



## 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:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$5,289,000
Co-financing:	\$26,660,000	Total Project Cost:	\$31,949,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Yoko Watanabe	Agency Contact Person:	Rikke Olivera

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?	Yes, China has ratified the CBD and eligible for GEF BD finance.	
	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.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	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.	

Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	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.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	refer above.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	n/a	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>Yes, the project will particularly contribute with additional PA coverage of 500000ha.</p> <p>2 April 2012 Please clarify the hectareage of the new protected areas under table A on FA strategy framework.</p>	
	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</p>	

		<p>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>	
	<p>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>	<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 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.</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>Yes, capacity building through policy and regulation development, and education and awareness raising initiatives is noted.</p>	
	<p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on</p>	<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</p>	

Project Design		<p>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>	
	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?		
	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>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	The project should further analyze what has already been done in this globally significant freshwater site including the	

	<p>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 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</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>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 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>	

	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?	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.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>There are number of organizations involved in conservation action in the region, particularly the international 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>	
	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>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>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.</p> <p>2 April 2012 Adequate information provided. Additional detail on the coordination</p>	

		the time of CEO endorsement.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<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>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<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>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<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 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</p>	



	cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	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.	
	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.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	Please provide adequate responses once comments are provided.	
	• Convention Secretariat?	Please provide adequate responses once comments are provided.	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	Please provide adequate responses once comments are provided.	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	No, please provide further information and revise the PIF based on the comments made above. The information on the development	

		<p>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.		
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?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 20, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 02, 2012	
	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?	<p>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.</p> <p>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> <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>
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<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>
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	No, please revise the PPG request based on the revised PIF and comments made above.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.