

## Audit Trail

The following comments were provided regarding the draft terminal evaluation (TE) report; the TE team's response and actions taken are summarized in the rightmost column:

Commentator	Comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team's response and actions taken
PMO	Opening Page	Start Date: 1 March 2014; Closed: 28 February 2019	According to the PIR reports, the start date was 24 January 2014 and the closing date was 26 February 2019.
PMO, XD	Executive Summary, Table 2, TE Ratings, Quality of Execution	PMO: We have different views on MS rating regarding quality execution. We consider that because of the timely adjustment of project management staff that the project management level and quality can be effectively improved and the implementation progress can be promoted. Especially after the mid-term evaluation, the relevant expert team has been adjusted, and the implementation rate and quality of the outcomes have been improved. Therefore, it is suggested that the quality assessment be "satisfactory". XD: I agree to Mina, because the quality of execution has been greatly improved. So it is suggested to remove "moderately"	The TE team carefully deliberated this rating and others. We agree that there were improvements throughout the project; however, there several issues that influenced our decision to rate this aspect as moderately satisfactory, including shortcomings in M&E, inconsistent financial delivery and changes in key positions including National Project Director and Project Manager. Based on internal ratings of project implementation indicated in the PIR reports, ratings of moderately satisfactory were applied in 2015 and 2016 and moderately unsatisfactory in 2017.
GJ	Executive Summary, Table 2, TE Ratings, Relevance	The rating scale for 'Relevance' is "R" (Relevant) or "NR" (Not Relevant). The rating table shows "Highly Satisfactory", so change that to "R".	Consistent with the 2017 GEF TE guideline, the TE team suggests applying the 6-point rating scale for relevance.
XD	Executive Summary, Table 2, TE Ratings, Efficiency	The project is efficiency after Mid-term review. Need to further explanation.	The TE team agrees that there were improvements after midterm. However, financial delivery was inconsistent overall; spending was highest near the end of the project and 19% of the GEF funds were unspent by the end of 2018. Regarding cofinancing, the project was not tracking contributions from confirmed cofinancing partners and contributions from other partners, including investments mobilized (e.g., purchase of infrared camera traps) were not recorded as cofinancing.
XD	Executive Summary, Table 2, Sustainability	Suggest to change the rate as "Satisfactory" because the activities on alternative livelihood is very good and will be continued. Not appropriate. Not suitable Normal situation in China Security concerns could be deleted, because now security is not a problem for tourism in Xinjiang Not strong evidence, especially the impacts from climate change will not be obvious in this relative small area.	The project did a good job demonstrating alternative livelihood opportunities among a few local communities. Capacities of the community based organizations remain generally low and will require further support. The mechanisms for replicating the co-management and alternative livelihood approaches to other communities near PA's in the Altai region is unclear. Even though it might be the normal situation in China (and in other countries) that officials among government agencies change, this does affect sustainability, as the institutional cohesiveness and capacity are disrupted. The TE team considers that security is an issue in Xinjiang, even though there are extensive law enforcement officials through the autonomous region. Potential climate impacts are uncertain and will likely be gradual; these are not affecting the sustainability rating for this project but, in our opinion, need to be considered.
XD	Executive Summary, Recommendation No. 1, Sustainability Strategy	May not necessary because the project has already produced a lot of policies, legislations, standards, guidelines, plans, management plans, which can ensure the sustainability after the project closure. Furtherly, if do this, does the "sustainability strategy and action plan" need to be officially approved?	It is unclear how some of the deliverables produced under the project will be institutionalized. In our opinion, a sustainability strategy and action plan would help provide guidance to enabling stakeholders on how to effectively institutionalize or mainstream the project deliverables. We would suggest that the

Commentator	Comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team's response and actions taken
			project steering committee review and approve the sustainability strategy and action plan.
XD	Executive Summary, Lessons Learned, Co-Management	This is not correct. In page 37 (output 3.2) it is stated that 8 co-management committees have been formed at village level. This means that the co-management agreements have been signed by the local communities.	Community collaborative management refers to community based organizations (CBOs) implementing PA management – not local government. The co-management agreements involve 2 parties, the NR management administration and local governments. The local community members have not formalized into CBOs.
XD	Executive Summary, Lessons Learned, KM Strategy	This is not clear expression. Usually they have strategic approach for all activities in hearts, not a written strategy document. It may be not good to draft so many strategy and action plans.	In our opinion, it would have been advisable to draft a strategy and action plan for communications and knowledge management. The strategy and plan could be rather simple; the main issue is to formulate a strategic approach, identify key stakeholder groups, decide upon key messages, etc.
GJ	Table of Contents, Annexes	Include the following in the list of Annexes: -Annexed in a separate file: Terminal GEF Tracking Tool -Annexed in a separate file: Audit Trail	Added to the tables of contents
XD	Section 2.2, Problems that the project sought to address	Should be "Uyghur".	The majority of English translations use the "Uyghur" version; and the project document uses Uyghur.
PMO	Section 4.1, Outputs, Output 2.5, Figure 8	Suggest not to include this picture in the TE report.	OK, noted. This photograph was deleted from the report.
PMO	Section 4.1, Outputs, Output 3.1, Figure 11	矿点的图也建议不要贴在报告里，阿尔泰山的稀有金属属于国家战略储备，领导建议去掉这张图。The map of the mine site is also recommended not to be posted in the report. The rare metal of the Altai Mountains belongs to the national strategic reserve, and management has suggested removing the map.	OK, noted. This photograph was deleted from the report.
XD	Section 4.1, Outputs, Output 3.2	Here, the co-management committees at local communities have been established. But this report in page 11 says "not", so please revise the words in page 11 under "lessons learned"	Community collaborative management refers to community based organizations (CBOs) implementing PA management – not local government. The co-management agreements involve 2 parties, the NR management administration and local governments. The local community members have not formalized into CBOs.
XD	Section 4.2.1, Effectiveness, Outcome 2, Indicator 6	Actually, this is achieved, because Xinjiang government already issued the regulation to ban mining activities in protected areas, and reclamation technologies of abandoned mining sites have been demonstrated in other places in Altai region.	TE assessment has been upgrade to "Partially achieved". Clear standards have not been officially established.
XD	Section 4.2.1, Effectiveness, Outcome 2, Indicator 9	PMO can provide evidence (whether mining rights have been revoked in other PA's in the AMWL region).	No evidence was available.
XD	Section 4.2.1, Effectiveness, Outcome 2, Indicator 10	The co-management committee at community level couldn't be formalized as a government-run mechanism.	The summary has been revised and the TE assessment upgraded to "Mostly achieved".
XD	Section 4.2.1, Effectiveness, Outcome 3	It is suggested to change the rating as "satisfactory"	The rationale for the rating of "moderately satisfactory" is explained in the discussion regarding the level of achievement of each of the performance indicators.
XD	Section 4.2.1, Effectiveness, Outcome 3, Indicator 13	PMO can check if the master plan has been approved by XFD by far.	No evidence was available.
XD	Section 4.2.1, Effectiveness, Outcome 3, Indicator 14	PMO can provide the figure to verify the target has already achieved.	There was no evidence available that demonstrates this. One issue is the phrasing of the end target, i.e., "average income for park residents ...". The demonstration alternative livelihood activities on the project were implemented for some households in a few communities.
XD	Section 4.2.1, Effectiveness, Outcome 3, Indicator 16	This actually is achieved (wildlife populations).	There was no evidence available that demonstrates that the end target was fully achieved. The targets should have been

Commentator	Comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team's response and actions taken
			adjusted at project inception, and monitoring data should have been better reported.
PMO, XD	Section 4.2.2, Relevance	PMO: Relevance is rated as HS in Table 2 Evaluation Rating. XD: This is a rated as "highly satisfactory" in Table 2 (page 8).	Noted. Changed here to "highly satisfactory".
GJ	Section 4.2.2, Relevance	Same comment as above. Use "Relevant" or "Not Relevant". This page shows "Satisfactory", which should be changed to "Relevant". Include brief text on the relevance of the project to UNDP country programming.	Consistent with the 2017 GEF TE guideline, the TE team suggests applying the 6-point rating scale for relevance. The relevance of the project with respect to the UNDP country programming has been added to the discussion in this section of the TE report.
XZ	Section 4.2.3, Efficiency	The correct amount will be \$2,862,008. The total expenditure for 2015 should be \$1,032,033. All delivery rates look good.	The total project expenditures were updated with the Q1 2019 figures.
GJ	Section 4.2.3, Efficiency	The first paragraph on this page states that operational closure will occur on 27 February 2019. Please note that operational closure cannot happen until the TE is done and the TE IC and NC are paid.	After clarification with the RTA, the TE team understands that the project has been effectively operationally closed in February 2019; however, the system does not yet indicate this.
XD	Section 4.2.3, Efficiency	After mid-term review, the project implementation is very efficiency indeed. It is suggested to change the rating in to "satisfactory".	The TE team agrees that there were improvements after midterm. However, financial delivery was inconsistent overall; spending was highest near the end of the project and 19% of the GEF funds were unspent by the end of 2018. Regarding cofinancing, the project was not tracking contributions from confirmed cofinancing partners and contributions from other partners, including investments mobilized (e.g., purchase of infrared camera traps) were not recorded as cofinancing.
XD	Section 4.3, Sustainability, Socioeconomic Dimension	It should be "likely" because the benefits will be continued even after the project closure.	A "moderately likely" rating does not mean that benefits are not expected to continue. Rather, this rating highlights that there are certain risks that need to be addressed, including the capacities of local community organizations.
PMO	Section 4.4, Progress towards Impact	Mining rights were revoked by government	OK, noted and revision made.
XD	Section 6.2, Quality of Execution	It is suggested to change the rating as "satisfactory" because XDF has tried best to promote the project implementation more efficiency under the special situation in XUAR for security issue.	rating and others. We agree that there were improvements throughout the project; however, there several issues that influenced our decision to rate this aspect as moderately satisfactory, including shortcomings in M&E, inconsistent financial delivery and changes in key positions including National Project Director and Project Manager. Based on internal ratings of project implementation indicated in the PIR reports, ratings of moderately satisfactory were applied in 2015 and 2016 and moderately unsatisfactory in 2017.
XD	Section 7.3, Environmental and Social Safeguards	PMO can explain it (EIA not being made for reclamation of mining sites).	The PMO did not explain this.
GJ	General Comment	Although it is not part of the TE guidance for GEF-financed projects, it would be helpful to add some text, in any appropriate section (Relevance? Other Assessments?), on linkages between the project and relevant SDG targets/indicators	Contributions to Aichi targets and SDG targets and indicators have been added to the report in Section 7, Other Assessments.

GJ: Gabriel Jaramillo; PMO: project management office; XD: Xue Dayuan; XZ: Xinhua Zhao