

French Comments on the Intersessional Work Program – PIFs March 2011

BIODIVERSITY

China - Securing Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use in China's Dongting Lake Protected Area

GEF Project ID	4356
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Project Name	Securing Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use in China's Dongting Lake Protected Area
Country	China
Region	Asia and the Pacific
Focal Area	Biodiversity
Operational Program	
Strategic Program	BD-1; BD-4
PIF Approval Date	December 10, 2010
PPG Approval Date	December 10, 2010
Approval Date	Not Yet Approved
Project Status	CEO PIF Clearance
GEF Agency	FAO
Executing Agency	Forestry Department of Hunan Province
Description	The goal of the proposed project is to secure the conservation of biodiversity of global importance in the Dongting Lake through strengthening existing management efforts and the promotion of the Wetland's long-term sustainable development. Specifically, the project objectives are to: (i) strengthen the existing institutional and policy framework; (ii) strengthen the existing network of wetland nature reserves; (iii) promote an integrated, ecosystem-wide planning and management approach; (iv) identify and demonstrate sustainable and/or alternative livelihoods designed to reduce human pressure on the Wetlands; and (v) increase institutional capacity and public awareness and support for wetlands conservation.
Implementation Status	
PPG Amount	50,000 US\$
GEF Project Grant	2,950,000 US\$
GEF Grant	3,000,000 US\$
Cofinancing Total	6,205,000 US\$
Project Cost	9,205,000 US\$
GEF Agency Fees	295,000 US\$

The project targets the Dongting Lake, a wetland of global importance. It proposes to develop a classical approach when dealing with ecosystem management focusing on 1) policy planning and institutional arrangements, 2) protected area management with a view to ensure their sustainable financing, 3) capacity building...

While the intentions are sound, the possibility to implement all of them can be questioned. Considering the complexity of the legal context of the area (4 protected area, several public agencies involved, etc.), the large geographical scope (more than 1 Mha), and the project appears quite ambitious.

Those ambitions should be confronted to the ambitions of former project on the area, in particular the GEF/PNUD project and what could be actually achieved.

Those ambitions contrast also with a thinly developed social context and thinly evaluated social stakes of the project:

- The PIF provide only scarce background data as for example the number of people living in and around the project area, the human density we are dealing with, the number of people depending directly and indirectly from the lake and its resources, etc.

- The PIF doesn't look into the potential impact of the project on the lake direct and indirect users:

- a) Who is going to win (and then support the project) and who is going to lose (and then resist the project)?

- b) How do we compensate or deal with the losing ones?

The contribution to the project to the local development must be developed. The project is planning for example to close down for example 50 paper mills. It means so many workers out of job.

What concrete opportunities and when will the project offer in return?

Opinion: Favorable, under the condition that the next step of preparation look more deeply into the concrete feasibility of the project and its social context and impact (and hence acceptability).

MULTI-FOCAL AREA

5. Costa Rica - Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme

GEF Project ID	4382
UNDP PMIS ID	4560
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Project Name	Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme
Country	Costa Rica
Region	Latin America and Caribbean
Focal Area	Multi Focal Area
Operational Program	
PIF Approval Date	February 15, 2011
Approval Date	Not Yet Approved
Project Status	CEO PIF Clearance
GEF Agency	UNDP - United Nations Development Programme
Executing Agency	UNOPS
Description	Global environmental benefits secured through community-based initiatives and actions to reduce habitat fragmentation in ten biological corridors linking eight Protected Areas and their buffer zones in Costa Rica
Implementation Status	
GEF Project Grant	4,398,148 US\$
GEF Grant	4,398,148 US\$
Cofinancing Total	4,625,000 US\$
Project Cost	9,023,148 US\$
GEF Agency Fees	351,852 US\$

The project's objective is to use the Costa Rican STAR allocation to contribute to the GEF/UNDP Small Grants Programme (SGP).

The PIF explain very clearly how this country contribution to the SGP is consistent with the GEF focal area strategies and national strategies/plans, which is a very good mainstreaming exercise.

On the contrary to the PIF number 6 and 8 below, this PIF provides at least some ideas on the project outputs toward the civil society. The § B.3 p14 explains that a maximum grant of 20.000 US\$ will be provided per project and that it is expected that 120 Community Based Organizations should benefit from this GEF Grant.

Then, one question raises: if the GEF grant is 4.398 M US\$ and only (20,000.00 US\$ x 120 CBO => 2,400,000.00 US\$ is directly awarded to CBOs, where the rest of the grant (1,998,148.00 US\$) is going ?

Moreover, the PIF lack of an assessment of previous SGP supports, successes and failures and the current status and needs in capacity building of the Costa Rican grant beneficiaries (there is some information on the global SGP program outcomes, but little if no detailed information on the Costa Rican SGP results and national CBOs issues).

Opinion: Favorable, if the previous questions on civil society support are clarified.

6. Ecuador - Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program in Ecuador

GEF Project ID	4375
UNDP PMIS ID	4518
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Project Name	Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program in Ecuador
Country	Ecuador
Region	Latin America and Caribbean
Focal Area	Multi Focal Area
Operational Program	
PIF Approval Date	February 15, 2011
Approval Date	Not Yet Approved
Project Status	CEO PIF Clearance
GEF Agency	UNDP - United Nations Development Programme
Executing Agency	UNOPS
Description	To conserve biodiversity by reducing habitat fragmentation and strengthening ecological connectivity across production landscapes through community initiatives and actions in globally significant ecosystems in Ecuador
Implementation Status	
GEF Project Grant	4,398,145 US\$
GEF Grant	4,398,145 US\$
Cofinancing Total	4,800,000 US\$
Project Cost	9,198,145 US\$
GEF Agency Fees	351,852 US\$

The project's objective is to use the Ecuadorian STAR allocation to contribute to the GEF/UNDP Small Grants Programme (SGP).

The PIF explains very clearly how this country contribution to the SGP is consistent with the GEF focal area strategies and national strategies/plans, which is a very good mainstreaming exercise.

On the contrary to the previous Costa Rican PIF, there is almost no information on the beneficiaries of the small grants (for comparison see the Costa Rica PIF above). On the quantitative side for example, there is no information on the number of communities/ civil society organizations which will benefit from the GEF funds and how much money in average will be granted to each of them (there is some communities output numbers in the table § "B Project Framework" page 2, but it's not clear if they can be summed up or if one community can benefit from one grant comprising/covering several project components).

From a qualitative point of view, as the SGP is to support and foster the civil society of the beneficiary country, the PIF lack of an assessment of previous SGP supports, successes and failures and the current status and needs in capacity building of the Ecuadorian grant beneficiaries.

If the global environment purpose of this 4,398 M US\$ grant is clear, the civil society purpose and rationale is unclear.

Opinion: Favorable, if the previous questions on civil society support are clarified.

8. Kenya - Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program in Kenya

GEF Project ID	4362
UNDP PMIS ID	4520
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Project Name	Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program in Kenya
Country	Kenya
Region	Africa
Focal Area	Multi Focal Area
Operational Program	
PIF Approval Date	February 15, 2011
Approval Date	Not Yet Approved
Project Status	CEO PIF Clearance
GEF Agency	UNDP - United Nations Development Programme
Executing Agency	UNOPS
Description	To secure global environmental benefits through community-based initiatives and actions in key terrestrial and marine ecosystems of Kenya
Implementation Status	
GEF Project Grant	5,000,000 US\$
GEF Grant	5,000,000 US\$
Cofinancing Total	5,500,000 US\$
Project Cost	10,500,000 US\$
GEF Agency Fees	400,000 US\$

Same as above (PIF n°6)

The project's objective is to use the Kenyan STAR allocation to contribute to the GEF/UNDP Small Grants Programme (SGP).

The PIF explain very clearly how this country contribution to the SGP is consistent with the GEF focal area strategies and national strategies/plans, which is a very good mainstreaming exercise.

On the contrary to the previous Costa Rican PIF, there is almost no information on the beneficiaries of the small grants (for comparison see the Costa Rica PIF above). On the quantitative side for example, there is no information on the number of communities/ civil society organizations which will benefit from the GEF funds and how much money in average will be granted to each of them (there is some communities output numbers in the table § "B Project Framework" page 2, but it's not clear if they can be summed up or if one community can benefit from one grant comprising/covering several project components).

From a qualitative point of view, as the SGP is to support and foster the civil society of the beneficiary country, the PIF lack of an assessment of previous SGP supports, successes and failures and the current status and needs in capacity building of the Kenyan grant beneficiaries.

If the global environment purpose of this 5 M US\$ grant is clear, the civil society purpose and rationale is unclear.

Opinion: Favorable, if the previous questions on civil society support are clarified.

POPs

11. China - Minimizing Formation and Releases of Unintentionally Produced POPs (UPOPs) from China's Pulp and Paper Sector

GEF Project ID	4441
IBRD PO ID	125528
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Project Name	Minimizing Formation and Releases of Unintentionally Produced POPs (UPOPs) from China's Pulp and Paper Sector
Country	China
Region	Asia and the Pacific
Focal Area	POPs
Operational Program	
PIF Approval Date	February 15, 2011
Approval Date	Not Yet Approved
Project Status	CEO PIF Clearance
GEF Agency	IBRD - The World Bank
Executing Agency	
Description	The project's objective is to minimize formation and releases of UPOPs from China's pulp and paper sector through investments in BAT/BEP adoption for non-wood pulp production, adoption of necessary policy measures, and support to national and local enforcement of industrial and environmental policies.
Implementation Status	
GEF Project Grant	15,000,000 US\$
GEF Grant	15,000,000 US\$
Cofinancing Total	60,000,000 US\$
Project Cost	75,000,000 US\$
GEF Agency Fees	1,500,000 US\$

The project targets the Unintentionally Produced POPs produced by China's pulp and paper sector, in particular **non wood** pulp and paper production. This sector contributes significantly to the total UPOP production in China.

The project rationale is based on a business as usual scenario where the industrial and environmental policies, guidance and standards are not enforced. It proposes accordingly **an incentive approach** by demonstrating the economic viability of improved technologies.

The success of such an approach will depend in particular on the convincing force of the pilot technology test.

In this regard, the PIF lacks information on the number of mills which would be selected, their geographical repartition, etc. i.e. the criteria used to ensure those pilot case offer a good representation of the sector.

The incentive approach (the "carrot") also eclipses the coercive one (the "stick"): what is happening at the end of the project if the updated industrial and environmental policies, guidance and standards are still not applied?

The project should look into a balance approach between the "carrot and the stick".

Opinion: Favorable taking into account above remarks