



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR PROGRAMMATIC FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

|  |   |                            |                         |
|--|---|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| GEF ID:                                    | <b>9768</b>   |                            |                         |
| Country/Region:                            | <b>China</b>  |                            |                         |
| Program Title:                             | <b>PRC-GEF Partnership Program for Sustainable Agricultural Development</b> |                            |                         |
| GEF Agency:                                | <b>UNDP, FAO and World Bank</b>   | GEF Agency Project ID:     | <b>5820 (UNDP)</b>      |
| Type of Trust Fund:                        | <b>GEF Trust Fund</b>   | GEF Focal Area (s):        | <b>Multi Focal Area</b> |
| GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | <b>BD-2 Program 4; BD-3 Program 7; CCM-2 Program 4;</b>                     |                            |                         |
| Anticipated Financing PPG:                 |   | Program Grant:             | <b>\$12,303,945</b>     |
| Co-financing:                              | <b>\$83,280,000</b>   | Total Program Cost:        | <b>\$95,583,945</b>     |
| PIF Approval:                              |   | Council Approval/Expected: |                         |
| Program Manager:                           | <b>Ulrich Apel</b>  | Agency Contact Person:     | <b>Lisa Farroway</b>    |

| Review Criteria            | Questions  | Secretariat Comments   | Agency Response |
|----------------------------|--|--|-----------------|
| <b>Program Consistency</b> | 1. Is the program aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup> | <p>03/28/2017 UA:<br/>Yes. The components of the program are aligned with GEF strategic objectives; however, the program is not fully coherent in its approach to include different elements on (a) agro-biodiversity and IAS and (b) climate-smart grassland management without a clear linkage between the two elements.</p> <p>07/14/2017 UA:<br/>The revised version has addressed the comment.</p> <p>Cleared</p> |                 |

<sup>1</sup> 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

|                       |   |  |  |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| <b>Program Design</b> | 2. Is the description of the baseline scenario reliable, and based on sound data and assumptions? Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning? | <p>03/28/2017 UA:<br/>The baseline for the grasslands restoration and conservation element of the program is unclear. On one hand, the "MOA invests annually \$1.8 billion to combat grassland degradation and an additional \$16.5 billion to promote sustainable pasture production" - however, it appears that those investments have largely failed due to top-down approaches? In this context, is it still "proposed to continue the current set of policies to conserve China's grasslands"?</p> <p>Please elaborate the incremental reasoning for this program element. The baseline states "China will continue to face tremendous challenges to address its grassland degradation issue". On this baseline, what will be the contribution of the program element?</p> <p>Further, the focus on climate change mitigation as a solution for a complex socio-economic issue of grassland management by pastoral communities in Western China does not appear to fully address all the issues and drivers of degradation involved.</p> <p>07/14/2017 UA:<br/>The revised version has adequately addressed the comment.</p> <p>Cleared</p> |  |
|                       | 3. Is the program framework (Table B) sound and sufficiently clear and  | <p>03/28/2017 UA:<br/>Not fully. The proposed elements that focus on grasslands management,</p>  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | appropriate to achieve program objectives and the GEBs?  | <p>evidence based PES schemes, and MRV systems needs to be better linked with the overall scope and focus of the program on agro-biodiversity and IAS.</p> <p>07/14/2017 UA:<br/>The revised version has adequately addressed the comment.</p> <p>Cleared</p>  |  |
|  | 4. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?   | <p>03/28/2017 UA:<br/>Not fully. The PFD, in particular the stakeholder analysis table does not sufficiently describe and consider opportunities and challenges of socio-economic aspects with regard to pastoral communities, ethnic groups and indigenous peoples.</p> <p>The PFD mentions as a barrier/issue the top down approach in grassland management that has been applied in the past, but the measures proposed to rectify this are not well elaborated.</p> <p>07/14/2017 UA:<br/>The revised version has adequately addressed the comment.</p> <p>Cleared</p> |  |
|  | 5. Does the program take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience) | <p>03/28/2017 UA:<br/>Yes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>  |  |

|                              |   |  |  |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|
|                              | 6. If there is a non-grant instrument in the program, is the GEF Agency(ies) capable of managing it?                      | n/a  |  |
|                              | 7. Is the program coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region? | 03/28/2017 UA:<br>Yes.<br><br>Cleared  |  |
|                              | 8. Is the program implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?   | 03/28/2017 UA:<br>Yes.<br><br>Cleared  |  |
|                              | 9. Does the program include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?           | 03/28/2017 UA:<br>Yes. Please refer to table 9 in the PFD document.<br><br>Cleared   |  |
|                              | 10. Does the program have description of knowledge management plan?   | 03/28/2017 UA:<br>Yes, knowledge management is incorporated in component 4.<br><br>Cleared   |  |
| <b>Resource Availability</b> | 11. 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>  | 03/28/2017 UA:<br>The BD STAR is currently available.<br>The requested amount of CC STAR of \$7,484,000 is not fully available.<br><br>All amounts will have to be re-checked at actual time of Work Program inclusion.<br><br>07/14/2017 UA:<br>CC STAR amount has been reduced accordingly.<br><br>All amounts will have to be re-checked at |  |

|                                   |   |  |  |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|
|                                   |   | actual time of Work Program inclusion.   |  |
|                                   |   | Cleared  |  |
|                                   | • the focal area allocation?  | 03/28/2017 UA:<br>See above.   |  |
|                                   |   | Cleared  |  |
|                                   | • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?                         | n/a  |  |
|                                   | • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?                             | n/a  |  |
|                                   | • focal area set-aside?   | n/a  |  |
| <b>Secretariat Recommendation</b> |   |  |  |
| <b>PFD Clearance</b>              | <b>Is the PFD recommended for clearance to include in the work program?</b> | 03/28/2017 UA:<br>No, please address comments.<br><br>07/14/2017 UA:<br>The revised package has adequately addressed all comments.<br>Program Manager recommends CEO clearance of the PFD. |  |
| <b>Review Date (s)</b>            | Review*   | March 28, 2017   |  |
|                                   | Additional Review (as necessary)  | July 14, 2017  |  |
|                                   | Additional Review (as necessary)  |  |  |

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the program. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.