

TERMINAL EVALUATION

Project ID:	5139
Project Name:	Sustainable Forest Management to Enhance the Resilience of Forests to Climate Change
Countr(ies):	China
Implementing Agency:	FAO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW3

A. Description3

B. Key Dates3

C. Disbursements3

II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES4

A. Main Terminal Evaluation Findings4

B. Stakeholder Engagement9

C. Gender Equality10

D. Knowledge Management11

III. CORE INDICATORS12

IV: CO FINANCING14

V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS14

VI. ANNEX15

I. Overview

A. Description

Project name

Sustainable Forest Management to Enhance the Resilience of Forests to Climate Change

Country

China

GEF ID

5139

Implementing Agency

FAO

Executing Entity

State Forestry Administration (SFA)

Trust Fund

GET

Project Type

FSP

Objective

To enable local communities in four Chinese provinces to effectively employ incentive-based sustainable forest management (SFM) practices in reforestation and forest restoration activities, enhancing carbon storage and sequestration as well as biodiversity conservation.

B. Key Dates

CEO Endorsement/Approval

4/10/2015

Agency Approval

7/21/2016

Implementation Start

9/30/2016

First Disbursement

8/1/2017

Expected MTR

MTR Submission

1/21/2026

Actual MTR

5/19/2020

Expected Completion

12/31/2025

Actual Completion

12/31/2025

Actual TE

4/30/2025

TE Submission

1/21/2026

Final Disbursement

C. Disbursements

Project Financing

7,832,237.00

Cumulative Disbursement

7,114,964.87

II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

A. Main Terminal Evaluation Findings

Executive summary

Introduction

1. This report presents findings and recommendations of the terminal evaluation (TE) of the project “Sustainable forest management to enhance the resilience of forests to climate change in China”. This TE is a requirement of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) for project monitoring and reporting purposes.
2. The project’s environmental objective was “To enable local communities in four Chinese provinces to effectively employ incentive-based sustainable forest management (SFM) practices in reforestation and forest restoration activities, enhancing carbon storage and sequestration as well as biodiversity conservation”. The project’s development objective was “To increase and improve provision of goods and services from forestry in local communities across four Chinese provinces in a sustainable manner, particularly emphasising the long-term resilience of restored and reforested forest areas against environmental pressures”. The project was structured around three main components:
Component 1: Strengthened institutional, policy and regulatory frameworks for the implementation of sustainable forest management from national to local level, creating a basis for enhanced biodiversity conservation and carbon sequestration. Four outcomes and nine outputs.
Component 2: Demonstration and adoption of SFM practices, enhancing carbon storage and improving biodiversity conservation. Three outcomes and eight outputs.
Component 3: Training and capacity development; awareness raising and knowledge exchange; monitoring, evaluation and dissemination of best practices. Three outcomes and nine outputs.
3. The objective of the TE has a dual function of accountability and learning. It assesses the project results and their value, and aims to draw lessons to facilitate the design and implementation of similar projects in the future. The primary audience and users of the TE are the central Project Management Office; the FAO Country Office and other FAO staff; the GEF as the primary international donor; and Chinese counterpart institutions, such as the provincial forest management bureaus and the state-owned forest farms.
4. The TE covers the project implementation period since its entry-on-duty date of 30 September 2016 until the end date on 31 December 2024. FAO is finalizing its project implementation obligations until 31 December 2025, during which period the project is not active. The TE covers all geographic areas and all project components.
5. The evaluation was undertaken by a team of two experts: an international consultant (lead evaluator) and a national consultant (technical expert). The TE was based on several evaluation questions that were provided in the terms of reference for the evaluation. The methodology involved multiple sources of data. The evaluation used qualitative methods and quantitative secondary analysis of some project monitoring data. The following four main data collection methods were used: (i) desk reviews of all relevant documents and information; (ii) key informant interviews (KIIs) with project stakeholders; (iii) focus group discussions (FGDs) with some stakeholders to draw out experiences in a group setting; and (iv) field visits. The field visits, FGDs and most KIIs were conducted between 21 to 30 April 2025, during a field mission to China. Data analysis was conducted to address the evaluation questions and ratings were assigned to some criteria, in accordance with the GEF evaluation requirements.

Findings and conclusions

Conclusion 1. Relevance and coherence. The project had strong alignment with the country's environmental and developmental priorities and this alignment has increased since the project was designed, especially with priorities around sustainable forest management, biodiversity conservation and carbon sequestration. The project was consistent with three GEF-5 programme strategies (CCM-5, BD-2 and SFM/REDD+), made a strong contribution to the previous FAO Country Programming Framework for China (especially given that

SFM was one of seven Impact Focus Areas) and is making a strong contribution to the current CPF. The project was well aligned with the mandates of executing partners, although it did not have a strong component of working with beneficiaries from local communities. The project had good external coherence, because the design responded well to political and policy trends, was well harmonized with the two significant national initiatives that provided the core of the project's co-financing, and added value and avoided duplication of effort. The project was well designed to deliver global environmental benefits and to develop SFM models and practices, but design shortcomings – in particular the lack of actions to support forest managers outside the forest farms to employ incentive-based SFM practices – meant that there was limited opportunity for the project to meet its environmental objective outside the 16 targeted forest farms. There was poor internal horizontal coherence between the environmental and development objectives.

Conclusion 2. Efficiency. There were significant delays at project startup due to long negotiations of the Operational Partners Agreement between the Operational Partner and the FAO and the time needed to open the project bank account. In spite of these delays, the FAO/OP partnership has been constructive and the implementation modality chosen has reflected strong national ownership. The project only delivered 52.0 percent of the GEF allocation, due to various issues, especially that several state-owned forest farms were not reimbursed for approximately USD 2.4 million worth of SFM project work they had undertaken on their land, because they did not follow procurement requirements when they had engaged services to do the work. These expenditures, originally meant to be charged on the GEF grant, added instead to the co-financing, thus representing a significant proxy of national ownership of the project. There were additional delays during implementation, especially due to COVID-19 impacts and due to challenges with putting in place delivery arrangements for activities in the 16 forest farms; therefore, the project received two no-cost extensions totalling 2 years and 2 months of extension. The cost effectiveness of the total project expenditure and the timeliness are considered moderate.

Conclusion 3. Effectiveness. The project's interventions have successfully strengthened relevant institutional, policy and regulatory frameworks from national to local level, with several policy and adjustments of national policies and guidelines now being administered by the NFGA, although there was no evidence that the project's experience at the local level was used to inform this. A range of high-quality incentive-based SFM, biodiversity and carbon sequestration interventions were made in the 16 forest farms (although the targets for area covered and carbon emissions reductions were partially met). The forest farms now each have an SFM Plan that is used regularly by practitioners in most forest farms. Local monitoring systems are now in place, allowing local forest managers to collect information to guide the local application of SFM practices, although the data collected cannot be easily accessed by the forest farms. The project implemented extensive training and capacity building, and personnel in the 16 forest farms are using the skills learned to implement new SFM practices, although there is no assessment of the effectiveness of the training or improvements in capacity. The project also implemented a range of knowledge sharing and public awareness activities, although there is no information available on the reach or effectiveness of these. The project laid solid foundations towards the environmental objective, with incentive-based SFM practices being implemented on the participating forest farms, but there has been little progress outside forest farms because the project design did not include actions to support local communities outside the target forest farms to enable them to effectively employ incentive-based SFM practices. Despite only 52.0 percent of the GEF allocation being expended, the GEF grant brought good incremental value in innovative approaches and technologies for SFM, biodiversity conservation and carbon management in forests. The planned co-financing from both the Operational Partner and FAO was fully materialized and made vital contributions to the project's achievements.

Conclusion 4. Sustainability. Important steps have been taken during implementation to increase the likelihood that results will be sustainable, such as through the strengthening of policy and regulatory frameworks, extensive capacity building activities, the development of strong partnerships of experts, and awareness raising about the project's approaches. The main risk is the financial sustainability of the SFM models developed, especially because many of the practices and models used involve higher input costs (such as selective logging and forest tending) and therefore have higher unit costs to produce, and SFM-accredited timber products do not always attract a premium. The project explored various approaches to mitigating this

risk, such as developing an under-forest economy and exploring innovative market-based models that generate a sustainable flow of funds to forest managers to care for slow-growing trees.

Conclusion 4. M&E. The M&E plan at the time of project endorsement identified sufficient resources and budget for M&E activities. However, the results framework did not include any indicators or targets relating to community beneficiaries (such as the number of direct community beneficiaries or the generation of socio-economic benefits) or the level of effective employment of incentive-based SFM practices, did not include measures to assess the effectiveness of training and capacity building, and some targets for the areas covered by relevant activities and associated carbon emissions reduction were somewhat unrealistic. The project followed the M&E plan and most information was gathered systematically and in a timely manner, although there were some shortcomings to the measurement, reporting and evidence against some indicators in the results matrix, which meant that some progress reporting in PPRs and PIRs was not realistic.

Conclusion 6. Gender equality and other equity and human rights issues. Although in the project document the consideration of gender issues was weak, the project was proactive in mainstreaming gender equality during implementation, including providing relevant training, preparing gender-disaggregated reporting, and developing a gender mainstreaming work plan. Also, although other equity and human rights issues were not mainstreamed during the project design, the project advanced human rights when employing local people to undertake work on the forest farms, especially by involving people from ethnic minority groups, supporting them in generating income and other socio-economic benefits, and advancing labour rights for people engaged to undertake manual labour.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1. (CPMO – immediate). The Sustainability Plan / Exit Strategy should be updated by including an analysis of the risks that may affect the sustainability of the project benefits (financial, institutional, environmental, socio-political and others) to identify additional actions that may be necessary to maximize sustainability and replication of the project's results.

Recommendation 2. (NFGA – before 31 December 2025). NFGA should share the M&E and database system to the 16 forest farms so that they can continue to monitor and improve their forest management outcomes.

Recommendation 3. (Provincial and county forestry bureaus and forest farms – Medium term). Build partnerships with research institutes and universities to investigate broader ecological benefits from the innovative SFM practices, especially conversion of monocultures to mixed species forest.

Recommendation 4. (State-owned forest farms – Medium term) State-owned forest farms should work with villages and individual forest farmers to support them to understand benefits and adopt the project's SFM practices.

Recommendation 5. (ICC – Future similar projects). Ensure that requirements for procurement and financial management are spelled out clearly at the start of all contractual arrangements. Ensure that a risk assessment is done for any significant changes to project implementation arrangements and responsibilities, including when project partners are assigned new procurement responsibilities.

Recommendation 6. (ICC, FAO China, responsible OCB FLO and GTO – Future projects) When implementing future similar projects, ensure that robust monitoring frameworks are in place and are used to efficiently inform reporting and evaluation; in particular, analyse early how indicators and targets will be interpreted, measured and reported against, including having this approved by the LTO and noted by the project steering committee / project advisory committee.

Suggestions:

- Ensure that reporting in PIRs and PPRs is reliable and evidence-based
- Ensure that reporting and evidence are prepared in a timely manner to be ready at the start of MTRs and TEs, including clear explanation of methodologies
- Ensure that training and capacity building for project management at project inception make clear the requirements and expectations around measurement, reporting and evidence
- Ensure that comprehensive records are kept of project training sessions, with the minimum required information being the attendees (including gender), their organization, and the training topic covered.

Recommendation 7. (NFGA, Fujian Provincial DARA, Shunchang Forest Farm – Medium term). Consolidate in a document the innovative practices and knowledge from the “One Yuan Carbon Credit” scheme in

Shunchang Forest Farm in Fujian province, and promote the initiative beyond Fujian province, including offering technical training on the model, to facilitate development of similar policies and investment nationwide.

Lessons learned

Lesson learned 1. Some projects require significant shifts at the MTR to refocus on achieving the objective. This project's strategy was well designed to strengthen policy frameworks, develop innovative SFM models and practices, increase institutional capacity and deliver global environmental benefits. However, it was missing actions and indicators that were specifically focused on supporting local communities outside the forest farms to employ incentive-based SFM practices. It would have been very valuable at the time of the MTR to have added actions to provide relevant capacity building and support to local communities outside the target forest farms and to add indicators reflecting the benefits that would have been expected. This would have been feasible given the high level of underspend at the time of the MTR (5.5 percent disbursed at that time).

Lesson learned 2. Documentation with evidence is critical for project management and reporting. Documentation with evidence is a critical part of GEF project management and reporting, to enable transparent validation of reported results. A systematic approach to reporting and evidence should be adopted from project inception. This may include establishing a standardized table to document data and attach evidence, which should be validated by project staff. The information should be readily available and logically presented, rather than relying on sources that cannot be substantiated (such as several years of area reporting from different provinces that cannot be tracked). As described under Recommendation 6, this should include systematic record keeping for all training and capacity building.

GEF evaluation criteria rating table

GEF criteria/dimensions	Rating ¹	Summary comments
A. OUTCOMES (relevance, coherence, effectiveness and progress to impact, efficiency)	MS	
A1. Relevance	S	Very high alignment with the country's environmental and developmental priorities and this alignment has increased since the project was designed; well aligned with the mandates of executing partners. See Section 3.1.
A2. Coherence	MS	Project design responded well to political and policy trends, and was well harmonized with the two significant initiatives that provided most of the project's co-financing; well designed to deliver global environmental benefits and develop SFM models and practices, but limited vertical alignment with its environmental objective because it did not include actions to support forest managers outside the forest farms. There was also poor internal horizontal coherence between the environmental and development objectives. See Section 3.2.
A3. Effectiveness	MS	The project laid solid foundations towards the environmental objective and made low progress towards development objective, due to project design shortcomings; successfully strengthened policy and regulatory frameworks, made a range of good-quality SFM, biodiversity and carbon sequestration interventions, and made a substantial contribution to strengthening capacities; achieved 23 of 26 indicators and 3 were partially achieved; not all targets for the area of forest under improved management and CO ₂ -e reduction were achieved, and reported training activities were only partially verified. See Section 3.4.
A4. Efficiency	MU	Startup delays and COVID-19 delays led to 2 years and 2 months of extension; relationships between OP and FAO were good; the modality reflected strong national ownership and institutional capacities were enhanced; low GEF disbursement (52.0 percent) due to various issues, especially the non-reimbursement of project partners for some incurred costs because they did not follow procurement requirements; cost-effectiveness was moderate and timeliness was moderate. See Section 3.3.
B. SUSTAINABILITY (financial, sociopolitical, institutional and governance, environmental dimensions including risks to sustainability)	ML	Sustainability is considered moderately likely; the main risk is the financial sustainability of the SFM models developed, although the project explored various innovative approaches to mitigating this risk. See Section 4.
C. IMPLEMENTATION	MS	Worked closely with the CPMO and OP in attempts to address the project's delays and accelerate the required procurement and reimbursement for works on the forest farms, although the agreed solution had mixed success; also, did not identify and correct shortcomings with project reporting against targets in PPRs and PIRs; otherwise fulfilled requirements as GEF Agency. See Section 3.3.1.

GEF criteria/dimensions	Rating ¹	Summary comments
D. EXECUTION	MS	Shown strong ownership, delivered technically good results, and generally fulfilled the requirements as OP. Liaison with PPMOs and forest farms over contractual and procurement arrangements for delivery of SFM works took several years and the agreed solution to the difficulties had mixed success; also, there have been shortcomings in reporting against some project indicators during PIRs and PPRs and for this terminal evaluation. The OP will facilitate follow-up to the project, especially through application of the national guidelines and standards. See Section 3.3.2.
M&E plan	MU	M&E plan identified sufficient resources and budget for M&E activities; however, the results framework did not include any indicators or targets relating to community beneficiaries or the level of effective employment of incentive-based SFM practices, did not include measures to assess the effectiveness of training and capacity building, and some targets for the areas covered by relevant activities and associated carbon emissions reduction were somewhat unrealistic. See Section 5.1.1.
M&E implementation	MS	Project followed M&E plan and most information was gathered systematically and in a timely manner. There were some shortcomings to the measurement, reporting and evidence against some indicators in the results matrix, which meant that some progress reporting in PPRs and PIRs was not realistic. See Section 5.1.2.
Overall project rating	MS	

Source: Evaluation team

Legend:

Satisfactory (S)

Moderately satisfactory (MS)

Moderately unsatisfactory (MU)

Moderately likely (ML)

Validation by the FAO Office of Evaluation

The report has been subject to independent quality assurance and validation exercises performed by FAO's Evaluation Office (OED). The performance ratings for the "Sustainable forest management to enhance the resilience of forests to climate change in China" (GEF ID 5139) project, set out in the GEF rating scheme, have been adjusted as a result. The overall project performance is validated at the Moderately Satisfactory level. See appendix 12 – OED validation scheme - for details on the validation of individual criteria ratings.

B. Stakeholder Engagement

Project partnership and stakeholder engagement

Finding 26. The project has built strong and sustainable partnerships and engaged effectively with most stakeholders during implementation.

172. During implementation, the project built strong partnerships and engaged effectively with stakeholders, including:

- The project built strong and productive expert partnerships, especially between government forestry staff and experts in universities and other research institutions. This includes partnerships within provinces involving provincial experts. The project's monitoring system has underpinned this, with rigorous monitoring enabling robust research projects to be developed.
- These partnerships were partly facilitated by the project's implementation and governance arrangements: provincial PMOs were set up in the provincial forestry departments, and these PPMOs used GEF funds to recruit specialized provincial consultants according to their needs.

- In the locations of the forest farms where the project’s interventions were delivered, a variety of partnerships were developed. For example, in Hainan, partnerships were developed with privately managed forests and the project participated in activities that had a focus on economic approaches to achieving SFM, biodiversity and CCM outcomes; and in Guangxi, some forest farms have deliberately developed relationships with local communities, including ethnic minorities, to provide employment and other socio-economic benefits. The good relationships between the county staff and forest farms and the local communities are vital to these partnerships

- The partnership between NFGA and FAO has been constructive and mutually respectful, underpinned by the OPA, as described under Finding 4.

173. The project document provides little information on the stakeholder engagement undertaken during the design stage. It is presumed that adequate engagement with national government and provincial government stakeholders was undertaken, because the project was well aligned with their priorities and responded well to political and policy trends. Also, the systematic analysis of forest statistics and identification of priority forest farms suggests that county-level government stakeholders were also closely involved. The project document refers to a consultation workshop in Guangxi in November 2013 (p.143).

174. However, as described under Finding 23, there was little evidence of local communities being involved in the design, and the project has only limited content that targets identified priorities of local communities or that aims to ensure that they benefit from the project.

175. The project document did not contain a stakeholder engagement plan.

176. During implementation, stakeholder engagement was good. As described in Appendix 5 under reporting for Outputs 3.1.4, 3.2.1, 3.2.2 and 3.3.2, the project built and promoted the use of various mechanisms for consultations with and between stakeholders and for the dissemination of project-related information to and between stakeholders, including:

- WeChat groups established at national and provincial levels
- Official project website
- 16 issues of project newsletter providing information and update
- Book “Good Practices of Sustainable Forest Management” published
- A “forest classroom” mechanism that combines indoor theoretical lectures with practical field-based learning
- Provincial experts were required under their contracts to visit field sites and share their knowledge.

177. The TE team considers these mechanisms to have been effective. During site visits and interviews, there was a good awareness of these mechanisms for engagement and information sharing, and the level of technical knowledge at provincial, county and forest farm levels was high.

C. Gender Equality

Gender and inclusion

Evaluation question 8.3: Were gender equality and empowerment and other equity and human rights issues mainstreamed in the project, both in design and implementation?

Finding 24. The project document contained no gender-specific activities, no gender-disaggregated targets and no requirement to develop a gender mainstreaming strategy, and did not address women’s empowerment. However, in response to an MTR recommendation, the project was proactive in mainstreaming gender equality during implementation, including providing relevant training, gender-disaggregated reporting, and developing a gender mainstreaming work plan. Women’s empowerment was addressed by providing equal opportunities for women to participate in paid labour on a “equal pay for equal work” basis in some project locations.

163. The project design contained no gender-specific activities and the results framework contains no gender-disaggregated targets. No gender analysis was conducted and there was no requirement for the project to develop a gender mainstreaming plan. Also, the project design did not address women’s empowerment. It

should be noted that, as a GEF-5 project, there were few formal requirements regarding the inclusion of such gender-related components in project design.

164. The MTR in 2020 found that there had been limited attention to gender issues during implementation and made a series of recommendations to address this. In response, the project put in place a range of measures, including:

- Conducted a gender awareness training course in 2021, which included relevant FAO policy and GEF requirements (under the guidance of FAO);
- Conducted follow-up practical training in 2021;
- Commenced collecting and reporting on gender-disaggregated reporting on participation in training and activities; and
- Prepared a Gender Mainstreaming Work Plan (2022–2023) in 2021.

165. These measures represented a notable improvement in the project’s approach to gender issues. Furthermore, from 2021 the reporting on gender mainstreaming in the PIRs and PPRs was significantly improved.

166. Some positive results relating to gender mainstreaming and gender equality are:

- Women are provided equal opportunities to participate in labour undertaken by local communities, especially planting, tending and protecting forests, on a “equal pay for equal work” basis for piece-work; the level of female participation in paid labour was up to 50 percent (in Huangbaishan Forest Farm in Henan).
- In Dongfang City in Hainan, the forest farm employs couples rather than individuals to assist family units to remain intact rather than some members leaving the village for other work.
- The CPMO reported that 22.7 percent of training participants were women.
- Female staff were involved in the project at all levels.

167. The equal opportunities for women to participate in paid labour on a “equal pay for equal work” basis represents an effort toward empowerment of these women to access opportunities and resources. There are no other examples of women’s empowerment from the project.

168. A gender expert was not engaged to guide this work, with the CTA and FAO experts providing the expertise.

Finding 25. Other equity and human rights issues were not mainstreamed into the project design, although the project advanced human rights when employing local people to undertake work on the forest farms, especially by involving people from ethnic minority groups, supporting them in generating income and other socio-economic benefits, and advancing labour rights for people engaged to undertake manual labour.

169. Other equity and human rights issues were not mainstreamed into the project design. As described under Finding 23, there is little evidence that either local communities or ethnic minority groups were engaged in project design and the project does not contain relevant activities or reporting.

170. The MTR in 2020 found that there had been limited attention to working with ethnic minorities in Fujian, Guangxi and Hainan provinces, where there are high populations of ethnic minorities. The TE team found that there were few formal project processes to involve ethnic minorities, but that there was a high level of involvement in project activities because ethnic minority members had equal opportunities to participate. In addition, the population of ethnic minority in some locations is particularly high, and a high percentage of local staff and other project stakeholders were from ethnic minority groups. An FGD was held with two people from the Yao minority group who were employed to undertake forest tending activities at Shankou forest farm in Guangxi; it was apparent that the employment on the forest farm provided enhanced income and an opportunity to work near their communities and families rather than having to travel away for work. This generated socio-economic benefits to the community.

171. The project also advanced human rights issues by protecting participants’ labour rights, especially with the “equal pay for equal work” principle.

D. Knowledge Management

Communication, knowledge management and knowledge products

Finding 27. Knowledge management has been a strength of the project, reinforced by a wide variety of SFM interventions that are underpinned by monitoring and research, a major training element, and a project culture of “learning by doing”. There has been little formal engagement with local farmers outside of the target forest farms to transfer technical knowledge, due to a shortcoming in project design.

178. The project developed a communication strategy (2022–2023) in 2021, in response to a recommendation of the MTR. This identified various knowledge sharing methods that were adopted, including the mechanisms identified under Finding 26 under engagement.

179. Knowledge management was a key element to the strategy of this project, with Component 3 focused on training and capacity development, knowledge management, and M&E. Reporting on Outcomes 3.1 and 3.2 in Appendix 5 provides information on relevant project activities. The key elements of this are described below.

- The M&E system was a key tool, providing a web-based portal providing access to an extensive supply of knowledge products and project tools.
- The M&E system including a database for storing and analysing monitoring data (although forest farm staff could not easily access this).
- Extensive technical training and capacity building was provided to national, provincial and local (county and forest farm) stakeholders. This included a variety of learning models, including the “forest classroom” model and development of close partnerships between provincial experts and project participants.
- The project had a strong culture of “learning by doing”, with the interventions under Component 2 intended to inform the policy and regulatory work in Component 1 and the training and capacity building in Component 3.

180. The most significant knowledge product developed was the publication of a book containing many best practices obtained from the project’s results; the TE team was provided with hard copies of this book and it is a well-produced and technically rigorous publication.

181. As noted elsewhere, there has been little formal engagement with local farmers to transfer the technical knowledge of project practices and models developed by the project. This is a shortcoming in project design, not in implementation.

III. Core Indicators

Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes under third-party certification incorporating biodiversity considerations

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Type/Name of Third Party Certification

Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value or other forest loss avoided

Disaggregation Type	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4.5 Terrestrial OECMs supported

Name of the OECMs	WDPA-ID	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)

Documents (Document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

Title

Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (direct)				5478726
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (indirect)				11088422

Indicator 6.1 Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (direct)				5,478,726
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (indirect)				11,088,422
Anticipated start year of accounting				
Duration of accounting				

Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) Sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (direct)				
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting				
Duration of accounting				

Indicator 6.3 Energy Saved (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Total Target Benefit	Energy (MJ) (At PIF)	Energy (MJ) (At CEO Endorsement)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at MTR)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at TE)
Target Energy Saved (MJ)				

Indicator 6.4 Increase in Installed Renewable Energy Capacity per Technology (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Technology	Capacity (MW) (Expected at PIF)	Capacity (MW) (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at MTR)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at TE)
------------	------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Indicator 11 People benefiting from GEF-financed investments

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female			0	4,779
Male			0	1,418
Total	0	0	0	6,197

IV: Co Financing

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Anticipated at CEO(\$)	Materialized at MTR(\$)	Materialized at TE(\$)
Recipient Country Government		Grant		40,650,000.00	27,583,942.00	46,853,214.00
Recipient Country Government	SFA and Henan Provincial Forestry	In-kind		7,350,000.00	8,841,266.00	915,442.00
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant		400,000.00		
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind				458,304.00
Total Co-financing				48,400,000.00	36,425,208.00	458,304.00

Comments

The FAO co-financing commitment was changed from “Grant” in the original project document to “In-kind” in the revised project document in January 2023

V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
		Low	Low

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

The project document did not assign an overall environmental and social risk rating, although it was assessed as Low risk in the first PIR in 2018. In all subsequent PIRs this Low risk was confirmed, although there was no justification given in the PIRs for this rating being confirmed. Given that the project is strongly promoting SFM, biodiversity conservation and CCM and no social and environmental risks have arisen during implementation, the TE team considers the rating of Low risk as appropriate.

VI. ANNEX

Uploaded Document

Document Category	Prefix	Title
M and E Document	Tracking Tool	GEFID5139_SFM Tracking Tool at TE
M and E Document	Tracking Tool	GEFID5139_CCM Tracking tool at TE
M and E Document	Tracking Tool	GEFID5139_BD Tracking tool at TE
M and E Document	Terminal Evaluation (TE)	GEFID5139_TER_FAO_China