



**GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\***  
**THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS**

GEF ID:	4356		
Country/Region:	China		
Project Title:	Securing Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use in China's Dongting Lake Protected Area		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$2,950,000
Co-financing:	\$6,205,000	Total Project Cost:	\$9,155,000
PIF Approval:	December 10, 2010	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Yoko Watanabe	Agency Contact Person:	Random DuBois

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	The project was first considered during GEF4 under the PMIS 4101.  China has ratified the CBD and eligible for GEF BD finance.	
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	A duly completed endorsement letter dated Sept 2, 2010 is attached that indicates a total commitment of \$3.3 million from the GEF5 STAR BD allocation, including PPG and Agency Fee.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Though the comparative advantage of the FAO is noted in the PIF, please further clarify FAO's experience in protected areas and wetland management in China  19 Nov 2010	

	5. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	FAO is contributing \$24000 in grant and \$298000 in kind for the project, which is 5% of the total cofinance.	
	6. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	The linkage with the UNDAF and some experience with GEF biodiversity projects in China are noted, however, it is useful to have some more detail information on the biodiversity projects that FAO have engaged in and the staff capacity in the country.	
Resource Availability	7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes, it is the first BD project under GEF5. China has an allocation of \$52 million.	
	• the focal area allocation?	Refer above.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?	n/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	
Project Consistency	8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	The linkage with BD1 and BD2 are clearly identified with measurable RBM framework.	
	9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/ LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	Yes, BD1 and BD2.	
	10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA?	The linkage with the NBSAP (Dongting is identified as one of the 16 priority sites for wetland conservation, and CBPF are noted.	
	11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes?	Capacity development is incorporated and followed by the policy, planning and institutional arrangements that the project will be engaged in to ensure sustainability.	
	12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	Section B1 is intended to explain the "baseline projects," which are initiatives that the government and other partners are planning to conduct with the current situation with their finance. Although the	

<p>Project Design</p>		<p>are no description on what the government and FAO are planning to do in Dongting, which would be considered as the "Baseline Project" for the GEF investment. Some information that has been provided under B2 should be included and expanded under B1. Please kindly revise and provide further information.</p> <p>19 Nov 2010, Relevant information has been provided, including Public Ecological Forest Compensation Programme (total RMB 246m), Wetland Service Compensation Scheme (RMB 11m), and National Wetland conservation programme (RMB 2m).</p>	
	<p>13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>It would be useful to include information on what has been achieved through the earlier investments on related activities, particularly the achievements made by the GEF/UNDP project. Also identify the remaining gaps to better understand the problems in the project site area. Please provide additional information.</p> <p>19 Nov 2010, Detail information provided. It provides necessary justification for further GEF investment, including: 1) expanded geographical area (former project covered only one reserve, but this one would cover all four); 2) different but complimentary project activities (former project focused on awareness raising and demonstration, biodiversity monitoring, and multi-sectoral planning, while the new project will focus on policy and regulatory system, institutional and financial sustainability, and livelihood system); and 3) different scale of funding (former project allocated only about \$1m, while this one will be approx \$3m).</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>The project framework is sufficiently sound with relevant components and</p>	

		is required to determine the relevance based on information on the former investment, particularly through the GEF/UNDP project. The detail information provided during GEF4 for the project could be included as an annex or in the relevant section.	
	15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem?	The incrementality to ensure sustainability (through policy, planning, and financial arrangement and development) is recognized. As noted above, the "baseline project" needs to be further clarified based on above comment to further justify the incrementality.	
	16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes, measurable GEB indicators have been identified in the PIF.	
	17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?	To be clarified at the time of CEO endorsement.	
	18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)?	The description is rather general at this stage. Necessary baseline data as well as socio-economic assesment, including gender, should be conducted or information should be compiled based on earlier investment in the same area to determine relevant project interventions and activities.	
	19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?	General information has been provided at this stage. Further information are required at the time of CEO endorsement based on stakeholder consultations.	
	20. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	Adequate information provided at this stage. Further analysis and details are required at the time of CEO endorsement.	
	21. Is the provided documentation	n/a	

	22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?	Refer comments under section 19.	
	23. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	As commented above, provide further information on the GEF/UNDP project in the same area, including GEF grant amount that was directed to the same site. This is particularly important to clearly demonstrate the gap and need for further investment.	
	24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	To be commented at the time of CEO endorsement.	
	25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost appropriate?	The management cost is identified at 10% of GEF total grant and proportionate to the cofinance. Table A and B are inconsistent in the project management costs. Please revise to ensure coherence.  19 Nov 2010 Revised adequately.	
	28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the incremental/additional cost reasoning principle?	Costs are generally considered appropriate. Further details on the budget are required at the time of CEO endorsement.	
	29. Comment on indicated cofinancing at PIF. At CEO endorsement, indicate if cofinancing is confirmed.	Cofinance is identified at about 1 to 2 ratio. Considering the country, all efforts should be made to increase the cofinancing ratio by the time of CEO endorsement.	

	30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Refer comments under section 28 above.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	To be completed by the time of CEO endorsement.	
	32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	Please provide adequate response once comments are made.	
	• Convention Secretariat?	Please provide adequate response once comments are made.	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	Please provide adequate response once comments are made.	
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>No, please refer to the above comments and provide adequate revision and further information. Particularly it is important to provide additional information on the earlier GEF investment, including information that has been prepared during GEF4 project development. Upon receipt of a revised PIF that adequately respond to the comments made, the PM will recommend the project for further processing.</p> <p>19 Nov 2010 A revised PIF was received which includes adequate information and revision based on earlier comments.</p> <p>UA: However, In line with recent Council decision GEF/C.39/09 on "Rules and Guidelines for Agency Fees and Project Management Costs", the project management costs need to be slightly</p>	

		adjustments.  UA 21-08-2010: Adjustments have been made. PM recommends PIF for CEO clearance.	
	35. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 17, 2010	
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 19, 2010	
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 09, 2010	

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.

## REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	The set of activities are generally considered appropriate with a few comments: 1) build on existing information as much as possible based on former GEF investment rather than conducting new assessment and study: 2) conduct necessary socio-economic assessment, including gender as appropriate.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	The cofinancing of the PPG is also expected to reflect the project cofinancing ratio. The current PPG cofinancing ratio is about 1 to 1, when the project is 1 to 2. Please review and revise as appropriate.  Please clarify how many workshops are planned in total.  Local consultant fee is average \$800 and international consultant is about \$2000, and considered appropriate.  19 Nov 2010 Cofinancing has been improved to 1 to 2 ratio.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	No, please refer to the above comments, particularly the cofinance and the socio-economic issues. Upon receipt of a revised PPG request that adequately respond to the above comments, the PM will recommend the PPG for CEO approval.  19 Nov 2010 A revised PPG has been received, which adequately addresses earlier comments.  UA: However, considering earlier GEF and other investments in the project area, the GEF could provide no more than \$50,000 for this PPG. Pls revise the PPG as appropriate.  UA 12-08-2010: Has been revised. PPG is recommended for CEO approval.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 17, 2010
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 08, 2010

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.



