

GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS

Country/Region: China

Project Title: China: Demonstration of Estuarine Biodiversity Conservation, Restoration, and Protected Area Networking

GEFSEC Project ID: 4175

GEF Agency Project ID:

GEF Agency: FAO

GEF Focal Area (s): Biodiversity

GEF-4 Strategic Program (s):

Anticipated Project Financing (\$): PPG: \$120,000 GEF Project Allocation: \$3,516,400 Co-financing: \$11,845,080 Total Project Cost: \$15,481,480

PIF Approval Date: January 25, 2010

Anticipated Work Program Inclusion: March 17, 2010

Program Manager: Yoko Watanabe

GEF Agency Contact Person: Jeffrey Griffin

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	China has ratified the CBD and eligible for GEF BD finance.	Yes, refer comment at the time of PIF approval.
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, check if project document includes a calendar of reflows and provide comments, if any.		n/a
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	An OFP endorsement letter dated 30 Sept 2009 is attached that confirms the RAF allocation to the project, total 4 million.	Yes, refer comment made at the time of PIF approval.
	4. Which GEF Strategic Objective/ Program does the project fit into?	The project conforms well with SP2 and SP4 by focusing its initiative on marine/coastal MPA network and mainstreaming biodiversity in sector policies.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
	5. Does the Agency have a comparative advantage for the project?	Further information is required on why FAO is best positioned to work on this project, compared to the other GEF Agencies including UNDP that have been working extensively on biodiversity and wetland issues in China. 23 Dec 2009 Adequate additional information provided.	No relevant information has been provided in the CEO endorsement request. Please provide relevant information. 16 May 2012 Adequate information provided.

Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed GEF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available for (if appropriate):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The RAF allocation? 	China : Biodiversity allocation \$47,350,000, utilization \$41,568,523, pipeline \$22,188,198, Available \$-16,406,721, P.M. Recommended \$0, Net available including "P.M. Recommended" PIFs \$-16,406,721	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal areas? 	Refer above.	refer above.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic objectives? 	n/a	n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic program? 	The project is a subproject of the programmatic approach, CBPF - China Biodiversity Partnership Framework for Action.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
Project Design	6. Will the project deliver tangible global environmental benefits?	<p>The GEB is stated and formulated in a very vague manner at this point. Please provide further tangible information, in line with the GEF BD strategy and including coverage data if available.</p> <p>23 Dec 2009 Adequate additional information provided with specific measurable indicators.</p>	
	7. Is the global environmental benefit measurable?		<p>Adequate indicators have been identified and incorporated in the project framework to measure the GEBs. However, baseline has yet to be established to adequately measure the identified indicators. Under GEF5, it is required that baseline data are established by the time of CEO endorsement (it should not wait until the first year of project implementation as stated in the request document). Please provide appropriate baseline information and data, and clarify the targeted project results.</p> <p>In addition, the target of 10% increase in METT scoring is a rather low target. Please clarify the current score, and review</p>

			<p>whether the project could aim for a higher target.</p> <p>16 may 2012 Adequate information provided.</p>
	<p>8. Is the project design sound, its framework consistent & sufficiently clear (in particular for the outputs)?</p>	<p>The project design is comprehensive but very ambitious. It is also rather confusing to understand which components and outcomes will be achieved at which levels, i.e. national, provincial and local levels. Please further clarify and provide focus in its approach.</p> <p>The threats and barriers in conserving estuarine ecosystem needs to be further explained and clarified by the time of CEO endorsement.</p> <p>23 Dec 2009 Adequate additional information provided.</p>	<p>As noted in the document and also commented during PIF review, the project design is comprehensive but very ambitious, covering two of the largest deltas in China. The PM suggests the proponents to further review the project design and focus on fewer outputs and activities that are critical and can produce catalytic impact at both policy/institutional and site levels.</p> <p>On component 2 (MPA networking etc):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On outcome 2.1: It is not very clear, from the identified outputs and indicators, what exactly the project will be implementing in the 11 target PAs. Is it focused only on the development of the management plans? Please clarify and identify adequate activities to strengthen the MPA system management. - On the restoration outputs, the GEF BD fund do not typically support restoration initiatives. The cost effectiveness and impacts of this pilot activity is questionable. Please review. This activity should be supported by cofinance or otherwise deleted/reconsidered. Considering the limited funding of the project, it is suggested that the project should focus on cost effective and impactful activities, particularly on strengthening the MPA system management. <p>On component 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - International study tours are no longer eligible for GEF finance, and it should be

			<p>financed by cofinance or otherwise deleted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outcome 4.2 and other sections in the project framework notes about the "non-project supported activities." It is unclear what this means. Please clarify. If the activities are not supported by either GEF or cofinance, why is it stated? <p>On component 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The identified budget is rather excessive for information dissemination activities. Please further clarify the type of activities and review/reduce the budget as appropriate. <p>16 May 2012 Adequate information and revision made besides the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) International study tour is not eligible, and should be reviewed and considered as specific training opportunity on related topic for the targeted participants. Please revise accordingly. 2) On the non-project supported activities, while these education and awareness raising activities are considered relevant for the project, it would be best to be included as cofinance. If not, it is unclear how the results and impacts would be monitored and accounted as result of the project. 3) Component 5 is further clarified with relevant information. The PM suggests that the title of the component to reflect the replication effect of the activities rather than just information dissemination. <p>13 July 2012</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) While the title is revised to south-south training and exchange of practices, the content is still no difference to international
--	--	--	--

			<p>study tour for senior officials and such activities are not supported by GEF grant since GEF-4. Please allocate cofinancing for this activity or delete.</p> <p>2) As it is clarified that the "non-project activities" are actually supported by cofinance, it should be considered as part of the project and such terminology is considered not appropriate. Please delete the language (i.e. non-project supported activities) and incorporate them as regular project activities. Please revise accordingly.</p>
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national priorities and policies?	The project's link with key national policies and strategies are well recognized.	Yes, the linkage with key national policies and strategies, including the recently approved NBSAP is well recognized.
	10. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>Number of related initiatives are noted, particularly with GEF IW projects. Please also recognize the link with the UNDP Wetland Conservation Project, which has recently completed and how the project will build up on its initiatives. Moreover, there are number of wetland related projects under GEF-4 CBPF projects, and their link to this project needs to be clarified as well.</p> <p>23 Dec 2009 Additional adequate information provided. Further details on the coordination mechanism and linkage need to be provided at the time of CEO endorsement.</p>	<p>Relevant projects are noted and listed. Coordination with the CBPF, particularly with the GEF5 CBPF-MSL program is important considering the focus of this project. However, it is rather unclear how this project will coordinate with the program in concrete terms. Please further clarify the coordination mechanism.</p> <p>16 May 2012 Adequate information provided.</p>
	11. Is the proposed project likely to be cost-effective?	General information is provided. Further detail is expected at the time of CEO endorsement.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated in project design?		<p>The cost-effectiveness of some of the project activities, particularly on the restoration activity, is not clear. Pls review and revise this project activity.</p> <p>16 May 2012</p>

			Adequate information provided.
	13. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF?		Project framework has been slightly modified based on PPG findings. Cofinancing amount has slightly increased (about \$100000).
	14. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and includes sufficient risk mitigation measures?	Potential risks are identified and these needs to be built in in further project preparation and framework.	Yes, appropriate risks have been identified and appropriate mitigation measures are built in project design.
Justification for GEF Grant	15. Is the value-added of GEF involvement in the project clearly demonstrated through incremental reasoning?	Further explanation would be useful to understand what would happen without GEF's investment, and what kind of leveraging impact the GEF resources would bring. 23 Dec 2009 Adequate additional information provided.	Further clarification and revision is suggested on how the mobilization of and impact on the national and local commitments would differ with the GEF support. 16 May 2012 Adequate information provided.
	16. Is the type of financing provided by GEF, as well as its level of concessionality, appropriate?	Grant resources are sought and justified.	Refer comment at the time of PIF approval.
	17. How would the proposed project outcomes and global environmental benefits be affected if GEF does not invest?		Without GEF investment, the progress could be slow in transforming the local insitutional environment towards a more integrated, inter-agency approach that s required to manage the highly complex estuarine ecosystems.
	18. Is the GEF funding level of project management budget appropriate?	The management budget is identified at 10% and proportionate to the cofinance.	management budget remains as 10% and considered appropriate.
	19. Is the GEF funding level of other cost items (consultants, travel, etc.) appropriate?		The local consultant fee is appropriate and there would be no international consultant working on project management. There is also no travel and office equipment charged to the GEF fund. The planning, coordination, stakeholder consultation budget are not typically supported by the GEF under the project

			<p>management cost, and the amount is high. Please review and re-categorize the cost to other appropriate budget lines.</p> <p>16 May 2012 Adequate information provided. However, aggregation of costs still seem to remain under one budget line (no cost noted under travel...). Please clarify.</p>
	20. Is the indicative co-financing adequate for the project?	Cofinancing ratio is 1:3.3 and considered adequate.	
	21. Are the confirmed co-financing amounts adequate for each project component?		Yes, cofinancing ratio has improved to about 1 to 3.4 ratio.
	22. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators?		<p>No, only a BD2 tracking tool for the Pearl river estuarine site has been provided. Considering that the project's main focus is on the MPA management, the BD1 tracking tool for both Yellow and Pearl river sites are required. BD2 tracking tool for Yellow river site is also missing. Please provide all necessary tracking tools.</p> <p>16 May 2012 Thanks for the clarification.</p>
	23. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes, and it is considered appropriate with relevant budget.
Secretariat's Response to various comments from:	STAP	Please provide adequate response once the comments are made.	Adequate responses provided. However as noted earlier, baseline information is required before CEO endorsement.
	Convention Secretariat	Please provide adequate response once the comments are made.	n/a
	Agencies' response to GEFSEC comments		There were several comments at the time of PIF review that noted need for further information and clarification at the time of CEO endorsement. Please provide responses on how these comments have

			<p>been addressed and incorporated in the project design.</p> <p>16 May 2012 Adequate information provided.</p>
	Agencies' response to Council comments		<p>Adequate information has been provided. However please review the ambitious project outputs and activities, and provide further focus that could lead to concrete project impact.</p> <p>16 May 2012 Adequate information provided.</p>
Secretariat Decisions			
Recommendation at PIF	24. Is PIF clearance being recommended?	<p>No, further information and revision are required based on above comments, particularly on the GEB and project design. Upon receipt of a revised PIF that adequately responds to the comments, the PM will recommend the PIF for CEO clearance.</p> <p>23 Dec 2009 A revised PIF has been received which adequately responds to and provides additional information based on earlier comments. The PIF is recommended by the PM for CEO clearance.</p>	
	25. Items worth noting at CEO Endorsement.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement	26. Is CEO Endorsement being recommended?		<p>No, please kindly address and provide further information based on the comments made above. Upon receipt of a revised CEO endorsement package that adequately respond to the comments, the PM will recommend the project for CEO endorsement.</p>

			<p>16 May 2012 No, please refer to further revision required based on comments made under section #9. Upon receipt of a revised document that adequately respond to the comments made, the PM will recommend the project for CEO endorsement.</p> <p>13 July 2012, No, please refer to further clarification made under section #9 and revise the document accordingly. If further clarification is required, please do not hesitate to contact the PM. Upon receipt of a revised document that adequately respond to the comments made, the PM will recommend the project for CEO endorsement.</p> <p>1 Nov 2012 Yes, all comments have been adequately responded and document has been revised. The PM will recommend the project for CEO endorsement.</p>
Review Date	1 st review	December 02, 2009	February 16, 2012
	2 nd review	December 15, 2009	May 16, 2012
	3 rd review	January 06, 2010	July 13, 2012

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	Activities 1 to 4 on workshops: The GEF do not support workshops for its own purpose but only for a clear outputs that are required for project preparation. Thus, pls revise the PPG request accordingly. Workshops could only be a tool to further clarify and identify certain project components, stakeholder analysis, etc.

		<p>Activity 7: technical consultants and travel are not activities. These should be embedded in other relevant activities. It can not be a stand alone activity as it is noted now.</p> <p>April 9, 2010 Additional information on the outputs of the workshops are noted. However, as GEF does not support standalone workshops and to ensure consistent formulation with other activities under this PPG, the PM suggest that the activities 1-5 to be further revised with a heading of, for example, 1) Assess and clarify institutional arrangements of the project; 2) Determine project sites; 3) stakeholder identification and analysis; 4) Develop and agree on project design, logframe, etc. The Annex B also do not match with the activities listed under table C and requires revision. Please kindly submit the revised activities and annex accordingly.</p>
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>It is expected that there is at least one to one cofinance for the PPG as well, particularly considering the country's capacity.</p> <p>April 9, 2010 The cofinance has not increased at a ratio of 1.2 to 1, and considered adequate.</p>
	3. Is the proposed GEF PPG Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available under the RAF/Focal Area allocation?	xxPPGResorcesxx
	4. Is the consultant cost reasonable?	The local consultant fee is identified as \$365 per week and international consultant fee at \$2133 and considered adequate.
Recommendation	5. Is PPG being recommended?	<p>No. The PPG requires further revision based on the above comments. Upon receipt of the revised PPG request that adequately responds to the comments, the PM will recommend it for CEO approval.</p> <p>April 9 2010 As commented above, please revise the activities and annex and resubmit. Upon receipt of the revised PPG request that adequately responds to the comments, the PM will immediately review and recommend it for CEO approval.</p> <p>April 20 2010 The GEFSEC received a revised PPG that adequately responds to the earlier comments. The PM recommends the PPG for CEO approval.</p>
Other comments		
Review Date	1 st review	March 22, 2010
	2 nd review	April 09, 2010

wb21049

C:\Users\wb21049\Documents\Visual Studio 2008\WebSites\WebSite9\LetterTemplates\ReviewSheetforGEFProject.rtf

8/28/2009 4:16:00 PM