, etc.				
	Baseline	End Target	Status at TE	TE Assessment
	Currently no monitoring system in place	Functioning policing records system with links to police/ court cases and an enhanced policing mandate of NR staff.	Illegal incident records included in the knowledge management system.	Achieved
		Routine report forms designed for numerical analysis.	Illegal incident records included in the knowledge management system.	Achieved
Value:	Baseline for the number of illegal incidents will be estimated at onset of the project. 1942 incidents, including criminal cases 34 and administrative cases 1908.	Both criminal and adminstrative incidents reduced to 50% of the baseline level.	Total number of incidents show steady decreasing trend; 2016 cases are 50% of the baseline number in 2011. The numbers of criminal cases are increasing; the number cases in 2016 were 135% more than reported in 2011.	Achieved
		Incidents reduced to 50% of the baseline level in the 12 pilot villages under Outcome 3 (based upon annual PSP log books).	Baselines were not established and follow-up assessments not made	Unable to assess
Date:	2011	Sep 2017	2016	Jul 2017

Note: Changes made after midterm review and approved in PSC meeting minutes 2016 October.

In terms of the number of illegal cases, there has been a 50% decrease in the total number of cases between 2011, baseline year, and 2016 (see **Exhibit 18**). But, the number of criminal cases has increased by 135% in this same period. This increase might not necessarily indicate shortcomings with respect to law enforcement. In fact, the opposite could be the case, i.e., increased staffing and strengthened capacities might have resulted in a more responsive and effective enforcement contingent. If this is indeed the case, the number of criminal cases would be expected to decrease eventually, after the enforcement entities reach their optimal effectiveness. It would be advisable to inquire with the Forest Bureau on the details associated with the increasing trend of criminal cases.

Exhibit 18: Number of illegal incident of	cases, 2011-2016
---	------------------

Year	Administrative	Criminal	Total
2011	1908	34	1942
2012	1946	22	1968
2013	1848	24	1872
2014	1143	56	1199
2015	1289	60	1349
2016	937	80	1017

Data provided by PMO; summary of annual reports of QFD Forestry Police Bureau

Note: criminal cases are more severe violations than administrative ones.

An additional target was recommended for Indicator 2.5 as part of the set of recommendations made during the midterm review. Considering that access to Forest Police Bureau records was uncertain, the MTR team suggested using the community patrolling records in the 12 demonstration villages. At the time of the MTR review, local people were assisting the local government through a Public Service Program (PSP), which has since been consolidated into the recently coined Eco-Position Program. The project manager and component manager informed the TE team that

the PSP records were found to be unreliable for the recommended purpose. In most cases, the community patrollers were issuing verbal warnings, and little documented evidence of illegal cases was recorded in the PSP log books.

Indicator 2.6 was designed to measure an increase in the amount eco-compensation funds diverted for PA financing. Large expanses of Qinghai Province are delineated as key ecological function zones, and central government eco-compensation funds are allocated as a subsidy for restricted development in these areas. Excluding the Sanjiangyuan Ecological Construction Plan, an estimated USD 1.89 million was allocated from these eco-compensation funds for PA financing in 2016, exceeding the end target of >USD 1 million.

Indicator 2.6: Annual income diverted to PA management from eco-compensation agreements (excluding funds arising from the Sanjiangyuan Ecological Construction Plan).						
	Baseline End Target Status at TE TE Assessment					
Value:	0	>USD 1.0 million	USD 1.89 million	Achieved		
Date: 2011 Sep 2017 2016 Jul 2017						

Indicator 2.7 is associated with PA system expansion, specifically with respect to the representativeness of system. According to baseline information described in the project document, among the 30 vegetation types included on the national vegetation map of China, only 13 of the vegetation types were represented within the PA system in Qinghai Province. An end target of 22 of 30 vegetation types⁴ was agreed upon in the strategic results framework.

An analysis prepared by the PMO indicates that, as of July 2017, the PA system in Qinghai province includes 26 of the 30 vegetation types included on the national vegetation map; this exceeds the end target of 22.

Indicator 2.7: More representative PA system approved with most of 'major vegetation types' represented (>5% coverage) in the NNR's.					
	Baseline	End Target	Status at TE	TE Assessment	
Value:	13 of 30 babitate	22 of 30 habitats (addition of desert and Qilian montane babitats, with an overall	PA representation: 26 of 30	PA representation: Achieved	
		increase of 18,000,000 200,000 ha in the provincial PA system)	Vegetation types PA expansion: 110,277 ha	PA expansion: Not expected to be achieved	
Date:	2011	Sep 2017	Jul 2017	Jul 2017	

Improvements in the representativeness in terms of vegetation type is partly attributed to delineation of nature reserves such as the Qilian Mountains provincial nature reserve, which was only conceptually characterized at the time when the project was being prepared. The project has also supported the QFD in expansion of the PA system, e.g., through assisting the QFD in preparing master plans for the 10 wetland parks and 4 desert parks that were gazetted during the implementation timeframe of the project; these parks cover a cumulative area of 110,277 ha, as summarized below in **Exhibit 19**. This area is short of the PA expansion target outlined in the strategic results framework for Indicator 2.7. The English phrasing of the target erroneously indicates 18,000,000 ha, which is unrealistic; the Chinese translation, on the other hand, indicates 200,000 ha.

No.	Name of PA	PA type	County	Area, ha	Main vegetation types
1	Banma Makehe	Wetland Park	Banma	1,611	Permanent river wetland, seasonal river wetland, flooding plain wetland and grass marshland, bush marshland, meadow and fresh water spring wetland types.
2	Dari Yellow River	Wetland Park	Dari and Gande	967	Permanent river wetland, flooding plain wetland types.
3	Ledu Dadiwan	Wetland Park	Ledu	610	Permanent river wetland, flooding plain wetland and pond wetland types
4	Qumalai Dequyuan	Wetland Park	Qumalai	18,648	Permanent river wetland, marshland, lake wetland types

⁴ The strategic results framework uses the term "habitats", but after review of the project document narrative description and discussions with the project manager, the term should have been "vegetation types".

No.	Name of PA	PA type	County	Area, ha	Main vegetation types
5	Zeku Zequ	Wetland Park	Zeku	72,303	Permanent river wetland, grass marshland, meadow
6	Minhe Bazhouhe	Wetland Park	Minhe	319	River wetland, artificial wetland
7	Yushu Nian Jicuo	Wetland Park	Yushu	Yushu 2,931 Permanent river wetland, seasonal r Yushu 2,931 plain wetland,lake wetland and gras. marshland, meadow and hotspring v	
8	Gande Banma rentuo	Wetland Park	Gande	4,431	Permanent river wetland, seasonal river wetland, flooding plain wetland, fresh water lake marshland, meadow and fresh water spring wetland types.
9	Gangcha Sha Liuhe	Wetland Park	Gangcha	2,282	River wetland, marshland and artificial wetland
10	Guinean Manqué	Wetland Park	Guinean	4,825	River wetland, flooding plain wetland and marshland
11	Haiyan Ketu	Desert Park	Haiyan	299	Shifting Sandy Land, Semi-shifting Sandy Land and Fixed Sandy land
12	Wulan Quanshuiwan	Desert Park	Wulan	456	Shifting Sandy Land, Semi-shifting Sandy Land and Fixed Sandy land
13	Maqin Youyun	Desert Park	Maqin	298	Shifting Sandy Land, Semi-shifting Sandy Land and Fixed Sandy land
14	De Linha Hong Shabao	Desert Park	Gahai town, De Linha city	298	Shifting Sandy Land, Semi-shifting Sandy Land and Fixed Sandy land
	T	otal:		110,277	

Exhibit 19: New protected	l areas gazetted during the	timeframe of the project
---------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

Outcome 3: Demonstration of Effective PA management through communityAchievement of Outcome:involvement in the Sanjiangyuan National Nature Reserve (SNNR)Satisfactory

Indicative budget in project document:

USD 2,764,000 USD 2,929,499

Actual cost incurred on this Outcome through 30 June 2017:

The highest proportion of funds, 52%, was allocated for Outcome 3 in the project design. As of 30 June 2017, the amount expended under this outcome was approximately 56% of the total amount spent by this date.

Indicator 3.1 was formulated to assess reduction of threats to wildlife as a result of improved livestock and grassland management and facilitated through community co-management arrangements. The first target under this indicator aimed at achieving 4000 km² of area closed for grazing by the end of project, an increase from 1000 km² recorded as a baseline, for the year 2011. The source of the baseline figure is uncertain; it probably is related to grassland recovery directives issued by the province, through the Department of Agriculture/Animal Husbandry. Reviewing information compiled by the PMO on grazing closure directives associated with provincial desertification control, black soil beach recovery, wetland protection, and afforestation initiatives, the cumulative area closed for grazing in the five counties where the project demonstration villages are situated was 143,412 ha, or 1,434 km² over the four year period of 2014-2017. The area closed for grazing in 2014 and 2017 was 5,347 ha (53 km²) and 31,526 ha (315 km²), respectively, as shown below in **Exhibit 20**.

	ha	De	esertifica	tion con	trol proje	ect	Bla	ick soil l	beach reo	covery pr	oject	v	Vetland p	orotecti	on pro	ject	Clos	sure to fac	cilitate a	afforest	tation	Total of projects
C		2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	
z	niduo County	5,333	2,000	2,000	667	10,000	0	4,600	0	4,000	8,600	0	6,667	6,667	0	13,333	1,333	0	3,333	0	4,666	36,600
Qı	ımalai County	3,333	2,000	10,000	6,667	22,000	0	0	10,067	5,480	15,547	0	6,667	8,000	0	14,667	1,333	0	0	0	1,333	53,547
M	aduo County	5,333	6,667	13,333	13,600	38,933	0	1,000	0	0	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,667	0	2,667	42,600
в	anma County	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,333	1,553	1,113	4,000	0	0	0	0	0	1,333	1,333	1,333	0	4,000	7,999
м	akehe Bureau	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,333	1,333	0	0	2,666	2,666
	Total	14,000	10,667	25,333	20,933	70,933	0	6,933	11,620	10,593	29,146	0	13,333	0	0	28,000	5,333	2,666	7,333	0	15,332	143,412

Exhibit 20: Grazing closure areas in counties of the SNN	R demonstration blocks from 2014-2017 (unit: ha)
--	--

Remarks : The desertification control, Black soil beach recovery, Wetland protection and Closure to facilitate afforestation projects are based on the approval documents and plans of Qinghai provincial development and Reform Commission. Projects listed above are designed at county level and have installed fences to close grazing.

Importantly, the grazing closures targeted under the above provincial directives involved closing specified areas with fences; which is counterproductive to the efforts advocated on the project to remove fencing, in order to allow more unrestricted migration of wildlife. In fact, the second target under Indicator 3.1 originally called for opening 500 km² of open corridors. At the midterm review, this target was reformulated with the aim of reaching agreements with collaborative herding units to remove fencing, as this is considered the main threat within the grassland ecosystems. The project diligently tried to reach agreements for removing fences, but by the end of the project, agreements had not been concluded. Local herders interviewed during the TE field mission stressed a general willingness to remove fencing, but they also indicated that they would require support by the government in order to realize the removal. As part of the land tenure legal reforms implemented in the 1990s, perimeter fences were first erected with government subsidies.

Indicator 3.1: (1) Extent of area (ha) closed from domestic grazing; (2) Area of open corridor. Number of collaborative herding units agreeing to remove fencing; (3) Area within the PA under community co-management.							
	Baseline	End Target	Status at TE	TE Assessment			
	(1) Area closed for grazing: 1,000 km ²	4,000 km ²	1,434 km ²	Unlikely to be achieved			
	(2) Number of agreements to remove fencing: 0	12	0	Unlikely to be achieved			
Value:	(3) Area under community co-management: 2,440 km ²	8,886 km²	31,439 km ² for the 12 SNNR demonstration villages; and 3,308 km ² for the 6 extension villages	Achieved			
Date:	2011	Sep 2017	2014-2017	Jul 2017			

Note: Changes made after midterm review and approved in PSC meeting minutes 2016 October.

With respect to the third target under Indicator 3.1, the project has been successful in facilitating community comanagement agreements with 12 demonstration villages in the SNNR having a total land area of 31,439 km² and also in 6 extension villages, added during the second half of the project, having a cumulative land area of 3,308 km² (see **Exhibit 21**).

Exhibit 21: Basic information of 12 demonstration villages and 6 extension villages

					-			
No.	Village	County	SNNR unit	Ecosystem	Area, km ²	No. Households	Population	Female
1	Duoxiu	Qumalai	Suojia-Qumahe	Grassland	7,210	374	1,160	510
2	Cuochi	Qumalai	Suojia-Qumahe	Grassland	3,483	461	662	335
3	Lechi	Qumalai	Suojia-Qumahe	Grassland	4,450	284	1,112	535
4	Angla	Qumalai	Suojia-Qumahe	Grassland	1,501	381	1,301	645
5	Junqu	Zhiduo	Suojia-Qumahe	Grassland	1,581	375	1,210	551
6	Moqu	Zhiduo	Suojia-Qumahe	Grassland	2,996	522	1,679	821
7	Yaqu	Zhiduo	Suojia-Qumahe	Grassland	1,783	775	1,998	1,024
8	Dangqu	Zhiduo	Suojia-Qumahe	Grassland	4,564	477	1,359	681

No.	Village	County	SNNR unit	Ecosystem	Area, km ²	No. Households	Population	Female
9	Duoyong	Maduo	Zhaling-Elinghu	Wetland	708	109	299	165
10	Zhuorang	Maduo	Zhaling-Elinghu	Wetland	2,134	114	326	162
11	Zhongzhi	Banma	Makehe	Forest	706	97	498	243
12	Gerize	Banma	Makehe	Forest	322	125	628	349
Total, 12 Pilot Villages					31,439	4,094	12,232	6,021
No.	Extension	County	SNNR unit	Ecosystem	Area, km ²	No. Households	Population	Female
1	Daiqu	Qumalai	Suojia-Qumahe	Grassland	1.020	680	2,175	1,131
2	Tongji	Qumalai	Suojia-Qumahe	Grassland	1,930	790	2,120	987
3	Gangdang	Qumalai	Suojia-Qumahe	Grassland	230	506	1,513	716
4	Reshui	Haiyan	Qinghai Lake	Grassland	1 022	274	913	447
5	Gahai	Haiyan	Qinghai Lake	Grassland	1,022	289	897	479
6	Qiangou	Huangyuan	Qinghai Lake Watershed	Forest	125	318	1,219	650
	Total, 6 Extension Villages					2,857	8,837	4,410
	Grand total					6,951	21,069	10,431

Exhibit 21: Basic information of 12 demonstration villages and 6 extension villages

Note: information obtained from participatory rural appraisals made prior to initiating the co-management activities.

Indicator 3.2 was added as part of the set of the midterm review recommendations. The sustainability of the community level co-management arrangements is largely dependent upon how the PA management integrates these collaborative structures into the management plans for the nature reserves. The project worked with the QFD in producing 9 management plans, including for 3 separate SNNR blocks and 6 other nature reserves as listed below.

- 1. Makehe SNNR Block
- 2. Suojia-Qumahe SNNR Block
- 3. Zhalinghu-Elinghu SNNR Block
- 4. Mengda NR
- 5. Kekexili NR
- 6. Qinghai Lake NR
- 7. Beichuanhe Source NR
- 8. Golmud NR
- 9. Chaidamu NR

The TE team found the management plans as proportionally suitable for the current circumstances, providing gender management guidance for the coming years. These plans can be incrementally strengthened as corresponding capacities are further built. Achievement of the end target for Indicator 3.2 is rated as "achieved"; however, there is room for improvement in the plans. For example, it would be advisable to integrate the community conservation zoning and village regulations into the management plans; this would provide a prescriptive framework for scaling up for other villages located within the particular nature reserve. For the SNNR blocks where the project support biodiversity surveys, it would be sensible to formulate specific management objectives associated with the populations of the selected indicator species. And, the management plans should include specific reference to the knowledge management system, indicating how information generated will be used by PA management and disseminated for the benefit of the broader stakeholder community, e.g., the further development and practical implementation of the application for community monitoring, along with training for users at community level. The combination of conservation and development goes hand in hand when focusing on local specific protection problems (human wildlife conflicts or NR poaching) and villagers' wishes, which would be advisable to integrate into managerial objectives and countermeasures.

Indicator 3.2: Representative management objectives provide guidance for biodiversity conservation in target areas								
	Baseline	End Target	Status at TE	TE Assessment				
Value:	Management plans not in place.	Management objectives and biodiversity assessment protocols formulated in NR management	Management plans prepared for 3 of the 18 blocks of SNNR and for 6	Achieved				

		plans and 12 village natural resource management plans	separate NRs. Village resource management plans prepared for 12 villages.	
Date:	2011	Sep 2017	Jul 2017	Jul 2017

Note: This indicator was added after midterm review and approved in PSC meeting minutes 2016 October.

Indicator 3.3 is the same as the third performance indicator at the project objective level. The conclusions from the survey results do infer that populations of selected species are largely stable, albeit there have been only a couple of years of data since baselines were established in 2014. An important aspect of the results of the biodiversity surveys is communication with the local communities; this is something that the TE team observed limited evidence of. It would be prudent before project closure to present the results of the wildlife surveys to the demonstration village committees, explaining to them how their conservation efforts contributed towards the results achieved and what further steps should be followed up, e.g., removing fences in critical areas. Many of the herders interviewed during the TE mission stressed concern about increasing numbers of wildlife, which are competing for grassland resources and also resulting in an increased number of human-wildlife conflicts. Communities would benefit from receiving information on the biodiversity survey results and from addressing some of these consequential concerns. Such communication would contribute towards a more collaborative partnership, rather than only depending on the local people for patrolling and monitoring. More professional trainings are required for wardens including wildlife identification, simple survey results analysis, data up-download via mobile APP specially developed on KMS platform, equipment management and simple maintenance for villagers' capacity building.

Indicator 3.3: Increase in the key species number and distributions in target co-management community sites (up to 12 community field sites).							
	Baseline	End Target	Status at TE	TE Assessment			
Value:	Baseline wildlife populations to be determined at onset of project (Target species will be rare or endangered, to be agreed with SNNR and local communities).	Key wildlife populations maintained or increasing in co- management areas	Based upon review of the summary reports of biodiversity surveys and interviews by the TE team of the sub-contractors who led these surveys, populations of indicator species have remained steady or slightly increased.	Achieved			
Date:	2011	Sep 2017	Jul 2017	Jul 2017			

The aim of Indicator No. 3.4 was to measure improvements to PA management effectiveness resulting from community co-management arrangements. The performance target for this indicator is the score assessed using the management effectiveness tracking tool (METT) for the SNNR. The METT score for the SNNR assessed at project closure was 71%, slightly exceeding the 70% end target. It is, however, difficult to conclude that the improvement in management effectiveness is partly or largely a result of co-management arrangements. Among the 30 questions included in the METT, 2 of them are associated with co-management: No. 23 addresses involvement of indigenous people and No. 24 is a measure of participation by local communities. As discussed above under Indicator 3.3, the project has facilitated involvement of local communities, e.g., through taking on patrolling and monitoring tasks, but the communities are not directly involved in PA management decisions.

Indicator 3.4: Management effectiveness increased in SNNR due to co-management arrangements using the METT tracking tool.								
	Baseline	End Target	Status at TE	TE Assessment				
Value:	33% Management unit baselines TBD at onset of project.	70%	71%	Expected to be achieved				
Date:	2011	Sep 2017	Jul 2017	Jul 2017				

Indicator 3.5 further builds upon the co-management aspect of Outcome 3, by assessing the number of formal and informal co-management agreements reached. By project closure, a total of 12 formal co-management agreements had been reached with the 12 demonstration villages. These agreements are signed by three parties: the village coordination committee, the SNNR Administration, and the PMO. In addition to these agreements, 6 informal ones were reached with the 6 extension villages; the informal agreements are also written, but signed by the village coordination committees and the PMO, and did not include the NR Administration. The envisaged participation by the private sector was not realized. The PMO explained to the TE team that the Makehe Forest Bureau was formerly operating as an independent commercial production entity, under the QFD, but since the logging ban imposed in

1998, the mandate of the Makehe Bureau shifted to conservation. After the logging ban, conflicts between forest resource users and conservation proponents frequently arose due to unclear identification of property rights, especially those within interlocking areas of forest and grassland. These tensions posed a significant challenge when developing collaborative management arrangements under the project. Ecotourism has been identified as one option for alternative livelihoods for local people; however, more time and resources are required for capacity building and further development of services.

Indicator 3.5: Number of private-NR or of community co-management agreements					
	Baseline	End Target	Status at TE	TE Assessment	
Value:	Private enterprise management agreements: 0	At least 1	0	Unlikely to be achieved	
	Informal, non-binding, agreements: 6	>10 agreements	6	Achieved	
	Formal, legally binding, agreements: 0	>2 agreements	12	Achieved	
Date:	2011	Sep 2017	Jul 2017	Jul 2017	

Indicator 3.6 was formulated to assess changes in awareness towards biodiversity conservation, and was meant to be measured using Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices (KAP) survey techniques. By the time of the midterm review in 2015, a baseline KAP survey had not yet been made. The project did carry out participatory rural appraisals in the 12 demonstration villages, but this is not a substitute for a KAP survey, which typically involves a broad spectrum of stakeholder groups and provides feedback that can be interpreted to provide an assessment of awareness. A management decision was made during the October 2016 PSC to remove this indicator. A recommended replacement indicator was proposed in the midterm review report, but the management team decided that remaining time was limited and it would be best to remove this indicator from the results framework.

Indicator 3.6: Awareness surveys among communities show increased positive attitude towards PA conservation							
	Baseline End Target Status at TE TE Assessment						
Value:	Baseline awareness TBD by Knowledge Attitudes & Practice (KAP) survey at onset of project	Baseline + 50%	N/A	N/A			
Date:	2011	Sep 2017	Jul 2017	Jul 2017			

<u>Note</u>: Changes made after midterm review and approved in PSC meeting minutes 2016 October.

3.3.2. Relevance

Relevance is rated as: Relevant

The project is relevant across a number of criteria, including with respect to national and provincial strategies, GEF strategic priorities, and the UN development assistance framework (UNDAF) in China.

With the principle of eco-civilization integrated into the national 13th 5-year plan, conservation has been elevated to one of the pillars of socioeconomic development in China. The Qinghai provincial 13th 5-year plan reflects this; in fact, two prefectures in Qinghai Province, Yushu and Guoluo among the first in the country to exclude gross development product (GDP) as a key performance indicator, in lieu of conservation.

The project was well-aligned with the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) for the period 2011-2030, and also with the Qinghai BSAP (2016-2030), approved in October 2016. The importance of biodiversity and ecosystem functions in Qinghai province, particularly within the SNNR, continues to be represented in national and subnational priorities. The Three Rivers Source National Park (NP) pilot was the first to be approved nationally, and this NP is providing a functional framework for other NP's in the country.

The project was also relevant with respect to Strategic Objective SO-1 under the GEF-4 biodiversity focal area strategy, as outlined below in **Exhibit 22**.

(GEF-4 Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy	Project Relevance	
Strategic Objective	Indicators		
SO-1: To catalyze sustainability of	• Extent of habitat cover (hectares) by biome type maintained as measured by cover and fragmentation in	 Targets on opening ecological corridors, reducing habitat fragmentation. 	

Exhibit 22: Relevance of the project according to the GEF-4 Biodiversity focal area strategy

protected area systems	 protected area systems Extent and percentage increase of new habitat protected (hectares) by biome type in protected area systems that 	•	Target on increasing representativeness of the Qinghai PA system, in terms of habitat and vegetation cover.
	enhances ecosystem representation	•	Targets on improving management
	 Protected area management effectiveness as measured by protected area scorecards that assess site management, financial sustainability, and capacity 		effectiveness, financial sustainability, and capacity within the Qinghai PA system.

The project was aligned with the objectives set out in the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for the period 2011-2015, specifically Outcome 1.2, "Policy and implementation mechanisms to manage natural resources are strengthened, with special attention to poor and vulnerable groups". The following outputs under Outcome 1.2 of the UNDAF are each relevant with the project design:

- Strengthened Government capacity to effectively manage land and water resources, ensuring poor and vulnerable groups' access to these resources is improved.
- Government capacity to conserve biodiversity and ecosystems is enhanced, and communities are empowered to increasingly benefit from the development of eco-based livelihood resources.
- Strengthened Government capacity to develop and implement policies that ensure compliance with environmental health and safety requirements.

Retrospectively, the project remains relevant with respect to the 2016-2020 UNDAF, particularly according to Outcome 2, "More people enjoy a cleaner, healthier and safer environment as a result of improved environmental protection and sustainable growth", under the "Improved and Sustainable Environment" priority area.

3.3.3. Efficiency

Efficiency is rated as: Satisfactory

Supporting Evidence:

- + The GEF funding addressed most of the key barriers that were constraining effective management of the PA system in Qinghai Province.
- + The project has managed to satisfactorily achieve the majority of intended outcomes within the allocated budget and timeframe.
- + Local capacity was efficiently utilized and strengthened in implementation of the project.
- + Actual cofinancing contributions exceeded the confirmed sum at project entry.
- The cost effectiveness of the KMS is questionable, e.g., compared to adding on to existing systems rather than developing a new system.

The project was satisfactorily cost-effective, achieving the majority of intended outcomes within the allocated budget and timeframe. Efficiency was further demonstrated through the effective utilization of local capacity for project implementation, in terms of scientists and consultants who supported the project activities, trainings delivered by qualified local service providers, and equipment and systems developed and installed by various institutions and companies.

Cofinancing contributions further enhances project efficiency, as the confirmed cofinancing at project entry was exceeded by 25%.

Cost effectiveness was diminished a bit, in the opinion of the TE team, with respect to the investment in the knowledge management system. The cost implications of integrating certain additional biodiversity aspects into the system earlier developed by the Environmental Protection Department, instead of developing a separate system for the QFD, were not fully analyzed. Fragmentation of information management is likely to increase in the short-term, with the development of a separate system for the Three Rivers Source National Park.

With respect to incremental cost criteria, the project was satisfactorily efficient, addressing the key barriers that were constraining the effective management of the PA system in Qinghai Province. In the opinion of the TE team, certain investments, such as infrastructure related to solid waste management, were not the best use of incremental GEF funds; these costs should have been borne or at least shared by the respective local governments.

3.3.4. Country Ownership

Country ownership has been **highly satisfactory**. Firstly, the project design was consistent with the Sanjiangyuan Ecological Construction Plan. Project outcomes have been incorporated into the provincial 13th 5-year development plan, and the project facilitated mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into sectoral plans for 5 provincial agencies.

Senior level QFD officials and representatives of other key provincial sectors were proactively involved in project design and implementation. There was limited involvement of civil society in the formulation and implementation of the project; but the role of NGOs and public foundations is increasingly gaining momentum in Qinghai Province, particularly since the approval of the Three Rivers Source National Park pilot.

Cofinancing from the Qinghai provincial government has exceeded the sums confirmed at CEO endorsement, and the contribution of nearly USD 3 million of cash cofinancing is an indication of strong country ownership.

3.3.5. Mainstreaming

The project has generated a number of results that help local populations within the 12 demonstration villages within the SNNR, and also, to a lesser extent, to the 6 communities extended after the midterm review. Facilitating village coordination committees in these communities strengthened social cohesion and provided community-driven frameworks for sustainable natural resource management. The number of direct beneficiaries in the 12 demonstration villages within the SNNR is 12,232, and an additional 8,837 in the 6 extension villages. Substantial project resources were also expended on training and mentoring of local people for PA patrolling and monitoring tasks; these acquired skills increase the likelihood that local communities will provide collaborative management support to local and provincial PA management authorities. Investment in ecotourism infrastructure also provides income generating possibilities for a certain number of local people in the target communities, particularly in the Makehe block.

Significant advances in human security were also facilitated by the project; for example, through investment in water supply systems, waste management, and bear defense fencing. Moreover, co-benefits with respect to increasing resilience to the potential impacts of climate change were also generated. Local communities will be able to better cope through increased awareness and reduced pressure on fragile ecosystems through implementation of sustainable natural resource management practices.

A gender or social inclusion analysis was not prepared at the project preparation phase or after implementation had started. In terms of social inclusion, nearly 100% of the demonstration villages under Component 3 are populated by Tibetan minority communities. A few gender and social considerations were added to the strategic results framework in response to the midterm review recommendations. Based on the TE field mission, we learned that women's awareness of conservation issues is improved along with capacity enhanced, yet women are still under traditional influence of their inferior status to men. Optimistically young women stand out, exhibiting strength in comanagement activities, such as ecotourism operations, environmental education with children, patience and carefulness in patrolling, etc. Though women's awareness and capacity in biodiversity improved greatly, their actual strength has not fully realized and released, thus requiring more focus even at the onset of project design. Examples of gender inclusion during project implantation are summarized below in **Exhibit 23**.

Group/Activity	Total number	Women participation
Project Steering Committee	25	4
Project training	2023 person-time	308 person-time
Rangers for 12 demonstration villages	576	40
Members for 12 demonstration villages' co-management committees	245	22
Provincial PMO	17	7
4 townships PMO	28	10
Specialists hired by this project	11	1

Exhibit 23: Gender involvement during project implementation

Exhibit 23: Gender involvement during project implementation

Group/Activity	Total number	Women participation
Legislation specialists group	7	2
Inter departments engineering management regulations specialists group	14	5
13 th five year planning specialists group	10	4
BSAP specialists group	12	2
KMS specialists group	7	2

3.3.6. Sustainability

Sustainability is generally considered to be the likelihood of continued benefits after the GEF funding ends. Under GEF criteria each sustainability dimension is critical, and the overall ranking, therefore, cannot be higher than the lowest one.

Overall:

Likelihood that benefits will continue to be delivered after project closure: Moderately Likely

Supporting Evidence:

- + Establishment of Three Rivers National Park (NP) and cross-sectoral integration of NP Administration.
- + Project facilitated a substantive number of regulatory and technical guidelines.
- + PA financing has steadily increased.
- + Increased awareness among demonstration communities.
- + Scale-able models of community collaborative management demonstrated.
- + Project cofinancing contributions exceeded sums confirmed at CEO endorsement.
- Eco-position programme is more top-down oriented than the bottom-up approach demonstrated by the project.
- Institutional transitional uncertainties, as a result of national park establishment.
- Limited progress made with respect to PA business planning and revenue generation.
- Limited involvement by NGOs.
- Uncertainties regarding continued development and maintenance of KMS
- Capacity constraints of local people.
- Uncertainties associated with potential impacts of climate change.

Financial Dimension:

Likelihood that benefits will continue to be delivered after project closure: Likely

With respect to the financial resources dimension of sustainability, a rating of "likely" has been applied by the TE team. There has been a substantive increase in PA financing for the PA system managed by QFD over the course of the project, significantly narrowing the gap between actual and optimal financing. With the approval of the Three Rivers Source National Park pilot, central government funding is expected to increase in coming years, albeit not directly to the QFD, but rather to the National Park Authority.

Through the governmental eco-compensation programme, which allocates funds for areas that fall with key ecosystem function zones, as a subsidy for restricted development, continues to be in place, offering an additional financing stream to the provincial PA system.

The consolidation of the public service program, by forming "eco-positions" is an additional line of evidence indicating increased financial commitment by the government. There are more than 10,000 eco-positions in the province and each person receives CNY 1,800 (approx. USD 275) per month. This program seems to be primarily a social welfare initiative, and it is likely, at least in the short to medium term, that the government will continue to implement it.

There was limited progress made with respect to PA business planning and revenue generation, as measured by the GEF financial sustainability scorecard. These aspects are not among the strategic focus of most of the nature reserves under QFD management. A few protected areas in the province, including the Qinghai Lake Scenic Area, are collecting significant amounts of tourism revenue, as tourism continues to grow in China. There is a potential for further advances with respect to revenue distribution within the broader PA system in the province.

Socio-Economic Dimension:

Likelihood that benefits will continue to be delivered after project closure: Moderately Likely

Ecological conservation is mainstreamed throughout the socioeconomic development strategies and plans for Qinghai Province. Stakeholder ownership among QFD officials and representatives from other provincial sectors was high on the project, and this enhances overall sustainability.

The project has also made contributions to raising awareness among local communities residing within the 12 demonstration villages in 3 of the 18 blocks of SNNR. These communities, however, remain some of the most remote and socio-economically disadvantaged in all of China. The establishment of the Three Rivers Source National Park pilot is a significant boost to the sustainability of project results. It will be difficult to replicate the bottom-up approach the project demonstrated at the village level. Integrating the eco-position program into the management structure of the national park and nature reserve blocks that do not fall within the national park will be a challenge in the short to medium term. On average, the capacity and awareness of local people need to be strengthened; literacy rates remain low and the remoteness of the villages represent logistical challenges. Handling such a large number of low-skilled people will likely lead to a more top-down approach, in the opinion of the TE team.

With respect to involvement by NGOs, there is much room for improvement. In the middle of 2014, co-management service contracts were signed between NGOs and the PMO for 12 pilot villages. Due to unsatisfactory implementation effectiveness, most of the NGO contracts were discontinued and the PMO handed over the service to township governments in 2015. NGOs play an important role in the local communities, and it will be important to utilize their services in the future, in order to help sustain the community collaborative management arrangements.

Institutional Framework and Governance Dimension:

Likelihood that benefits will continue to be delivered after project closure: Likely

The project has facilitated significant improvements to provincial level institutional frameworks, with respect to mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into development planning. Working with 8 provincial departments facilitated by cross-sectoral advisory groups, the project has helped mainstream biodiversity conservation in the respective sector plans of these departments. Also, regulations and technical guidelines are being prepared for some of the key infrastructure related activities posing threats to the ecological integrity of the PA system; including road construction, electricity transmission lines, sand and gravel extraction, etc.

The project has further supported the completion of the Qinghai Province Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (QBSAP), which establishes a guidance framework for allocating resources for biodiversity conservation in the Province. Some of the specific actions outlined in the QBSAP and in the sectoral plans will be operationalized in the 13th 5-year plan which is under preparation by Provincial governmental planners.

Sustainability is further enhanced through the additional GEF support for a new PA management effectiveness strengthening project⁵ that is in preparation under the GEF-6 funding cycle.

Establishment of the Three Rivers Source National Park Administration in the province, in one aspect, bolsters the overall strength of PA governance. On the other hand, the introduction of this new administration has resulted in certain uncertainties with respect to the authority and influence of the QFD. The two largest nature reserves in the QFD's portfolio, SNNR and Kekexili NR, were shifted into the National Park Administration, resulting in a state of institutional transition. It will likely take time to sort out the roles of QFD and the National Park Administration.

Under Component 3, the project demonstrated local level PA governance can be strengthened by empowering local villages through collaborative management arrangements. In 12 villages in 3 of the 18 blocks of SNNR, village

⁵ Preliminary title of project proposed under GEF-6: "Strengthening the PA system in the Qilian Mountains-Qinghai Lake landscape"

coordination committees were established, village regulations amended with specific conservation objectives, and local people trained in patrolling and monitoring tasks. The National Park Administration has stressed commitment to continue with some of the local community activities, but it seems that the involvement will be primarily delivered through the eco-position program. The National Park requires the assistance from local herders in the vast landscapes of the SNNR, however, there are concerns regarding how participating the community engagement will be in the future.

In summary, although there are relevant risks associated with the institutional transition and certain shortcomings with respect to institutional coordination between conservation agencies and agriculture/animal husbandry, we feel that the priority assigned to biodiversity conservation in the province is high and the institutional and governance risks will likely be sorted out over the short to medium term.

Environmental Dimension:

Likelihood that benefits will continue to be delivered after project closure: Likely

With respect to environmental risks, the potential impacts associated with climate change are likely to pose the most significant threats to the ecological systems in Qinghai province.

Due to the national and global importance of Qinghai Province in terms of water catchment, there have been many studies in recent years on the potential effects due to climate change. Generally, temperature is expected to rise more significantly than the forecasted global average, and precipitation and the rate of shrinkage of alpine glaciers are expected to increase (see **Exhibit 24**).



Source:Ming Xu and Renqiang Li (presentation). The Institute of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research, CAS

Exhibit 24: Climate change trends in Qinghai Province, 1962-2012

Studies have also shown a strong correlation between climate change and grassland vegetation variation, revealing higher climate sensitivity at higher elevation areas of the Tibetan Plateau⁶.

The project has engaged some of the leading scientists in China, within the Chinese Academy of Sciences, and monitoring of climate parameters is being designed into the information management system under development. The system will enable timely assessment of potential alterations in biodiversity dynamics to the predicted climate perturbations.

Even with abundant wetland ecosystems, surface water quality in parts of the province is poor due to high salt content, for example. Many local communities depend upon spring water for potable supplies, and improper waste management, both in terms of household and livestock wastes, is threatening these scarce supplies. Through some of the activities implemented under Component 3, the project has facilitated strengthening of the resilience of the demonstration villages to the potential impacts of climate change. For example, waste management is one of the prime concerns of local villagers, and the project supported the villages in developing improved waste management practices. Implementation of such waste management improvements contributes an enhanced level of safe-guarding limited potable water supplies, and could provide replicable models to be up-scaled in other villages. Increased awareness among the local people, as a result of training, awareness campaigns, and participation in collaborative PA management, also contributes to strengthened resilience of the demonstration communities.

⁶ Tao, J. et al, 2015. Elevation-dependent relationships between climate change and grassland vegetation variation across the Qinghai-Xizang Plateau, International Journal of Climatology, Vol. 35, Issue 7.

These factors increase the likelihood that project results will be sustained after GEF funding ceases.

3.3.7. Catalytic Role

GEF funding is catalytic, providing incremental resources for delivering global environmental benefits. This project was designed to facilitate the catalytic role of the GEF funds, including strengthening the enabling conditions at the provincial government level through mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into cross-sectoral development plans, and also through demonstration of community collaborative management arrangements.

As the sector plans in the province are implemented over the course of the upcoming few years, the catalytic role of the project will likely become more apparent. There have already been substantive advances in terms of mainstreaming biodiversity conservation; for instance, the Provincial Government agreed in 2016 to remove GDP as the leading key performance indicator in the autonomous prefectures of Yushu and Guolou, and instead use conservation as the main measure of performance.

One of the lessons learned in community co-management efforts implemented before this project was the relatively small scale and difficulties in scaling up across broader landscape level ecosystems. This project made a concerted effort to capture a larger geographic scale for the community level work. For example, in the Suojia-Qumahe block of SNNR, co-management was demonstrated in all 4 villages of the Suojia Township, thus providing a township level model.

The project team also produced a practical and informative collection of project case studies that can be used by the QFD, NR and NP Administrations, and other implementation teams for replicating best management practices.

The large number of institutional, academic, and professional partners contracted for implementation activities also increases the likelihood that the project results and approaches will be scaled up elsewhere in the province and, indeed in other parts of China. Professional outreach was further expanded in 2016 by hosting the bi-annual meeting of the Qinghai-Tibetan Plateau Expert Forum in Yushu.

The knowledge management system (KMS) also has the potential as a platform for facilitating scaling up. If the KMS is further developed and applied across the relevant sectors in the province, the system's catalytic role would be enhanced. Another example of catalytic effect is the illustrated flora and fauna handbooks produced by the project. These handbooks have been widely disseminated, with positive feedback from professional users. Moreover, the environmental education storybook "*My Home Is in the Three River Sources*" provides a practical model for capturing traditional ecological knowledge in an easy to understand format.

3.3.8. Impact

The typical timeframes of GEF-financed projects, e.g., 5 years, are often insufficient for verifiable improvements in ecological status to materialize. Such impacts could take a decade or more. But, impact can also be tested according to verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems and through specified process indicators that progress is being made towards achievement of stress reduction and/or ecological improvement.

An evaluation of the status of the impact indicators is summarized below in Exhibit 25.

Impact Indicator	Comments			Impact Rating*	
Verifiable improvements in	Based on baseline su and 2017, populatio where the project su communities have sl An impact rating of r surveyed areas has b representative of the and the timeframe f	urveys made in 2014 and follow-up assessments in 2 ns of selected indicator species within the three SNN upported collaborative management arrangements w hown stable or slightly increasing trends. minimal is applied. Ecological status of these species been steady or slightly improving; the results are e surveyed geographic areas within 3 of the 18 SNNF rom baseline was limited to 3 years.	Minimal		
	SNNR Block	Species	IUCN Red List		
		Tibetan wild ass (Equus kiang)	LC		
	Suojia-Qumahe	Tibetan gazelle (Procapra picticaudata)	NT		
		Tibetan antelope (Pantholops hodgsonii)	NT		
	Zhaling-Elinghu	bar-headed goose (Anser indicus)	LC		

Exhibit 25: Analysis of project impacts

Impact Indicator	Comments			Impact Rating*
		ruddy shellduck (Tadorna ferruginea)	LC	
		brown-headed gull (Chroicocephalus brunnicephalus)	LC	
		rhesus macaque (<i>Macaca mulatta</i>)	LC	
	Makehe	blue eared pheasant (Crossoptilon auritum)	LC	
		alpine stream salamander (Batrachuperus tibetanus)	VU	
Verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems	There have also been minimal rating is app by the Qinghai Fores have reduced from 1 increased over this ti Reductions in stress for grazing; a cumula grazing in the years 2 counties and in the N erecting fencing, as t Husbandry sector, fo counterproductive w routes.	n verifiable reductions in stress on ecological system lied for this aspect. The number of illegal incidents is t Police has decreased in recent years; administrativ ,980 in 2011 to 937 in 2016. There has, however, ha me period, from 34 to 80, respectively. have also been achieved through closure of grasslar tive land area of 143,412 ha (1,434 km ²) have been 2014-2017, in the Zhiduo, Qumalai, Maduo, and Ban Makehe Bureau. These closures were often accompa his is standard practice implemented by the Animal r grassland recovery interventions, which is ith conservation objectives of freeing up wildlife mi	Minimal	
Progress towards stress/status change	With respect to prog is applied. The project facilitated in 12 +6 vi management effective 152,300 km ² SNNR, t in 2011 to 71% in 20 The financial sustain system managed by from 23.64% in 2011 increased in this time USD 8 million, which system level financin regard to the USD 13 Progress towards stat gazettement of 110, wetland parks and 4 system in terms of vo	progress made towards stress/status change, a rating of significant project facilitated collaborative management arrangements +6 villages covering a cumulative land area of 34,746 km ² . The ffectiveness of 5 key NR's significantly increased; e.g., for the INR, the METT score increased by 39 percentage points, from 32% in 2017. stainability, measured by the GEF4 financial scorecard, of the PA ed by the QFD, covering a cumulative area of 216,294 km ² improved 2011 to 40.89% in 2017. PA financing has also significantly s timeframe, with total governmental funding in 2016 exceeding which is more than USD 1.5 million greater than the estimated ancing required for basic management, and closing the gap with SD 13.5 million estimated optimal management scenario. ds status/stress change has also been advanced through 110,277 ha (1,103 km ²) of new protected areas, including 10 and 4 desert parks, and improved representativeness of the PA s of vegetation type.		Significant

Exhibit 25: Analysis of project impacts

*Rating scales: negligible, minimal, significant

4. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, LESSONS, GOOD PRACTICES

4.1. Conclusions

In the 5 years since implementation of the project was initiated, there have been significant improvements in the protected area (PA) system under management by the Qinghai Provincial Forestry Department (QFD). The PA system is **more representative, better funded**, and **under improved management** compared to the baseline circumstances in 2011. These advancements have occurred during a time when biodiversity conservation has been mainstreamed into central and provincial government development planning in China. The principle of eco-civilization is a core part of the national 13th 5-year plan, and the central government has initiated pilot implementation of a national park system, with the Three Rivers Source national park (NP), which covers 5 of 18 blocks of the Sanjiangyuan national nature reserve (SNNR) and the entire Kekexili national nature reserve, approved in 2015 as the first NP pilot in the country. Kekexili's designation as the World Heritage Site in July 2017 further strengthens the PA system.

The selection of the SNNR as the focus of the project was also highly relevant, not only because of the NP pilot, but due to the fact that it is a globally significant site for biodiversity conservation, harboring several endangered and vulnerable species, including, but not limited to the snow leopard (*Panthera uncia*), wild yak (*Bos mutus*), black-

necked crane (*Grus nigricollis*), but also because it delivers globally important ecosystem services, being the source of three major rivers in China and neighboring Asian countries: the Yangtze, Yellow, and Mekong Rivers.

Through consistent and proactive involvement by the QFD, the project facilitated improvements in management effectiveness of the SNNR, as well as other PA's within the QFD's portfolio, and also strengthened the enabling conditions within the province for cross-sectoral collaboration towards mainstreaming biodiversity conservation. The project was effective at adapting to changed circumstances, e.g., assisting the newly created NP administration in preparation of the draft NP regulation which was approved in June 2017. A substantive proportion of the GEF funds were expended under Component 3, which focused on developing functional collaborative management arrangements with Tibetan herder communities situated within the SNNR. End targets have mostly been achieved, including scale-able models of community collaborative management arrangements demonstrated in 12 villages within the SNNR.

Ownership by the QFD has been strong and consistent. For example, nearly USD 3 million in cash cofinancing was contributed, directly deposited into the PMO's bank account and used to support specific project activities, including infrastructure related investments for eco-tourism, water supply systems for some of the local communities, in addition to funding the salaries of many of the PMO staff, including the three component managers.

Establishment of the Three Rivers Source NP pilot enhances the sustainability of the project results, as funding, staffing, and other resources are likely to increase in coming years. The QFD's portfolio of PA's has expanded during the lifespan of the project, with 10 newly established wetland parks and 4 desert parts. Moreover, there remain 8 nature reserves under QFD management, and the Qilian Mountains provincial nature reserve has recently (June 2017) been approved as a cross-provincial NP pilot, together with neighboring Gansu Province. Although management arrangements are unclear at this time for the Qilian Mountains NP, it is likely that the State Forestry Administration (SFA) will be the lead agency at the central government level; both the QFD and Gansu Forestry Department report directly to the SFA; thus, it seems probable that management responsibility will remain within the QFD, although this is uncertain.

The significant changes to the institutional landscape in Qinghai Province have resulted in certain transitional uncertainties. For instance, the institutional capacity and influence of the QFD have been partly diminished, with the two largest nature reserves formerly under their management, SNNR and Kekexili NR, shifted into the Three Rivers Source NP Administration. It will likely take a few years before the institutional arrangements among the agencies responsible for PA management will be sorted out.

Another factor that presents short to medium term challenges to the sustainability of project results is the operationalization of the Eco-Position Programme, which has been recently formed through consolidation of earlier social welfare programmes aimed at providing employment opportunities for lower income persons. The eco-positions are now under direct management by the NP administration and the QFD. Though now managed by conservation oriented agencies, poverty alleviation remains the core objective of the programme. The Three Rivers Source NP pilot, for example, has more than 10,000 eco-positions allocated. One person from each household in specific villages is provided with an eco-position and they are tasked with assisting the NP and/or NR in patrolling and monitoring activities. These activities are similar to the collaborative management arrangements facilitated in the 12 project demonstration villages; however, the approach is quite different. The project delivered a bottom-up approach, empowering local village representatives to identify particular issues that were important to their communities; whereas the eco-position programme is more top-down, with instructions being administered from NP and NR administrative stations. And, integrating more than 10,000 people, mostly who are Tibetan herders, into the PA system will take time too.

Although the co-management activities delivered by the project were participatory and larger in scale than some of the efforts made prior to the project, there is room for improvement for genuine collaboration on PA management. Communities were trained in providing assistance in patrolling and monitoring tasks, and locally relevant conservation zoning was facilitated by the project and more integrated into village level regulations. However, local people are not yet meaningfully participating in PA management decisions. For instance, the results of biodiversity surveys are not fully shared with local people, e.g., to show them how their conservation efforts are leading to increased wildlife populations. Decisions regarding grassland recovery and livestock management remain at the provincial level, specifically under the Agriculture/Animal Husbandry Department, with no evidence of consultations with local communities beforehand. Many of the interviewed local herders stressed interest in the apparent increasing trend in wildlife populations, how these wild animals are competing for grassland resources and also in the increasing number of human-wildlife conflicts.

There are also uncertainties associated with the sustainability of the knowledge management system (KMS) developed by the project. The KMS is technically impressive but requires further development, e.g., some of the annual datasets only run up to 2012, and the field applications for remote transfer of patrolling monitoring data are not yet fully functional. Maintenance of the system also will require resources, including support from specialized IT experts. QFD management stressed commitment towards ownership of the KMS after project closure, but the NP administration indicated that they will develop a separate system for the Three Rivers NP, which now encompasses the SNNR, which was the focus of the project and where the field applications were trialed. Moreover, the environmental protection sector in the province is maintaining its own information management system with some overlapping content. Long-term plans of developing a large integrated sky-earth system were mentioned to the TE team, but in the short to medium term, biodiversity information management will likely be rather fragmented among the key stakeholders in the province, especially considering the context of inertial forces of segmented sector management, long-term knowledge barriers, as well as technical challenges.

4.2. Recommendations

No.	Recommendation				
Corre	prrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project				
1.	Certain infrastructure interventions observed during the TE field mission require corrective action and record documentation. For example, the gates of some of the bear-proof fences were not sufficiently secure and supports were not adequately finished, and the water supply line to one of the public shower houses improperly fitted. Prior to project closure, it would be advisable to have sub-contractors make warranty reparations and prepare record documentation of the completed infrastructure interventions, not only for the examples indicated here.				
Actio	ns to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project				
2.	According to annual incident records provided by the Qinghai Forest Police Bureau, the number of criminal cases has steadily increased over the past 5 years. An assessment of the root cause(s) of this increase should be made prior to project closure, providing guidance for QFD and National Park Administration officials for focusing their enforcement efforts.				
3.	The knowledge management system (KMS) requires further development and continued professional operational and maintenance support moving forward, in order for it to be a functional and integrated platform. A work plan should be prepared, itemizing the specific development requirements along with associated cost estimations, and outlining estimated operation and maintenance support required over the next 2-3 years.				
4.	There are a few technical regulations and guidelines that have not yet been approved. A work plan of follow-up actions should be prepared, indicating responsibilities, estimated timeframes, and method of confirmation once actions have been fulfilled.				
Propo	osals for future directions underlining main objectives				
5.	Local people in the 12 demonstration villages have provided collaborative management support to the SNNR Administration, in terms of assistance with patrolling and monitoring. Whilst the project has done a good job with facilitating participatory involvement, it was apparent based upon TE field interviews that there has been some shortcomings with respect to communication on certain issues, including results of biodiversity surveys, estimated wildlife carrying capacities of the ecosystems, PA management objectives regarding wildlife populations and habitats, and data regarding trends in terms of human-wildlife conflicts. The PA management plans should be further developed incrementally, providing increasing levels of participatory management involvement, beyond patrolling and monitoring support.				
6.	Grassland management in Qinghai Province needs to be better synergized with conservation objectives. The Agriculture/Animal Husbandry and Forestry sectors are not effectively collaborating with respect to deciding upon grazing closures, livestock reductions, etc. A comprehensive grassland management programme should be developed that balances production goals with conservation objectives.				
7.	Integrating the Eco-Position Programme into the PA management objectives of the province poses a formidable challenge. A training and integration programme should be developed based upon a specific strategy for this large number of eco-positions.				
8.	Qinghai Province has implemented a progressive revision to the key performance indicator (KPI) programme for some local governments, e.g., adopting conservation as a primary KPI in lieu of economic performance. It				

No.	Recommendation
	would be prudent to further develop this approach, e.g., formulating eco-compensation contributions according to conservation results.
9.	Based upon interviews held during the TE mission, it seems that there is an opportunity to more efficiently utilize the service of volunteers in PA management. Guided by the Three Rivers Source National Park Management Rule for Volunteers and the Three Rivers Source National Park Regulation, the National Park Administration and/or the QFD should develop a volunteer programme for assisting with PA management, including activities on biodiversity monitoring, guiding tours, community outreach, environmental education, etc. The volunteer programme should include recruitment procedures, qualification criteria, health and safety measures, and intellectual property considerations.
10.	Progress towards PA business planning objectives fell short of the performance targets. PA business plans should be developed for the Qinghai Province PA's, under a framework that recognizes the ecological goods and services provided by the PA's. Generating revenue and financial inputs for the PA's as a means to improve PA management, fulfilling financial, ecological, and social sustainability objectives.

4.3. Good Practices and Lessons Learned

GOOD PRACTICES:

The project has prepared an impressive compilation of case studies and good practices achieved over the course of the project. These achievements have been shared across the portfolio of GEF projects in China and also provide meaningful input for GEF global programmes. A few of the good practices on the project are summarized below.

Empowering local communities

More than half of the project budget was spent under Component 3, implementing collaborative management arrangements between local communities situated in 3 of the 18 blocks of the SNNR. Several innovative practices were implemented, e.g., jointly developing local conservation zoning maps with local communities, establishing several small protection units that enabled broad participation and effective spatial coverage of patrolling and monitoring activities.

Demonstrated use of remote upload of monitoring data to KMS (albeit, further development is required)

The project was innovative in developing and demonstrating field application of electronic data forms being filled out in the field by local herders and uploaded to the knowledge management system (KMS) using applications programmed onto tablet computers.

Involving religious leaders and traditional knowledge in village communities

The project team astutely facilitated involvement of religious leaders from local monasteries in village comanagement committees. Local people highly respect these leaders, including monks who are actively involved in conservation issues. Traditional ecological knowledge was also integrated into the community co-management arrangements; e.g., identifying holy sites, which often coincide with higher levels of biodiversity.

Project management structure, e.g., component managers

The project management office was well staffed, e.g., with three separate component managers, funded by the governmental cofinancing contributions, supporting the project manager. The PMO also provided experienced services in human resource management, financial management, procurement, and IT systems.

Efficiently utilized and strengthened local capacity

There were many opportunities for involvement of local and national service providers, including biodiversity professionals from research institutes and consultancies, civil society (during first half of the project), media experts, IT experts, and construction companies. Setting up local PMOs at the townships and forest bureaus where the field interventions also was a good way to build local capacity and provide entry points for local service providers to participate.

LESSONS LEARNED:

Linkages with other initiatives should be fully worked out at design phase

Linkages with other initiatives were not fully worked out, for example, with grassland recovery programmes. There are contradictory approaches being advocated between the animal husbandry sector and the conservation sectors, including the QFD. Through the grassland recovery programme, the agriculture/animal husbandry sector is building fences to restrict livestock grazing, allowing grasslands to regenerate naturally. At the same time, the project was promoting removal of fences erected along lands held by herders. Working out some type of collaborative approach, e.g., voluntarily agreeing to temporary grazing closure without erecting fences might have improved chances of implementing measures to enable achievement of conservation objectives.

Assigning a performance indicator associated with fence removal requires thorough consultation and planning at the project preparation phase

Plans involving removal of fences in Qinghai grasslands needs to be prudently worked out at the project preparation phase. Relevant issues like herders' property rights and traditional practices should be sufficiently taken into considerations along with practical technical guidance and financing requirements.

Stakeholder engagement with certain stakeholders should be sufficiently detailed at design phase

Stakeholder engagement was not sufficiently detailed for certain stakeholders, including agriculture/animal husbandry and local governments. Assigning specific implementation activities, for example for the agriculture/animal husbandry sector, might have enabled improved stakeholder engagement from that sector. In response to community consultations held during the early phases of implementation, the project ended up being involved in more infrastructure related activities than originally planned. Issues such as waste management, water supply, and bear-proof fences fall under the sphere of local government. Although there was involvement with local governmental stakeholders during project implementation, detailing a more systematic involvement plan, including transfer of assets, defining operational and maintenance responsibilities, etc., would have enhanced the likelihood that the built infrastructure systems would be sustained after project closure.

Infrastructure type activities need to be supported by robust design, inspection, and record documentation

Infrastructure type activities should be supported by robust design, field inspection, and record documentation. It is essential that the designs for infrastructure, such as water supply systems, are sufficiently detailed and record drawings are prepared following construction. Construction management is an important, integral part of the process, and sufficient resources should be allocated to ensure that contractors are realizing the plans according to specifications and any deviation from the design is properly assessed and recorded. If any problems arise after project closure, such best management practices would better ensure that issues can be assessed and resolved accordingly.

Socioeconomic conditions should be adequately characterized

The effects of protected areas on human well-being are complex. Compiling sufficient baseline information is important to enable monitoring and evaluation beyond project's lifespan. The herder communities were situated on the Qinghai grasslands long before the nature reserve was established there, for example. The government has implemented a number of measures over the years to address these communities, including ecological migration/resettlement, eco-compensation initiatives, livestock control measures, land tenure laws and policies, grazing closures, etc. In order to better enable assessment of a particular intervention on the well-being of these communities, it is important that sufficient baseline information is collected, such as basic situations of the village (geography, populations and labor force, historical significant events), biodiversity and natural resources status (wildlife, grass, forest, wetland, water resources), social economy and public service (herders' production and living, income and living standard, poverty population analysis, cooperative, seasonal calendar, community tradition and knowledge, public service), differentiating the impacts of the various interventions including specific changes in ecological status. Some of this information was collected as part of the participatory rural appraisals completed in 2014 during the early stages of project implementation; however, there were no subsequent or terminal assessment made to allow for evaluation of assessment of socioeconomic impacts.

Gender aspects among Tibetan communities should be analyzed at the project preparation phase

In order to meaningfully integrate gender inclusion objectives into the project design, a thorough gender analysis should be made at the project preparation phase. And, analysis of gender issues within the Tibetan communities should be made by experienced practitioners, through culturally sensitive consultations.

Filling out tracking tools should be an inclusive process supported with adequate quality control

Preparation of tracking tools and capacity development scorecards should be more inclusive and reviewed thoroughly. There were many inconsistencies among the tracking tools at each stage, including the baseline, midterm, and endpoint assessments. The process of filling out tracking tools should be reconsidered. For example, more emphasis should be placed during the project inception phase at validating the baseline tracking tools that were approved at CEO endorsement. This process would enable the project management team to become more familiar with the details before implementation kicks off. Outsourcing the midterm and endpoint tracking tool assessments is a sensible approach, but the process should be inclusive. For example, a focus group arrangement, involving PA management, project management staff, NGOs, and other relevant stakeholders, is recommended as a way to openly discuss the information provided in the tracking tools. Adding supporting information to each separate entry is also important, in order to provide sufficient documentary evidence of the assessments made.

Allocation of field equipment

Assigning field equipment, such as cameras, binoculars, GPS units, tablet computers, etc., to local PMOs, which then distributed the equipment to village co-management committees was a way to demonstrate trust and foster ownership among the local communities. In hindsight, however, it might have been more prudent to allocate all of the equipment to the nature reserve administration and then the reserve would be responsible for distributing to local herders and communities. The nature reserves are inherently better positioned to manage the equipment, creating a trackable inventory, for example, and have professional staff properly maintain the units. At project closure, the fate of the distributed equipment is fairly uncertain, with the increasing role of eco-positions and unsure mentorship for the community patrolling and monitoring structures demonstrated by the project.

5. ANNEXES

Annex 1: TE Mission Itinerary

日期 Date	活动Activity	地点 Location
19-23 June	内业审查和终期评估启动报告 Desk review and inception report preparation of Terminal Evaluation	家中 at home
	上午:9:00-10:00: 访谈知识管理系统分包商徐明教授,中科院地理科学与资源研究所 AM:9:00-10:00 Interview Professor Xu Ming, Sub-contractor of Knowledge Management System, Institute of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research, CAS	北京,中科院地理 所Beijing ,Institute of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research, CAS
1 July	上午:10:15-11:30: 访谈基线调查专家李欣海教授,中科院动物所研究所 AM:10:15-11:30 Interview Professor Li Xinhai, Expert in biodiversity baseline survey at the Institute of Zoology, CAS	北京,中科院地理 所Beijing,Institute of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research, CAS
	 下午:13:00-14:30: 访谈METT评估专家和社区监测巡护专家李迪强教授、刘炎林博士,中国林科院 PM:13:00-14:30 Interview with METT Evaluation Specialist, Professor Li Diqiang, Community Monitoring Expert, Dr. Liu Yanlin, Chinese Academy of Forestry 	北京,中科院地理 所Beijing ,Institute of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research, CAS
7 July	15. 00–17. 00 Hold a kick -off meeting of Terminal Evaluation	РМО
7 July	17. 00–18. 00 Interview National Project Director	РМО
	下午10.00-12.00 访谈省林业厅动管局,了解省级自然保护区情况和GEF项目合作情况 PM: 10.00-12.00 Interview with wildlife and nature Reserve Management Bureau to understand the situation of provincial nature reserves and GEF project cooperation	РМО
8 July	 下午14.00-16.00 访谈三江源国家自然保护区管理局了解GEF项目社区共管和保护区协同工作情况 PM:14.00-16.00 Interview with Sanjiangyuan National Nature Reserve Administration to understand community co-management and synergic situation 	三江源保 护区管理 局 SNNR Administration
	下午17:00-18:00 访谈生物多样性基线调查分包商(刘伟教授,中科院西北高原生物研究 所),了解扎陵湖-鄂陵湖乡及玛可河林业局基线调查结果 PM:17:00-18:00 Interview with Prof. Liu Wei, Northwest Institute of Plateau Biology, CAS Biodiversity Survey Subcontractor to understand the baseline survey results of Zhaling- Eling Lake and MakeheBlocks of SNNR	项目办 PMO
9 July	上午 :访谈项目经理 AM: Interview with project manager	项目办PMO

日期 Date	活动Activity	地点 Location
	下午14:30-16:00 访谈项目首席技术顾问 PM: 14:30-16:00 Interview CTA	项目办PMO
	下午: 16:00-18:00 访谈组分经理 PM: 16:00-18:00 Interview with component managers	项目办PMO
10 July	 上午:9:00-11:00 会见青海省法制办,了解相关行业环保标准和技术规程、三江源国家公园管理条例和配套办法、野生动物补偿立法后评估工作。 AM:9:00-11:00 Meet with Provincial Office of Legislative Affairs to understand sectoral environmental safeguard standards and technical guidelines, Sanjiangyuan national park regulation and supporting codes, post-assessment regulation of compensation for wildlife damage. 	项目办PMO
	上午11:00-12:00 数据库专家李飞 AM:11:00-12:00 Mr. Li Fei Database expert	项目办PMO
11 July	驱车:西宁-玛可河 Drive from Xining to Makehe	项目办PMO
12 July	上午:玛可河汇报社区共管和生态旅游开展情况 AM:TheMakehe Forestry Bureau make a presentation on community co- management and eco-tourism development. 下午:与忠智村共管委员会座谈,参观饮水系统、垃圾焚烧炉、淋浴房 等硬件建设,考察旅游接待户	玛可河 Makehe Forestry Bureau 玛可河 Makehe Forestry
	 PM: Discusswith Zhongzhi village co-management committee and visit drinking water system, waste incinerator, shower houses and homestay. 上午:与格日则村共管委员会座谈,参观饮水系统、路灯、垃圾焚烧炉 	Bureau 玛可河
13 July	、淋浴 房等硬件建 设,考察旅游接待户 AM: Discuss with Gerize village co-management committee(CMC) and visit drinking water system, waste incinerator, shower house and homestay.	Makaehe Forestry Bureau
	下午 :驱车玛可河-玛多县 PM: Drive from Makaee to Maduo county	玛多县 Maduo county
14 July	驱车:玛多县— 治多 县 From Maduo county to Zhiduo county	治多 县 Zhiduo county
15 July	上午 : 治多 县索加乡项目办汇报项目工作 AM: local PMO of Suojia Township,Zhiduo County make a presentation	治多 县索加乡办事 处in Suojia township Office at Zhiduo county Downtown
	下午:驱车治多县索加乡政府(当曲村) PM: Drive toSuojia township,Zhiduo county	索加乡 Suojia township
16 July	上午:与当曲村共管委会成员座谈 AM: Discus with co-management committee(CMC) in Dangqu village	索加 乡当曲村 Dangqu village ,Suojia township

日期 Date	活动Activity	地点 Location
	下午:查看当曲村接种防疫围栏、垃圾转运站、防熊围栏等 PM: Check inoculation vaccination fence in Dangqu village , garbage transfer station, anti-bear fence and so on	索加 乡当曲村 Dangqu village,Suojia township
17 July	 上午:驱车索加乡当曲村到牙曲村 下午:访谈牙曲村共管委会成员 考察雪豹栖息地,查看接种防疫围栏、垃圾转运站、防熊围栏等防熊围 栏示范户 AM: Drive from Dangqu to Yaqu village PM: Discuswith co-management committee(CMC) in Yaqu village and visit Snow leopard habitat and inoculation vaccination fence in Yagqu village, garbage transfer station, anti-bear fence and so on 	治多 县Zhiduo county
18 July	 上午:驱车:治多县-玉树 AM: Drive from Zhiduo county to Yushu city 下午:准备终期评估发现 PM: Prepare findings of TE 	玉树Yushu city
19 July	上午:玉树-西宁MU2314 12:10-13:30 AM: Fly fromYushu to Xining,MU2314 12:10-13:30 下午:准备终期评估发现	西宁 Xining
20 July	 上午9:00-11:00:与国家项目主任以及项目办主要领导和工作人员召开 终期评估反馈会议 AM 9:00-11:00: Hold feedback meeting with the National Project Director and the PMO staff 	
	下午:由西宁飞往北京(航班号: CZ9146 15:30-18:05) PM: Fly from Xining to Beijing(flight No: CZ9146 15:30-18:05)	西宁-北京 From Xining to Beijing
21 July	终期评估任务反馈会和中国保护地改革项目进展汇报 Hold a feedback meeting of TE and progress of C-PAR project	北京UNDP
23 July	国际终期评估专家离境 International Terminal Evaluators fly from Beijing back home county	北京Beijing

Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology		
Relevance: Is the project relevant with respect to the environmental and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?					
To what extent is the principle of the project in line with subnational and national priorities?	Level of participation of the concerned agencies in project activities. Consistency with relevant strategies and policies.	Minutes of meetings, Project progress reports, national and regional strategy and policy documents	Desk review, interviews		
To what extent is the project aligned to the main objectives of the GEF focal area?	Consistency with GEF strategic objectives	GEF Strategy documents, PIRs, Tracking Tools	Desk review, interview with UNDP-GEF RTA		
To what extent is the project aligned to the strategic objectives of UNDP?	Consistency with UNDP strategic objectives	UNDP Strategic Plan, Country Programme Document	Desk review, interview		
Effectiveness: To what extent have the	e expected outcomes and objecti	ives of the project been achie	eved?		
Assessment of progress made toward a	chieving the indicator targets agree	ed upon in the logical results f	ramework		
Sustainability: To what extent are the long-term project results?	re financial, institutional, social-e	conomic, and/or environme	ntal risks to sustaining		
Is there evidence that sufficient funding has been secured to sustain project results?	Financial risks	Progress reports, sectoral plans, budget allocation reports, testimonial evidence	Desk review, interviews		
Have individual and institutional capacities been strengthened, and are governance structures capacitated and in place to sustain project results?	Institutional and individual capacities	Progress reports, testimonial evidence, training records	Desk review, interviews		
Are there social or political risks that may threaten the sustainability of project results?	Socio-economic risks	Socio-economic studies, macroeconomic information	Desk review, interviews		
Are there ongoing circumstances and/or activities that pose threats to the sustainability of project results?	Risks to sustainability	Sectoral plans, progress reports, macroeconomic information	Desk review, interviews, field visits		
Have delays affected project outcomes and/or sustainability, and, if so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?	Impact of project delays	Progress reports	Desk review, interviews		
Impact: Are there indications that the p	roject has contributed to, or enab	led progress toward long last	ing desired changes?		
Has the project made verifiable environmental improvements	Verifiable environmental improvements	Progress reports, sectoral plans, municipal development plans	Desk review, interviews, theory of change analysis		
Has the project made verifiable reductions in stress on environmental systems	Verifiable reductions in stress on environmental systems	Progress reports, sectoral plans, municipal development plans	Desk review, interviews, theory of change analysis		
Has the project demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements?	Progress toward impact achievements	Progress reports, sectoral plans, municipal development plans	Desk review, interviews, theory of change analysis		
Efficiency: Was the Project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?					
Was the project efficient with respect to incremental cost criteria?	Incremental cost	National strategies and plans, progress reports	Desk review, interviews		

Evaluation Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology		
Was the achievement of project objective and results realized according to the proposed budget and timeline	Efficient utilization of project resources	Progress reports, financial records	Desk review, interviews		
Country Ownership:					
How are project results contributing to national and subnational development plans and priorities?	Development planning	Government approved plans and policies	Desk review, interviews		
Have governments approved policies or regulatory frameworks in line with the project objective?	Policy reform	Government approved plans and policies	Desk review, interviews		
Have governmental and other cofinancing partners maintained their financial commitment to the project?	Committed cofinancing realized	Audit reports, project accounting records	Desk review, interviews		
Stakeholder Involvement and Partnersh	nip Arrangements:				
Has the project consulted with and made use of the skills, experience, and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector entities, local governments, and academic institutions?	Effective stakeholder involvement	Meeting minutes, reports, interview records	Desk review, interviews, field visits		
Were partnership arrangements properly identified and roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?	Partnership arrangements	Memorandums of understanding, agreements	Desk review, interviews		
How have partnerships influenced the effectiveness and efficiency of project implementation?	Effective partnerships	Progress reports, interview records	Desk review, interviews, field visits		
Have relevant vulnerable groups and powerful supporters and opponents of the processes been properly involved?	Inclusive stakeholder involvement	Meeting minutes, reports, interview records	Desk review, interviews, field visits		
Has the project sought participation from stakeholders in (1) project design, (2) implementation, and (3) monitoring & evaluation?	Stakeholder involvement	Plans, reports	Desk review, interviews, field visits		
Catalytic Role:					
How has the project had a catalytic or replication effect in the country?	Catalytic effect	Interview records, municipal development plans	Desk review, interviews		
Synergy with Other Projects/Programs					
How were synergies with other projects/programs incorporated in the design and/or implementation of the project?	Collaboration with other projects/programs	Plans, reports, meeting minutes	Desk review, interviews		
Preparation and Readiness					
Were project objective and components clear, practicable, and feasible within its time frame?	Project coherence	Logical results framework	Desk review, interviews		

Evaluation Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Were the capacities of the executing institution(s) and its counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?	Execution capacity	Progress reports, audit results	Desk review, interviews
Were counterpart resources, enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at Project entry?	Readiness	Interview records, progress reports	Desk review, interviews, field visits
Financial Planning			
Did the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allowed management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allowed for timely flow of funds?	Financial control	Audit reports, project accounting records	Desk review, interviews
Has there been due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits?	Financial management	Audit reports, project accounting records	Desk review, interviews, field visits
Has promised cofinancing materialized?	Realization of cofinancing	Audit reports, project accounting records	Desk review, interviews
Supervision and Backstopping			
Has GEF agency staff members identified problems in a timely fashion and accurately estimate their seriousness?	Supervision effectiveness	Progress reports	Desk review, interviews
Has GEF agency staff members provided quality support, approved modifications in time, and restructured the project when needed?	Project oversight	Progress reports	Desk review, interviews
Has the implementing agency provided the right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix, and frequency of field visits for the project?	Project backstopping	Progress reports, back-to- office reports, internal appraisals	Desk review, interviews, field visits
Monitoring & Evaluation			
Were intended results (outputs, outcomes) adequately defined, appropriate and stated in measurable terms, and were the results verifiable?	Monitoring and evaluation plan at entry	Project document, inception report	Desk review, interviews
Has the project monitoring & evaluation plan been implemented as planned?	Effective monitoring and evaluation	Progress reports, monitoring reports	Desk review, interviews
Has there been sufficient focus on results-based management?	Results based management	Progress reports, monitoring reports	Desk review, interviews
Mainstreaming			
Were gender issues had been taken into account in project design and implementation?	Greater consideration of gender aspects.	Project document, progress reports, monitoring reports	Desk review, interviews, field visits
Were effects on local populations taken into account in project design and implementation?	Positive or negative effects of the project on local populations.	Project document, progress reports, monitoring reports	Desk review, interviews, field visits
Annex 3: List of Persons Interviewed

No.	Name	Organization	Position
01	Gao Jingyu	QFD	National Project Direct / Deputy Chief
		DMO: Wildlife and Nature Decoryo	Project Director of PMO;
02	Zhang Xueyuan	Management Burgau, OED	Director of Wildlife and Nature Reserve
		Management Bureau, QFD	Management Bureau, QFD
03	Li Yande	РМО	Deputy Project Director
04	Fan Longqing	РМО	Project Manager
		Institute of Geographic Science and	
05	Yu Xiubo	Natural Resources Research, Chinese	Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) /Professor
		Academy of Science	
06	Zhao Haiping	Planning and Financial Division, QFD	Division Chief
07	Oi Chengde	International Cooperation Division,	Division Chief
0,	di chengue	QFD	
		Institute of Geographic Science and	
08	Xu Ming	Natural Resources Research, Chinese	KMS Contractor/Professor
		Academy of Science	
09	Li Xinhai	Institute of Zoology, Chinese Academy of	Baseline Survey Contractor/ Associate
		Science	Professor
		Institute of Forest Ecology, Environment	
10	Li Diqiang	and Protection, Chinese Academy of	METT Evaluation Specialist/ Professor
		Forestry	
11	Liu Vanlin	Institute of Forest Ecology, Environment	Community Manitaring Export / Dast destar
11	Liu Yaniin	and Protection, Chinese Academy of	Community Monitoring Expert/ Post-doctor
12	Vilybai	PMO	Brejest Coordinator
12	ti LVDei	PMO	Manager of Component 1 / Senier Engineer
14		PMO	Manager of Component 1/ Senior Engineer
14	Cuan Ming	PMO	Manager of Component 2
16	Wen Oingging	PMO	Coordinator of Component 2
17		PMO	Coordinator of Component 3
1/	Li sinnaa	Northeast Institute of Plateau Biology	
18	Liu Wei	Chinese Academy of Science	Baseline Survey Contractor/ Professor
		Ecology Conservation Division,	
19	Zhang Dehai	Sanjiangyuan National Park	Division Chief
20	Zhana Vanviana	Laws and Regulations Division, Qinghai	Deputy Division Chief
20	Zhang Yanxiang	Provincial Office of Legislative Affairs	Deputy Division Chief
21	Dang Mingfon	Planning Division, Qinghai Provincial	Doputy Investigator
21		Water Conservancy Department	
		Technical Center of Environmental	
22	Li Guangving	Planning and Protection, Qinghai	Division Chief
		Provincial Environmental Protection	
		Department	
23	Lan Zhoujia	Wild Life Conservation Society (WCS)	Community Co-Management Specialist
_		Natural Forest Conservation Office of	
24	Shi Changhong	Bangian Forestry Farm, Makehe	Deputy Division Chief/ Senior Engineer
		Forestry Bureau	
25		Natural Forest Conservation Office of	-+- #
25	IVIA YUTINg	Bandian Forestry Farm, Makaene	staπ
		Natural Forest Conservation Office of	
26	Ly lishan	Bangian Forestry Farm Makehe	staff
20	LV JISNAN	Forestry Bureau	Stan
		Administrative Office of Bangian	
27	liu Ping	Forestry Farm, Makehe Forestry	staff
		Bureau	

28	Yang Zhijing	Natural Forest Conservation Office of Banqian Forestry Farm, Makehe Forestry Bureau	staff
29	Yang Haishan	Friendship Bridge Forestry Farm, Makehe Forestry Bureau	Deputy Division Chief
30	Xieran Nima	Suojia Township PMO	Project Director
31	Gama Yixi	Suojia Township Government	Township Head
32	Zhongga Caiji	Suojia Township Government	Deputy Township Head
33	Ren Zeng	Natural Resources Management Bureau, Zhiduo County Management Division, Sanjiangyuan National Park	Deputy Bureau Chief
34	Cairen Dongzhou	Planning and Finance Section, Qumalai County Management Division, Sanjiangyuan National Park	Section Chief
35	Cai Ping	Wildlife and Nature Reserve Management Bureau, QFD	Deputy Bureau Chief
36	Luo Shenglian	International Finance Division, Qinghai Provincial Finance Department	Division Chief
37	Ma Chaode	UNDP China	Program Manager
38	Wang Lei	UNDP China	Project Coordinator
39	Zhao Xinhua	UNDP China	Program Associate
40	Xue Lin	UNDP China	Program Assistant

Annex 4: List of Information Reviewed

Document	Language Chi/Eng
General	
Project Identification Form (PIF)	Eng
Request for CEO Endorsement/Approval	Eng
Project Document, signed version	Eng
United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the People's Republic of China (UNDAF China) 2016-2020	Eng
Project TE Inception Report	Eng
Project MTR Midterm report, June 2015	Eng
Financial Expenditures broken down by outcome and ATLAS Code for each year	Eng
Financial Audits completed to date	Chi
Co-Financing Letters	Chi
Co-Financing realized (amount, source, activity, date)	Eng-Chi
Maps of QH Terrain, Soil, Water System, Vegetation Division, Major Function Zoning etc.	Chi
Combined Delivery Report by Activity (CDR) 2013-2017	Eng
Investing and Financing Analysis and Creative Mechanism of Protected Areas	Eng
Qinghai Provincial Maior Functional Area Zoning Plan	Chi
Oinghai Provincial NR Management Effectiveness, Capacity Building and Financing Status Evaluation	
Report	Chi
Press clippings and other evidence of media exposure	Chi-Eng
Tracking Tools	
GEF Biodiversity Tracking Tool	Eng
METT for comparison of 5 nature reserve (Sanjiangyuan Mengda, Kekexili, Qinghai Lake, Golmud)	Eng
Financial Sustainability Scorecard for Qinghai PA System	Eng
Capacity Development Scorecard for Qinghai PA System	Eng
Outcome 1: Mainstreaming PA Management into Provincial Development and Sector Planning Process	<u>_</u>
Output 1.1 Qinghai Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (QHBSP)	Chi
Output 1.1 Qinghai 13th 5-year plan (Development and Reform Commission)	Chi
Output 1.1 Qinghai 13th 5-year plan (Land and Resources Department)	Chi
Output 1.1 Qinghai 13th 5-year plan (Water Conservancy Department)	Chi
Output 1.1 Qinghai 13th 5-year plan (Agro-Husbandry Department)	Chi
Output 1.1 Qinghai 13th 5-year plan (Environmental Protection Department)	Chi
Output 1.1 Qinghai 13th 5-year plan (Forestry Department)	Chi
Output 1.1 Qinghai 13th 5-year plan Mainstreaming reports (1+5)	Chi
Output 1.2 Qinghai Transportation and Traffic Infra-construction Environmental Protection Regulation	Chi
Output 1.2 Qinghai Infra-construction Environmental Protection Regulation and Guideline of State Grid	Chi
Qingnai Company	Ch :
Output 1.2 Qinghai Green Building Development and Promotion Regulation	Chi
Output 1.2 Qinghai Management Regulation in House Construction and Municipal Intrastructure	Chi
Operation on site	Chi
Output 1.2 Qinghai Grassiand Warden Regulation	Chi
Output 1.2 Salijiangyuan National Park Regulation	Chi
Output 1.2 Eight Supporting Management Regulations for Sanjiangyuan National Park (Scientific Research	Chi
Vicitors International Cooperation and Evolution, Project Investment, Social Donation, Volunteers,	CIII
Visitors, international Cooperation and Extraction Management Regulation /to be issued)	Chi
Output 1.2 Qinghai Ago Husbandry Capital Construction Management Regulation (to be issued)	
Output 1.2 Qinghai Ago-nusualiury Capital Construction Manual in CNNP (to be issued)	
Output 1.2 Pest Control (Platedu Pika) Operational Manual III Sivikk (Code Issued)	CIII
Signature)	Chi
Outcome 2: Increasing PA Management Effectiveness through Strengthened Institutional and Staff Cap	pacities
Output 2.1 Qinghai Nature Reserve Monitoring Plan	Chi

Output 2.1 Technical Guideline (Forest) of Monitoring for Qinghai NR	Chi			
Output 2.1 Technical Guideline (Grassland/Desert) of Biodiversity Monitoring for Qinghai NR				
Output 2.1 Technical Guideline (Wetland) of Biodiversity Monitoring for Qinghai NR	Chi			
Output 2.1 Technical guideline of Patrolling for Qinghai NR	Chi			
Output 2.1 Technical Guideline of Infra-triggered Camera for Wild Animal Monitoring for Qinghai NR	Chi			
Output 2.1 Technical guideline of Database Construction and Update for Qinghai NR	Chi			
Output 2.1 Qinghai NR Development Planning (2011-2020)	Chi			
Output 2.2 Master Plans of 10 National Wetland Parks (Makehe, Yellow River, Dadiwan, Dequyuan, Bazhouhe,	Chi			
Zequ, Banma Rentuo, Nianjicuo ,Shaliuhe, Mangqu)	CIII			
Output 2.2 Master Plans of 4 National Desert Parks (Ketu, Youyun, Quanshuiwan, Hongshaba)	Chi			
Output 2.3 Investing and Financing Analysis and Creative Mechanism of Protected Areas	Eng-Chi			
Output 2.4 Makehe Community-Based Ecotourism Development Plan and Marketing Strategy	Chi			
Output 2.4 Makehe Community-Based Ecotourism Marketing Strategy	Chi			
Output 2.4 Implementation Program of Makehe Community-based Ecotourism Project	Chi			
Output 2.5 Institution and Training Needs Analysis of Qinghai PA	Chi			
Output 2.5 Collections of Training Materials	Chi			
Output 2.5 International Training Development Specialists Report (Nov. 2014)	Eng			
Output 2.6 Research on Qinghai Biodiversity Conservation Strategy and Climate Change Resilience	Chi			
Output 2.6 Qinghai Biodiversity Conservation GAP Analysis	Chi			
Output 2.6 Nine PA Management Plans (Mengda, Kekexili, Qinghai Lake, Golmud, Beichuanhe, Chaidamu, Three	Chi			
Blocks of SNNR (Makehe, Suojia-Qumahe, Zhalinghu-Elinghu)	CIII			
Output 2.6 Baseline Survey and Annual Monitoring Reports of Key Species in Three Blocks of SNNR	Chi			
(2014-2017)	CIII			
Component 3: Demonstration of Effective PA Management through Community Involvement in SNNR				
Twelve Villages' PRA Reports and Cooperative Management Plans	Chi			
Twelve Villages' Co-management Agreements	Chi			
Community Co-management Regulations of Three Blocks of SNNR	Chi			
Fauna Illustrated Handbook of the Three River Sources	Chi			
Flora Illustrated Handbook of the Three River Sources	Chi			
Fauna Handbook of the Three River Sources (Pocket Book)	Chi			
Flora Handbook of the Three River Sources (Pocket Book)	Chi			
Traditional Knowledge Handbook of Tibetan Community	Chi			
Community Monitoring and Patrolling Manual	Chi			
Brochure of Key Protected Species of Animals in Qinghai	Chi			
Garbage Classification Brochure in Qinghai	Chi			
Project Management and Communications				
My Home Is in the Three River Sources	Chi			
Exploring New Approaches of Ecological Conservation and Development in the Three River Sources	Chi			
Practices and Explorations of UNDP-GEF Qinghai Biodiversity Conservation Project in the Three River	Chi			
Sources	CIII			
NGO Co-management Technical Service Contract (2014-2016)	Chi			

Annex 5: Summary of Field Visits

Field Survey Description:

The field visits cover two blocks of SNNR totaling 6 villages, respectively representing typical forest and grassland ecosystems. The interviewees are representatives of village co-management committees.

In Makehe Block of SNNR featuring forest ecosystem, 2 pilot villages (Zhongzhi and Gerize) are visited with their drinking water system, waste incinerator, shower house and home-stay, and interviewed with the members of village co-management Committee (CMC).

In Suojia-Qumahe Block of SNNR featuring grassland ecosystem, 4 pilot villages (Dangqu, Yaqu, Junqu and Moqu) were visited with snow leopard habitat, garbage transfer station, anti-bear fence and inoculation vaccination fence, and interviewed with the members of co-management Committee (CMC).

Key Findings in 2 Blocks:

- Community co-management model completed and functions well.
- Field interventions not only captured 3 main ecosystems of SNNR, also realistically incorporate the uniqueness of each type of ecosystem into co-management activities.
- The awareness of biodiversity conservation generally and significantly improved, while capacity building for both individual and village requires more efforts.
- A combination of co-management, indigenous culture and religious strength is key to catalyze project progress.
- Young village co-management leaders with vigor, thought and resolute mobility, plays more important role in sustainable development.
- With respect to sustainability, still gaps to analyze and offset, e.g. ecotourism, water supply.
- Way of NGOs' involvement in governments' input requires better understanding and higher mix.
- Women's awareness and capacity in biodiversity conservation improved greatly, while actual strength not fully realized and released, requiring more focus even at the onset of project design.

Specific Findings in Makehe Block:

Makehe Forestry Bureau encompasses 3 national forestry centers. Since late 1990's, conflicts in forest use and conservation frequently arise between local forestry administrative agency and villagers, due to unclear identification of natural resources property rights, esp those interlocking forest and grassland resources. The problem left over by history poses real challenge for GEF-4 project when developing village co-management model. Optimistically we find the model operations smoothly and effectively based on field survey and desk review.

Annual Household Revenue:

- Zhongzhi Village ≦2,000-3,000 (lowest); 25,000-30,000 (medium); ≧70,000-80,000 (highest)
- Gerize Village ≦10,000 (lowest); 10,000-16,000 (medium); ≧30,000 (highest)

Villagers highly accept co-management model and actively join in activities, such as patrolling, waste treatment, drinking water and road management, village-level affair participation etc. And willing to continue to operate after project closure, though management model, responsibility and work stress may vary, which mainly depends on follow-up policy.

Villagers speak highly of the support provided by project (ranking in importance): drinking water system, road reconstruction, patrolling fund realized, home-stay and solar street lamp, etc. However, controversial voice heard on shower house, for some doesn't function well in the past 2 years due to improper management.

Compared to pasture area, patrolling missions in forest area has its uniqueness, such as anti-illegal poaching intensity. For example, Friendship Bridge Forest Centre (where Gerize Village locates) is situated at the most lower reaches of Makehe (Qinghai Section), very close to Rangtang County of Sichuan Province, where illegal poaching for wildlife are rampant, thus greatly increasing patrolling difficulty and risks.

With respect to conflicts between human-animals (e.g., wild boar), incidents show an increasing tendency, mainly grain losses (e.g. potatoes) without compensation instead of personal injury.

14 Zhongzhi villagers and 10 Gerize Villagers hold eco-positions, with 1800 yuan per month.

Villagers believe that patrolling equipment is of great help for biodiversity conservation, with the right to use transferred to co-management committee while the ownership still in PMO over the period of project implementation. Patrollers will get the equipment and then return it back to co-management committee after patrolling.

No cooperation with cooperatives yet. When Gerize Village appears no obvious interest, Zhongzhi Village exhibits positive attitude towards the new thing, however hoping government to take the lead in agriculture, animal husbandry and supplementary occupations, e.g. Tibetan tea, morchella vulgaris, black highland barley. Apparently the awareness and actions in terms of alternative livelihood development are different between the two villages. For Zhongzhi Village, co-management leader plays a more important role in adaptive management to relieve conflicts arising from conservation and development.

Specific Findings in Suojia Block:

In 2015, People's Government of Suojia Township was determined as project technical service institution due to certain NGOs unsuccessful implementation in pilot villages, which means only 2 and a half year left for co-management model to establish and operate. Even in that case, we perceive a very fruitful project outcome by joint efforts, esp local PMO leader's endeavour and persistent support and guidance of provincial PMO. For example, co-management model in 4 pilot villages functions very well due to 5 key factors: relevant policies or stipulations provided by project; organizations established; the awareness and capacity of herders and co-management committee improved significantly, though gaps existed to be made up because of villagers' relatively low literacy ; village rules or community regulations not rest on paper, but realized sufficiently in the process of implementation, e.g. herders' collective discussion; the last but not the least factor is sound financial support. With those five factors' guarantee, the bottom-up co-management is well integrated with top-down administration.

A combination of village co-management, indigenous culture and religion is typical in Suojia, and we can take local cultural festival as a good example.

Extra Findings valuable for Each Village:

Visit to Zhongzhi Village, Dengta Township, Banma County

Basic information: 706.31 km², 97 Households, total 498 inhabitants including 243 female, Comanagement Agreement signed in 2013

Apart from those key common findings, we find the home-stay are typical in this village. Among five homestay visited, however, only half are ready to provide business service, with the rest still under renovation or lack of basic hardware facilities (e.g. Wifi). Even for those well prepared ones, some has no access to visitors at all even in high season. Combined with desk review, we've found the ecotourism profit model and economic benefit analysis keep a good text consistency, while not sufficient enough in operations, such as entertainment capacity, marketing ability, and close liaison between home-stay and local tourism authority in charge.

Visit to Gerize Village, Dengta Township, Banma County

Basic information: 321.78 km², 125 Households, total 628 inhabitants including 349 female, Comanagement Agreement signed in 2013. With respect to project outcome in co-management, the interviewees generally identify three aspects: the first is the improvement of organizing ability, esp in waste treatment and hygiene awareness; the second is illegal poaching has been curbed to a great extent, and herb pickup drops by degrees; thirdly, co-management model has led to positive behavior change. However, with regard to co-management agreement and regulations, the contents are expected to be more closely to village needs and more inclusive.

We visited a female, director of the village women, also representative of co-management committee. Compared with common village woman, she takes initiative to display confidence and great interest in the project. Villagers including women seldom migrate out for work. Some women join in patrolling, though not as many as men, still play important role in co-management, e.g. patrolling more around houses, more carefully find and remove hunting cannula, and willing to do routine cleaning, which has greatly helped develop good atmosphere in village.

Another valuable experience is the incorporation of local monastery. A Lama (also representative of comanagement committee) is interviewed. Villagers show great respect for him, and we can perceive the key role of the Lama himself and monastery's mature organization structure setting and irreplaceable functions. The monastery set patrolling position, environmental conservation and education divisions, and environmental management office as well. The monastery guide villagers in waste treatment, and not yet found a satisfactory way of treatment (landfill or burning). They even tried in garbage classification, though failed. It's clear the sustainability of co-management is satisfactory and trustworthy, when positive religious strength join in.

Visit to Dangqu Village, Suojia Township, Zhiduo County

Basic information: 4,564.03 km², 477 Households, total 1359 inhabitants including 681 female, Comanagement Agreement signed in 2015.

Visit to Yaqu Village, Suojia Township, Zhiduo County

Basic information: 1,783.12 km², 775 Households, total 1998 inhabitants including 1024 female, Comanagement Agreement signed in 2015.

Visit to Junqu Village, Suojia Township, Zhiduo County

Basic information: 1,580.98 km², 375 Households, total 1210 inhabitants including 551 female, Comanagement Agreement signed in 2015.

Visit to Moqu Village, Suojia Township, Zhiduo County

Basic information: 2,996.17 km², 522 Households, total 1679 inhabitants including 821 female, Comanagement Agreement signed in 2015.

Survey Questionnaires Respectively for the Village and the Herder

Name of the village_____ Township_____ County____ Interviewed village carders______ Village Questionnaire

No.	Questions	Choices/unit	Answers
1	No. of households	НН	
2	No. of population	Person	
3	Area of the village	km ²	
4	Average HH income	10,000yuan/year	
5	How many households directly participated in this project by now	НН	
6	When did this village sign the co-management agreement, and will continue the agreement	Year	
7	Did the formulation and implementation of village co-management agreement involve the herders	1=Y, 2=N	
8	Whether this village has Eco- Position	1=Y, 2=N	
9	Project provided what kinds of support for village (ranking in importance)	1=Training, 2=Waste management equipment, 3=Patrolling fuel subsidy, 4=Office facilities, 5=Bear fence, 6= Patrolling equipment, 7=Alternative livelihoods equipment, 8=Publicity calendar, 9.tourism service 10=others	
10	When project finished, do you have plans to keep village co-management committee in place, or replace it by eco-position teams?		
11	Are there any regulations regarding fencing management? If yes, please explain (Suojia Block only).		
12	Does the village help herders get compensation for loss or damages due to human-wildlife conflicts? Does the herder have those information? In the past few years, such incidents are increasing or not?		
13	How is the village managing the equipment the project provided. For example, computers, printers, cameras, GPS and binoculars, etc.		
14	Compared with pasture village co-management, what particularities are there in forestry farm co- management (Makehe Block only)?		
15	What achievements out of the project, especially out of village co-management mechanism, can be incorporated into village's future development?		
16	Is there any cooperation with agriculture cooperatives? If yes, please explain.		

Name of the village______ Name of the interviewed herder_____ Questionnaire for Herder

No.	Questions	Choices/unit	Answers
1	Gender	1=M, 2=F	
2	Do you know this project?	1=Y, 2=N	
3	Did you directly participate in project? In what ways?	1=Y, 2=N	
4	Are you satisfied with the project implementation in this village?	1=Y, 2=so so, 3=N	
5	Do you know the co-management agreement of this village? Any recommendations?	1=Y, 2=so so, 3=N	
6	If you saw someone break the co-management agreement, whether you will take action?	1=Y, 2=N	
7	As you know, are there any villager kill wildlife currently	1=Y, 2=N	
8	Are you holding an eco-position? If yes, any pay? How much do you work?	1=Y, 2=N	
9	Have you removed any fencing in recent years, or have added fencing? What is your willingness to change the fencing to make it more biodiversity friendly?		
10	With respect to human-wildlife conflicts, what losses or damages have you experienced? Have you been compensated? Do you know the content of compensation?		
11	How do you manage the equipment the project provided, e.g. cameras, GPS, binoculars, etc.?		

Names of Persons Interviewed during Field Mission:

No.	Village Name	Person Name	Gender
01	Zhongzhi Village, Dengta Township, Banma County	Kari Cairang	Male
02	Zhongzhi Village, Dengta Township, Banma County	Luo Ming/ Village Head	Male
03	Zhongzhi Village, Dengta Township, Banma County	Er De	Male
04	Zhongzhi Village, Dengta Township, Banma County	Er Qiu	Male
05	Zhongzhi Village, Dengta Township, Banma County	Ang Qiu	Male
06	Zhongzhi Village, Dengta Township, Banma County	Nie Ben	Male
07	Zhongzhi Village, Dengta Township, Banma County	Li Tuo	Male
08	Zhongzhi Village, Dengta Township, Banma County	Renzeng Duojie	Male
09	Zhongzhi Village, Dengta Township, Banma County	Gama Jia	Male
10	Zhongzhi Village, Dengta Township, Banma County	Luo Gui	Male
11	Zhongzhi Village, Dengta Township, Banma County	Zhou Duo	Male
12	Zhongzhi Village, Dengta Township, Banma County	Duo Gong	Male
13	Zhongzhi Village, Dengta Township, Banma County	Man La	Male
14	Gerize Village, Dengta Township, Banma County	Dongwa Erben	Male
15	Gerize Village, Dengta Township, Banma County	Ga Li	Male
16	Gerize Village, Dengta Township, Banma County	Dongzhi Zhuoma	Female
17	Gerize Village, Dengta Township, Banma County	Ge Sangjie/ Lama	Male
18	Gerize Village, Dengta Township, Banma County	Ban Que	Male
19	Dangqu Village, Suojia Township, Zhiduo County	Ci Muhui	Male
20	Dangqu Village, Suojia Township, Zhiduo County	Suo Nancuo	Female
21	Yaqu Village, Suojia Township, Zhiduo County	Wen Di/ Secretary of Village Party Branch	Male

No.	Village Name	Person Name	Gender
22	Yaqu Village, Suojia Township, Zhiduo County	Ri Jia	Male
23	Yaqu Village, Suojia Township, Zhiduo County	Re Jia	Male
24	Yaqu Village, Suojia Township, Zhiduo County	La Zhong	Female
25	Moqu Village, Suojia Township, Zhiduo County	Xianba Qupei/ Secretary of Village Party Branch	Male
26	Moqu Village, Suojia Township, Zhiduo County	Ri Sa	Male
27	Moqu Village, Suojia Township, Zhiduo County	Jiari Qiongjia	Male
28	Junqu Village, Suojia Township, Zhiduo County	Gang Jia	Male
29	Junqu Village, Suojia Township, Zhiduo County	Ren Zeng	Male
30	Junqu Village, Suojia Township, Zhiduo County	Zhou Luo	Male
31	Junqu Village, Suojia Township, Zhiduo County	Zhuoga Caiji	Female
32	Suojia Township Government	Zhongga Caiji/ Deputy Township Head	Female

Annex 6: Matrix for Rating Achievement of Project Objective and Outcomes

Indicator 指标	Baseline 基线	End of Project target 项目最终目标	TE Comments	TE Status		
Objective: 目标: To catalyze management effectiveness of Qinghai's PA system to fulfil its purpose of conserving globally important biodiversity 促进青海保护区体系管理有效性,实现其保护全球重要生物多样性的目的						
Financial sustainability score (%) for national systems of protected areas: 国家保护区体系融资可持续性得分(百分比)			For Component 1, the endpoint assessment reported a score of 47.78%, which exceeds the end target of 30%; however, the baseline figure in the tracking too file is 34.44%, not 15.4% as recorded in the strategic results framework. Considering that 47.78% is more than 13 percentage points greater than the 34.44% baseline, the TE considered the end target achieved. For Component 2, the endpoint assessment reported a score of 38.98%, which short of the 50% target. There are also inconsistencies with respect to the baseline figure for this component; the strategic results framework indicates a baseline of 11.5%, whereas the tacking tool reports a baseline of 13.56%. For Component 3, the endpoint score was reported at 36.11%, slightly short of the 40% target, but, again, there are inconsistencies with the baseline figures. strategic results framework indicates a baseline of 8.5%, whereas the tracking has a baseline figure of 18.06%.			
Component 1 – Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks 组分1- 法律、法规以及机构框架	15.4 %	30%	47.78%	Achieved		
Component 2 – Business planning and tools for cost- effective management 组分2- 商业计划和成本效益管理工具	11.5%	50%	38.98%	Unlikely to be achieved		
Component 3 – Tools for revenue generation 组分3- 创收工具	8.5%	40%	36.11%	Unlikely to be achieved		
METT scores for different PAs: 各个保护区监测评估跟踪工具得分:: SNNR 三江源国家级自然保护区 Mengda 孟达 Kekexili 可可西里 Qinghai Lake 青海湖 Golmud Poplar forest 格尔木杨树林	33% 32% 54% 50% 40% 58% 53% 22% 23%	70% 65% 65% 75% 50%	71% 73% 67% 76% 55%	Achieved		
Selected indicator species that are rare and threatened show stable or upward trends in numbers (including INTER ALIA wild yak, wild ass, Tibetan antelope, snow leopard, Pallas' cat, musk deer, white-lipped deer, black-necked crane, etc.) 选定的指示性物种,包括在数量上趋于稳定或上升的珍稀濒危物种	Baseline survey of selected indicator species at outset of project, in three target units of the SNNR (Suojia-Qumahe, Zhaling-Elinghu, Makehe)	Key wildlife populations maintained or increasing; appropriate	Based upon review of the summary reports of biodiversity surveys and interviews by the TE team of the sub-contractors who led these surveys, populations of indicator species have remained steady or slightly increased.	Achieved		

Indicator 指标	Baseline 基线	End of Project target 项目最终目标	TE Comments	TE Status	
(尤其是野牦牛、野驴、藏羚羊、雪豹、帕拉斯猫、林麝、白唇 鹿、黑颈鹤等)	项目开始时在三江源国家级 自然保护区三个目标单位 (索加-曲蔴河、扎陵湖- 鄂陵湖、玛可河)选定的指 示性物种基线调查	population structure. Biodiversity assessment protocols are included in the management plans for the national NRs. 主要野生动物种群数 量保持或增加;适宜 的种群结构			
Outcome 1 Mainstreaming PA management into provincial development 成果1 : 将保护区管理纳入省级发展和部门规划过程中	t and sector planning process				
 Outputs: 产出: 1.1 Inter-sectoral coordination and planning mechanism established to integrate PA systems and objectives into development and sectoral planning process. 建立跨部门协调和规划机制,将保护区体系及其目标融入发展和部门规划过程中; 1.2 Institutional capacities of the provincial government built for planning, monitoring and enforcement of biodiversity management to avoid/mitigate threats to PAs. 建立省政府生物多样性管理监测和执法机构能力,以避免/减弱对保护区体系的威胁; 1.3 Knowledge management system established including climate change resilience monitoring component. 建立知识管理系统,包括气候变化适应力监测组分 					
Indicator 1.1: PA system and its management mainstreamed within the provincial sectoral and development planning framework at the provincial level: indicated by clear inclusion of due consideration and concrete measures for biodiversity conservation and PA development, as well as ear marked budget in the sectoral development plans at provincial I evels and in the (national) 13th 5- year plan. 在省级层面将保护区体系及其管理纳入省级各部门和发展规划框 架中:明确显示纳入了对生物多样性保护和保护区发展的适当考 虑和具体措施,且在省级部门发展规划和(国家)13个5年规划中 有专项预算。	No sectoral plans integrate PA objectives 没有在部门预算中整合保护 区目标 Development plans include no vision and development plan for PAs and no link is made between the PAs and development, nor no concrete measure for biodiversity conservation 发展规划中没有包括保护区 愿景和发展计划,且没有将 保护区与发展相联系,也没 有生物多样性保护的具体措 施。	At least 3 sectoral plans integrate consideration of PAs and of biodiversity conservation measures 至少有3个部门的规 划整合了对保护区的 考虑和生物多样性保 护的具体措施 13 th 5 year-Plan recognises clear linkage between PAs and provincial development, and includes PA- and biodiversity-related targets and budgets 第13个5年计划认可	Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed in 13 th 5-year plan and sector plans of the Provincial Development and Reform Commission; Forestry Department; Animal Husbandry Department; Environmental Protection Department; and Hydrologic Water Management Department. The Provincial Land Use Plan is consistent with the key conservation areas identified in the QBSAP.	Achieved	

Indicator 指标	Baseline 基线	End of Project target 项目最终目标	TE Comments	TE Status		
		了保护区和省级发展 间的明确联系,并包 含了与保护区和生物 多样性相关的目标和 预算 The Provincial Land Use Plan includes key conservation areas identified in QBSAP				
Indicator 1.2: Threats to PAs from infrastructure placement (roads, dams) and other adverse forms of land use avoided, mitigated or offset, leading to more effective conservation in Qinghai's PA system covering 251,665km ² . 由于基础设施配置(道路, 水坝)和其他土地利用负面影响使保护区面临的威胁得以避免、减轻或抵消,从而更有效地保护青海省保护区体系占地25.1665万平方公里的面积	No procedure in place to deal with incompatible developments 没有到位的程序处理彼此相 矛盾的开发活动	Official standards for infrastructure development and operation within the PAs are developed and operationalised, with clear rehabilitation/offset mechanism. 在保护区范围内进行 基础设施建设和经营 的官方标准得以制定 和运行,且具有明确 的恢复/替代机制。	Five technical regulations have been approved, and three are pending. Rehabilitation/offset mechanisms are not explicitly represented in these technical regulations.	Expected to be achieved		
Indicator 1.3: PA management is supported through a cross-sectoral knowledge management system that builds upon lessons learned and facilitates decision-making processes for implementing strategic management actions	Knowledge management system not in place	A knowledge management strategy that is informed by a functional PA system- wide environmental information management system is approved by the PSC	KMS has been developed, training delivered. Further investment required in development and maintenance.	Expected to be achieved		
Outcome 2 : Increasing PA management effectiveness through strengthe 成果2 : 通过加强机构和人员能力建设,提高保护区管理有效性	Outcome 2: Increasing PA management effectiveness through strengthened institutional and staff capacities 成果2:通过加强机构和人员能力建设,提高保护区管理有效性					

Outputs 产出:

2.1 Systemic capacity strengthened for effective PA system management.

加强有效保护区体系管理的系统能力;

Terminal Evaluation Report, 2017 CBPF: Strengthening the Effectiveness of the Protected Area System in Qinghai Province GEF Project ID: 3992; UNDP PIMS ID: 4179

Indicator 指标	Baseline 基线	End of Project target 项目最终目标	TE Comments	TE Status
 2.2 Institutional strengthening plan adopted and operationalised. 机构加强计划被予以采纳并得到运行; 2.3 Budgeting procedures and resource allocation improved, directly ad 预算和资源分配直接推动了解决保护区威胁; 2.4 Business case made to show economic benefits from PA functions. 利用商业案例说明保护区功能带来的经济效益; 2.5 PA staff skills raised, with 200 PA staff and other participants receivin 提高200名保护区工作人员技能,以满足职业能力标准; 2.6 PA system plan developed with climate change considerations. 制定顾及气候变化因素的保护区体系计划 	dressing threats to PAs. ng training to better meet occu	pational competence stan	dards.	·
Indicator 2.1: Capacity development scorecard (%) for the protected area system. 保护区体系能力发展计分卡(百分比)	35.5%	60%	66.7%	Achieved
Indicator 2.2: Strategic plans prepared for PA institutions and procedures and investment, and PA staff numbers dramatically increased 起草保护区机构、规程及投资战略规划,保护区人员数量显著增加 - Permanent staff 正式职工	No strategic plans 没有战略规划	Strategic Plan developed and adopted 制定并通过了战略规 划	Strategic plan has not been developed. The project has facilitated a PA system-wide monitoring plan; however, the TE team does not consider this plan a substitute for the envisaged strategic plan.	Unlikely to be achieved
- Temporary staff 聘用人员	160 142 5	360 389	626	Achieved
	minority staff unavailable	150 At least 25% of new bires are women or	10,568	Achieved
		minorities	New Minority Staff (SNNR-NP): 67.2% New Women Staff (SNNR-NP): 26%	Achieved
Indicator 2.3: Province's system level PA financing increased to close the existing annual financing gap of US\$ 4.6 million for basic expenditure scenario (tracked with PA financial sustainability scorecard) 全省保护区系统融资增加至接近现有每年460万美元的基本支出资金缺口(通过跟踪保护区财务可持续性计分卡)	US\$ 2 million / year USD 2.88 million / year 200万美元/年	US\$ 6.6 million per year, and at least 25% increase for each national NR 每年660万美元	USD 8 million	Achieved

Indicator 指标	Baseline 基线	End of Project target 项目最终目标	TE Comments	TE Status
Indicator 2.4: Ratio of total PA budget spent on field operations raised to narrow spending gap 整个保护区用于野外作业的总预算比例提高,缩小了支出差距	<10% of PA revenue spent on field operations 保护区收益中用于野外作业 的资金不足10%。	>30% of PA revenue spent on field operations 保护区收益中用于野 外作业的资金大于 30%。	>30%	Achieved
Indicator 2.5: Reduction in illegal incident cases within the NRs – poaching, illegal harvesting, illegal-grazing, etc. 在自然保护区内违法案件减少 – 盗猎、非法采伐、非法放牧等	 Ks - Currently no monitoring system in place. 当前没有到位的监测体系 Baseline for the number of illegal incidents will be estimated at onset of the project. 在项目伊始就要对违法案件 数量基线进行预测。 1942 incidents, including criminal cases 34 and administrative cases 1908 	Functioning policing records system with links to police/ court cases and an enhanced policing mandate of NR staff. 警务记录制度在与警	Illegal incident records included in the knowledge management system.	Achieved
		project. 在项目伊始就要对违法案件 数量基线进行预测。 1942 incidents, including criminal cases 34 and administrative cases 1908	察/法院案件处理和 增强自然保护区工作 人员治安职责的链接 中发挥作用 Routine report forms designed for	Illegal incident records included in the knowledge management system.
	numerical analysis. 为数值分析设计了例 行报告表。 Both criminal and adminstrative incidents reduced to 50% of the baseline level. 案件减少到基线水平 的50%。 Incidents reduced to 50% of the baseline level in the 12 pilot villages under Outcome 3 (based upon annual PSP log books)	Total number of incidents show steady decreasing trend; 2016 cases are 50% of the baseline number in 2011. The numbers of criminal cases are increasing; the number cases in 2016 were 135% more than reported in 2011.	Achieved	
		Baselines were not established and follow-up assessments not made	Unable to assess	

Indicator 指标	Baseline 基线	End of Project target 项目最终目标	TE Comments	TE Status
Indicator 2.6: Annual income diverted to PA management from eco- compensation agreements (excluding funds arising from the Sanjiangyuan Ecological Construction Plan) 从生态补偿协议转移支付给保护区管理的年收入(不包括出自三江 源生态建设规划的资金)	0	>US\$1.0m 100万美元以上	USD 1.89 million	Achieved
Indicator 2.7 : More representative PA system approved with most of 'major vegetation types' represented (>5% coverage) in the NNR's 在国家级自然保护区内最能代表的"主要植被类型"(覆盖率大于5%)更具代表性的保护区体系而得到批准。	13 of 30 habitats 30个栖息地中的13个	22 of 30 habitats (addition of desert and Qilian montane habitats, with an overall increase of 18,000,000 200,000 ha	PA representation: 26 of 30 vegetation types	Achieved
10,000 in th 30个材 (除于 山地林 护区仪 2000 ³ 积)		in the provincial PA system) 30 个栖息地中的22个 (除了沙漠和祁连山 山地栖息地,全省保 护区体系整体增加 2000平方公里的面 积)	PA expansion: 110,277 ha	Unlikely to be achieved
Outcome 3: Demonstration of Effective PA management through comm 成果3:在三江源国家级自然保护区通过社区参与示范有效的保护区管	unity involvement in the Sanjia 译理	ngyuan National Nature R	eserve (SNNR)	
Outputs 产出:				
 3.1 PA management system in three management units covering 59,100 通过共同管理使覆盖面积为5.91万平方公里的 3个管理分块中保 3.2 Monitoring and adaptive resource management systems in place. 	ukm ² in SNNR (Makahe, Suojia- 护区管理体系得到加强(玛可	Qumahe, Zhaling-Elinghu) 「河、索加-曲麻河、扎陵	improved through co-management 湖-鄂陵湖).	
监测和适应性资源管理体系到位 3.3 Piloting of eco-compensation schemes in demonstration areas to re 在示范区开展生态补偿试点,减少对生物多样性的威胁	duce biodiversity threats.			
Indicator 3.1: Extent of area (ha) closed from domestic grazing 家畜禁牧区扩展面积(公顷)	1,000 km² 1,000公里²	4,000 km² 4,000公里²	1,434 km ²	Unlikely to be achieved
Area of open corridors 廊道开通面积	0 km² 0公里²	500 km² 500公里²	0	Unlikely to be achieved
a within the PA under community co-management128,88国区内社区共管面积2,440 km²8,8		8,886 km² (or more) 8,886公里 ² (或更	31,439 km ² for the 12 SNNR demonstration villages; and 3,308 km ² for the 6 extension	Achieved

Indicator 指标	Baseline 基线	End of Project target 项目最终目标	TE Comments	TE Status
	2,440公里 ²	多)	villages	
Indicator 3.2: Representative management objectives provide guidance for biodiversity conservation in target areas	Management plans not in place.	Management objectives and biodiversity assessment protocols formulated in NR management plans and 12 village natural resource management plans	Management plans prepared for 3 of the 18 blocks of SNNR and for 6 separate NRs. Village resource management plans prepared for 12 villages	Achieved
Indicator 3.3: Increase in the key species number and distributions in target co-management community sites (up to 12 community field sites) 关键物种数量和目标共管社区网点分布增加(多达12个社区实地网点)	Baseline wildlife populations TBD at onset of project 项目伊始野生动物数量基线 数据待建 (Target species will be rare or endangered, to be agreed with SNNR and local communities) (目标性物种稀有或濒临绝 种,且被三江源国家级自然 保护区和当地社区认可)	Key wildlife populations maintained or increasing in co- management areas 在共管地区关键野生 动物种群数量保持或 增加。	Based upon review of the summary reports of biodiversity surveys and interviews by the TE team of the sub-contractors who led these surveys, populations of indicator species have remained steady or slightly increased.	Achieved
Indicator 3.4: Management effectiveness increased in SNNR due to co- management arrangements using the METT tracking tool 由于使用管理有效性跟踪工具进行共管安排,使三江源国家级自然 保护区管理有效性提高。	33% Management unit baselines TBD at onset of project 项目伊始管理单位基线数据 待建	70%	71%	Expected to be achieved
Indicator 3.5: Number of private-NR or of community co-management agreements: 私营保护区或社区共管协议数量:		At least 1	0	Unlikely to be achieved
- Private enterprise management agreements 私营企业管理协议 - Informal, non-binding, agreements	0	至少1个	6	Achieved

Terminal Evaluation Report, 2017 CBPF: Strengthening the Effectiveness of the Protected Area System in Qinghai Province GEF Project ID: 3992; UNDP PIMS ID: 4179

Indicator 指标	Baseline 基线	End of Project target 项目最终目标	TE Comments	TE Status
非正式的、不具约束力的协议 - Formal, legally binding, agreements 正式的、具有法律效力的协议	6 0	>10 agreements 10个以上协议 >2 agreements 2个以上协议	12	Achieved
Indicator 3.6: Awareness surveys among communities show increased positive attitude towards PA conservation 社区民意调查显示对保护区保护活动提高了积极性.	Baseline awareness TBD by Knowledge Attitudes & Practice (KAP) survey at onset of project 项目伊始由知-信-行调查的 理念基线数据待建	Baseline + 50% 基线数据+50% positive attitude 积极性	A management decision was made during the October 2016 PSC to remove this indicator. A recommended replacement indicator was proposed in the midterm review report, but the management team decided that remaining time was limited and it would be best to remove this indicator from the results framework.	Not Applicable

Annex 7: Cofinancing Table

Co-Financing Source		GEF Agency (USD million)		Government (USD million)		NGOs (USD million)		Private Sector (USD million)		Total Co-Financing (USD million)	
		Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Government											
Qinghai Department of Finance	In-kind			14.6029						14.6029	
Desertification control project in Zhiduo, Qumalai,Maduo Counties and Makehe area	In-kind				8.9710						8.9710
Black soil beach recovery project Desertification control project in Zhiduo, Qumalai,Maduo Counties and Makehe area	In-kind				8.2000						8.2000
Wetland protection project Desertification control project in Zhiduo, Qumalai,Maduo Counties and Makehe area	In-kind				1.5420						1.5420
Afforestation-Desertification control project in Zhiduo, Qumalai,Maduo Counties and Makehe area	In-kind				1.5261						1.5261
Sub-total				14.6029	20.2391					14.6029	20.2391
Government										-	
Qinghai Department of Finance	Cash			3.8971						3.8971	
Component-1: KMS development, workshop and logistic support for field visit.	Cash				0.5254						0.5254
Component-2 : Mainly use for Makehe Ecotourism development and staff trainings.	Cash				0.6674						0.6674
Component-3 : compensation for co-management, operational fee for co- management committees and small-scale facilities for impeovement of herdsmen livelihoods.	Cash				0.8339						0.8339
Project management : PMO staff salary and fee for heating and electricity	Cash				0.8719						0.8719
Others: Office facilities and euqipment(including office, conference room, electricity, water, heating and vehicle maintainence etc.)	Cash				0.0870						0.0870
Sub-total				3.8971	2.9855					3.8971	2.9855
Total Cofinancing for Project Implementation:		0.000	0	18.500	23.2246	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	18.5000	23.2246

Note: CNY:USD exchange rate of 6.9 was used to convert cofinancing in CNY to equivalent USD.

Annex 8: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct Agreement Form

Evaluators / Consultants:

- 1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
- 2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
- 3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and: respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
- 4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
- 5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
- 6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/ or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
- 7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

TE Consultant Agreement Form Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System Name of Consultants: James Lenoci, Li Jiao We confirm that we have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation. Signature: 23 June 2017 June 2017 James Lenoci, International Consultant / Team Leader Li Jiao, National Consultant

Annex 9: Terms of Reference

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of theStrengthening the effectiveness of the protected area system in Qinghai Province, China to conserve globally important biodiversity (PIMS 4179.)

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

Project	Project Strengthening the effectiveness of the protected area system in Qinghai Province, China					
Title:	to cor	nserve globally	important biodiversity			
GEF Proj	ect ID:	80635 <u>at endorsement</u>		at endorsement	at completion	
		80035			<u>(Million US\$)</u>	<u>(Million US\$)</u>
UNDP F	Project ID:	4179	GEF financing:	5,354,545		
Co	ountry:	China	IA/EA own:			
R	legion:	AP	Government:	18,500,000		
Foca	l Area:	BD	Other:			
FA Obje	ctives,		Total co-financing:	10	500.000	
(C	P/SP):			10,	500,000	
Exe	cuting	Qinghai	Total Project Cost:			
A	gency:	Forestry		23	,854,545	
		Department				
Other Pa	rtners		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		2012.09.14	
inv	olved:		(Operational) Closing Da	te:	Proposed:	Actual:
					2017.09.13	2017.12.31

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to strengthen the effectiveness of the PA system in Qinghai Province, China to conserve globally important biodiversity. The project objective is <u>to catalyse management</u> <u>effectiveness of Qinghai's PA system to fulfil its purpose of conserving globally important</u> <u>biodiversity</u>, by removing the barriers mentioned above with three inter-related outcomes. The focus of the project is to strengthen the PA system in Qinghai to better protect a representative sample of its unique biodiversity and more effectively manage this PA network as a whole. Three outcomes have been listed:

Outcome 1 Mainstreaming PA management into provincial development, plans and policies

Outcome 2: Increasing PA management effectiveness through strengthened institutional and staff capacities

Outcome 3: Demonstration of Effective PA management through community involvement

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance**, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the <u>UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects</u>. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*fill in <u>Annex C</u>*) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to (pilots in *Qinghai Province of China*), including the following project sites (*Makehe and Suojia blocks of SNNR*). Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: (Institute of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research, Institute of Zoology and Northwest Plateau Institute of Biology of CAS, Chinese Academy of Forestry, Qinghai Provincial Office of Legislative Affairs, SNNR, Natural Resources and Nature Reserve Management Bureau and Makehe Forestry Bureau of QFD, Suojia Township Administration and village co-management committees and wardens).

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in <u>Annex B</u> of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see <u>Annex A</u>), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in <u>Annex D</u>.

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA& EA Execution	rating
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	rating	4. Sustainability	rating

¹ For additional information on methods, see the <u>Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development</u> <u>Results</u>, Chapter 7, pg. 163

Relevance	Financial resources:	
Effectiveness	Socio-political:	
Efficiency	Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating	Environmental :	
	Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing	UNDP ow	n financing	Governmer	nt	Partner Age	ency	Total	
(type/source)	(mill. US\$)	(mill. US\$)		(mill. US\$)		(mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
 In-kind support 								
Other								
Totals								

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.²

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in *China*. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the

²A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: <u>ROTI Handbook 2009</u>

country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 25 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	<i>3</i> days	Before June 30th
Evaluation Mission	16 days	July 15-30
Draft Evaluation Report	5 days	August 1-15
Final Report	1 day	Before August 30

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception	Evaluator provides	No later than 2 weeks	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Report	clarifications on timing	before the evaluation	
	and method	mission.	
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP
			со
Draft Final	Full report, (per annexed	Within 3 weeks of the	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA,
Report	template) with annexes	evaluation mission	PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving	Sent to CO for uploading to
		UNDP comments on draft	UNDP ERC.

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of *(1 international and 1 national evaluator)*. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The international evaluator *will be designated as the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report)*. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

Competencies

- Strategic technical and intellectual skills in the substantive area with global dynamic perspectives;
- Leadership, innovation, facilitation, advocacy and coordination skills;
- Ability to manage technical teams and engage in long term strategic partnership;
- Entrepreneurial abilities and ability to work in an independent manner;
- Ability to work effectively in a team, with good relationship management skills ;
- Strong managerial and coordination skills, including ability to coordinate the development of large, complex projects;

- Demonstrated ability to operate effectively in a highly complex organizational context;
- Ability to maintain high standards despite pressing deadlines;
- Excellent communication (both oral and written) and partnership building skills with multidimension partners and people, skill for conflict resolution and negotiation;
- Excellent writing skills, especially in the preparation of official documents and reports;
- Good knowledge of China's environmental and socio-economic context.

Required Skills and Experience

Education

• An advanced degree in conservation, natural resources management, environmental science or related fields, preferably in PA conservation and management.

Experience

- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience including Project development, implementation and evaluation
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF, such as GEF policy and practices, GEF project requirements;
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s) including biodiversity conservation, agriculture, natural resources co-management, integrated planning, etc.
- Expertise in economic and social development issues
- Good communications and writing skills in English
- Professional experiences in working in China and with Chinese counterparts would be an advantage.
- Working experiences in high altitude areas

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English is required;
- Good knowledge of Chinese is an asset.

IT Skills:

• Good IT skills.

EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the <u>UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'</u>

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

(this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)

%	Milestone
10%	At contract signing
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation
	report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online (http://jobs.undp.org, etc.) by (May 15, 2017). Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

ANNEX A: PROJECT	LOGICAL	FRAMEWORK
-------------------------	---------	-----------

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target
Objective: To catalyze management effectiveness of Qinghai's PA system to fulfil its purpose of	 Financial sustainability score (%) for national systems of protected areas: Component 1 – Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks 	42.3 %	50%
conserving globally important biodiversity	 Component 2 – Business planning and tools for cost- effective management 	32.8%	50%
	 Component 3 – Tools for revenue generation 	36.8%	50%
	METT scores for different PAs:		
	SNNR	33%	70%
	Mengda	54%	65%
	Kekexili	50%	65%
	Qinghai Lake	58%	75%
	Golmud Poplar forest	22%	50%
	Selected indicator species that are rare and threatened show stable or upward trends in numbers (including <i>inter alia</i> wild yak, wild ass, Tibetan antelope, snow leopard, Pallas' cat, musk deer, white-lipped deer, black-	Baseline survey of selected indicator species at outset of project, in three target units of the SNNR (Suojia-Qumahe, Zhaling-Elinghu, Makahe)	Key wildlife populations maintained or increasing; appropriate population structure

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target
	necked crane, etc.)		
Outcome 1 Mainstreaming PA management into provincial development, plans and policies	PA system and its management mainstreamed within the provincial sectoral and development planning framework at the provincial level: indicated by clear inclusion of due consideration and concrete measures for biodiversity conservation and PA development, as well as ear marked budget in the sectoral development plans at provincial levels and in the (national) 13th 5-year plan.	No sectoral plans integrate PA objectives Development plans include no vision and development plan for PAs and no link is made between the PAs and development, nor no concrete measure for biodiversity conservation	At least 3 sectoral plans integrate consideration of PAs and of biodiversity conservation measures 13^{th} 5 year-Plan recognises clear linkage between PAs and provincial development, and includes PA- and biodiversity- related targets and budgets
	Threats to PAs from infrastructure placement (roads, dams) and other adverse forms of land use avoided, mitigated or offset, leading to more effective conservation in Qinghai's PA system covering 251,665km ² .	No procedure in place to deal with incompatible developments	Official standards for infrastructure development and operation within the PAs are developed and operationalised, with clear rehabilitation/offset mechanism.
Outcome 2: Increasing PA management effectiveness through strengthened	Capacity development scorecard (%) for the protected area system.	35.5%	60%
institutional and staff capacities	STRATEGIC PLANS PREPARED FOR PA INSTITUTIONS AND PROCEDURES AND INVESTMENT, AND PA STAFF NUMBERS DRAMATICALLY INCREASED	No strategic plans 160 5	Strategic Plan developed and adopted 360 150

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target
	- RANGERS - TEMPORARY STAFF(INCLUDING THE RANGERS)		
	PROVINCE'S SYSTEM LEVEL PA FINANCING INCREASED TO CLOSE THE EXISTING ANNUAL FINANCING GAP OF US\$ 4.6 MILLION FOR BASIC EXPENDITURE SCENARIO (TRACKED WITH PA FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY SCORECARD)	US\$ 2 million / year	US\$ 6.6 million per year
	RATIO OF TOTAL PA BUDGET SPENT ON FIELD OPERATIONSRAISED TO NARROW SPENDING GAP	<10% of PA revenue spent on field operations	>30% of PA revenue spent on field operations
	Reduction in illegal incident cases within the NRs – poaching, illegal harvesting, illegal- grazing,etc.	Currently no monitoring system in place. Baseline for the number of illegal incidents will be estimated at onset of the project.	Functioning policing records system with links to police/ court cases and an enhanced policing mandate of NR staff. Routine report forms designed for numerical analysis. Incidents reduced to 50% of the baseline level.
	ANNUAL INCOME DIVERTED TO PA MANAGEMENT FROM ECO- COMPENSATION AGREEMENTS (EXCLUDING FUNDS ARISING FROM THE SANJIANGYUAN ECOLOGICAL	0	>US\$1.0m

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target
	CONSTRUCTION PLAN)		
	MORE REPRESENTATIVE PA SYSTEM APPROVED WITH MOST OF 'MAJOR VEGETATION TYPES' REPRESENTED (>5% COVERAGE) IN THE NNR'S	13 of 30 habitats	22 of 30 habitats(with the addition of desert and Qilian montane habitats, and with overall increase of 2,000 km ² in provincial PA system)
Outcome 3:Demonstration of	Extent of area (ha) closed from domestic	1,000 km²	4,000 km²
Effective PA management through community	grazing Area of open corridors	0 km²	500 km²
involvement	Area within the PA under community co- management	2,440 km²	8,886 km² (or more)
	Increase in the key species number and distributions in target co-management community sites (up to 12 community field sites)	Baseline wildlife populations TBDat onset of project (Target species will be rare or endangered, to be agreed with SNNR and local communities)	Key wildlife populations maintained or increasingin co- management areas
	Management effectiveness increased in SNNR due to co-management arrangements using the METT tracking tool	33% Management unit baselines TBD atonset of project	70%
	NUMBER OF PRIVATE-NR OR OF COMMUNITY CO-MANAGEMENT		

Objective/ Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	End of Project target
	AGREEMENTS:	0	At least 1
	- PRIVATE ENTERPRISE MANAGEMENT	6	>10 agreements
	AGREEMENTS	0	>2 agreements
	- INFORMAL, NON-BINDING,		
	AGREEMENTS		
	- FORMAL, LEGALLY BINDING,		
	AGREEMENTS		
	Awareness surveys among communities	Baseline awareness TBD by	Baseline + 50%
	show increased positive attitude towards PA conservation	Knowledge Attitudes & Practice (KAP) survey at onset of project	positive attitude

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

A list of suggested key documents to include is as follows:

1. Project documents

- 1) GEF Project Identification Form (PIF), Project Document and Log Frame Analysis (LFA)
- 2) Project Inception report
- 3) Implementing/executing partner arrangements
- 4) List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted
- 5) Project sites, highlighting suggested visits
- 6) Midterm evaluation (MTE) and other relevant evaluations and assessments
- 7) Annual Project Implementation Reports (PIR), APR, QPR
- 8) Project budget, broken out by outcomes and outputs
- 9) Project GEF BD-1 Tracking Tool
- 10) Financial Data including Combined Delivery Reports (CDR)
- 11) Sample of project communications materials, i.e. press releases, brochures, documentaries, etc.
- 12) Comprehensive report of subcontracts (even in Chinese for national evaluator's reference).

2. UNDP documents

- 1) Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
- 2) Country Programme Document (CPD)
- 3) Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)

3. GEF documents

1) GEF focal area strategic Programme Objectives

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.

Evaluative CriteriaQuestions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF foca	l area, and to the environment and developmer	t priorities at the local, region	al and national levels?
•	•	٠	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of t	he project been achieved?		
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•		•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international	and national norms and standards?		
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-econon	nic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining lon	g-term project results?	
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enable	d progress toward, reduced environmental stre	ss and/or improved ecologica	Il status?
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution	Sustainability ratings:	Relevance ratings
 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems 	 Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks Unlikely (U): severe risks 	 Relevant (R) Not relevant (NR) <i>Impact Ratings:</i> Significant (S) Minimal (M) Negligible (N)
Additional ratings where relevant:		
Not Applicable (N/A)		
Unable to Assess (U/A		

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

- 1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
- 2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressedlegal rights to receive results.
- 3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
- 4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
- 5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
- 6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
- 7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form³

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System
Name of Consultant:
Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant):
I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.
Signed at <i>place</i> on <i>date</i>
Signature:

³www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct
ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁴

i. Opening page:

- Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
- UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
- Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
- Region and countries included in the project
- GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
- Implementing Partner and other project partners
- Evaluation team members
- Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
 - (See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁵)
- 1. Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the evaluation report
 - Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Baseline Indicators established
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results
- 3. Findings

2.

(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated⁶)

- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation
 - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
 - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

⁴The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁵ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁶ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues
- **3.3** Project Results
 - Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
 - Relevance(*)
 - Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Mainstreaming
 - Sustainability (*)
 - Impact
- 4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
 - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
 - Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by	
UNDP Country Office	
Name: Ma Chaode	-
Signature: Date: NOV- 20, 20/	4
UNDP GEF RTA	
Name:Lisa Farroway	
Signature: Nov. 20, 2017	

Annex 10: Signed TE Final Report Clearance Form

Terminal Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared By:		
UNDP Country Office		
Name:		
Signature:	Date:	
UNDP GEF Regional Technical Advisor		
Name:		
Signature:	Date:	