



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

GEF ID:	4633		
Country/Region:	China		
Project Title:	PRC-GEF Partnership: Shaanxi Weinan Luyang Integrated Saline and Alkaline Land Management		
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-1; LD-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,000,000
Co-financing:	\$80,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$82,000,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	

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?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes, letter dated 08/31/2011	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes. ADB has been a key agency in the previous GEF-PRC partnership on land degradation and has experience in this type of project.	
	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?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes.	
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

Availability			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	09-02-2011 UA: Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	09-02-2011 UA: Yes. The projects requests \$2 million from LD STAR (total \$9.42 million).	
	<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?	09-02-2011 UA: No. As the project proposal stands now, the main expected outcomes of (1) Rehabilitation of drainage systems and reduction of soil salinity (2) Improvement of flood storage capacity (3) Improvement of wetland management do not or only partly fit with the LDFA results framework.  09-23-2011 UA: The outcomes have been revised.  Cleared	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	09-02-2011 UA: LD-1  Question: Table B also refers to BD-2 but no funding from BD is requested?  09-23-2011 UA: Has been clarified. Only LD funds are requested.	

	<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>09-02-2011 UA: The project is predominantly in line with State Council's decision to create the "Guanzhong - Tianshui Economic Zone". The linkages to NAPA are considered weak.</p> <p>09-23-2011 UA: Linkages to relevant Government documents have been added.</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>09-02-2011 UA: n/a - the project does not have a focus on capacity building.</p>	
Project Design	<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>09-02-2011 UA: Yes.</p>	
	<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?</p>		
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>09-02-2011 UA: Yes.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>09-02-2011 UA: Not fully. As mentioned above (#7) there are questions regarding the</p>	

		<p>Another issue is that Table B appears to include several activities that form the baseline for this project, e.g.: 1.1.3. Rehabilitated 800 bridges and 35 km of roads.</p> <p>09-23-2011 UA: Framework has been revised.</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>09-02-2011 UA: Yes.</p> <p>09-23-2011 UA: I have to correct myself regarding this point. The additional information provided in the responses to 09-02-2011 comments concerning the baseline project now raise concerns about the incrementality of the GEF funded activities. If the baseline project includes the 4 main areas of investment: (i) dredging of desalinisation drainage canals (ii) Access roads and bridges (iii) dredging and rehabilitation of wetland area of 800 ha and reconstruction of Tianjiao, Tianlu, and Tianzi lakes (iv) planting of 130 ha greenbelts In this case, what would be the incrementality of the GEF support and what would be the added value of GEF support in terms of creation of GEBs?</p> <p>16 Mar 2012 UA: The re-submitted version has provided adequate incremental reasoning along with a reduction and clear attribution of</p>	

		objectives.  Cleared	
	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?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes. Local socio-economic benefits of farmers are a major expected outcome of this project.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes. Is being considered and will have to be elaborated on during project preparation.	
	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)	09-02-2011 UA: Yes.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	09-02-2011 UA: The project is mainly co-ordinated with "Guanzhong - Tianshui Economic Zone Program". The link to combating land degradation and desertification is weak.  09-23-2011 UA: Co-ordination arrangements have been improved.  Cleared	
	20. Is the project implementation/execution arrangement adequate?	09-02-2011 UA: 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 refloes included?		

Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>09-02-2011 UA: Yes. However, activities listed under component 4 are partly additional management costs. Efforts should be made to reduce monitoring and reporting costs.</p> <p>09-23-2011 UA: Has been addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>09-02-2011 UA: The co-financing appears to be inclusive of baseline investments that do not essentially contribute to the project objective. Please clarify.</p> <p>09-23-2011 UA: The clarification has been provided but again raise concerns about the incrementality of GEF support. If the entire baseline investment is essential for attaining the development objectives of the project, what can the additional \$2 million of GEF support achieve?</p> <p>16 Mar 2012 UA: Baseline funding and co-financing has been properly attributed.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	09-02-2011 UA: See comment above.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	09-02-2011 UA: Yes.	
Project Monitoring	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for		

	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?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>09-02-2011 UA: No. The project as it stands does not appear to be fully eligible under the LDFA. The expected project impact will be sustained economic growth in the Guanzhong - Tianshui Economic zone; in this context it is questionable whether tangible GEBs can be created.</p> <p>09-23-2011 UA: No. Although the PIF has been improved regarding alignment with LDFA objectives the project proposal fails to demonstrate incrementality and added value in terms of creation of GEBs.</p> <p>22 Mar 2012 UA: Yes. PM recommends the PIF for CEO clearance.</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</b>		

Review Date (s)	First review*	September 02, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 23, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 22, 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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	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.