



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Asia and The Pacific Region
Country (ies):	China
Project Title:	Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Land Management in the Soda Saline-alkaline Wetlands Agro Pastoral Landscapes in the Western Area of the Jiling Province
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/CPR/048/GFF
GEF ID:	4632
GEF Focal Area(s):	Biodiversity, Land Degradation, MFA
Project Executing Partners:	The Department of Water Resources of the Jilin Province
Project Duration:	4 years

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	23 June 2015
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	18 November 2016
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	07 March 2021
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	
Actual Implementation End Date³:	

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	2,627,000
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	16,800,000
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	131,350
Total estimated co-financing	

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

³ Actual date at which project implementation ends/closes operationally -- only for projects that have ended.

⁴ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	
---	--

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	22-24 August 2019
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	Yes

Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	MU	
Overall implementation progress rating:	U	
Overall risk rating:	M	

Status

Implementation Status (1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	1 st PIR
--	---------------------

⁵ Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

⁶ Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Yao Chunsheng, Project Manager, FAO China Office	Chunsheng.Yao@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Li He, Program Officer, FAO RAP, Bangkok	He.Li@fao.org
Budget Holder	Vincent Martin, FAO Representative in China and DPR Korea	Vincent.Martin@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Yurie Naito, Programme Officer, FAO GEF Coordination Unit	Yurie.Naito@fao.org

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Objective(s):						
Outcome 1:						
Outcome 2:						
Outcome 3:						

⁷ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

⁸ Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

⁹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)**, **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**.

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹⁰

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?

¹⁰ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 1.1.1 <i>(please write output entry)</i>	Q1 Y3	<i>e.g 5 farmer field schools established in 4 pilot sites</i>	<i>5 working farmer field schools and 4 in progress</i>				%	
Output 1.1.2		<i>e.g. baseline study</i>	<i>n/a (or done)</i>				%	
Output ...							%	
Output							%	
							%	

¹¹ Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

¹² As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹³ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

¹⁴ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):

Max 200 words:

The GEF project had been approved by the GEF in June 2015 and was launched in March 2017, when the first Project Steering Committee Meeting and Project Inception Workshop were held. However, due to some changes in government priorities, a delay in the implementation of the Songyuan Irrigation Area (an important baseline project), and the need to identify alternative pilot sites, the implementation of the project has been delayed.

A technical field assessment of project sites in the Jilin-BCSLM Project had been conducted in September 2018 and an assessment report completed in December 2018. The change of pilot sites was agreed by the multi-stakeholder meeting on 9th September 2018 and by the Jilin Water Resource Department on 10th September 2018.

In April 2019, FAO's GEF Unit took a lead to revise the project document for the CPR/048 Jilin project (GEF ID 4632), following the "procedures for Minor Amendment for FSPs" modality outlined in the GEF Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy (2017). The revised project document has been approved by FAO GEF Unit in June 2019. The project document as well as the 2019 AWPB have been approved by the Project Steering Committee in August 2019.

It is anticipated that the project will be able to fully resume implementation once the change of pilot sites is approved. Since the start of the project has been delayed, thus, there will be some delays in the realization of the GEBs.

What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?

Max 200 words:

Only in September 2018, the Operational Partner (OP) has agreed to receive the technical assessment organized by FAO to identify new pilot project sites. The report has been finalized by the FAO's Lead Technical Officer in December 2018. During 2019, based on the assessment report, FAO has prepared the revised ProDoc including updated logframe in June. Based on which, the OP and FAO have agreed on the action plans with timeframe, such as recruitment of CTA, preparation of AWPB.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating ¹⁵	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating ¹⁶	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator			<i>This project has been delayed for over two years mainly because the project sites have to be changed due to some changes in key government baseline projects. FAO has made great efforts to work with OP to identify new potential projects and revise the project documents so that the initially proposed GEBs can still be achieved. The revised project document has been approved by FAO GEF Unit and the new PMO has been set up with new project director and newly recruited CTA. It is expected that the project will be able to get back on track after the PSC meeting held during August 22-24th.</i>
Budget Holder			<i>This used to be a problematic project and it's been seriously delayed due to various reasons. I'm glad new project sites have been selected and the revised project document has been approved thanks to great efforts of FAO and OP. The new project director shows strong leadership and would like to speed up the implementation of the project. I believe the project will be able to resume implementation soon. However, more training should be provided to PMO to strengthen the capacity on GEF project management and implementation.</i>
Lead Technical Officer¹⁷			<i>As Executing Partner requested, a joint field work identified the necessary replacement of the project sites, the changes were endorsed by stakeholders, and approved by the PSC meeting conducted on 22-24 Aug 2019. The project implementation has been re-initiated.</i>

¹⁵ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁶ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁷ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

GEF Funding Liaison Officer			<i>The project has suffered a long delay in project start-up due to combination of challenges. After the revised project document has been completed in mid-2019, several follow up meetings/exchanges have taken place with the provincial government which shows a strong commitment and possesses a technical expertise to carry out the implementation. FAO will continue to provide required support to make positive progress in the project activities.</i>
------------------------------------	--	--	--

3. Risks

Environmental and Social Safeguards (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid¹⁸. If not, what is the new classification and explain.

Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
<i>The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant.</i>

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
1					

¹⁸ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

¹⁹ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²⁰ If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period”.

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
2					
3					

Project overall risk rating (Low, Medium, Substantial or High):

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months²¹

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes		
Project Outputs		

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval, please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	<p>Original NTE: Revised NTE:</p> <p>Justification:</p>

²¹ Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

5. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)?

Was a gender analysis undertaken or an equivalent socio-economic assessment? Please briefly indicate the gender differences.

Does the M&E system have gender-disaggregated data? How is the project tracking gender impacts and results?

Does the project staff have gender expertise?

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

- closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;
- improving women's participation and decision making; and or
- generating socio-economic benefits or services for women.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.

If applies, please describe the process and current status of on-going/completed, legitimate consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities

7. Stakeholders Engagement

Please report on progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO Endorsement/Approval (when applicable))

If your project had a stakeholder engagement plan, specify whether any new stakeholders have been identified/engaged:

If a stakeholder engagement plan was not requested for your project at CEO endorsement stage, please

- list all stakeholders engaged in the project;
- briefly describe stakeholders' engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes.

8. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval

- Please tell us the story of your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihood and how it is contributing to achieve the expected global environmental benefits
- Please provide the links to publications, video materials, etc.

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²²	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
		TOTAL				

Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement

²² Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** - Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”); **Satisfactory (S)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings); **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits); **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** - Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives); **Unsatisfactory (U)** - Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits); **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** - The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

Implementation Progress Rating – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice”. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action. **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action. **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.