

ACEDP Annual Planning Process - 2007/08.

"Input of the Environment Advisory Team (EAT)".

<i>Table of Contents.</i>		<i>Page</i>
1.	Background	2
2.	Review of China and Australia Country Surveys.	2
3.	The Concept Proposals (07/08	3
	Group 1 - <i>'proceed now'</i>	4
	Group 2 - <i>'further scoping needed'</i>	6
	Group 3 - <i>'new high level policy initiatives'</i>	7
	Group 4 - <i>'not supported'</i>	7
4.	Recommended Approach for the 08/09 Annual Plan.	8
Annexes.		
Annex 1 -	Group 1 Proposals - <i>'those activities proceeding to final feasibility/design in 07/08'</i> .	9
Annex 2 -	Group 2 Proposals - <i>" those concepts where further conceptual or project development is necessary</i>	22
Annex 3 -	Group 4 Proposals- <i>"those proposals that are not supported"</i>	24
Annex 4 -	Summary; <i>Evaluation Results for all Proposals.</i>	28
	<u>Abbreviations.</u>	48

ACEDP Annual Planning Process - 2007/08.

Input of the Environmental Advisory Team (EAT).

1. Background.

The EAT is intended to provide a high level and independent advisory, planning and review function to ACEDP. Its main function is to provide high-level policy and programming advice, guidance and support to ensure the strategic focus and objectives of ACEDP remain appropriate and selected activities contribute to the agreed Program objectives.

The main parts of the Terms of reference for EAT for this present assignment (advice regarding the 07/08 annual plan) are as follows,

- (i) Review the two country surveys (China and Australia) in light of the outcome from the two national workshops and, in collaboration with Chinese and Australian program partners, provide guidance on how they might be updated over the next six months, and how they should guide decisions on the allocation of program funds to proposals received.
- (ii) Evaluate and assess the relative merits of proposals put forward by individual Australian and Chinese agencies as well as those proposals generated by Chinese and Australian program partners through the national workshop mechanisms employed by the program, to assist in decisions on activity funding.
- (iii) Provide a brief justification for each proposal that outlines why it should or should not be considered for inclusion in the ACEDP. This will include consideration of co-funding arrangements. Where proposals are deemed suitable, provide comment on areas for adjustment or improvement. Where proposals are not deemed suitable: explore if they could be upgraded to suitability through elaboration, addition of new components or other means; and provide a full justification and be prepared to defend it in the plenary discussions. Summarize the recommendations in a concise overview paper with detailed proposal-by-proposal annex for distribution to all program partners by not later than end September 2007
- (iv) Participate in the discussion at the Joint High Level Round table scheduled tentatively for 25 September in Beijing and provide guidance, advice and strategic direction as and when required by AusAID and MOFCOM..
- (v) Participate in consultation with government agencies in both Australia and China to help identify priorities for ACEDP for the period till June 2008.

The EAT for the 07/08 annual planning process is operating in an 'interim' capacity and it completes its work later in 2007 once the deliberations for this year's work plan have been completed. The interim EAT comprises Peter Millington (Australia) and Si Zhizhong (International).

This report and its annexes deals with the EAT response to points i) to iii) above.

2. Review of China and Australia Country Surveys.

The process for engaging with Australian and Chinese partners was based on first undertaking country surveys in both countries of the existing and emerging issues relating to the 'water related environment', and secondly, to use this information as a catalyst for discussion at two later workshops - one in each country - that sought to identify and link the areas of Australian experience and skills, with those areas where china is facing problems and difficulties. An iterative process was used at both workshops to concentrate on the priority areas where 'skills and experience' best match the 'present and emerging problems'.

This process seems to have worked well in linking the 'experience and the problems'. It has generated a lot of interest in ACEDP as is evidenced by the fact that 57 proposals for ACEDP support were received in just the 6 weeks or so since the partners' workshops (40 from Chinese agencies and 17 from Australia). However, this very short time frame has also been a barrier to producing proposals that have clear project detail (most are brief summaries), that show in good detail how they relate to ACEDP objectives, that have well defined budgets and timeframes (even if in summary form), and which include clear details as to how Australian - or Chinese - counterpart agencies are to be engaged.

As indicated this really is understandable due to the short time frame. However it has made it difficult for the EAT to be able to place relative importance on many of the projects - some are in high priority areas but have not provided clear details whilst others have been well presented but perhaps not in areas as critical as others. Also in some areas such as environmental/ecological flow methodology and techniques, and in developing appropriate guidelines for water resource planning, implementation and management, there are at least 8 proposals and very different in nature and quality. Which proposal is of highest merit, which should proceed immediately, which are the best Australian partners to provide the best technical and management input, and which should be further developed?

It is understood that options for environmental flow methodology and for water planning guidelines to incorporate an appropriate methodology is a high Chinese priority to fit in with a 2 year timeframe for the review of national water resources/river basin planning processes and guidelines. This was not conveyed to EAT during discussions nor is it apparent in the 3 or so main proposals in this area; none of these effectively indicated the immediacy of this work or that a counterpart partner was important to the proposal. The nature of this requirement must be clearly understood and specified at the outset as a project which is to provide practical guidelines and methodologies within 2 years for inclusion in the revised River Basin Master planning guidelines will be very different to a project which is to provide and trial, methodologies which have been adapted and trialed under Chinese conditions. For example ecological flow methodologies based on international theoretical procedures may be quite different to ecological flow methodologies developed specifically for the arid areas of China, where greatest priority is placed on groundwater recharge to meet the needs of water dependant forests. This just means that there needs to be careful thought as to what are the desired outcomes for such a project, when it is designed. And there remains the problem of how best to deal with those high priority areas where a large number of related proposals have been submitted. These issues are discussed in the section dealing with the 'Concept Proposals 07/08'.

What can be done next time (08/09) to improve this early part of the program planning cycle?

- Both Australian and Chinese partners need to understand the range of potential counterpart partners that exist, what are their capabilities and interests, what are the current and previous areas of interest and how they might be able to participate - an information pack of agencies, organisations of relevance to ACEDP. This will enable proponents to more closely identify the most appropriate counterpart and the role that they could play.
- In the Australian context this means better identifying State natural resource/environmental agencies, the Cooperative Research Centres that relate to ACEDP, other water and environment research bodies, the major urban water companies and the major privatised and corporatised irrigation companies. Contact details, key persons of interest, achievements, new activities etc.,
- Existing cooperation activities between Australian and Chinese agencies that exist separate from ACEDP need to be identified (this was raised in the Australian partners workshop),
- Information needs to be assembled of all donor supported activities in China in water management and water related environmental areas (and later in other areas that ACEDP partners decide to include in the program) so that overlaps are avoided and synergies created,

As well, the guidelines for submitting an activity for consideration should be expanded. It is accepted that partners should not have to complete large, time-consuming documents but very brief details, and only general details about the importance of an activity to real-life Chinese priorities, makes assessments and evaluations quite difficult. There needs to be a reasonable mix between the amount of detail in a proposal submission and the amount of time that Managing Contractor (MC ACEDP) should have to put in to expanding the proposal detail to an acceptable level; this needs to be spelt out in guidelines for the 08/09 planning cycle.

3. The Concept Proposals (07/08)

50 proposals have been submitted by Chinese agencies and partners and 17 by Australian parties. There has been little time since the project start, and between the two country workshops and when project requests had to be submitted. To receive 57 proposals in such a short time is exceptional.

As indicated above, this short period has not allowed much time for agencies and interested parties to add detail to concepts, to identify which might be the best counterpart agencies with which to 'team' nor what might be a reasonable estimate of cost spread over how many years.

Only one project - Tarim Basin Integrated Water Resources Planning (No. 40) - is in a format and stage of project development that it could proceed, with a small amount of review, to the 'expression of interest/tender' stage. The summary nature of all the other concept notes means that all need further development - some individually but in most cases by bringing together 2 or more concepts and creating a more focused and detailed project that better aligns with ACEDP objectives. In some cases, the various proposals contributing to the one area are all quite clear and complementary to each other and EAT believes that in those cases, we can proceed immediately to a feasibility/design phase that will be facilitated by Managing Contractor (MC) ACEDP.

In other cases relating to the same 'theme' area (there are 8 proposals relating to environmental flow management, and 6 relating to 'integrated river basin management') the complementarity of all the proposals is not clear cut and there does need to be some further scoping to sort out the high priority areas and how these should proceed to the feasibility/design phase. But there are various ways to move forward with these reviews and this depends largely on the priority specified by Chinese partners and the needs for sound project design principles.

There is another area which has not so far been covered by the submitted proposals and that is where current and emerging policy approaches and options within the ACEDP coverage are presently being considered by senior Chinese agencies - these areas could benefit by experience sharing with Australian peak government policy bodies and these links need to be explored. Such deliberations are likely to lead to the highest priority areas for further project support.

And finally there are a number of proposals that do not meet ACEDP objectives and guidelines and cannot be reasonably enhanced at present to bring them in line with ACEDP. These are not supported.

A summary of the evaluations of all 57 proposals is at Annex 4. Also attached to that annex is the 'working evaluation table' that was used by EAT to focus discussions and debate as to the merits of each proposal. Each EAT member made judgements for each project as per the criteria in the table and debated differences until consensus was reached.

This has led to creating four groupings of proposals:

Group 1 - Those concept proposals that can proceed immediately to 'project design document' stage, plus those where concepts are reasonably well developed in high priority areas but have considerable overlap with others but can be brought together into a consolidated proposal through a combination of 'project scoping and project design',

Group 2 - Those concepts where further conceptual or project development is necessary or where there are a significant number of similar activities that require much more information, consolidation and development, and a degree of agency cooperation to resolve this,

Group 3 - Higher level policy areas (including those that may be emerging at present) that would benefit from further interaction and cooperation at senior agency levels in Australia and China.

Group 4 - Those proposals that are not supported at present and cannot be reasonably enhanced now, to better meet ACEDP objectives. (*Whilst the EAT does not support these proposals, it is recognised that they may become more relevant once other activities within ACEDP begin to produce results and we recommend that MC ACEDP continue discussions with the proponents of these proposals*).

Group 1.

Note that all of these projects in the group have a strong connection to key policy development areas, but most have failed to provide a convincing link to the higher levels in a way that could influence national policy and decision making. This is an issue that should be addressed as projects are developed further. They need clearer definition of likely Australian partners (both at policy and technical levels) and the role that these could play both now and in the future.

Annex 1 provides more details on the proposals and activities within Group 1.

i) - *Tarim Basin Integrated Water Resources Planning* (No. 40)- This proposal does not support the overall higher level 'basin master planning' activity but concentrates on support for four underpinning and critical activities that feed into the master planning process. This extends the earlier China-Australia cooperation in the Tarim basin and utilises an area of considerable experience in river basin planning from the Murray Darling basin. This activity needs only small revisions to the existing project design document to proceed.

ii) - *Regulatory Strengthening and Governance for Shiyang River Basin* (Nos. 4 and 7) - This proposal is close to integrated river basin management, by focusing a number of key elements, including regulatory development for river basin management, ecological monitoring, water resource reallocation, ecological compensation, demonstration of water-saving irrigation techniques, formation of water user associations and training. The river basin is a priority for both NDRC and SEPA. In recent years, it has drawn international attention, including DFID and ADB. Whilst this high priority region is closely aligned to Australian expertise in all aspects of IRBM, there is a lot of donor and government activity in this river basin and the first ACEDP activity should be to review the present situation relative to what Australia considers 'good IWRM', assess how successful recent activities have been and what is proposed for the next few years and whether there is a 'strategic ACEDP role' that will make a difference and help deliver good water resources management to this high priority area'. This amounts to a small 2 week scoping exercise.

iii) - *Lake Tai Basin Water Resources Management and Pollution Control* (Nos. 5, 23, 30, 39 and part 46) - At least three proposals deal with various parts of water management, water pollution, plan of action, and regulatory and institutional aspects of the Lake Tai basin. This is a basin of highest Chinese priority and although none of the proposals submitted are 'complete' and in a format ready to proceed, the overall issue of improved Lake Tai basin management has such a priority that immediate work on project enhancement should proceed. This would be at feasibility/design level for a multi-year initiative led by NDRC and involve all relevant agencies; possible counterpart involvement would be identified.

iv) - *Wetlands Management Policy, Guidelines and Capacity Building* (Nos. 24, 25, 26 and 27)- Additional to the particular issues at Lake Tai, a high priority issue identified in the background studies is developing an improved capability in all aspects of wetlands management. At least four concept proposals cover parts of wetlands management but are not comprehensive in coverage. A start can be made immediately on assisting the relevant agencies (mainly SFA and SEPA) to further develop the proposal and proceed to feasibility/design. This initiative could be led by the Chinese Academy of Forestry, National Wetland Research Center under the SFA (proposal #24). Counterpart partners would also need to be identified.

v) - *Water Ecology Compensation Policy and Mechanism* (Nos. 34, 11 and 21)- Three proposals cover parts of this priority policy area. None can be immediately implemented in present form. The need for research and policy in this area is emphasised in all Chinese environmental management strategic priorities. Again, feasibility/design work can proceed immediately with relevant agencies to scope and design a suitable project led by Chinese Academy for Environmental Planning (CAEP) with the Guangting Reservoir as an initial case study (proposal #34). Having researched the topic for the past few years, the CAEP is one of the leaders in the country in the field of ecological compensation. Guangting Reservoir is a major water supply source for Beijing.

vi) - *Water Rights and Allocation Trading in the Yellow River Basin* (14, part of 55) - a trial water trading scheme has been in operation in the YRB since 2003. As well, the AusAID supported WET project has almost completed two phases of a project that has explored how a water trading and water allocation scheme could be introduced; this has trialled concepts within a number of small sub-basins. It would be highly relevant to now further explore water trading at the much larger scale of the Yellow river which would provide practical experiences and outcomes, and lead to determining a range of important national policy outcomes. A number of proposals relate to water rights, trading and water allocation and these need to be rationalised with this broader Yellow River trading project to provide the widest possible set of experiences. Detailed design should now proceed.

vii) - *Irrigation Water Management for Large Irrigation Districts; Yellow River Basin* (No. 6, part of 55) - The main objectives are to study policies and strategies of irrigation water management to assess where considerable water savings can be made, productivity improved and the need and shape of new national policies identified. Departments within MWR are seeking to partner Australia's CSIRO Land and Water. There are also opportunities to involve Australia's large corporatised and privatised irrigation schemes to provide practical examples and experiences as to how water efficiencies have been achieved with increased productivity and improved scheme environmental management. Water use efficiency in irrigation has been specified as high priority in the 11th 5yr. plan. The proposal is too narrow at present, concentrating on the use of remote sensing to identify efficiency issues. A broader scoping of the project to include the intent of a number of other projects relating to irrigation can commence immediately with feasibility/designs to follow, facilitated by MC ADECP.

The above seven projects are likely to be 'major' in the sense that they will extend for more than one year, have a budget in excess of \$150,000 and are likely to have a second, or further stages, if the results show a need to progress to a higher level of policy/strategy development and possible regulatory change.

There are a number of other smaller projects that are mostly about capacity building/study tours in what the EAT has assessed as being high priority areas. If skills and experiences are built now in these areas it will assist Chinese agencies in the implementation of many of the seven major ACEDP projects for 07/08, or in other high priority areas such a groundwater management. These are recommended to proceed during 07/08 and are listed below.

Trans-Administrative Region Water Environment Policy/Guidelines (No. 31) - This project is relatively small and of 8 months duration. It aims to research the critical issue of cross boundary pollution management and develop improved processes based on comparing Australian and Chinese experiences.

Study on Mechanisms for Public Participation in Water Pollution Control (No. 33)
Integrated Watershed Management etc., for Control of Eutrophication of Lakes(No. 36)

These two projects both relate to community/farmer/village involvement in managing sub-basins and the problems of overcoming diffuse pollution through a range of processes underpinned by public participation. Neither proposal is developed to quite that extent. Australia has very well developed community processes through its basin management structure and the role of 'Catchments Management Agencies' that develop land and water management plans that have diffuse pollution as a key component.

Groundwater Management Policies and Regulations (No. 51, 54 plus MWR discussions) -

Neither nos. 51 or 54 should proceed as stand alone projects. However during discussions with MWR (Water Resources Management Centre) a briefing was given to EAT on a major groundwater policy/strategy/regulatory project that is aimed at producing groundwater management plans (use, allocation, recharge etc..) and to support this with new legislation and procedures. A request was made to be able to study the Australian approaches, particularly at state levels (NSW, Vic., and WA in particular) and this is a very good idea and is exactly what ACEDP should do. It seems that MWR has not submitted a proposal on this issue (there seemed to be some confusion on this; at least EAT has not seen one.) There is scope to package all of these groundwater issues into a consolidated high priority project through a broad scoping review, and if the withstands further review, to proceed to feasibility. ADB is reported to be interested in funding a large project on enhancing regulations and policies in water conservation and savings and related management issues and this should be taken into account.

There is one other major area of cooperation that needs to be considered under the Group 1 category and this relates to '*Environmental Flow Management –Methodologies, Policies and Guidelines.*' As mentioned earlier this is an area where there are 8 proposals that relate to his subject in varying degrees. On the one hand, there is such variation (and some inconsistency) between all proposals that it would be sensible to follow the 'group 2 approach' below and allow some time for better scoping of the proposals into a manageable and focused structure before proceeding to feasibility/design; this had been the preferred EAT approach. On the other hand, as has now been indicated to EAT (after the roundtable meeting), this general area of environmental flow management is quite critical to Chinese agencies with regard to the timetable for development of new river basin planning processes and guidelines and an earliest start as possible has been requested.

To meet both these needs and ensure integrity of the project development process EAT suggests that this environmental flow management project be considered as Group 1 (ie., proceed immediately to feasibility/design) but that commencement be preceded by a 2 day scoping workshop in Beijing at which all the 8 activities within this category, plus those recently completed, relevant activities such as the 'WET' project, are scrutinised by an expert panel (which would include the team recruited to undertake design) so that the most appropriate 'shape and content' for the project(s) as well as the best mix of Australian expertise, can be identified before commencement. The MC ACEDP could commence organising the design team and the panel, now. More details are provided in Annex 1.

Group 2

Annex 2 provides more details about the two 'project development missions' that are to underpin the development of Group 2 proposals.

Other than the number listed as Group 4 as 'not supported', and the Group 1 proposals above, the remainder either need more development as a single stand-alone project before being judged as suitable to proceed or need combining and rationalising into

a more focused project that better meets the ACEDP objectives and specific Chinese priorities. Many of the Australian proposals fall within this category of being 'not supported' at present but are likely to become more relevant as other Chinese priorities and activities are developed.

This does not mean that these proposals are not dealing with priority issues - they mostly are. For example, there are 16 proposals that fall within an 'environmental management' category (including the 8 mentioned above in the environmental flows category) and these cover ecological restoration methodologies, environmental flow techniques for varying river systems, basin flow management linkages to river health, wetland management, coastal zone environmental management, erosion and land management issues, eutrophication etc.) and a further 6 that relate to IRBM approaches and experiences. As well there are a number of capacity building projects that cover both of these categories that should not proceed until there is a clearer definition of the needs as the particular activity projects are developed and implemented.

EAT believes that the best way to deal with these Group 2 activities is to create a number of 'theme' or 'category' areas and then for Chinese agencies/partners involved in these 'themes' to visit Australian partner/technical organisations on project development missions to discuss and observe experiences, policies and strategies and then, based on this experience, to develop appropriate project activities that align more closely with ACEDP objectives, Chinese priorities and agency needs. A concluding workshop could be organized at the end of the project development to identify project activity (activities) and Australian and Chinese participating partners under the given theme, and if possible, define the scope and detailed design of each activity. MC ACEDP would facilitate this process, which should take place progressively over the next 6 to 12 months and result in a range of better focused and more tightly designed projects that would be ready for the 08/09 work plan. The two 'theme' areas that would be investigated in 07/08 would be integrated river basin management methodologies and practices (IRBM) and all aspects of environmental management (EM). It is stressed that even though 8 of the proposals for environmental management will now be treated as a Group 1 activity, this does not mean that the agencies involved should be excluded for these missions. There is in fact a strong need for all relevant agencies to participate in these missions to Australia as these will allow all Australian and Chinese partners to interact and develop relationships which is a key objective of ACEDP. Annex 2 details how both of these 'themes' should be addressed in 07/08.

During this process, it would be sensible for the Australian counterparts who have indicated a clear interest and role in these theme areas and the likely projects within them, to visit China to become more familiar with river basin and environmental priority areas, and perhaps assist in final scoping of jointly sponsored projects.

Group 3.

There is a further area that would benefit from joint study/discussion and that is in the area of emerging policy discussion and regulatory reform. Chinese ministries, and particularly the NDRC, have an immediate and emerging policy and regulatory program under development and it would benefit both countries if a mechanism for high level dialogue, experience sharing and exchange on these issues, as they relate to environmental/natural resources management, could be developed. This would also be the way to discuss the current ACEDP proposals that are set at a higher policy level than would normally be a single ministry consideration.

As well such a group should look at the broader interpretation of environmental issues that ACEDP might start to consider later in the program after the water related issues have been advanced - areas such as climate change for one.

The MC ACEDP should take the lead in facilitating how such a high level group could be created and how it could operate, and how regular exchange visits could occur to each country for policy review and dialogue.

Group 4.

There are about 20 proposals that EAT considers do not align closely enough with ACEDP objectives to continue in one form or another, and that cannot be reasonably enhanced at this stage. Even with these we recommend that MC ACEDP discuss the projects further with the proponents as there may be opportunities to restructure the work later in the life of ACEDP as other projects produce results and open up the need for new initiatives. Annex 3 lists those projects not supported at all, at present.

In summary, out of the 57 proposals received,

- 29 have been classed as 'Group 1' (this includes the environmental management category above) and are to be further developed to the feasibility/design stage mostly as grouping of a number of proposals into a more focused series of projects. Only one is ready to proceed immediately to implementation (Tarim Basin Integrated Water Resources Planning),
- 8 are classed as 'Group 2' and directly related to the two project development missions to Australia and are likely to be supported later in a revised, consolidated form (NOTE that the people/agencies in these missions should also include some of those from Group 1 such as the environmental management area as there is still a need to experience the widest range of Australian practices),
- 20 are 'Group 3' and not supported but we have recommended that MC ACEDP continue dialogue with these proponents as some will increase in status and priority as ACEDP progresses.

4. Recommended Approach for the 08/09 Annual plan.

By April 08 the partners (Roundtable) should be able to,

- Consider the feasibility/design work that will have been completed for all the Group 1 activities,
- For those that may have progressed to implementation (eg., the Tarim project, plus the three smaller projects of 6 to 9 months duration, assess progress as compared with the project design to determine overall program effectiveness and continued relevance,
- Consider the scoping studies that should have been developed from the project development missions to Australia and endorse those that can proceed to project design,
- By that stage, a range of on-going high level coordination arrangements should be recommended by the MC ACEDP that will be the focal point for emerging policy issues that come from the various projects and studies.

In addition, as detailed in Section 2 earlier, there are a number of 'lessons' from the short initial planning process for 07/08.

- Both Australian and Chinese partners need to better understand the range of potential counterpart partners that exist, what are their capabilities and interests, what are the current and previous areas of interest and how they might be able to participate - an information pack of agencies, organisations of relevance to ACEDP. This will enable proponents to more closely identify the most appropriate counterpart and the role that they could play.
- In the Australian context this means better identifying State natural resource/environmental agencies, the Cooperative Research Centres that relate to ACEDP, other water and environment research bodies, the major urban water companies and the major privatised and corporatised irrigation companies. Contact details, key persons of interest, achievements, new activities etc.,
- Existing cooperation activities between Australian and Chinese agencies that exist separate from ACEDP need to be identified (this was raised in the Australian partners workshop),
- Information needs to be assembled of all donor supported activities in China in water management and water related environmental areas (and later in other areas that ACEDP partners decide to include in the program) so that overlaps are avoided and synergies created,

As well, the guidelines for submitting an activity for consideration should be expanded. It is accepted that partners should not have to complete large, time-consuming documents but very brief details, and only general details about the importance of an activity to real-life Chinese priorities, makes assessments and evaluations quite difficult. There needs to be a reasonable mix between the amount of detail in a proposal submission and the amount of time that Managing Contractor (MC ACEDP) should have to put in to expanding the proposal detail to an acceptable level; this needs to be spelt out in guidelines for the 08/09 planning cycle.

ACEDP Annual Plan 07/08.

Group 1 activities - *those activities proceeding to final feasibility/design in 07/08:*

<i>Tarim Basin Integrated Water Resources Planning –Concept No. 40.</i>

Background.

The World Bank has conducted two projects addressing water resources management in the Tarim Basin since the early 1990's. A key component of these projects was the introduction of new regulations for the Tarim Basin Water Resources Committee (TBWRC) involving contemporary approaches to participative and integrated river basin management. Additionally, policy measures were introduced that resulted in a reduction in use of Prefecture water quotas and lead to water savings and increased environmental flows to the lower river 'Green Corridor' and the Tarim River's terminal lake system - for the first time in more than 20 years. Investments were also made to increase local water productivity, reduce salinity problems and raise local living standards.

AusAID provided assistance during the second of these World Bank projects to support the integrated environmental management of the Tarim Basin. The TA supported institutional capacity building of the TBWRC; assessment of the environmental conditions in the lower Green Corridor, remote sensing of trends in land and water use in the Tarim Basin; an assessment of water quality and its impacts in the Tarim Basin, and development of a pilot, community based, Land and Water Management Plan. Study tours to the Murray Darling Basin in Australia were conducted to support the water resource aspects of the project.

All of these AusAID-supported components have been considered a success by the World Banks ex-poste evaluation.

Request for ACEDP Assistance.

The Tarim Basin Water Resources Commission is about to commence development of a 'Masterplan for the Tarim Basin'. During March 2005, AusAID was requested to provide further support for this purpose and to assist further development of the Tarim River Basin management system. An AusAID design mission visited the Tarim in March 06 to assess which components of a 'master basin planning' study could benefit from assistance from Australia.

Five key areas of support have been identified,

i)- Enhancing Hydrological Models,

Already there are a large number of computer based models for various elements of the Tarim Basin water system. This component will aim to link and configure the models so that it is possible to carry out efficiently, policy based studies and scenario evaluations of water sharing, allocation and understanding the Basin's water carrying capacity (quantity and quantity if feasible). A priority will be to link tributary to mainstream models.

ii) - Green Corridor Studies

Studies are to be conducted to ascertain the extent and condition (current and historic) of the 'Green Corridors' throughout the Basin and their particular water dependencies. This will build on the work conducted during previous phases of assistance when assessments were linked to remote sensing analyses.

iii) - River Health Indices

This component will provide detailed TA on the approaches used in Australia regarding River Health indices and their use. The component will also describe the approach (eg. scientific expert panels) used when determining ecological water requirements to use in water sharing studies.

iv) - Economic Studies

This component will firstly provide a benchmark for living conditions in the different oases as a basis for evaluating the local economic and social impact of various Tarim River development scenarios. Secondly it will compile an assessment of the different oases of the available water resource and the economic efficiency of use and scope to make water savings. Finally this component will also provide a high level assessment of the relative costs and benefits of the alternative development scenarios for policy making and pre-feasibility assessment purposes.

v) - *Institutional and Policy Studies*

This component has a primary purpose of integrating the results and using the tools produced by the other studies in a policy analysis framework. This will include identifying a range of alternative development scenarios, evaluating their relative merits (using the economic studies element and support by the hydrological models).

MWR has now requested ACEDP support and this relates directly to the PDD prepared by the AusAID mission. As this has come from the MWR as opposed to the Xinjiang autonomous region it indicates strong central government support for this province level initiative.

Relevance to ACEDP.

This project proposal has close relevance to ACEDP objectives. It will enhance government to government dialogue through close links to the similar experiences within the Murray Darling basin, will provide practical examples of applying a range of concepts of modern IRB planning, will provide the evidence and platform for any RBM policy reform needs, and can be seen as a 'priority area' pilot that can be used to transfer experiences elsewhere. It includes strong capacity building elements, has strong counterpart support, and the previous Tarim activities have shown adequate to strong capacity to implement. It is highly relevant to the development of further national policy for the integrated management of river basins.

It has a high degree of relevance.

Actions for 07/08

The existing PDD is well structured. As it is now 15 months 'old' it needs some minor review (desk study plus discussions with MWR) to ensure its continuing relevance regarding structure and outputs, risk profile and budget, its links to the developing national activities on river basin planning guidelines, and the project management structure and accountabilities within the Tarim Basin Management Bureau, and who will oversight these accountabilities for the Chinese side. This short review could proceed by recruiting a short term consultant for about 5-10 days with previous knowledge of the Tarim basin WB/AusAID activities, or alternatively the MC ACEDP could directly organise this small piece of work. If this review is supportive, immediately proceed to preparing TOR and to tender.

Regulatory Strengthening and Governance for Shiyang/Shule River Basins –(Nos. 4 and 7)

Background.

This proposal relates to two concept proposals that cover similar areas - integrated river basin management methodologies, practices and applications, particularly in arid areas. By analysing practices in Australia (and this is an area of Australian expertise) the aim is to assess what might be appropriate for China and then to use the Shiyang and Shule river basins as pilots for any new practices. Concept No. 4 deals solely with the Shiyang whilst No. 7 deals with both basins. Both areas are of the highest priority for China's water management plans. It is an area of extreme resource management conflict in that annual resources are insufficient under present use patterns and efficiencies to meet both consumptive and environmental demands, and in particular the urban needs of the 'oasis' at the end of the system. The river basins are a priority for both NDRC and SEPA. In recent years, both basins have received support from international donors, particularly the Shiyang (DFID and ADB), and the present proposal aims to build on/complement these initiatives where appropriate, to expand support in integrated river basin planning and management.

Request for ACEDP Assistance.

In general terms, the project is to,

- Investigate and analyse the present situations of natural resource and environmental condition, economy, ecological monitoring, water resource allocation, ecological compensation, demonstration of water-saving irrigation techniques, formation of water user associations, watershed management techniques and institutional arrangements (collectively these make up river basin planning and the aim should be to provide assistance to enable this to be done in an integrated and knowledge driven way).
- Study how similar sub-basins in arid areas of Australia, particularly within the Murray Darling basin, address these problems and issues,
- Use the lessons learnt to develop and implement an appropriate approach to integrated river basin planning that targets the particular problems of the Shiyang river basin, and develop a capacity building program to better equip the relevant agencies with new basin planning concepts,
- Based on the actual experiences of implementing the new basin planning processes, prepare evaluation reports and identify where new policies and strategies for basin planning could be used in the broader national context.

Neither project as presented is suitable for funding support as it is not clear how the project relates to similar work that has been done or is underway in both basins in recent years. However the concept aligns with the highest of China water management priority and should be further developed as a possible complementary activity to the existing water resource projects in the area, particularly as it relates to an area of IWRM where Australia has much skill and experience.

Relevance to ACEDP.

This project proposal has close relevance to ACEDP objectives. It will enhance government to government dialogue through close links to the similar experiences within the Murray Darling Basin, will provide practical examples of applying a range of concepts of modern IRB planning, will provide the evidence and platform for possible RBM policy reform needs, and can be seen as a 'priority area' pilot that can be used to transfer experiences elsewhere. It has a high Chinese priority as evidenced by the MWR comments at the Roundtable meeting. It includes strong capacity building elements, has strong counterpart technical/research support (a research institute of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, and MWR's Institute of Water Resources and Hydropower) but does need to have 'ownership' extended to the agencies at central and local levels that would have to implement pilots, understand what the results are showing and generally be able to improve skills in basin management. The main issue to resolve is how effective and extensive the previous water resources planning/management work in both basins has been and where the 'window' is for ACEDP to 'make a difference'.

It has a high degree of relevance.

Actions for 07/08

Have review/scoping study undertaken that would:

- Review previous and current IWRM/IRBM work in both basins, both locally and donor funded,

- Assess involvement of relevant Chinese institutions
- Assess the completeness and effectiveness of the previous work with respect to Australian practices or IRBM,
- Identify key gaps in either elements of IRBM covered or as a result of less than optimal effectiveness,
- Develop a project that would take account of the perceived 'gaps' plus address the requests as covered in the two concept notes,
- In broad terms, define the scope and content of a study tour to Australia that would provide exposure and capacity building to all aspects of Australian approaches to IRBM but with a focus on those areas of immediate importance to the Shiyang and Schule basins (this study tour should be at the start of any project if it is concluded that a sensible project can be developed) and lead to involvement of appropriate organisations
- Include return visit by Australian counterparts if they have agreed to be part of the project.

It is likely that these two basins will have received different levels of water resources planning and management and a key activity should be to learn from each other. There should be some form of joint workshops that would discuss the findings and observations from the study tour and sort out the detail of specific projects that should be undertaken. The scoping study should explore in a preliminary way how coordination and cooperation between the two basins could occur. Proposal No.4 is recommended to take the lead.

The scoping study is likely to take about 3 weeks - 4 days in each basin, 4 days in Beijing, travel, write-up.
Approximate cost \$25,000.

Lake Tai Basin Water Resources Management and Pollution Control- (no. 5, 23, 30, part 36 and 46)

Background.

At least three proposals deal with various parts of water management, water pollution, plan of action, and regulatory and institutional aspects of the Lake Tai basin. This is a basin of highest Chinese priority and although none of the proposals submitted are 'complete' and in a format ready to proceed, the overall issue of improved Lake Tai basin management has such a priority that immediate work on project enhancement should proceed. This would be at feasibility/design level for a multi-year initiative led by NDRC (proposal #4) and involve all relevant agencies; possible counterpart involvement would be identified.

Request for ACEDP Assistance.

No. 5 aims to:

- Strengthen water resources protection in Taihi Lake to ensure drinking water safety,
- Control eutrophication,

No. 23 aims to use Taihu Lake as a focus to:

- Better understand basin management through research if Australian conditions and relate these to China
- Promote inter-country scientific collaboration,
- Develop a IRBM management mechanism for the Lake,
- Seek to build long standing 'fellowship' between the countries in IRBM,

No. 30 aims to:

- Review environmental flow experiences in Australia, relate to Chinese conditions and use this experience to the Tai lake problems,

No. 39 aims to,

- Undertake a wide range of technical studies on all the elements and attributes of the pollution issue for the Lake and suggest management and institutional ways of addressing the problems,

Part of No. 46 looks at:

- the eutrophication problems and seeks to identify the best ways of dealing with them based on Australian experience.

Collectively, this will provide a very strategic way of addressing all the technical, management, institutional issues - but it must be done in an integrated way; none of the proposals should proceed as a stand alone.

Relevance to ACEDP

This project proposal has close relevance to ACEDP objectives. It will enhance government to government dialogue through close links to the similar experiences within the Murray Darling basin and other areas of Australia, will provide practical examples of applying a range of concepts of modern IRB planning and show how they can relate to the identification, investigation and management of both point and non-point source pollution, and how public participation can add to these processes, will provide the evidence and platform for possible RBM policy reform needs, and can be seen as a 'priority area' pilot that can be used to transfer experiences elsewhere. It includes strong capacity building elements, has strong counterpart technical/research and line ministry support (NDRC, MWR, Taihu Lake Authority, SEPA). An important issue is to assess the previous work that has been done in Taihu Lake and to assess how this fits into the overall IRBM needs of the lake and determine where ACEDP can make a difference.

This has a high degree of relevance.

Actions for 07/08.

In view of high priority, proceed straight to feasibility/design,

- The study should work closely with the proponents of the various proposals mentioned above to more clearly define the project, and determine where ACEDP can complement the large amount of work that is already planned,

- It must take account of the current NDRC work that is to draft, by the end of 07, a 'plan of research and investigation' for the Tai Lake study,
- A study tour to Australia by late November is a high priority for NDRC; this must involve not only technical issues relating to lake pollution but also institutional and policy issues as to how Australia handles these issues, particularly diffuse pollution which is said to be 60% of the pollution source,
- This means discussions with state agencies (environment and resource management), MDBC, major irrigation corporations (these have environmental improvement and drainage conditions of licenses), and catchment management agencies that oversight development of land and water management plans that address diffuse pollution,
- Identify and negotiate involvement of strong Australian counterpart input
- During 08, NDRC wants to incorporate a number of technical seminars funded by ACEDP as the planning and then implementation phases of the NDRC project gets underway,
- Include a return visit by Australian counterparts if they agree to be part of the project.

One/ Two Australian experts should be able to complete project feasibility/design in 4 weeks (2 weeks in country). This would include identifying possible Australian counterparts and their role.

Wetlands Management Policy, Guidelines and Capacity Building - No. 24, 25, 26 and 27

Additional to the particular issues at Lake Tai, a high priority issue identified in the background studies is developing an improved capability in all aspects of wetlands management. At least four concept proposals cover parts of wetlands management but are not comprehensive in coverage. A start can be made immediately on assisting the relevant agencies (mainly SFA and SEPA) to further develop the proposal and proceed to feasibility/design. This initiative could be led by the National Wetland Center under the SFA but with the close involvement of relevant departments within SEPA and MWR that have responsibility for wetlands management. Counterpart partners would also need to be identified.

Request for ACEDP Assistance.

The four projects seek to study and research Australian expertise in,

- monitoring and management of wetlands on the 'Ramsar' listing (note: all wetlands should be considered in terms of developing wetlands management guidelines),
- developing wetlands management guidelines and assessing how appropriate policies can be developed, how communication and coordination among agencies can be achieved,
- linking the wetlands policies and management guidelines into integrated river basin planning,
- a range of training and capacity building to ensure new policies and systems can be effective.

Whilst SFA (Office of Wetland conservation and Management) has been the proponent for these proposals, SEPA and MWR have a major role in how wetlands are managed, how flows are maintained to wetlands and how ecological values and health are maintained. The project must incorporate all three agencies.

Relevance to ACEDP.

This project proposal has close relevance to ACEDP objectives. It will enhance government to government dialogue through close links to the similar experiences within the Murray Darling Basin, and Australian national and state agencies, will provide practical examples of applying a range of concepts of linking environmental policies, strategies and issues to modern IRB planning, will provide the evidence and platform for possible RBM policy reforms that will better cater for environmental management issues, and can be seen as a 'priority area' that can be used to transfer experiences to wetland areas throughout China. It includes strong capacity building elements, has strong counterpart technical/research support and will be linked closely to line/management agencies through SEPA and MWR. The main issue to resolve is how to effectively bring SEPA and MWR into the project as all four proposals have been proposed by SFA.

Highly relevant to ACEDP.

Actions for 07/08

Proceed to feasibility/design which should include the following elements:

- Discuss with SFA as to how to incorporate all four proposals into a rational, comprehensive wetlands management project,
- Review other national and donor supported projects in this area to determine synergies,
- Hold discussions with SEPA and MWR to determine relevant roles and responsibilities, their needs for such a project and how they are to be involved,
- Develop study tour to research and assess Australian experience, methods and key counterparts, and relevance to China,
- Assist with developing policy, strategy and management guidelines for wetlands that may be appropriate for China,
- Capacity building requirements.
- Return visit by Australian counterparts.

One/ Two Australian experts should be able to complete project feasibility/design in 4 weeks (2 weeks in country). This would include identifying possible Australian counterparts and their role.

Water Ecology Compensation Policy and Mechanism - No. 34, 11 and 21.

Three proposals cover parts of this priority policy area. None can be immediately implemented in present form. The need for research and policy in this area is emphasised in all Chinese environmental management strategic priorities. Again, feasibility/design work can proceed immediately with relevant agencies to scope and design a suitable project led by Chinese Academy for Environmental Planning with the Guangting Reservoir as an initial case study. Guangting Reservoir is a major water supply source for Beijing.

Request for ACEDP Assistance.

All three proposals adopt a similar approach but address different aspects of environmental/ecological compensation.

- Set up stakeholder groups and agency working committees,
- Study tour to Australia, review methods and options,
- Review options in a Chinese context, develop options,
- Have stakeholder consultations and consultations with key government policy agencies,
- Recommend appropriate policy.

SEPA has already done a large amount of work in this area and this project will provide an opportunity to discuss and test this work with Australian agencies and research bodies.

Relevance to ACEDP

This project proposal has close relevance to ACEDP objectives. It will enhance government to government dialogue through close links to the similar experiences within the Murray Darling Basin, and Australian national and state agencies, will provide practical examples of applying a range of concepts relating to environmental management, market and economic principles and incentives, and compensation/ pollution penalties/resource tax, and linking these environmental policies, strategies and issues to modern IRB planning. This will provide the evidence and platform for possible pollution/compensation/RBM policy reforms that will better cater for environmental management issues, and can be seen as a 'priority area' that can be used to transfer experiences throughout China. It includes strong capacity building elements, has strong counterpart technical/research support and will be linked closely to line/management agencies through SEPA and MWR. It should lead to strong on-going links to Australian national and state environmental agencies and to the Cooperative research Centres dealing with environmental management and ecological economics.

Highly relevant to ACEDP.

Actions for 07/08

Proceed immediately to feasibility/design, which should include,

- Review of existing Chinese initiatives in this area,
- Assessment of the three proposals and the consolidation into one strategic response,
- Assessment of likely Australian counterparts and the role that could be played,
- Scope and nature of a study tour, capacity building initiatives and when these should be started within the project, on-going technical and policy seminars,
- On-going policy links and how these can be strengthened.

One expert consultant should be able to complete this feasibility/design in 4weeks (2 weeks in country).

Water Rights and Allocation Trading in the Yellow River Basin - No. 14 and part 55)

A trial water trading scheme has been in operation in the YRB since 2003. As well, the AusAID supported WET project has almost completed two phases of a project that has explored how a water trading and water allocation scheme could be introduced; this has trialled concepts within a number of small sub-basins. It would be highly relevant to now further explore water trading at the much larger scale of the Yellow river which would provide practical experiences and outcomes, and lead to determining a range of important national policy outcomes. Proposal No. 14 basically does that. A number of proposals relate to water rights, trading and water allocation and these need to be rationalised with this broader Yellow River trading project to provide the widest possible set of experiences. The earlier work within the 'WET' project is very relevant to this project. That is, whilst the project is about taking water trading experiences to a higher river basin level, it should include relevant aspects of water rights and allocation, as trading is very difficult if the 'right' and 'allocation' levels are not clearly defined.

Request for ACEDP Assistance.

The project aims to use the experience from a recent small scale water trading project in the Yellow River to:

- evaluate the feasibility of implementing water rights transfer on a basin, or large sub-basin perspective from a hydrological, economical and social standpoint,
- identify policy and political drivers to facilitate the success of water rights transfer during formulation and implementation,
- recommend policy changes to improve water trading policies and practices that includes both government and non-government levels.

The role sought for Australian input needs further development, and needs to include a 'first hand' understanding of water rights and trading in the southern Murray Darling Basin where trading has been underway for many years and where trading at a Basin and interjurisdictional scale has been undertaken.

Relevance to ACEDP

This project proposal has close relevance to AusAID supported 'WET' project has already undertaken a large amount of work in water right, allocation and trading and, if incorporated into a new project, will create a high degree of relevance in terms of ACEDP. It is also an area where there is a great deal of experience in Australia; in the southern Murray Darling Basin, water transfers and trading has taken place for two decades, interstate (interprovincial) trading has been trialed for many years and there is a strong understanding of the practical aspects (and pitfalls) rather than just the theoretical benefits. The project should include either a study tour or a series of high level seminars in China (probably both) and will then enhance government to government dialogue through close links to the similar experiences within the overall Murray Darling Basin. Australian national and state agencies will provide practical examples of applying a range of concepts relating to water trading, market and economic principles and incentives, practical experiences including unforeseen impacts, and linking these strategies and issues to modern IRB planning. This will provide the evidence and platform for possible policy reforms, and can be seen as a 'priority area' that can be used to transfer experiences throughout China. It includes strong capacity building elements, has strong counterpart technical/research support and will be linked closely to line/management agencies through MWR.

Actions for 07/08

Proceed immediately to feasibility/design, which should include,

- Review of the previous pilot trading scheme conducted in the YR basin,
- Assessment of the 'WET' project outputs to assess relevance to this current proposal,
- Scope out a detailed proposal that will include study tour and review of a range of Australian examples especially in the southern Murray Darling Basin (where the largest variations and problems in practical water trading has occurred),
- Assess how the project will be implemented relative to the Yellow River basin and whether it should be confined to sub-basin areas to increase effectiveness,
- Identify strong Australian counterparts and the role that they might play,
- Identify how outputs can be developed into broader policy options that could be considered at the national level,

One expert, preferably with senior experience in the southern Murray Darling Basin, should be able to undertake this design work in 4 weeks (2 weeks in country).

Management for Large Irrigation Districts (Yellow River Basin) - No. 6 and 55

The main objectives are to study policies and strategies of irrigation water management to assess where considerable water savings can be made, productivity improved and the need and shape of new national policies identified. Departments within MWR are seeking to partner Australia's CSIRO Land and Water. There are also opportunities to involve Australia's large corporatised and privatised irrigation schemes to provide practical examples and experiences as to how water efficiencies have been achieved with increased productivity and improved scheme environmental management. Water use efficiency in irrigation has been specified as high priority in the 11th 5yr. plan. As well the WET 2 project has completed relevant work that should be incorporated. The proposal is too narrow at present, concentrating on the use of remote sensing to identify efficiency issues. A broader scoping of the project to include the intent of a number of other projects relating to irrigation can commence immediately with feasibility/designs to follow, facilitated by MC ADECP.

Request for ACEDP Assistance.

This request comes from the Remote Sensing Technology Application Centre of the MWR. It is linked to a similar centre of the YRCC and seeks to partner with an Australian counterpart, CSIRO Land and Water. The main objectives of the proposal are to study policies and strategies of irrigation water management and water saving agriculture. It intends to use remote sensing as a way of developing approaches to improve efficiency.

The project aims to first review all aspects of irrigation efficiency in the YRB, then research Australian experiences and approaches, compare to the Chinese conditions and ultimately develop new efficiency generating policies and strategies. The project is planned to cover 5 years with ACEDP input being \$100,000 per year. A range of technical exchanges are planned together with capacity building mainly in the last three years.

Relevance to ACEDP.

This project proposal has close relevance to ACEDP objectives. It will enhance government to government dialogue through close links to the similar experiences within the Murray Darling Basin, and Australian national and state agencies, and has the opportunity to link to the practical experiences of the large irrigation corporations in the MD basin. The project design will need to include this link with the private irrigation sector. It will provide practical examples of applying a range of concepts relating to irrigation management and efficiency and should link to the earlier work from the 'WET 2' AusAID supported project and the extensions for this project that are at proposal No. 55. This will provide the evidence and platform for possible irrigation management policy reforms that will address a 'high priority area' from the current China 5 year plan. It includes strong capacity building elements, has strong counterpart technical/research support and will be linked closely to line/management agencies MWR. It should lead to strong on-going links to Australian national and state agencies as well as creating links into the private irrigation sector - this should be an important goal for the project.

Highly relevant to ACEDP.

Actions for 07/08

Proceed immediately to feasibility/design - include the following:

- Arrange study tour to meet Australian counterparts and inspect/discuss efficiency issues with the large private irrigation corporations in Australia,
- Prior to the study tour, the Chinese proponent to develop position paper on the situation on irrigation efficiency in YRB,
- Develop ACEDP input to complement the 5 year study proposed by MWR including involvement of appropriate Australian partners,
- Utilise the outputs from WET 2 and the approach in Concept No. 55 to strengthen the proposal.
- Return visit by Australian counterparts to include private irrigation corporations.

One expert should be able to undertake this design work in 4 week (2 weeks in country).

Environmental Flow Management –Methodologies, Policies and Guidelines –Nos. 9, 10, 16, 17, 19, 20, 28 and 47.

All of the proposals mentioned in the title have some involvement in this subject - the main ones being 9, 16, 17 and 47.

As mentioned on page 6 under 'Group 1', there is wide variation (and some inconsistency) between all these proposals, which cover environmental flow and ecological restoration methodologies, river health assessment, water use versus protection balances, developing environmental flow policies, strategies and regulations, evaluating the success or otherwise of the recent environmental water transfers in key basins, establishing a river health index etc.,. It has been agreed that despite the obvious preference of focusing such a wide scatter of projects through a project development mission to Australia, the very high priority and relative urgency for China of developing suitable processes for environmental flow management will move this category into Group 1 for immediate feasibility consideration. However, commencement should be preceded by a 2 day scoping workshop in Beijing at which all the 8 activities within this category, plus those recently completed, relevant activities such as the 'WET' project, are scrutinised by an expert panel (which would include the team recruited to undertake design) so that the most appropriate 'shape and content' for the immediate project(s) can be identified before commencement, as well as those that should be deferred until the EM project development mission is undertaken.

The assessment needs to focus on the objectives and tangible outcomes of the projects. For example a project to satisfy the guidelines requirements for Master planning in the required timescale could be a quite short and technically focussed project adapting already existing environmental guidelines both from Australia and internationally, some of which are already in Chinese (IUCN, 2003¹). However, a project to consider closely the Australian approaches to best practice in river health and ecological flows, and to then adapt an appropriate approach to Chinese conditions (and test this in the widely varying situations within China) would, by contrast, be longer term and involve many Chinese agencies especially MWR, SEPA, Ministry of Forests and perhaps some others. It may be necessary to have several projects depending upon purpose, partners and best Australian counterparts. The expert panel would advise on this.

The MC ACEDP could commence organising the design team and the panel, now.

Request for ACEDP Assistance.

There is a wide range in the nature, extent and cost of these proposals. 4 are costed at between \$100000 and \$150000 for about a 1 to 2 year project, another is \$300000 for a 3 year project, 1 is for \$700000 for about 2 years, and the 2 largest are \$2000000 for 1 to 2 years, and \$5800000 for 4 years. The point here is that there is a wide variation and this will require the inception workshop to carefully align work value with value for money. The largest project submitted by the MWR does not have any reference to a counterpart partner; it is very large and seems to require the ACEDP money to do all the research and development, as opposed to complementing Chinese studies with Australian experience and practices, and using ACEDP to develop policy options and then guidelines and implementing procedures.

In terms of the environmental flow management component of this broad, multi-faceted group of projects, the most advanced proposal is No. 47 by the Department of Environment and Water, Canberra. It draws on the experience and achievements of WET 2 and aims to "focus on the practical application and refinement of principles for water allocation planning and definition of environmental flows". It is sensible to base any new project on the work done so far. However as yet there has been no evaluation of the success, relevance or effectiveness of WET and whilst EAT has no reason to doubt these issues, good project/program design and management says that some form of interrogation should occur to give confidence as to the best way forward. The suggested 2 day inception workshop will provide this scrutiny via an expert panel plus the project design team and it will be important to at least hear from other expert Australian groups with expertise in environmental flow management (such as the CRC for EWater, and its predecessor, the CRC for Freshwater Ecology particularly as they bring together scientific, policy and management expertise from a range of governments) to ensure the appropriateness of the approach in the proposal. It is inappropriate, at this stage to "back a (WET) winner" in the absence of any information on progress and appropriateness and without considering alternative "winners". Of course if AusAID is proposing an end-of- project assessment report (an Independent Completion Report) then really this 2 day workshop should not occur until after that report was received.

¹ IUCN (2003) Dyson, M., Bergkamp, G., Scanlon, J. (eds). Flow. The Essentials of Environmental Flows. Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK. xiv + 118 pp

Relevance to ACEDP

All the projects within this activity have close relevance to ACEDP objectives.. They will enhance government to government dialogue through strengthening the close links already established through WET although these need to go much beyond MWR so that the Program is a genuine 'environmental program'. They will link to similar experiences within the Murray Darling Basin, and within Australian national and state agencies, Catchment Management Agencies and will provide practical examples of applying a range of concepts of linking a wide range of environmental policies, strategies and issues to modern IRB planning, will provide the evidence and platform for possible RBM policy reforms that will better cater for environmental management issues, and can be seen as a 'priority area' that can be used to transfer experiences to the many river basins China. Strong capacity building elements are included, there is strong counterpart technical/research support and will be linked closely to line/management agencies through SEPA and MWR, depending on which component activities are included in the newly scoped project that will go forward for design. The main issue to resolve is holding an effective 2 day inception workshop to ensure that the most appropriate processes and practices are incorporated within the project.

Highly relevant to ACEDP.

Actions for 07/08

- Hold a 2 day scoping/inception workshop at which all proponents of the 8 or so proposals within this 'environmental flow management grouping will attend,
- Select a feasibility/design team that will ultimately undertake this phase for the scoped project that will emerge from the workshop,
- Add a 2 person expert panel to the design team for the workshop activity and for discussions with the key Chinese agencies; these two people to have skills that cover peak level IRBM, environmental flow methodologies and ecological restoration techniques, flood plain, wetland and environmental flow interactions and groundwater-environmental flow interactions.
- The workshop should assess the merits and the needs of all the various aspects of environmental flow management etc., that are within the proposals and suggest the best way forward for all components,
- Develop the specific needs and objectives of (several if necessary) projects for further scoping based on the needs of the different agencies.
- Ensure that the strongest possible Australian team which is linked to practical management and policy in regard to environmental flows is involved. This may benefit from a rapid assessment, competitive tender approach.
- Particular areas or projects should be scoped - not only the key environmental flow project work based on recent WET work and the short term MWR need for practical environmental flow guidelines, but also projects such as evaluating the effectiveness of the environmental releases that have been made in recent years, why they have worked (or why not), the costs and benefits of these, and how these outcomes relate to what might be achieved if an other approach was adopted.

Smaller Projects to Proceed as Part of Group 1 Activities.

There are also 3 smaller projects that should proceed as part of the Group 1 activities

1. *Trans-Administrative Region Water Environment Policy/guidelines (No. 31) -*

This project in the Zhangweinan sub-basin is relatively small and of 8 months duration. It aims to research the critical issue of cross boundary pollution management and develop improved processes based on comparing Australian and Chinese experiences. There has already been considerable work done on transjurisdictional water pollution disputes; see ADB TA 3588 PRC 'Transjurisdictional Environmental Management - Local Legislation to Support Transjurisdictional Water Pollution Management'. That project has done all the background and no need here to reinvent. So the project should proceed but commence with a review of what has happened with the ADB TA recommendations, particularly the case study for the Fen river, for which dispute resolution procedures were developed. The project needs to be designed to complement the World Bank-SEPA project taking place in the ZWN sub-basin. Then the Australian experiences can be researched as per the proposal.

Actions for 07/08

A small review and project design is needed. MC ACEDP should be able to prepare TOR and proceed to recruit support, or

alternatively, supervise this project directly. Activities should be designed with an appreciation of the World Bank ZWN work.

2. *Study on Mechanisms for Public Participation in Water Pollution Control (No. 33)
Integrated Watershed Management etc., for Control of Eutrophication of Lakes(No. 36)*

These two projects both relate to community/farmer/village involvement in managing sub-basins and the problems of overcoming diffuse pollution through a range of processes underpinned by public participation. Neither proposal is developed to quite that extent. Australia has very well developed community processes through its basin management structure and the role of 'Catchments Management Agencies' that develop land and water management plans that have diffuse pollution as a key component.

It should include a study tour to Australia to understand how the 15 sub-basins within the MD basin are operated, visit 3 of the catchment management agencies (CMA's) that oversight natural resource management within these sub-basins, research differences in these and assess suitability for China. Agencies on the study tour should be broader than the Nanjing Institute and the Research Academy of Environmental Sciences to include a range of agencies that will be responsible for natural resource use and protection planning at the county levels (SEPA, MWR, at the central and lower levels, basin organisations.)

Also, the previous AusAID funded Tarim Basin studies trialled local level land and water planning approaches (these are similar to activities within the CMA's mentioned above) and a review of this activity should occur to assess whether it proved effective in Chinese conditions. This review should probably occur after the Australian study tour.

Actions for 07/08

As with the previous project, a small review and project design is needed. MC ACEDP should be able to prepare TOR and proceed to recruit support, or alternatively, supervise this project directly.

3. *Groundwater Management Policies and Regulations (no 51, 54 plus MWR discussions)*

Neither nos. 51 or 54 should proceed as stand alone projects. However during discussions with MWR (Water Resources Management Centre) a briefing was given to EAT on a major groundwater policy/strategy/regulatory project that is aimed at producing groundwater management plans (use, allocation, recharge etc.) and to support this with new legislation and procedures. A request was made to be able to study the Australian approaches, particularly at state levels (particularly NSW, Vic., and WA) and this is a very good idea and is exactly what ACEDP should do. MWR has not submitted a proposal on this issue. There seemed to be some confusion on this issue but nevertheless the EAT has not seen one.

As well, ADB is reported to be interested in funding a large project on enhancing regulations and policies in water conservation and savings and related management issues, which is supposed to include groundwater. See also concept note 54, which is not supported by itself but may have relevance in an integrated project.

Actions for 07/08

MC ACEDP should further explore the groundwater issue with MWR, and identify what other donors are doing, and if this indicates that a sound project could be developed within the ACEDP objectives and can be readily scoped, then 'GW management' should become a Group 1 activity for 07/08 and proceed to feasibility/design.

One Australian expert with extensive experience of groundwater management in China and Australia should be able to scope this work and prepare a feasibility/design within 4 weeks (2 weeks in country). This includes discussions with potential Australian counterparts.

ACEDP Annual Plan 07/08.

Group 2 Activities - *" Those concepts where further conceptual or project development is necessary or where there are a significant number of similar activities that require much more information, consolidation and development, and a degree of agency cooperation to resolve this",*

For Group 2 proposals, two 'project development missions' (advanced discussion study tours) have been recommended after which it should be possible to rationalise or merge many of the Group 2 proposals into more focused and relevant projects. The two missions should cover,

- *Integrated river basin management (IRBM), and,*
- *Environmental management (EM),*

Integrated River Basin Management (IRBM) Project Development Mission

About six projects directly relate to this subject and many others relate to how IRBM is implemented. For example incorporating all the new methodologies into IRB planning is all about 'doing' IRBM. With China now developing new procedures for its RBM and planning, and the fact that the '3 rivers, 3 lakes' priorities apply (ie., basin planning for these six key areas is a high priority) it is important that Chinese agencies experience the widest range of Australian experience.

A 2 to 3 week study tour/project development mission should be undertaken before February 08 that would allow enough time before the next planning roundtable in about April 08 for the participants to workshop, at the end of the visit, the experiences and lessons learnt and scope out the nature and extent of suitable projects. It is this would in the merging and reshaping of the projects that are presently within this activity.

The study group should,

- Meet national agencies in Canberra to be briefed on the make-up of the Australian water/environmental sector and the nature of national/state relations, and recent national water reform initiatives,
- Visit the Murray Darling Basin Commission and be fully briefed on its role, activities and interstate coordination. This should also deal with water sharing, and allocation including environmental allocations between states.
- Visit state agencies at least in New South Wales and Victoria (also South Australia and Queensland if time permits) and be briefed on water management and planning at basin and sub-basin/catchment levels, water permitting and trading, environmental water, water pricing, and the role of the pricing regulator,
- Visit a number of catchment management agencies to understand how these operate at the sub-basin level and the role that the community/local levels play in this lower level planning and management,
- Visit some of the major privatised or corporatised irrigation corporations, and the major urban water supply agencies and be fully briefed on their activities especially in relation to water entitlements, permits, annual water planning and allocation, water pricing and environmental management.
- All potential Australian partners should be part of, or make presentation to, the study mission including those that have capacity building proposals already submitted to ACEDP.
- At the end of the study mission a workshop should be held to discuss the experiences and lessons learnt, and to restructure and refocus the present range of IRBM-related proposals into groups that better represent ACEDP objectives.

Environmental Management (EM) Project Development Mission

There are 16 proposals that generally fall within the category of 'environmental management' or have a close relationship. Virtually all proposals - both Chinese and Australian - either need more development as a single stand-alone project before proceeding or need combining and rationalising into a more focused project that better meets the ACEDP objectives and specific Chinese priorities. Eight of these are being addressed in the group 1 activity 'Environmental Flow Management Methodologies, Policies and Guidelines'. These projects cover areas such as ecological restoration methodologies, environmental flows, river health indices, effectiveness of environmental water releases in improving downstream conditions, wetland management, coastal zone environmental management, erosion and land management issues, point source and diffuse pollution and planning/management approaches to address these issues etc. Whilst the policies and practices to address each of these might

be different, they all have to be captured and implemented by basin wide planning and management institutions and organisations (or at the smaller sub-basin/catchment levels). Therefore the preferred approach to undertaking a project development mission is for agencies involved to be together for the first half of the mission for general discussion on Australian institutional and management aspects of 'aquatic environmental management' and then to break into smaller groups, as necessary, to study particular theme topics such as those listed above. Maybe the participants will prefer to remain as one group and be briefed jointly on all aspects of the mission.

The study group should,

- Meet national agencies in Canberra to be briefed on the make-up of the Australian water/environmental sector and the nature of national/state relations, and recent national water/environmental reform initiatives, and on the approach to international water environmental protocols,
- Visit the Murray Darling Basin Commission and be fully briefed on its natural resource/environment program,
- Visit state agencies at least in New South Wales and Victoria (also South Australia and Queensland if time permits) and be briefed on all aspects of water environmental management (including regulatory and the water related role and activities of State EPA's) and planning at urban, basin and sub-basin/catchment levels,
- Visit a number of catchment management agencies to understand how these operate at the sub-basin level and the role that the community/local levels play in developing land and water management plans to balance resource use and protection, and nutrient/pollution/salinity management issues,
- Visit the relevant Cooperative Research Centres, and other research agencies and research centres that are involved in aquatic ecology and environmental management
- All potential Australian partners should be part of, or present to, the study mission including those that have capacity building proposals already submitted to ACEDP.
- At the end of the study mission a workshop should be held to discuss the experiences and lessons learnt, and to restructure and refocus, as necessary, the present range of aquatic environmental management proposals into groups that better represent ACEDP objectives.

Following the two project development missions it would be sensible for the Australian counterparts who have indicated a clear interest and role in these theme areas and the likely projects within them, to visit China to become more familiar with river basin and environmental priority areas, and perhaps assist in final scoping of jointly sponsored projects.

Group 4 Proposals- Not Supported

“Those proposals that are not supported at present and cannot be reasonably enhanced now, to better meet ACEDP objectives. (Whilst the EAT does not support these proposals, it is recognised that they may become more relevant once other activities within ACEDP begin to produce results and we recommend that MC ACEDP continue discussions with the proponents of these proposals).”

1	Institutional Mechanism and Information Exchange for Ecological Water Use in Arid and Semiarid Areas	SFA, Office for Returning Farmland to Forestry as both HA and IA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Failed to demonstrate strong links between returning farmland to forests, ecological water and climate change; poor links to ACEDP - Australia does not seem to have much to offer in this area except for funding - Little possibility for establishing a sustained Australian-Chinese institutional linkage - Duration unrealistic to achieve any meaningful results 	<u>Not supported.</u>
2	Demonstration Program on Comprehensive Treatment and Development in West Mountainous Area	SFA, Mountainous Development Office Gansu Province, Forest Bureau of Jingchuan County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Neither activities nor results well articulated - Failed to demonstrate linkage to ACEDP - Failed to demonstrate policy impacts - Failed to demonstrate sustained Australian-Chinese institutional linkage 	<u>Not supported.</u>
3	Program on Construction Ability of Mountainous Protection and Development	SFA, Mountainous Development Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objectives not explicitly aligned with ACEDP - Neither activities nor deliverables well articulated - Failed to demonstrate policy impacts - Duration unrealistic to achieve any meaningful results 	<u>Not supported.</u>
12	Changjiang Real-Time Water Quality Monitoring and Forecasting System	MWR, Changjiang Water Resources Commission, Bureau of Hydrology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inconsistent with ACEDP objectives - Only requesting equipment and labour costs from ACEDP - does not meet eligibility criteria 	<u>Not supported</u>
15	Climate Change and Impacts to River Basin Management	MWR, Yellow River Conservancy Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only partial links to ACEDP objectives, proposal does not draw much relevance to climate change, in terms of methodology, activities and deliverables - Methodology, activities and deliverables not well articulated, - No Australian partner, 	<u>Not supported.</u>
18	Hydroelectricity Development in Middle/Small Catchments Based on Its Effect on Ecology	MWR, Bureau of Comprehensive Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Partial links to ACEDP objectives, - more of a research/ academic study, - no close links to policy development, - Scope not well articulated, - Hydro development issues should not study environmental flow methodology but should use outputs from other projects to better analyse hydro projects. 	Not supported.
22	Water Safety Administration Mechanism (Comparison and Research)	Academy of the Yangste River	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concept is more technical and research with no clear links as to how to might relate to improved policy, - Not close to the main four ACEDP objectives, - No identification of any Australian partner; virtually no local budget commitment, - Not directly linked to high Chinese priorities, - No particular Australian expertise that warrants targeting, 	<u>Not supported.</u>
37	Comparison Study of Environmental	Research Academy of environmental sciences.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally meets ACEDP objectives but is more research driven and with unclear links to policy development, 	<u>Not supported</u>

	Management of Coastal Zone.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No obvious links to aust counterparts nor to areas of unique Aust expertise. 	
38	Assessment of Industrial COD Emissions and Technical options.	Research Academy of Environmental Sciences.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This project does not meet the short to medium term objectives of ACEDP (water related environmental issues). - Very technical and unlikely to lead to policy considerations by itself. - Related pollution management issues should be taken up in the Tai lake study. 	<u>Not supported.</u>
41	Technology and policy applications to enhance decision making to manage land degradation and water quality	AgWest International	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A general expression of interest for program development; not a clear understanding of the Chinese situation or needs • Plans a scoping workshop in China to develop better understanding • Insufficient information to judge compliance with program objectives • Research appears to be the main focus rather than practical IWRM/IRBM outcomes • Funding problem 	<u>Not supported</u>
42	Technology and policy applications for environmental monitoring to manage land degradation and water quality.	AgWest International (ARWA Centre for Ecohydrology & Department of Agriculture and Food, WA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A general expression of interest for program development with little understanding of the Chinese situation or needs • Insufficient information to judge compliance with program objectives • Research appears to be the main focus rather than practical IWRM/RBM outcomes • Funding problem 	<u>Not supported</u>
43	Identification, assessment and prioritization of water and nutrient management activities	AGWEST International	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A general expression of interest for program development with little understanding of the Chinese situation or needs • Insufficient information to judge compliance with program objectives • Research appears to be the main focus rather than practical IWRM/IRBM outcomes • Funding problems and generally unclear 	<u>Not supported</u>
44	Integrated River Basin Management approaches and policy to control and abate Schistosomiasis control in people and their livestock	The Nature Conservancy (in association with Chiangjiang Water Resources Commission (CWRC); Three Gorges Dam Company; Hunan Institute of Parasitic Diseases) AND School of Population Health, University of Queensland;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deals with one fairly narrow (and uncommon in Australia) aspect of river basin management which is public health related • Is a balance of research, public sector engagement and demonstrations (although this is mostly education materials) and has a clear project design. • Generally consistent with program objectives although the demonstration implementation aspect could be stronger • Does not deal with the transfer of the primary practical aspects Australian water resource management expertise. • Priority for this project should rest with Chinese side • Funding problem- no matching cash, nature and security of large in-kind share uncertain. 	<u>Not supported;</u>
45	Using the Catchment Modeling Toolkit to help build capacity for integrated river basin Management in China	eWater CRC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no specific proposal for activity • Does not address program objectives • Toolkit tools would be input, as relevant, via the involvement of relevant water resource managers and technical specialists. • No funding details 	<u>Not supported</u>

46	Cyanobacteria Management Taihu Basin	International Centre of Excellence in Water Resource Management with Taihu Basin Authority (MWR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A technical capacity building project, • Not close to ACEDP objectives, does not promote on-going policy dialogue not inter-government relations, • Not a practical application of IRBM, • Is a capacity building exercise and is detailed and well presented in that context, • Relates to the high priority issue of improved water quality for Lake Taihu. 	<u>Not supported</u>
49	Piloting a new indicator methodology to determine investment priorities for strengthening rural livelihoods Yellow River	International Water Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not close to ACEDP objectives; not strong in current form, • Project would be improved if it dealt with transferring practical experiences of best practice Australian water resources management. • Research project where practical applications and outcomes, and how it would add substantially to existing RB planning and poverty management approaches, are uncertain. • Linkages to existing Chinese approach of identifying 'poverty' (vulnerable) counties unclear • Project would be relevant if a larger comprehensive project was developing a river basin plan. • objectives • Funding problem- no matching cash, limited in-kind matching . 	<u>Not supported</u>
51	Improving Ground Water Governance in North China Plains	Uni of SA / International Water Management Institute	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not close to ACEDP objectives • Sustainable groundwater management is a recognised high priority in China. • Groundwater management is an important opportunity for transferring practical Australian expertise; project needs to better identify ways to incorporate this experience rather than be presented solely by IWMI (close connections to aust practices not obvious). • As structured would not create on-going, inter-government policy links • World Bank Hai Basin-and WCP project have major groundwater efforts underway. DFID project doing similar work elsewhere. • Research focussed. Transfer into action needs greater development. • Funding problem- large ACEDP investment no matching cash. Expensive for deliverables 	<u>Not supported</u>
52	Collaborating for Policy Change on Water, Food, Livelihoods and the Environment in China	National Water Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal is research, not close to all ACEDP objectives; would require a very strong interest by senior Chinese policy makers to do this type of research when there are many more obvious and pressing priorities, • Involvement of actual Australian water managers is weak • Transferring Australian best practical water resource management approach is not evident • Funding problem- large ACEDP investment no matching cash. 	<u>Not supported.</u>
53	Implementation of Integrated biosystems technology for the prevention of aquatic pollution in rivers, lakes and lagoons	South Australian Research and Development Institute and Environmental Biotechnology CRC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deign and implementation of a biological waste water treatment system • Developmental research • Limited relevance to Program objectives • Funding problem- large ACEDP investment no matching cash/limited in-kind 	<u>Not supported.</u>

	caused by intensive animal feeding system in Southern China			
54	The role of popular participation in groundwater governance: guidance for policy making and implementation	WET	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable groundwater management is a recognised high priority in China. • Groundwater management is an important opportunity for transferring practical Australian expertise. • World Bank Hai Basin-and WCP project have major efforts in WUAs and in Hebei.; potential overlap with this project DFID project doing similar work elsewhere. • WUAs are not an area where Australia has special expertise; this is not a standalone project of high priority • Not especially strong in regard to Program objectives. • Funding problem- large ACEDP investment no matching cash, • Uses UK Agency for GW expertise in an area where Australia has high expertise and close experience with the Hai basin work.; doesn't establish on-going close links 	<u>Not supported</u>
56	When Water Prices Rise: Running the World's First In-Field Water Price Policy Experiment and Documenting its Costs and Consequences	Australian Bureau of Agricultural & Resource Economics (ABARE) Chinese partners: Center for Chinese Agricultural Policy, Chinese Academy of Sciences and IWHR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research; not closely related to ACEDP objectives. • Numerous assumptions about the chinese circumstances are questionable and go to the heart of the proposal, concerns about the availability of reliable data. • Claimed independence between farmer grant and subsequent farmer behaviour is questionable. Options of farmer adaptation are limited and constrained in the timeframe. (Post experiment issues of farmer re-adaptation are an important consideration to be considered). • Deals with only one possible element of changing water demand, • Unlikely to deliver best Australian practice and experience with water pricing • Understanding of Chinese approach and constraints in relation to water pricing (social- rural employment issues), cropping patterns (subsistence needs, central planning), etc, needs to be addressed • Outputs and outcomes are decoupled from program objectives • Funding problem- ACEDP investment no matching funds. 	<u>Not supported.</u>
57	Better River Basin Management in China, implementing some of the key recommendations from the IRBM Stocktake report	WWF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relates generally to ACEDP but not clearly, • Many of the project elements are major and ambitious areas of study as standalone projects (eg. environmental flows, climate change) and are addressed in other parts of this program • Appreciation and experience in Australian approaches to IRBM is not demonstrated, nor is it clear how this would be input. • Understanding of Chinese experiences and needs in relation to IRBM does not appear to be well understood • Practical and useful outputs and outcomes are considered overly ambitious and unlikely • Matching funding arrangements are unclear 	<u>Not supported.</u>

ACEDP – EAT Planning Inputs 07/08

Summary Evaluation Results for all Proposals

Notes:

In the following table,

- Group 1 - Those concept proposals that can proceed immediately to 'project design document' stage, plus those where concepts are reasonably well developed in high priority areas but have considerable overlap with others but can be brought together into a consolidated proposal through a combination of 'project scoping and project design',
- Group 2 - Those concepts where further conceptual or project development is necessary or where there are a significant number of similar activities that require much more information, consolidation and development, and a degree of agency cooperation to resolve this,
- Group 3 - Higher level policy areas (including those that may be emerging at present) that would benefit from further interaction and cooperation at senior agency levels in Australia and China. This is a high priority aspect in order to meet the national policy aspirations of the ACEDP.
- Group 4 - Those proposals that are not supported at present and cannot be reasonably enhanced now, to better meet ACEDP objectives. *(Whilst the EAT does not support these proposals, it is recognised that they may become more relevant once other activities within ACEDP begin to produce results and we recommend that MC ACEDP continue discussions with the proponents of these proposals).*

For Group 2 proposals, two 'project development missions' (advanced discussion study tours) have been recommended after which it should be possible to rationalise or merge many of the Group 2 proposals into more focused and relevant projects. The two missions should cover,

- *Integrated river basin management (IRBM), and*
- *Environmental management (EM),*

Summary Comments on Proposals

Project Number	Title	Home Agency/ Implementing Agency	Funding/ Duration	Strengths and Weaknesses	Group	Recommendation
1	Institutional Mechanism and Information Exchange for Ecological Water Use in Arid and Semiarid Areas	SFA, Office for Returning Farmland to Forestry as both HA and IA	TOTAL: \$180,000 ACEDP: \$98,000 Duration: 20 days	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Failed to demonstrate strong links between returning farmland to forests, ecological water and climate change; poor links to ACEDP - Australia does not seem to have much to offer in this area except for funding - Little possibility for establishing a sustained Australian-Chinese institutional linkage - Duration unrealistic to achieve any meaningful results 	4	<u>Not supported.</u>
2	Demonstration Program on Comprehensive Treatment and Development in Small-Basin in West Mountainous Area of China	SFA, Mountainous Development Office Gansu Province, Forest Bureau of Jingchuan County	TOTAL: \$180,000 ACEDP: \$100,000 Duration: 7 months	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Neither activities nor results well articulated - Failed to demonstrate linkage to ACEDP - Failed to demonstrate policy impacts - Failed to demonstrate sustained Australian-Chinese institutional linkage 	4	<u>Not supported.</u>
3	Program on Construction Ability of Mountainous Protection and Development	SFA, Mountainous Development Office	TOTAL: \$80,000 ACEDP: \$80,000 Duration: 1 month	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objectives not explicitly aligned with ACEDP - Neither activities nor deliverables well articulated - Failed to demonstrate policy impacts - Duration unrealistic to achieve any meaningful results 	4	<u>Not supported.</u>
4	China-Australia Cooperative Project for Water Resource Management in Inland River Basin in NW China	Chinese Academy of Sciences, Cold and Arid Regions Environment and Engineering Research Institute (CAREERI) Shiyang River Management Bureau, Gansu Province	TOTAL: \$896,330 ACEDP: 650,000 Duration: 2 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consistent with ACEDP objectives: regulatory reform, methodological development, water conservation and water resource management, integration of environment-economy-social development - links to Australian expertise in IRBM, - links to other donor programs to create synergies, - capacity building in key IRBM areas, - on-going links at policy levels of government, - well structured proposal - expensive proposal with no Australian counterpart identified 	1	<u>Project Supported - Merge with Concept No. 7. Can proceed to feasibility/design.</u> NOTE: There has been a large amount of donor projects in the high priority Shiyang basin and the coverage and effectiveness of these activities in relation to accepted IRBM practices needs to be reviewed as part of defining a suitable project for the Shiyang and/or Schule river basins (ie. avoiding overlap and achieving synergies).

5	Taihu Lake Pollution Control and Water Resources Management	NDRC, International Cooperation Centre Municipal Governments of Suzhou and Wuxi	TOTAL: \$1,900,000 ACEDP: \$800,000 Duration: 1 year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consistent with ACEDP objectives - Top Chinese priority, with strong NDRC support - Scope well defined - Activities and results well articulated, but need further refinements - "Action Plan" as important output - Good candidate for multi-year project - Clarification of 3rd party funding needed, - High level on-going policy dialogue between countries, - Strong capacity building elements, - Highly relevant to ACEDP objectives and outcomes. 	1	<u>Project Supported. High Priority: Can immediately proceed to feasibility study/design phase</u> <u>Project should be developed to include concepts 23, 30, 39 and parts of 36, 46.</u>
6	Irrigation Water Management for Large Irrigation Districts in the Yellow River Basin	MWR, Remote Sensing Technology Application Center Information Center of Yellow River Conservancy Commission Yellow River Water Resources Institute	TOTAL: \$1,000,000 ACEDP: \$500,000 Duration: 4.5 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Water saving for irrigation: consistent with ACEDP objectives and high priority for 11th Five year plan, - Policy linkages demonstrated - Activities and results well articulated - Australian partner (CSIRO) identified - Use of remote sensing technology to identify efficiency issues is too narrow, and needs to be broadened; <u>this is a critical issue for the project to proceed.</u> - Needs to be strengthened to include Australian irrigation corporations to provide practical experiences. - Will provide on-going Australian linkages - Highly relevant to ACEDP 	1	<u>Project supported - proceed to feasibility/design stage.</u>
7	Integrated Basin Management and Response Measures of Uncertainties in Arid and Semi-Arid Area under Changing Environment	Chinese Institute of Water Resources and Hydropower Research; Tsinghua University; Shiyang River Basin Management Bureau; Shule River Basin Management Bureau	TOTAL: \$2,000,000 ACEDP: \$1,000,000 Duration: 4.5 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consistent with ACEDP objectives - Well formulated proposal but considerable overlap with Proposal No. 4, - High priority area regarding river basin management in areas of resource constraints, shortages and competing economic/environmental use, - Expensive project but plans to extend for 4 years; needs rationalising with No. 4 and restructuring budget. 	1	<u>Project supported - link to Concept No. 4.</u> See comments for No. 4; feasibility/design needs to be preceded by a scoping review to determine the shape and content of a possible project (or the detailed scoping and feasibility/design can be incorporated into the one phase.
8	Integrated Catchment Management Framework in China	MWR, Pearl River Water Resource Commission Pearl River Basin Water Environmental Monitoring Center	TOTAL: \$200,000 ACEDP: \$150,000 Duration: 1 year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Methodology not well articulated - Basin too large for a demonstration - Low counterpart contribution - Generally meets ACEDP objectives, - Has overlap with many other proposals on IRBM, - Should be deferred to await the IRBM project development mission to Australia to then determine how various 'like' projects can be rationalised. 	2	<u>Not supported at this stage as a stand alone project.</u> Reconsider after the IRBM project development mission.
9	River Health Assessment in	MWR, Pearl River Water Resource	TOTAL: \$300,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets ACEDP objectives, - Concrete outputs, but attempting to cover too much 	2	<u>Not supported at this stage</u> - await the outcomes of the 'environmental management

	China	Commission	ACEDP: \$150,000 Duration: 1 year	(information systems, decision support systems, artificial intelligence systems, etc.) - Technocratic approach - Will create on-going policy links, - Needs more definition as to Australian partner links,		(EM) mission to Australia.
10	South China River Ecosystem Restoration Study	MWR, Pearl River Water Resources Commission	TOTAL: \$275,000 ACEDP: \$150,000 Duration: 1.5 years	- Meets ACEDP objectives, - Scope very broad and ambitious, with limited funding - Technocratic approach, but linked to a priority policy area (environmental flows, - An area of Australian expertise, - Needs to consider the range of environmental flow issues in china than just focus initially on the Pearl. -	2	Not supported at this stage - await outcomes of the EM project development mission,
11	Efficiently Compensated Mechanism Between Water Resources Protection and Utilization in Pearl River Catchments	MWR, Pearl River Water Resource Protection Research Institute	TOTAL: \$200,000 ACEDP: \$150,000 Duration: 1 year	- meets ACEDP objectives, - Scope, methodology and deliverables unclear but does understand importance of issues, - Priority area relating to balance between water use and water protection, - No Australian counterpart identified.	2	Not supported at this stage- await outcomes of the EM project development mission.
12	Changjiang Real-Time Water Quality Monitoring and Forecasting System (Demonstration)	MWR, Changjiang Water Resources Commission, Bureau of Hydrology	TOTAL: \$674,000 ACEDP: \$350,000 Duration: 1 year	- Inconsistent with ACEDP objectives - Only requesting equipment and labour costs from ACEDP - does not meet eligibility criteria	4	Not supported
13	Study on Integrated River Basin Planning and Management	MWR, General Institute of Water Resources and Hydropower Planning and Design	TOTAL: \$8,050,000 ACEDP: \$8,050,000 Duration: 2 years	- Meets ACEDP objectives, - Very ambitious in scope and budget, - Structure suggests this is large support for existing on-going initiatives, - No counterpart funding is proposed, - Large overlap with a number of other projects, - No Australian partner identified	2	Not supported as a stand alone project. Await outcomes of the IRBM project development mission
14	Water Rights Trading in the Yellow River Basin	MWR, Yellow River Conservancy Commission	TOTAL: \$350,000 ACEDP: \$300,000 Duration: 2 years	- Consistent with ACEDP objectives - Scope, activities and deliverables well articulated - Building on AusAID-supported WET project; high potential for policy impacts and replication, - takes existing pilots studies on a smaller scale and up-sizes to a basin (or part basin) level	1	Project supported. Can proceed to feasibility/design. This project should incorporate parts of No. 55 and also incorporate outputs and lessons from the previous 'WET' project.
15	Climate Change and Impacts to River Basin	MWR, Yellow River Conservancy Commission	TOTAL: \$180,000 ACEDP: \$100,000	- Only partial links to ACEDP objectives, - proposal does not draw much relevance to climate change, in terms of methodology, activities and deliverables	4	Not supported.

	Management		Duration: 1 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Methodology, activities and deliverables not well articulated, - No Australian partner, 		
16	Environmental Flow and Sustainable River Basin Development	MWR, Yellow River Conservancy Commission	TOTAL: \$210,000 ACEDP: \$150,000 Duration: 1 year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets ACEDP objectives, - Proposal reasonably developed - Scope, methodology, activities and deliverables well articulated, - High priority area on environmental flows, - No Australian counterpart, but potential for on-going policy links, - Overlap with many other proposals 	2	<u>Not supported as a stand alone project.</u> Await outcomes of the EM project development mission
17	Study on Policy for Ecological and Environmental Flow Regulation and Aquatic Ecosystem Rehabilitation in China	MWR, General Institute of Water Resources and Hydropower Planning and Design; Pearl River Water Resources Commission; Tai Lake Basin Management Bureau	TOTAL: \$6,600,000 ACEDP: \$5,800,000 Duration: 4 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets ACEDP objectives, - Proposal reasonably developed - Scope, methodology, activities and deliverables well articulated, but budget very ambitious, - Appears as if asking ACEDP to take over total funding for a new initiative (rather than links government policy dialogue), - Many other projects cover the same topic to varying degrees. - Overall too ambitious for ACEDP. 	2	<u>Not supported as a stand alone project.</u> Await outcomes of the EM project development mission
18	Policy of Hydroelectricity Development in Middle/Small Catchments Based on Its Effect on Ecology	MWR, Bureau of Comprehensive Development	TOTAL: \$195,000 ACEDP: \$95,000 Duration: 1.5 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Partial links to ACEDP objectives, - more of a research/ academic study, - no close links to policy development, - Scope not well articulated, - Hydro development issues should not study environmental flow methodology but should use outputs from other projects to better analyse hydro projects. 	4	Not supported.
19	Ecological and Environmental Impacts of Inter-Basin Water Transfer	MWR, Bureau of Comprehensive Development	TOTAL: \$98,000 ACEDP: \$98,000 Duration: 8 months	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets ACEDP objectives, - Scope very broad, relates to a high priority area but fails to demonstrate policy relevance, - No counterpart funding, - Similar to other projects relating to environmental flows, needs to better relate theory to practical aspects such as groundwater replenishment as a key environment issue. 	2	<u>Not supported as a stand alone project.</u> Await outcomes of the EM project development mission
20	Evaluation and Guideline of Water Transfer Project on Purpose of Ecology Restoration	MWR, Bureau of Comprehensive Development	TOTAL: \$900,000 ACEDP: \$700,000 Duration: 8 months	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets ACEDP objectives, - Same topic, same applicant as Proposal No. 19 - Scope very broad - Failed to demonstrate policy relevance similar comments to no. 19.t 	2	<u>Not supported as a stand alone project.</u> Await outcomes of the EM project development mission
21	Water Ecology	MWR - Water	TOTAL: \$900000	- consistent with ACEDP objectives	Part 1	<u>The proposal needs further development to</u>

	Compensation Mechanism and Policy	Resources Management centre	ACEDP: \$800000 Local: in-kind Duration: 18 months	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - top Chinese priority - scope reasonably well defined, targets appropriate but links to policy levels not clear, - no clear description of Australian counterpart nor role or input, - unclear as to how on-going links would be established, - similar to Concept Notes Nos. 11 and 34. 	& 2	focus how outputs will be translated into policy options and how the policy level agencies will be included. Australian partners need to be properly identified and likely roles, inputs and budgets established, <u>Concept Notes 11 and 34, plus parts of this proposal, should be incorporated into one more specific proposal. (see Note 34)</u> Parts of these activities are within the 'environmental management' (EM) theme; include in the EM project development mission to Australia before any further development of this particular proposal.
22	Water Safety Administration Mechanism (Comparison and Research)	Academy of the Yangste River	TOTAL: \$98000 ACEDP: \$96000 Local: (unclear) Duration: 6 months	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concept is more technical and research with no clear links as to how to might relate to improved policy, - Not close to the main four ACEDP objectives, - No identification of any Australian partner; virtually no local budget commitment, - Not directly linked to high Chinese priorities, - No particular Australian expertise that warrants targeting. 	4	<u>Not supported.</u> Concept not closely enough aligned with ACEDP objectives to proceed. Ranks at the bottom end of proposal priorities.
23	Research on the Reform of Integrated Taihu Lake Basin Management Mechanism	Taihu Lake Authority (MWR)	TOTAL: \$880000 ?? ACEDP: \$100000 Local ;280000 RMB ? Budget unclear; in-kind or cash, and amount??? Duration: unclear.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - consistent with ACEDP objectives, - no identification of Australian partner, - unclear budget, - focuses on the institutional issues, researches Aust. approaches and capacity building for new methods and administration for Lake Taihu. - Addresses a high priority issue 	1	<u>This project should be merged with Concept Note 5</u> (probably under the leadership of the NDRC) to create an overall project that looks at the integrated water resources/pollution management of the basin, which will include the institutional issues. On this basis, should proceed to feasibility/design but take close account of similar work done for Yellow RB, and Tarim RB.
24	Technology Training and Investigation of Ecological Water/Wetland Management.	Chinese Academy of Forestry (Wetland Research Centre), SFA (Wetland Conservation and Management Office)	TOTAL: \$98600 ACEDP: \$98600 Local : Nil Duration: 1 year	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally meets ACEDP objectives, not closely linked to policy initiatives by itself or to inter-government dialogue, - Primarily capacity building in a priority water related area but needs work done first on a wetlands management policy and strategy framework first. - A good area for capacity building and concept is supported. 	1	<u>Not supported as a stand alone project.</u> This training concept is just part of the overall work that should be done on researching and developing a wetlands management framework. Concept notes no. 25, 26 and part of 27 also address other parts of wetland management. Concept 26 most closely relates to the overall wetlands management framework issue. This is a high priority area and a feasibility/design phase should start now that incorporates all three concept notes, identifies likely Australian partners and roles and includes an up-front study tour of Australia to investigate and discuss Australian approaches, and assess relevance to china.

25	Monitoring and Management of 'Ramsar' Wetlands.	SFA (Office of Wetland Conservation and Management), Institute of Wetland Ecology plu (Nanjing University), plus 5 other groups.	TOTAL: \$1043087 ACEDP: \$400000 Local: 4000000 RMB Duration: 3 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - meets ACEDP objectives, - promotes high level and on-going Aust. - china links, - strong on training and monitoring but does not place emphasis on the overall wetlands management policy framework, - concentrates on Ramsar' sites; other areas also require guidance fro an enhanced wetlands management framework. - Good aust. counterpart identified. 	1	<u>See comments for note. 24 above.</u> This project could proceed by itself but there will be a much enhanced project if concepts 24, 25, 26 and part of 27 are integrated. Proceed immediately to an integrated feasibility/design phase.
26	Research and communication program for wetlands management policies, systems	SFA (Office of Wetland Conservation and Management)	TOTAL: \$270000 ACEDP: \$270000 Local: some form of in-kind; not clear. Duration: 3 years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - meets ACEDP objectives, - focuses on researching and developing first a wetlands management framework and then using two key laks for case studies/pilots, - includes capacity relevant building, - doesn't identify Aust counterpart, nor roles expected, budget unclear. 	1	By itself, the proposal needs more development before it could proceed but is a high priority area. See comments at 24, and 25 above. <u>Proceed to an integrated feasibility/design phase.</u>
27	Integrating wetland Conservation into IRBM (TaerRiver basin case study)	SFA (Office of Wetland conservation and Management)	TOTAL: \$100000 ACEDP: \$100000 Local: Nil Duration:8 months.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - meets ACEDP objectives, - has considerable overlap with other projects that seek to study and develop 'good' IRBM', - the second component that combines IRBM methodology with wetlands management policy and strategy aspects is good but should come after these two aspects are studies separately under other components. - No identification of Aust. Partners, nor any budget commitment (a 'good idea but with no development detail') 	1	Whilst this is a sound project, it should not proceed immediately. Its basic underpinning components - creating suitable IRBM practices, and developing a wetlands management framework will proceed under other components or 'themes', and this concept 27 should some of these outcomes before possibly proceeding. <u>Defer for consideration until 08/09.</u> The intent of concept 27 should be part of the IRBM theme project development mission to Australia.
28	Establishment and Application of the Health Index system (Yangste River)	Changjiang River Scientific research Institute	TOTAL: \$298000 ACEDP: \$298000 Local: Nil Duration: 3 years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - not good links to ACEDP objectives but can be part of a wider project on integrated environmental management and environmental flows. - Not good upward links to policy development and options, - More research than practical application, 	2	<u>This project should not proceed by itself.</u> But it could be part of a broader project that considers water related environmental management and should therefore be studied, in concept, through the 'environmental management' (EM) theme and the project development mission to australia. This will then determine whether this concept should proceed in later year by itself or merged with other activities in the EM theme. Has overlap with Note No. 9 - better linkages??
29	Institutional capacity building on environment development Cooperation	SEPA (Foreign Cooperation Office); Australian DEW.	Total: \$198000 ACEDP \$100000 Local: \$98000 (half cash and half in-kind)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A detailed capacity building program that aims to foster high level dialogue and knowledge generation between Australian and China, - generally meets ACEDP objectives; good government to government dialogue 	2	<u>Not Supported as a stand alone project.</u> This should be considered after the two project development passions to Australia, in conjunction with the other capacity building projects.
30	Comparative	Nanjing Institute of	TOTAL: \$145000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - meets ACEDP objectives, 	1	This proposal is well structured, topical and will

	research on Watershed Management system and Environment-Economy	Environmental Sciences (SEPA)	ACEDP: \$95000 Local: 310000RMB in-kind Duration: 6 months.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a clear proposal that studies relevant aust experiences and develops appropriate approaches for environmental management in an ERBM context, - addresses a high priority area, - will develop good on-going links, although not clearly identified within proposal. 		create higher level policy dialogue. <u>But it has considerable overlap with other proposals in the 'IRBM' them and the 'EM' theme.</u> It will produce more effective overall ACEDP responses if this project and its proponents are included in the IRBM and EM project development missions to Australia and then an appropriate project developed that integrates all key aspects from a number of proposals. It could also be included in the Lake Tai project (no. 5, 23 and 39) which will proceed immediately; <u>This is the preferred approach.</u>
31	Trans-administrative Region Water Environment Management Policy.	Chinese Research Academy of Environmental sciences.	TOTAL: \$140000 ACEDP: \$90000 Local: 300000RMB cash. Duration: 6 months.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - meets ACEDP objectives, - relates to a high priority and difficult area of transjurisdictional pollution management, - does not identify an Aust partner or counterpart. - Is well structured and will develop high level policy dialogue if aust partners are properly identified. 	1	This project is small and could proceed immediately as it addresses both a high priority issue and a local area where disputes are high. There has already been considerable work on transjurisdictional water pollution disputes; see ADB TA 3588 PRC 'Transjurisdictional Environmental Management - Local Legislation to Support Transjurisdictional Water Pollution Management'. This project has done all the background; don't reinvent. So whilst this project could proceed 'as is', it should be preceded by a review of what has happened with the ADB TA recommendations, particularly the case study for the Fen river, for which dispute resolution procedures were developed. <u>Proceed provided the project is restructured with the up-front review (this will change the budget)..</u>
32	Technical system of Water Environmental Quality Monitoring etc.,	Chinese Research Academy of Environmental Sciences.	TOTAL: \$110000 ACEDP:\$100000 Local: 60000RMB in-kind	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - technical monitoring project; does not meet ACEDP guidelines, - no links to polcy development or dialogue, not really a practical example of IRBM. 	No	<u>This proposal should be culled - no strong relevance to ACEDP.</u>
33	Study on Mechanism and Platform of Public Participation in Water Pollution Control	Nanjing Institute of Environmental Sciences	TOTAL: \$135000 ACEDP: \$85000 Local: 310000TMB in-kind Duration: 6 months	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - this is a small study that will research Aust. Experience in community involvement in watershed management ('Catchment Management Boards/authorities') and develop options for china, - meets ACEDP guidelines and relates to an area of high Aust expertise, - does not identify any aust counterparts, - it will identify approaches for public involvement within the broader IRBM studies within ACEDP such as the 	1	<u>This project is supported but needs further development.</u> It should include a study tour ro Aust to understand how the 15 sub-basins within the MD basin are operated, visit 3 of the catchment management agencies (CMA's) that oversight natural resource management within these sub-basins, research differences in these and assess suitability for china. Agencies on the study tour should be broader

				Lake Taihu study in No. 5		<p>than the Nanjing Institute. See Concept No. 36, which relates to this. Also, the Tarim basin studies have trialled local level land and water planning approaches (these are similar to activities within the CMA's mentioned above) and a review of this activity should occur to assess whether it proved effective in chinese conditions</p> <p>The outputs/outcomes must be injected into the other IRBM studies within ACEDP to create synergies - <i>how will this be done? Need an on-going high level Chinese coordinating committee supported by MC ACEDP to review all project outputs and decide actions.</i></p> <p><u>Proceed provided the project is restructured as per above (this will change the budget)..</u></p>
34	Research on Watershed Environmental Compensation across Borders	Academy of Environmental Planning	<p>TOTAL: \$100000 ACEDP:\$100000 Local: nil</p> <p>Duration: 1 year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - meets ACEDP objectives, - addresses a high priority Chinese policy area, wil lead to on-going policy dialogue and promote policy reviews to better manage cross-border pollution impacts. - No Aust counterpart identified and no local funding input. 	1	<p>This is a high priority area and is supported. But the proposal needs further development, it needs to link with the similar parts of Concept No. 11, it needs to identify Aust partners (the CRC for Ecological Economics and Water Policy research in Armidale??) and the study tour needs to include numerous relevant agencies (including the proponents of No. 11). Also the Tarim Basin study has previously looked at creating an 'environmental Management Fund' that would also seek to balance out transboundary env. Impacts. Also refer to the ADB TA 3588 mentioned above in No. 31.</p> <p><u>This project should be restructured and proceed to feasibility/design. Its budget will increase as a result of a better design and local commitments should be sought as a reflection of ownership.</u></p>
35	River Eco-safety assessment and Countermeasures Management.	Research Academy of Environmental Sciences.	<p>TOTAL: \$233000 ACEDP: \$100000 Local: 800000RMB cash Duration: 6 months.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - meets ACEDP objectives, - is linked through a logical process to higher level policy considerations, - a high priority area for China, - well structured proposal, local funding commitment, no aust counterpart identified and role suggested, - capacity building included, - on-going policy links and dialogue with Aust agencies likely.. 	2	<p>This project is all about environmental flows methodology and implementation. It is supported. However it is similar to Concept Notes No. 9, 10 and 16. before any attempt is made to restructure and create an integrated project, the key agencies fro these four proposals should visit Australia as part of the EM Theme project development mission. After that mission, the agencies will be asked to revise the proposals into a more logical and focused structure. <u>Include No. 35, 9, 10 and 16</u></p>

						in the EM project development mission for 07/08.
36	Integrated watershed Management (IWR) strategy, with reference to eutrophication control.	Research Academy of Environmental Sciences	TOTAL: \$98000 ACEDP: \$98000 Local: Nil Duration: 6 months.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets ACEDP objectives, - Addresses a high priority Chinese policy area (pollution from diffuse sources within river basins and institutional/management approaches to deal with this), - No Australian counterpart, - Heavily based on study tours/training. 	1	Tai basin plus a bit of 33 This project is supported as it attempts to research/study the community based IWRM on a catchment basis as per the MD basin in Australia. It relates to the difficult issue of managing diffuse pollution sources and it will relate experiences to the Tai lake basin . It relates to both No. 5 and 33 for different issues and should be linked to those projects. <u>Should proceed but on the basis of merging/linking to No. 5 and 33.</u>
37	Comparison Study of Environmental Management of Coastal Zone.	Research Academy of environmental sciences.	TOTAL: \$90000 ACEDP: \$80000 Local: 60000RMB cash/in-kind Duration: 8 months.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally meets ACEDP objectives but is more research driven and with unclear links to policy development, - No obvious links to aust counterparts nor to areas of unique Aust expertise. - Aust does not appear to have an advantage over many other countries regarding coastal management, 	4	<u>Not supported</u> This project does not have the close relevance to ACEDP objectives nor to practical IRBM than many of the others..
38	Assessment of Industrial COD Emissions and Technical options.	Research Academy of Environmental Sciences.	TOTAL: \$85000 ACEDP:\$80000 Local: 30000RMB cash Duration: 6 months	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This project does not meet the short to medium term objectives of ACEDP (water related environmental issues). - Very technical and unlikely to lead to policy considerations by itself. - Related pollution management issues should be taken up in the Tai lake study. 	4	<u>Reconsider if the strategic direction and coverage of ACEDP changes. Not supported at present.</u>
39	Tai Lake Blue Algae Prevention and Control Countermeasures Study	MWR	TOTAL: \$5000000 ACEDP: unclear, Local: unclear. (mostly ACEDP contribution). Duration: 20 months.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets ACEDP objectives, - Very detailed, comprehensive 'basin management' study for Tai lake, very expensive; seeks large ACEDP input and no commitment from local sources, - No aust counterpart agency identified, nor any role discussed; no mention of Aust involvement at all. 	1	<u>Whilst this project could not be supported on its own</u> (very technical and does nothing to promote inter-government policy dialogue or share IRBM experience), it does have much similarity with Concept Nos. 5, 23 and 39. It should be included in the feasibility/design phase for Concept 5 that is to start immediately. <u>Proceed with restructured project to feasibility/design.</u>
40	Tarim Basin Integrated Water Resources Planning	MWR	TOTAL: \$1500000 ACEDP:\$1500000 Local: To be determined Duration: 2 years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets ACEDP objectives, - Builds on previous successful AusAID intervention in areas of priority need, - Will show practical examples of good IRBM, - Will improve the calibre of integrated water resources planning in the Tarim and provide examples for possible national consideration, 	1	<u>Highly supported.</u> <u>Proceed immediately to small scale revision/review of PDD, prepare tender documents, and recruit consultants.</u>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Highly relevant. - A well structured PDD already exists and requires minimal revision/review before proceeding to tender. 		
41	Technology and policy applications to enhance decision making to manage land degradation and water quality	AgWest International	Total: \$AU45,000 ACEDP: NA Chinese: NA Duration: Nov/Dec 2007 (1 month?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A general expression of interest for program development; not a clear understanding of the Chinese situation or needs • Plans a scoping workshop in China to develop better understanding • Insufficient information to judge compliance with program objectives • Research appears to be the main focus rather than practical IWRM/IRBM outcomes • Funding problem 	4	<u>Not supported</u> Agwest could be involved in the two planned project development missions to Australia (IRBM and EM) to present its interest and ideas.
42	Technology and policy applications for environmental monitoring to manage land degradation and water quality.	AgWest International (ARWA Centre for Ecohydrology & Department of Agriculture and Food, WA)	No detail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A general expression of interest for program development with little understanding of the Chinese situation or needs • Insufficient information to judge compliance with program objectives • Research appears to be the main focus rather than practical IWRM/RBM outcomes • Funding problem 	4	<u>Not supported</u> Same comments as for Concept No. 41
43	Identification, assessment and prioritization of water and nutrient management activities	AGWEST International	Total: \$AU80,000 ACEDP: NA Chinese: NA Duration: Nov 07 - Mar 08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A general expression of interest for program development with little understanding of the Chinese situation or needs • Insufficient information to judge compliance with program objectives • Research appears to be the main focus rather than practical IWRM/IRBM outcomes • Funding problems and generally unclear 	4	<u>Not supported</u> Same comments as for Concept No. 41
44	Integrated River Basin Management approaches and policy to control and abate Schistosomiasis control in people and their livestock	The Nature Conservancy (in association with Chiangjiang Water Resources Commission (CWRC); Three Gorges Dam Company; Hunan Institute of Parasitic Diseases) AND School of Population Health, University of Queensland;	Total: \$AU 150,000 ACEDP: \$150,000 Chinese: \$275,000 in-kind Duration:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deals with one fairly narrow (and uncommon in Australia) aspect of river basin management which is public health related • Is a balance of research, public sector engagement and demonstrations (although this is mostly education materials) and has a clear project design. • Generally consistent with program objectives although the demonstration implementation aspect could be stronger • Does not deal with the transfer of the primary practical aspects Australian water resource management expertise. • Priority for this project should rest with Chinese side • Funding problem- no matching cash, nature and security of large in-kind share uncertain. 	4	<u>Not supported</u> ; the project is a narrow (and uncommon) aspect of IRBM and not close to recognised strengths of Australian water managers Priority would need to be demonstrated better by Chinese side.

45	Using the Catchment Modeling Toolkit to help build capacity for integrated river basin Management in China	eWater CRC	Total: TBA ACEDP: TBA Chinese: TBA Duration: TBA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no specific proposal for activity • Does not address program objectives • Toolkit tools would be input, as relevant, via the involvement of relevant water resource managers and technical specialists. • No funding details 	4	<u>Not supported</u> at this stage. The specific capacity building needs should become clearer once the two project development missions (IRBM and EM) are undertaken and more focused projects developed. eWater should present to both of these missions.
46	Cyanobacteria Management Taihu Basin	International Centre of Excellence in Water Resource Management with Taihu Basin Authority (MWR)	Total: \$272010 ACEDP: \$200610 ICE WaRM:\$44000 (on kind) Chinese: 170000RMB in kind Duration: 1 month	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A technical capacity building project, • Not close to ACEDP objectives, does not promote on-going policy dialogue not inter-government relations, • Not a practical application of IRBM, • Is a capacity building exercise and is detailed and well presented in that context, • Relates to the high priority issue of improved water quality for Lake Taihu. 	4, but linked to project 5.	<u>Not supported as a stand alone.</u> However, the feasibility/design phase for Concept No. 5 (which will incorporate other concepts notes as well) should take account of this concept 46 and if review suggests that this form of capacity building is warranted it should be included within that project.
47	Environmental flows and water allocation planning project	DEW	Total: \$ 2,000,000 ACEDP: \$ 2,000,000 Chinese: TBD Duration:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets ACEDP objectives, • Understanding of, and approach for improving river health and environmental flows are an important need in China • Such a project needs to appreciate Chinese priorities for ecological flows where, for many parts of northern China, the purpose is groundwater recharge for riparian vegetation rather than for the in-stream environment, which may be a longer term (nd possibly impractical) issue. • More stakeholders than MWR alone • There are already a number of such projects in China and these experiences should be built upon. • Very large budget • Funding problem- large ACEDP investment, no matching cash. 	2	<u>Not supported in present form.</u> This project and proponent should be par of the EM project development mission to aust in 07/08 A large and comprehensive river health project (s) needs to be developed out of the mission with input of best Australian approaches. (There are a number of proposals on this topic)
48	Australia-China cooperation to explore applicability of Healthy Waterways Partnership	International Water Centre	Total: \$AU 3 million ACEDP: \$ 3 million Chinese: TBA Third Party: TBA Duration: Jan 08 - Dec 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healthy waterways is a priority issue for China; it meets the ACEDP objectives • this project could be a component of a larger waterway health project • Emphasis is on technical elements and decision support tools. Institutional and policy links/relevance are unclear. • Needs strengthening in regard to transferring practical Australian water resource management expertise. • Approach to much of North China situation may need to be adapted as ecological water need is groundwater 	2	<u>Not supported in present form.</u> See comments for concept note 47. The proposal should be considered and developed further as part of a larger and more comprehensive approach to river health in China, following the EM mission to Australia.

				<p>dependant ecosystems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding problem- large ACEDP investment no matching cash. 		
49	Piloting a new indicator methodology to determine investment priorities for strengthening rural livelihoods Yellow River	International Water Centre	<p>Total: \$AU 220,000 ACEDP: \$220,000 Chinese: \$50,000 in kind Third party: \$10,000 in-kind Duration: Feb 08 - Aug 10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not close to ACEDP objectives; not strong in current form, Project would be improved if it dealt with transferring practical experiences of best practice Australian water resources management. Research project where practical applications and outcomes, and how it would add substantially to existing RB planning and poverty management approaches, are uncertain. Linkages to existing Chinese approach of identifying 'poverty' (vulnerable) counties unclear Project would be relevant if a larger comprehensive project was developing a river basin plan. objectives Funding problem- no matching cash, limited in-kind matching . 	4	<u>Not supported in present form</u> ; enhancement should only occur if strong interest shown at highest Chinese policy levels.
50	Integrated River Basin Management Leadership Training for Senior Managers of Yellow River	International Water Centre	<p>Total: \$AU 146,200 ACEDP: \$120,00 Chinese: \$16,200 in-kind Third party: \$ 10,000 in-kind Duration: Feb 08 - Aug 2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consist with ACEDP objectives, Training of relevant managers is an important need. Training programs should more clearly be identified to respond to clear needs and agencies; should best be delivered as part of a more comprehensive project where training is more on the job and directly linked to project needs. Aims to deliver best Australian practice and experience, Is somewhat theoretical and would benefit from more direct involvement of actual water resource managers (in several states) and the practical Australian approach. (Currently this is a weak aspect of the project.) Funding problem- no matching cash, limited in-kind funding. 	2	<u>Not supported at this stage.</u> The proponent should be part of the IRBM and EM project development missions in 07/08 to enable a more clear definition of needs to be assessed and to present the capabilities of IWC in training. A more focused proposal can then be prepared for 08/09.
51	Improving Ground Water Governance in North China Plains	Uni of SA / International Water Management Institute	<p>Total: \$AU 1 million ACEDP: \$ 1 million Chinese: TBD Third party: \$100,000 in-kind Duration: Nov 07 - Mar 09</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not close to ACEDP objectives Sustainable groundwater management is a recognised high priority in China. Groundwater management is an important opportunity for transferring practical Australian expertise; project needs to better identify ways to incorporate this experience rather than be presented solely by IWMI (close connections to aust practices not obvious). As structured would not create on-going, inter-government policy links World Bank Hai Basin-and WCP project have major 	4 (see comments)	<u>Not recommended in present form. BUT,</u> during discussions with MWR (Water Resources Management Centre) a briefing was given to EAT on a major groundwater policy/strategy project that is aimed at producing groundwater management plans (use, allocation, recharge etc..) and to support this with new legislation and procedures. A request was made to be able to study the aust approaches, particularly at state levels (NSW, Vic., and WA in particular) and this is a very good idea and is exactly what

				<p>groundwater efforts underway. DFID project doing similar work elsewhere.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research focussed. Transfer into action needs greater development. • Funding problem- large ACEDP investment no matching cash. Expensive for deliverables 		<p>ACEDP should do. MWR has not submitted a proposal on this issue (there seemed to be some confusion on this; at least EAT has not seen one.)</p> <p>As well, ADB is reported to be interested in funding a large project on enhancing regulations and policies in water conservation and savings and related management issues, which is supposed to include groundwater. See also concept note 54, which is not supported by itself but may have relevance in an integrated project.</p> <p><u>MC ACEDP should further explore the groundwater issue with MWR, and identify what other donors are doing, and if this indicates that a sound project could be developed within the ACEDP objectives and can be readily scoped, then 'GW management' should become a Group 1 activity for 07/08 and proceed to feasibility/design.</u></p>
52	Collaborating for Policy Change on Water, Food, Livelihoods and the Environment in China	National Water Commission	<p>Total: \$AU400,000 ACEDP: \$ 400,000 Chinese: TDB</p> <p>Duration: Nov 07 - Mar 09</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal is research, not close to all ACEDP objectives; would require a very strong interest by senior Chinese policy makers to do this type of research when there are many more obvious and pressing priorities, • Involvement of actual Australian water managers is weak • Transferring Australian best practical water resource management approach is not evident • Funding problem- large ACEDP investment no matching cash. 	4	<u>Not supported.</u> Needs strong Chinese interest to be shown to re-activate this proposal.
53	Implementation of Integrated biosystems technology for the prevention of aquatic pollution in rivers, lakes and lagoons caused by intensive animal feeding system in Southern China	South Australian Research and Development Institute and Environmental Biotechnology CRC	<p>Total: \$AU 600,000 ACEDP: \$500,000 Chinese: \$ 66,000 in-kind Third party: \$16,600 in-kind</p> <p>Duration: 3 years</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deign and implementation of a biological waste water treatment system • Developmental research • Limited relevance to Program objectives • Funding problem- large ACEDP investment no matching cash/limited in-kind 	4	<u>Not supported.</u>

54	The role of popular participation in groundwater governance: guidance for policy making and implementation	WET	Total: \$AU 308,000 ACEDP: 300,000 Chinese: 8,000 Duration: Jan 08 - Jun 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable groundwater management is a recognised high priority in China. • Groundwater management is an important opportunity for transferring practical Australian expertise. • World Bank Hai Basin-and WCP project have major efforts in WUAs and in Hebei.; potential overlap with this project DFID project doing similar work elsewhere. • WUAs are not an area where Australia has special expertise; this is not a standalone project of high priority • Not especially strong in regard to Program objectives. • Funding problem- large ACEDP investment no matching cash, • Uses UK Agency for GW expertise in an area where Australia has high expertise and close experience with the Hai basin work,; doesn't establish on-going close links 	4	<u>Not supported in present form</u> See comments at concept note 51;
55	Irrigation reform in northern China: evidence-based guidance for financing, rights allocation and water transfer	WET / ABARE/ Qld Department of Natural Resources and Water / CCAP / Tsinghua University	Total: \$ AU 550,000 ACEDP: 550,000 Chinese: 0 Duration: Feb 08 - Aug 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WET 2 project- unclear whether this is extension of existing project or new proposal? • Generally meets ACEDP objectives but needs strengthening, • Water permitting, water transfer and pricing are important issues being addressed across China. • Largely research with little evidence of practical delivery of outcomes or what they might be (transfer into national policy??); a concern with the proposal, • Uncertain that this proposal would deliver best Australian practice and experience. • Other projects in China also addressing this topic (World Bank Hai Basin, DFID Shiyang Basin, and other past TA) • Funding problem- large ACEDP investment no matching cash 	1 for part, and 2, as part of the IRBM and EM project development missions.	<p><u>Not supported in present form.</u></p> <p>i) Outputs from WET 2 plus relevant parts of this present proposal should be considered in the context of concept note 14 (Yellow River Trading project),</p> <p>ii) The remainder of the proposal should be considered after the IRBM and EM project development missions in 07/08.</p> <p><u>NOTE: There are number of proposals in this area, and also activities outside the ACEDP program, and whilst a project using best Australian practical management experience, and more directly addressing program objectives, is likely to be supported later in the program, it is essential that a detailed review be undertaken of donor supported projects in the water resources/environment area to identify where overlaps or synergies exist.</u></p>
56	When Water Prices Rise: Running the World's First In-Field Water Price Policy Experiment and Documenting its Costs and	Australian Bureau of Agricultural & Resource Economics (ABARE) Chinese partners: Center for Chinese Agricultural Policy, Chinese Academy of Sciences and IWHR	Total: \$AU 400,000 ACEDP: 4 400,000 Chinese: nil Duration: Dec 07 - Jun 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research; not closely related to ACEDP objectives. • Numerous assumptions about the chinese circumstances are questionable and go to the heart of the proposal, concerns about the availability of reliable data. • Claimed independence between farmer grant and subsequent farmer behaviour is questionable. Options of farmer adaptation are limited and constrained in the timeframe. (Post experiment issues of farmer re-adaptation are an important consideration to be 	4	<p><u>Not supported.</u></p> <p>Research funding bodies better able to evaluate and support according to their mandates rather than attempt to use ACEDP which has different objectives. <u>This project should 'do its research' and then if results are promising, seek ACEDP to test via pilot schemes elsewhere in China and then progress to policy options based on this broader</u></p>

	Consequences			<p>considered).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deals with only one possible element of changing water demand, • Unlikely to deliver best Australian practice and experience with water pricing • Understanding of Chinese approach and constraints in relation to water pricing (social- rural employment issues), cropping patterns (subsistence needs, central planning), etc, needs to be addressed • Outputs and outcomes are decoupled from program objectives • Funding problem- ACEDP investment no matching funds. 		<i>experience.</i>
57	Better River Basin Management in China, implementing some of the key recommendations from the IRBM Stocktake report	WWF	<p>Total: \$AU \$1,020,000 ACEDP: \$450,000 Chinese: \$ 570,000 (source and nature cash/in-kind is unclear)</p> <p>Duration: (3 yr) Jan 08 - Dec 10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relates generally to ACEDP but not clearly, • Many of the project elements are major and ambitious areas of study as standalone projects (eg. environmental flows, climate change) and are addressed in other parts of this program • Appreciation and experience in Australian approaches to IRBM is not demonstrated, nor is it clear how this would be input. • Understanding of Chinese experiences and needs in relation to IRBM does not appear to be well understood • Practical and useful outputs and outcomes are considered overly ambitious and unlikely • Matching funding arrangements are unclear 	4	<p><u>Not supported.</u> However, the recommended priority study areas within the earlier WWF IRBM study could be used as a catalyst for discussion at the end of the IRBM project development mission in 07/08.</p>

ACEDP Working Evaluation Table

Overarching Themes:

Primary.

1. Support bilateral, regional or international environment policy dialogue that is in the mutual interest of the governments of Australia and the PR China - enhanced government to government dialogue.
2. Test options that will enhance environment policy/program implementation and compliance at all levels of government and across jurisdictions - options that are practical; any research will lead to policy/strategy enhancement or development.
3. Promote shared understanding of IRBM principles and practices in Australia and China including multi-jurisdictional water and land management - IRBM in practice not theory.
4. Support strategic demonstrations and piloting of models and policy options for IRBM in China, including integrated resource assessment, participatory planning and community ownership- pilots and demonstrations that lead to enhanced/ new policies.

Supporting.

1. Strengthen capacities at the individual, institutional and legislative/regulatory level
2. Strengthen environmental governance at all levels and across jurisdiction
3. Facilitate development of partnerships among Australian and Chinese environment agencies, institutions and individuals at all levels.

Evaluation Criteria.

Primary (Core) Criteria.

1. Consistency with the objectives of the ACEDP
2. Demonstrate they contribute to enhanced policy formulation and/or implementation
3. Demonstrate they contribute to the development of sustained linkages between Australian and Chinese agencies
4. Evidence available on the likely feasibility of proposed activities
5. Demonstrate they are supportive of Chinese government policy priorities and consistent with Chinese agency policy programs

Supporting criteria.

1. Demonstrate sufficient counterpart support in terms of (i) policy intent and (ii) resource allocation on a sustained basis for the period of the intervention
2. Demonstrate a realistic strategy for ensuring post-intervention funding, resource allocation or policy intent
3. Demonstrate that implementation capacities exist, or that comprehensive capacity building measures at the appropriate levels are included
4. Demonstrate greater harmonisation and development effectiveness by working with multilateral agencies and other donors
5. Demonstrate they are consistent with relevant Australian government policies on gender equity, governance, anti-corruption, environment

Rating of ACEDP Proposals

Summary Ranking Guide.

Rank	Description
1	Meets all core criteria and all supporting criteria of ACEDP
2	Meets all core criteria and three supporting criteria of ACEDP
3	Meets all core criteria and two or less supporting criteria of ACEDP
4	Meets some core criteria and some supporting criteria of ACEDP
5	Does not meet selection criteria of ACEDP

Proposal number.	Proponent Organisations	Proposal Description	Core Criteria.					Overall Ranking/ comments
			A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	
1	SFA - Office for Returning Farmland to Forestry	Ecological water use						
2	SFA - National Integrated Leading Office for Mountainous areas	Small River Basin Integrated Management and Exploration Demonstration Project in West Mountainous Areas						
3	SFA - National Integrated Leading Office for Mountainous areas	Mountainous Area Protection and Exploration Capacity Building						
4	CAS - Cold and Arid Regions Environment and Engineering Research Institute, Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAREER)	China-Australia Cooperative Project for Water Resource Management in Inland River Basin in Northwest China						
5	NDRC - International Cooperation Center	Reducing Water Pollution of Taihu Lake in Suzhou						
6	MWR - Remote Sensing Technology Application Center	Irrigation water management for large irrigation districts in the Yellow River Basin						
7	China Institute of Water Resources and Hydropower Research	Integrated Basin Management and Response Measures to Uncertainties in Arid and Semi-arid Area under Changing Environment						
8	MWR - Pearl River Water Resource Commission	Integrated Catchment Management Framework in China						
9	MWR - Pearl River Water Resource Commission	River Health Assessment in China						
10	MWR - Pearl River Water Resource Commission	South China River Ecosystem Restoration Study						
11	MWR - Water resource protection research institute of Pearl River, Pearl River Water Resource Commission	The efficiently compensated mechanism between water resources protection and utilization in Pearl River catchments						
12	Bureau of Hydrology, Changjiang Water Resources Commission	Changjiang Real-time Water Quality Monitoring and Forecasting System (Demonstration)						
13	MWR - The General Institute of Water Resources and Hydropower Planning and Design	Study on Integrated River Basin Planning and Management						
14	Yellow River Conservancy Commission	Water Rights Trading in the Yellow River Basin						
15	Yellow River Conservancy Commission	Climate Change and Impacts to River Basin Management						
16	Yellow River Conservancy	Environmental Flow and Sustainable River Basin						

	Commission	Development						
17	MWR - The General Institute of Water Resources and Hydropower Planning and Design	Study on Policy for Ecological and Environmental Flow Regulations and Aquatic Ecosystem Rehabilitation in China						
18	MWR - Bureau of Comprehensive Development	Policy of Hydroelectricity Development in Middle/Small Catchments based on its Effect on Ecology						
19	MWR - Bureau of Comprehensive Development	Ecological and Environmental Impacts of Inter-basin Water Transfer						
20	MWR - Bureau of Comprehensive Development	Evaluation and Guideline of Water Transfer Project on Purpose of Ecology Restoration						
21	MWR - Water Resources Management Center	Water Ecology Compensation Mechanism and Policy in River Basin						
22	MWR - Academy of Yangzi River	Water Safety Administration Mechanism Comparison & Research between China and Australia						
23	MWR - Taihu Lake Authority	Research on the Reform of Integrated Taihu Lake Basin Management Mechanism: Revelations from Catchment Management Authority Institutional Evolution in Australia						
24	SFA - The Office of Wetland Conservation and Management	Technology Training and Investigation on Ecological Water Requirement Management of Wetland						
25	SFA - The Office of Wetland Conservation and Management	Monitoring and management of Wetlands of International Importance (hereinafter referred to as "Ramsar sites") in China						
26	SFA - The Office of Wetland Conservation and Management	Research and communication program for China wetlands management system, coordination mechanism and related policies						
27	SFA - The Office of Wetland Conservation and Management	Integrating wetland conservation into Integrated River Basin Management (IRBM)---Case study on Taoer River Basin						
28	Changjiang River Scientific Research Institute(CRSRI)	Establishment and application of the health index system for the Yangtze River						
29	SEPA-Foreign Economic Cooperation Office (FECO)	Institutional capacity building on environment development Cooperation						
30	SEPA-Nanjing Institute of Environmental Sciences	Comparative Research on Watershed Management System and Environment-Economy Policies Between China and Australia						
31	SEPA-Chinese Research Academy of Environmental Sciences	Trans-Administrative-Region Water Environment Management Policy						
32	SEPA-Chinese Research Academy of Environmental Sciences	The Technical System of Water Environmental Quality Monitoring and Pollution Source Supervision in Watershed						
33	SEPA-Nanjing Institute of Environmental Sciences.	Study on Mechanism and platform for public participation in water pollution control in river basins..						
34	SEPA-Chinese Academy for Environmental Planning	Research on Watershed Environmental Compensation cross border--A Case Study of Guanting Reservoir						
35	SEPA-Chinese Research Academy of Environmental Sciences	Integrated watershed management (IWM) strategy, pattern and application demonstration for eutrophication control of Lakes in China						
36	SEPA-Chinese Research Academy of Environmental Sciences	Comparison Study on Environment Management of Coastal Zone in China and Australia						
37	SEPA-Chinese Research Academy of Environmental Sciences	Assessment on Industrial COD Emissions and Technical Options for Optimized Reduction						

<u>Chinese proposals received in full format, not in proposal concept note</u>									
i	MWR	Tai Lake Blue Algae Prevention and Control Countermeasure Study							
ii	MWR	Tarim Basin Masterplanning - Pilot Study							
<u>Australian Proposals</u>									
1	AgWest International	Technology and policy applications to enhance decision making to manage land degradation and water quality							
2	AgWest International (ARWA Centre for Ecohydrology & Department of Agriculture and Food, WA)	Technology and policy applications for environmental monitoring to manage land degradation and water quality.							
3	AGWEST International	Identification, assessment and prioritization of water and nutrient management activities							
4	The Nature Conservancy (in association with Chiangjiang Water Resources Commission (CWRC); Three Gorges Dam Company; Hunan Institute of Parasitic Diseases) AND School of Population Health, University of Queensland;	Integrated River Basin Management approaches and policy to control and abate Schistosomiasis control in people and their livestock							
5	eWaterCRC	Using the Catchment Modeling Toolkit to help build capacity for integrated river basin Management in China							
6	International Centre of Excellence in Water Resource Management with Taihu Basin Authority (MWR)	Cyanbacteria Management Taihu Basin							
7	DEW	Environmental flows and water allocation planning project							
8	International Water Centre	Australia-China cooperation to explore applicability of Healthy Waterways Partnership							
9	International Water Centre	Piloting a new indicator methodology to determine investment priorities for strengthening rural livelihoods Yellow River							
10	International Water Centre	Integrated River Basin Management Leadership Training for Senior Managers of Yellow River							
11	Uni of SA / International Water Management Institute	Improving Ground Water Governance in North China Plains							
12	National Water Commission	Collaborating for Policy Change on Water, Food, Livelihoods and the Environment in China							
13	South Australian Research and Development Institute and Environmental Biotechnology CRC	Implementation of Integrated biosystems technology for the prevention of aquatic pollution in rivers, lakes and lagoons caused by intensive animal feeding system in Southern China							
14	WET	The role of popular participation in groundwater governance: guidance for policy making and implementation							
15	WET / ABARE/ Qld Department of natural Resources and Water / CCAP / Tsinghua University	Irrigation reform in northern China: evidence-based guidance for financing, rights allocation and water transfer							
16	Australian Bureau of Agricultural & Resource Economics (ABARE) Chinese partners: Center for Chinese Agricultural Policy, Chinese Academy of Sciences and IWHR	When Water Prices Rise: Running the World's First In-Field Water Price Policy Experiment and Documenting its Costs and Consequences							
17	ICE WaRM	Managing cyanobacteria							
18	WWF	Better River Basin Management in China, implementing some of the key recommendations from the IRBM Stocktake report							

ACEDP EAT Planning Input 07/08

Abbreviations

ACEDP	Australia China Environment Development Program
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
DAFF	Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
DEW	Department of the Environment and Water Resources,
DFID	United kingdom International Aid Agency
EAT	Environment Advisory Team
EM	Environmental Management
IRBM	Integrated River Basin Management
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
MC ACEDP	Managing Contractor, ACEDP
MDBC	Murray Darling Basin Commission
MOFCOM	Chinese Ministry of Commerce
MWR	Ministry of Water Resources
NDRC	National Development and Reform Commission
NWC	National Water Commission,
SEPA	State Environment Protection Agency
SFA	State Forestry Administration