



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

GEF ID:	5142		
Country/Region:	China		
Project Title:	Sustainable and Climate Resilient Land Management in Western PRC		
GEF Agency:	ADB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-3; LD-3; LD-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,652,603
Co-financing:	\$12,400,000	Total Project Cost:	\$16,052,603
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Frank Radstake

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.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. Letter dated Sep 13, 2012.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes.	
	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?	Yes.	
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"> • the STAR allocation? 	Yes	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	n/a	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>Not correctly. Please note that STAR resources cannot be used for LD-4 enabling activities (EA). The country would have to apply for EA funding through the other available modalities (EA umbrella project, EA template for Agencies or Direct Access).</p> <p>8 Jan 2013 UA: Has been adjusted.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	LD-3	
	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?	Yes.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>No. It is unclear how the capacity development activities will contribute to the sustainability of the project outcomes, and in particular how they will contribute to the sustainability of the PRC-GEF LD partnership program outcomes.</p> <p>The proposal would need to show how the capacity building contributes to a further evolving partnership. This is</p>	

		<p>is a clear evolution from the first to the second. Compared with the second project (GEF ID #3484) the current proposal represents - in our view - a step back from the ambitious targets of the predecessor.</p> <p>8 Jan 2013 UA: Has been adequately addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
<p>Project Design</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 sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>Not fully.</p> <p>There are two baseline projects mentioned. First, the PRC-GEF LD partnership and secondly the partnership development strategy (PDS). We understand the PRC-GEF LD partnership as the appropriate baseline on which further incremental GEF support can build. However, in this case, an incremental reasoning would have to be based on the achievements to date and how the further support would (a) contribute to the creation of GEBs and how it would leverage ongoing and future investments to scale up achievements.</p> <p>The PIF states that: "The project will also ensure that innovative and climate resilient SLM and INRM practices are scaled up through investment projects under the partnership". We fully agree! Please elaborate how this will be achieved.</p> <p>8 Jan 2013 UA: Has been adequately addressed.</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>Please refer to comments #11 above to improve incremental reasoning.</p> <p>8 Jan 2013 UA: Has been adequately addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>Not fully.</p> <p>(a) Please name the 6 target provinces in the project objective.</p> <p>(b) Component 1 lacks focus. What is the rationale of including SFM and collective tenure reform etc. into the project? Moreover, how does output 1.1.1 overlap with the other project proposal from FAO: Sustainable forest management to enhance the resilience of forests to climate change in China (FAO) for which SFA is the executing agency? Please make sure to avoid duplication of efforts.</p> <p>(c) Component 2 is conceptually fine but please explore how this component can be developed from demonstration sites and production models with a few communities towards a linkage with large scale implementation, including estimates of area coverage and soil carbon benefits. GEF would very much welcome the use of the simplified assessment tool of the Carbon Benefits Project (CBP), which is now available. The project proponent should check</p>	

		<p>at PIF stage in order to estimate carbon benefits.</p> <p>(d) Component 3 is the strongest element of the project proposal and fits well with GEFs LD strategy and the partnership goals. The PIF should build around this as a core component, with a clear link to implementation, to targeted capacity building that supports large scale creation of GEBs, and with estimates what can be achieved in terms of area and carbon. In addition, some innovative and new approaches could be tested in demonstration sites.</p> <p>(e) As mentioned earlier, component 4 includes Enabling Activities, which, unfortunately, cannot be funded with STAR resources.</p> <p>8 Jan 2013 UA: Has been adequately addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>As mentioned above, please provide some estimates already at PIF stage.</p> <p>8 Jan 2013 UA: Has been provided.</p> <p>Cleared</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>More information will be required at CEO endorsement stage.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration. their role</p>	<p>More information will be required at CEO endorsement stage.</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)	More information will be required at CEO endorsement stage.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>Please elaborate on the synergy that will be developed with government funded programs mentioned under B.6</p> <p>Please also explain possible coordination and address overlaps with the FAO project that is being proposed in Shaanxi, Yunnan, Guangxi, and Sichuan to be executed by SFA.</p> <p>8 Jan 2013 UA: Has been clarified and potential duplication eliminated by re-focusing the PIF on SLM.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes.	
	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?		
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes.	
Project Financing	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes	<p>No. Please refer to #25</p> <p>8 Jan 2013 IIA</p>	

		Cleared	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	In line with comments to #14, point (d) a higher of co-financing should be explored through linking the project with ongoing investments. 8 Jan 2013 UA: Has been addressed. Co-financing linked to national and provincial projects will be explored during project preparation. Every effort should be made to increase co-financing. Cleared	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes. But please check ADB co-financing figures for consistency. Two figures are being presented \$400,000 and \$600,000? 8 Jan 2013 UA: Has been corrected Cleared	
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?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		

Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>25 Sep 2012 UA: No. Please address comments and clarification requests.</p> <p>8 Jan 2013 UA: The PIF is technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.</p> <p>Please note that if the PIF will be selected for WP inclusion, the PIF would need to be resubmitted with an adjusted Agency fee of 9.5% and PMC of not more than 5%.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	8 Jan 2013 UA: At CEO endorsement stage, the project should be designed in a way that upscaling is facilitated by linkages to provincial development plans and investment programs.	
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 25, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 08, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	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.