



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

GEF ID:	4632		
Country/Region:	China		
Project Title:	Conservation of Biodiversity and Sustainable Land Management in the Soda Saline-alkaline Wetlands Agro pastoral Landscapes in the Western Area of the Jilin Province		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; BD-2; LD-1; LD-3; LD-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,627,000
Co-financing:	\$16,800,000	Total Project Cost:	\$19,427,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	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?	09-06-2011 UA: Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	09-06-2011 UA: Yes, with letter dated 08-30-2011.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	09-06-2011 UA: Yes. The comparative advantage of the FAO in water policy and water management issues is noted in the PIF. Experience with a number of recent biodiversity wetlands projects is mentioned.	
	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?	09-06-2011 UA: The water and land degradation issues fits into the agency's strategic frameworks and plans.	

Resource Availability	Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	09-06-2011 UA: Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	09-06-2011 UA: Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	
	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	09-06-2011 UA: Yes. The project is aligned with BD and LD result frameworks.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	09-06-2011 UA: BD-2, LD-1, 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?	09-06-2011 UA: Yes. The proposed project is consistent with the priorities of the GoC in mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in production sectors and has also linkages to CBD and UNCCD implementation.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	09-06-2011 UA: Yes. The project has only a small focus on capacity building. Capacities that are developed will be sustained through close work with the Water Resource Department and local governments in Jilin.	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek(s) to address	09-06-2011 UA & YW: Not fully. The water diversion model that will be applied by the Water	

Project Design	<p>sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>would only apply a few alternatives for adequate land uses. It is a credible scenario that the model will be more integrated with GEF involvement by including e.g. conservation agriculture, rehabilitation of native grasslands, water quality monitoring etc.</p> <p>However, the negative impact of the water diversion, particularly on the BD resources at the downstream area is not clear. Considering that an EIA and other assessments are mentioned, wplease provide a little more specific information on the biodiversity impact.</p> <p>Also, the current baseline situation, threats, and conservation gaps of the project site is not very clear. Particularly, significant portion of the BD budget will be used for restoration of wetlands of rather limited area (about 28,000 ha) but there is no clear information on the significance of this particular site. Please clarify.</p> <p>09 DEC 2011 UA: Adressed.</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>09-06-2011 UA: Yes.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>09-06-2011 UA: Yes. The project framework is clear and</p>	

		<p>biodiversity and land degradation are worked out.</p> <p>09 DEC 2011 UA: The re-submission of the PIF now informs that: "the construction work has almost finalized", which raises the question whether there is sufficient adaptive flexibility built into the project that the GEF investment can still "introduce and improve the water diversion and management model to rehabilitate 49,883 ha of wetlands in the pilot sites...". Please clarify.</p> <p>21 DEC 2011 UA: The following issues need to be further clarified: a) The framework table B would benefit from a more visible indicative split for which of the proposed outcomes and output BD resources and for which ones LD resources are being applied. b) The PIF text still mentions the old hectare coverage of 28,353 ha, which is not consistent with the 49,883 ha wetlands mentioned in the framework</p> <p>1 Feb 2012 UA: Addressed.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>09-06-2011 UA &amp; YW Not fully. GEBs are described in detail but are mostly LD related. Please provide more information on the GEBs related to BD in addition to the wetland coverage. It is not clear what tangible changes this initiative would bring. Does this site has importance for specific water fowl and birds, and ecosystem function?</p>	

		09 DEC 2011 UA: Addressed.	
	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?	09-06-2011 UA: Yes. Socio-economic benefits in production areas that are subject to reduced productivity through land degradation processes are an important element of this project.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	09-06-2011 UA: Yes. Sufficient at PIF stage, but further elaboration, especially on the role of NGOs will be required at CEO endorsement stage.	
	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)	09-06-2011 UA & YW: Not fully. The risk that the water diversion model will cause negative effects downstream has been addressed by a government investment project including an EIA. But more detailed information on potential negative impacts and mitigation measures this model would be required already at PIF stage.  09 DEC 2011 UA: Detailed information has been provided.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	09-06-2011 YW: Not fully. If I remember correctly, the past UNDP/GEF Wetland Conservation Project included Jilin as one of the four project sites. Please provide information on lessons learned and what has been achieved in Jilin and how the project will build on these achievements.  09 DEC 2011 UA: Addressed.	

	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	09-06-2011 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 reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	09-06-2011 UA: Yes, 5%.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	09-06-2011 UA: Yes.  09 DEC 2011 UA: No. The co-financing has been substantially reduced in this re-submission, while outcome targets have partly been increased.  21 DEC 2011 UA: Co-financing has been adjusted. However, based on CEO advise the co-financing for this project should not be less than comparable recent investments into wetlands in China in GEF-5.  1 Feb 2012 UA: Addressed. The ratio is now 1 : 6.4	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	09-06-2011 UA: Main co-finance comes from Jilin Province, a \$16.4 million grant. In the previous BD/CC version of the project, \$18.6 million co-finance was indicated. What is the reason for the reduction?	

		<p>09 DEC 2011 UA: The reasons have been explained; however, they are not acceptable. Because the GEF investment has been reduced, the co-financing has to be increased in order to achieve the envisaged outcomes.</p> <p>21 DEC 2011 UA: Please refer to comment in #24, based on CEO advise the co-financing for this project should not be less than comparable recent investments into wetlands in China in GEF-5.</p> <p>1 Feb 2012 UA: Addressed.</p>	
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>FAO contributes \$200,000 in kind. In case a PPG would be requested, GEF would expect a significant co-financing and involvement of FAO in the PPG to ensure a proper project design especially in regard to the water diversion model.</p> <p>09 DEC 2011 UA: Addressed.</p> <p>21 DEC 2011 UA: Please explain what the \$200,000 in kind that have been offered entail. Based on CEO advise, FAO should make every effort to increase its contribution to the project. If the contribution is only \$200,000 in kind, please further elaborate in section C on how FAO's technical input and expertise could compensate the comparably low financial contribution.</p> <p>1 Feb 2012 UA:</p>	

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:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council comments?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<p><b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b></p>	<p>09-06-2011 UA: No. Please address issues raised in this review.</p> <p>09 DEC 2011 UA: No. Please address the follow-up clarification requests in this review.</p> <p>NOTE: the project budget has been revised in this re-submission, which created the need for additional clarification.</p> <p>21 DEC 2011 UA: No. The PIF has been intensively discussed with the BD Focal Area Coordinator and the CEO, who both raised more in-depth clarification requests before the PIF can be cleared. In summary, these are:</p> <p>1) As the project requests 2/3 of the resources from the BD STAR, the project needs to further elaborate on the Global Environmental Benefits for</p>	



		<p>global BD benefits clearly visible, accompanied by a financial breakdown showing which investments are made into Biodiversity Conservation related activities. The PIF as presented is a viable SLM project, but since mostly BD resources are being applied, a better justification is requested.</p> <p>2) For a project of that type, and based on previous and ongoing substantial investments into China's wetlands, the CEO expects a more solid co-financing.</p> <p>1 Feb 2012 UA: The above points have been adequately addressed in the re-submission. The PM recommends the PIF for CEOP 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 being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 06, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 09, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 21, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 01, 2012	
	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**

<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Decision Points</b>	<b>Program Manager Comments</b>
<b>PPG Budget</b>	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	4. Other comments	
<b>Review Date (s)</b>	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.