



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

GEF ID:	5665		
Country/Region:	China		
Project Title:	A New Green Line: Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation Objectives and Practices into China's Water Resources Management Policy and Planning Practice.		
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-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,639,726
Co-financing:	\$25,975,000	Total Project Cost:	\$28,714,726
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
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.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	yes, duly signed endorsement letter is attached.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes, the project total amount is \$3m and within the remaining GEF-5 BD STAR allocation.	
	• the focal area allocation?	Refer above.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	

*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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	n/a	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	Yes, conforms with BD-2 as it aims to mainstreaming biodiversity in water resource management in china.	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	Yes, consistent with the China NBSAP and other key policies.	
Project Design	<p>6. 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>	<p>Context and threats: Further clarification would be helpful to clarify and explicitly note the situation at both national and provincial levels. The discription is rather general. It is particularly important to understand the specific threats in Chongqing and Yunnan, and why the project pilots are focused on these two provinces.</p> <p>Baseline projects: While some information has been provided, it would be helpful to understand the scale of the baseline initiatives (including finance), why some of the barriers are not</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		addressed through the baseline work, and further clarify how the limited GEF finance could play a catalytic difference. Please also clarify how the GEF funded activities and baseline initiative will be coordinated/work together.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>The four components are relevant and sufficiently clear in design. However, please further clarify on the following:</p> <p>1) On component 2, is the pilot limited to planning, assessments, and monitoring? or can the project engage in the actual actions to ensure environmental flow of the dams? Please clarify and strengthen the on-the-ground implementation elements, particularly with cofinancing support.</p> <p>2) Are there any role for the private sector considering the focus on water and fish resource management?</p> <p>3) As noted below, please further substantiate the GEBs and its targets of the project.</p>	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Please provide indicative targets on the GEBs that are identified in table B and paragraph 41 . Particularly, indicative target on coverage (hectarage), increased investment, species population stabilization/increase, etc are required.	
	9. 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		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	While TNC and other partner institutions are noted, it is unclear what role they are expected to play. Please also clarify engagement of ethnic minorities and local communities in the target provinces.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	<p>The first risk (i.e. development pressure) is a real and major risk to the project. In addition to the relevant project approach, please clarify national and provincial political and institutional commitment and other mitigation measures to ensure sustainability and mainstreaming biodiversity in the sector.</p> <p>Please also clarify whether coordination between the national and provincial level actors is a potential risk, and how it could be strengthened.</p>	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	While other relevant projects and initiatives are identified, please further clarify potential concrete coordination measures with them.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency 	Yes, the project is innovative in that it is designed to work with non-traditional partners to achieve GEBs, and address major threats to China's aquatic biodiversity. However, the sustainability element is rather vague and requires further information and concrete approach to ensure sustainability. Please further explain.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	experience. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 		
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes, cofinancing ratio is close to 1 to 10 and considered appropriate.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	Please clarify whether FAO and TNC's cofinance is cash or in-kind. Please also clarify why there is no cash contribution from the provincial level.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	PMC is about 5% of the project grant and considered appropriate.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> ,	Yes, \$100000 is requested and it is within the norm.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>No, please address the comments made above and resubmit a revised PIF with adequate information and revision.</p> <p>27 Jan 2014 Yes, the GEFSEC has received a revised PIF that adequately responds to all comments made earlier. Please also take note of the below issues to be fully incorporated and addressed by the time of CEO endorsement. The PM recommends the PIF for work program inclusion.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please ensure that the following elements are addressed and incorporated in the CEO endorsement package:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>1) The innovative element of this project is its focus on biodiversity mainstreaming at the national policy and planning level, that would have scaling up and replication effects nation-wide. The CEO endorsement should provide substantive information on these policy/strategy changes as well as concrete plan on how it would be implemented beyond the pilot sites (i.e. concrete action and implementation plan with budget).</p> <p>2) The pilot initiatives at the provincial level should be an on-the-ground implementation activities to make the e-flow actually happen, i.e, not only assessment and planning, but also actual implementation through the project. Please clarify the detail implementation plan.</p> <p>3) Under the PPG, appropriate consultation and consent should be received from the ethnic minorities and local communities that are involved in the project activities. Appropriate social and gender analysis should be conducted through the PPG to come up with an appropriate project design with relevant indicators.</p> <p>4) Further details on the threats and baseline initiatives.</p> <p>5) Private sector and NGOs involvement in the project, possibly as implementation</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>and cofinancing partners.</p> <p>6) Further details and tangible/measurable GEBs.</p> <p>7) Concrete coordination mechanism with related GEF and other initiatives that are focused on water resource and river-basin/watershed management.</p> <p>8) Concrete commitment from the national and provincial governments to work on the project initiative, in the form of cofinancing letters with substantial cash cofinancing as identified.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	January 10, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	January 27, 2014	
	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.