



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

GEF ID:	4662		
Country/Region:	China		
Project Title:	CBPF-MSL: Piloting Provincial-level Wetland Protected Area System in Jiangxi Province		
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; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$133,018	Project Grant:	\$5,289,000
Co-financing:	\$26,692,000	Total Project Cost:	\$32,114,018
PIF Approval:	April 16, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	June 07, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Yoko Watanabe	Agency Contact Person:	Jeffrey Griffin

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes, China has ratified the CBD and eligible for GEF BD finance.	Yes, as noted at time of PIF approval.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, an endorsement letter from the OFP dated 31 Aug 2011 is attached.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	No, please provide further information on the FAO's experience in wetland and species conservation as well as experiences in working with the concerned province and actors. 2 April 2012 Additional information has been provided.	Yes, as noted at time of PIF approval.

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	n/a
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	The project is in line with the UNDAF. FAO has increased capacity in China to manage their biodiversity portfolio, which is considered adequate.	Yes,as noted at time of PIFapproval.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes, this is a sub-project of the China PFD on CBPF- Main Streams of Life, that works on strengthening of wetland PA systems in China (GEF \$23 million). This PIF is planned for \$5.910 million under the PFD, and it is coherent with the PIF request.	Yes,as noted at time of PIFapproval. No change in project amount.
	• the focal area allocation?	refer above.	refer above.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	n/a
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	n/a
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	n/a
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	n/a
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes, the project will particularly contribute with additional PA coverage of 500000ha. 2 April 2012 Please clarify the hectarage of the new protected areas under table A on FA strategy framework.	Table A now notes 216431 ha, which is a significant decrease from the time of PIF approval. Further, this number is inconsistent from the number noted under component 2, which states 93357ha. Please kindly clarify the coverage and have it consistent throughout the proposal. Further, please explain the significant decrease in coverage from the time of PIF approval.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>The conformity with the BD 1 could be further strengthened, with a clear PA system/network approach at the provincial and national level.</p> <p>The proposal takes a site based approach at the Lake Poyang Ecosystem, though it is understood that it also covers the limited sub-system with the network of four nature reserves. What kind of impact could this project make at the provincial level on wetland PA system management? Would it be feasible to work on a provincial level wetland PA system, while Poyang lake be placed as a key site initiative? Identify concrete link with the national level PFD and umbrella PIF.</p> <p>2 April 2012 Adequate revision has been made in line with the GEFSEC comments. The project now takes a wetland PA system approach at the provincial level with a site level demonstration at Poyang Lake PA network.</p>	Yes,as noted at time of PIF approval.
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	<p>The linkage with the key national strategy and plan are recognized. While we know the global importance of Poyang lake ecosystem, please provide further information on how the Poyang Lake has been identified and prioritized as a critical site for wetland conservation under key national strategies, including the NBSAP.</p> <p>2 April 2012</p>	Yes,as noted at time of PIF approval.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Adequate information provided. Please incorporate the response provided in the Response Paper in the PIF, including the fact that the Poyang Lake and Jiangxi Province has been listed as one of the priority sites under the NBSAP.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes, capacity building through policy and regulation development, and education and awareness raising initiatives is noted.	Yes, as noted at time of PIF approval.
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>While the baseline project on the conservation initiative is noted, further information is required on the status and impact of the development initiatives at the site, associated with the Ecological Economic Zone Project along with the plan to develop a dam/barrage that could have a significant impact on the wetland ecosystem.</p> <p>Unless the GEF is provided with sufficient further information on this issue, including appropriate assurance and commitment from the government and appropriate plans, the GEF would not be in a position to provide further finance towards the area.</p> <p>2 April 2012 Adequate additional information provided. Please incorporate the response in the PIF. The description provided in the risk section is rather vague compared to what has been stated under the response paper.</p>	Concern on the dam/slucice gate still remains. Please refer to the comments made under the risk analysis section below.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		Shift in approach to strengthen the existing PA network is generally understood. Please clarify the how much the project is targeted to increase management effectiveness of existing PAs (not very clear from the project framework) to further understand the cost effectiveness of the project.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>The scenario with and without GEF financing should be further clarified to assess the incremental reasoning.</p> <p>2 April 2012 Adequate information provided and the new project design at the PA system level further clarifies the incremental benefits of the GEF investment. Again, please incorporate the response in the PIF.</p>	Yes,as noted at time of PIF approval.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>The project should further analyze what has already been done in this globally significant freshwater site, including the GEF funded projects, and analyze gaps for further interventions. The GEF project on migratory birds with UNEP has provided significant support for the conservation of the lake. In order to justify further financing in the same sites, description on the achievements and gaps should be clearly presented, including information from the former project evaluation.</p> <p>In addition, the GEF BD FA strategy has moved from supporting site level PA management to strengthening capacity at the system level . The</p>	<p>The project framework is sufficiently clear with measurable indicators with baseline date. However, there are some overlaps with outcomes and outputs statement. Please revise as necessary.</p> <p>Please also further clarify how the project is planning to ensure sustainability of PA system in Jianxi province. The activities related to sustainable finance seems rather weak in the project framework. Please identify relevant activities, outputs, and outcomes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Programmatic Approach on wetland PA management, the parent PFD, calls for a national and provincial level system management. The approach should be further clarified and revised based on the comments also made above.</p> <p>Supporting alternative livelihood initiatives would only work in specific conditions, and many literatures have proved its limitation for conservation. Please review the approach and provide necessary information.</p> <p>The description on the programmatic approach needs updating.</p> <p>It seems there are few baseline and threat analysis already conducted in and around Poyang Lake by NGOs and other organizations, such as IUCN and WWF. Please clarify and reconsider the need for further analysis under the PPG and also under the project.</p> <p>2 April 2012 Significant revision has been made on the project framework in line with the earlier comments. Below are a few comments on the project framework. Please further consider and revise as necessary:</p> <p>1) Outputs 1.1.4 may fit better under component 3.</p> <p>2) Outcome 1.2. 30% improvement in</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>METT score may or may not be significant depending on the baseline value. We suggest that actual value is stated as a target rather than percentage.</p> <p>3) Output 2.1.3. Please state brief information on the different rehabilitations and restoration techniques that are envisioned under the project.</p> <p>4) Alternative livelihood pilots are still noted under B.3. Please incorporate response provided in the response paper in the relevant section of the PIF.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>The Global Environmental Benefit could be described in a more tangible manner, with measurable indicators. Please provide further information on the GEB, including PA coverage and species.</p> <p>2 April 2012 Significant improvement has been made with the revision. Please note the comment above on the METT percentage target.</p>	<p>Please clarify on the PA coverage information as noted above.</p>
	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?</p>	<p>Yes, sufficient information provided at this stage. Through further assessment during the project preparation phase, appropriate activities and indicators should be developed by the time of CEO endorsement.</p>	<p>There are no socio-economic indicators included in the results framework. Gender issues are also not clarified. Please provide further information and include relevant indicators as appropriate.</p>
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role</p>	<p>There are number of organizations involved in conservation action in the region, particularly the international</p>	<p>Role of CSOs are clarified. Please clarify if there is any involvement of indigenous peoples/ethnic minorities in</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	identified and addressed properly?	<p>NGOs. Please provide further information on the baseline activities conducted by these organizations with the government, and clarify potential collaboration for the proposed project implementation.</p> <p>2 April 2012 Adequate additional information has been provided. Further concrete lessons from the earlier GEF investment should be assessed during PPG, so that this project will clearly built on them.</p>	the area.
	18. 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)	<p>The risks from the development activities, including the dam construction should be further erabolated.</p> <p>2 April 2012 Please provide explicit information based on above comment and response provided in the response paper.</p>	The major risk on the wetland with the construction of the sluice gate continue to be real and serious. Please clarify whether there has been any key policy direction (in addition to the speech of the former governer...) that provides convincing argument that the government is serious to consider ecological impact of the gate, and all the analysis that the project is planned to conduct will be seriously considered to mitigate the risk. It raises question on whether commitment of GEF investment at this timing is appropriate, if we have not secured policy and strategical assurance at a longer term in the past few years during project preparation, while the governor has changed. Please provide further information and clarification.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	No, please provide further information on the GEF financed projects as well as other NGOs and organizations' work, and how the project build on them.	Yes, coordination with other related projects, particularly with the projects under the programmatic approach on wetland PAs are recognized.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>2 April 2012 Adequate information provided. Additional detail on the coordination mechanism and lessons are expected at the time of CEO endorsement.</p>	
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>The role of the identified actors and the arrangement for implementation are not clear. Please provide further information.</p> <p>2 April 2012 Adequate information provided.</p>	<p>Yes, adequate information has been provided.</p>
	<p>21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>Please clarify the question on new and exciting PA coverage as noted above.</p>
	<p>22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>		<p>n/a</p>
Project Financing	<p>23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>It is exactly 5 percent and considered adequate.</p> <p>2 April 2012 The project management cost should be less than 5% of the project sub-total cost (i.e. total of components, not the project grand total). The PMC is slightly higher than 5% of the project sub-total cost. Please revise.</p>	<p>Yes, consistent with the time of PIF approval.</p>
	<p>24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>The overall cofinancing is expected to increase to at least 1 to 5, and also increase cofinancing ratio for each objective/component.</p> <p>2 April 2012</p>	<p>Cofinancing ratio is 1 to 5.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		The comment has not been reflected in the revised PIF. Other sub-projects under this Programmatic Approach had cofinancing ratio of 1 to 6-7. Please review and increase the cofinance ratio as stated.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	As noted above, the overall ratio is expected to increase at least to 1 to 5, particularly considering that there has been earlier GEF investment in the area and the baseline actions and commitment from the government and other organizations are essential. 2 April 2012 Please address the issue.	All cofinancing letters are provided.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	The cofinancing of the Agency is very limited. Every efforts should be made to increase the cofinance. 2 April 2012 Additional information has been provided. FAO's cofinance is identified as total of \$380000, including some cash.	FAO's contribution has decreased to 320000, all in kind. Please explain the change since PIF approval.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes, adequately completed TT has been submitted for all PAs.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes, adequate M&E plan provided.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 	Please provide adequate responses once comments are provided.	Yes, adequate response provided.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• Convention Secretariat?	Please provide adequate responses once comments are provided.	n/a
	• Council comments?		Please further clarify and provide explanation on the dam/slucice gate issue as noted above under the risk section.
	• Other GEF Agencies?	Please provide adequate responses once comments are provided.	n/a
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>No, please provide further information and revise the PIF based on the comments made above. The information on the development activities (dam construction) and former GEF investment are critical issues that require detail information and further assessment to identify relevant project interventions.</p> <p>2 April 2012 Significant revision has been made on the project framework, in line with earlier comments made by the GEFSEC. However, there are still a few remaining issues as noted above, including cofinance, project management cost, and others. Please address the comments and resubmit a revised PIF.</p> <p>12 April 2012 The GEFSEC received a further revised PIF that adequately responds to all comments made earlier. The PM recommends the PIF for work program inclusion.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>4 April 2014 No, please submit a revised CEO</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		endorsement request package by adequately responding to the comments made above. 21 Aug 2014 Yes, all issues have been adequately addressed and responded. The PM recommends the project for CEO endorsement.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 20, 2011	April 04, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 02, 2012	August 21, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 12, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **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. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	It is not very clear why the assessment of the methodologies for economic valuation requires to be a separate component and requires that much funding. As commented also under the PIF review, please clarify the former and ongoing work on assessing the status and needs of the PA system, including diagnosis, biodiversity status, threats analysis, etc, in the Poyang lake and at the Provincial level, so that the key gaps are identified and we can properly assess the relevance of the suggested activities under the PPG.

		<p>As commented under the PIF review, supporting alternative livelihood initiatives would only work in specific conditions, and many literatures have proved its limitation for conservation. Please review the approach and revise the component.</p> <p>GEF PPG do not finance the writing and preparation of the project document development (the last component). Please remove.</p> <p>1 June 2012 A substantially revised PPG request have been received by the GEFSEC that is in line with the other sub-projects under the Programmatic Approach.</p> <p>The activities are all relevant and considered appropriate.</p>
	<p>2. Is itemized budget justified?</p>	<p>The total budget requested is rather excessive for a site that the GEF has already invested in the past. Please review the budget and the components.</p> <p>The cofinancing ratio is very low. The ratio for PPG should at least match the ratio of the PIF.</p> <p>The consultant rates seem appropriate.</p> <p>1 June 2012 The PPG budget is rather high compared to the other sub-project PPGs under the UNDP. Please explain.</p> <p>the cofinancing ratio is rather low and recommend to be in line with the PIF ratio of 1 to 5.</p> <p>Miscellaneous cost is not a relevant budget line, and needs to be specified.</p> <p>The consultant rates, national \$1400 and international \$2700 per week, are considered appropriate.</p>
<p>Secretariat Recommendation</p>	<p>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</p>	<p>No, please revise the PPG request based on the revised PIF and comments made above.</p> <p>1 June 2012 No, please revise the PPG request based on the above noted comments and resubmit.</p>

		19 June 2012 Yes, the revised PPG request adequately responds to all comments made earlier. The PM is recommending the PPG for CEO approval.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 20, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 19, 2012

* 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.