



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9518		
Country/Region:	China		
Project Title:	Building Climate Resilient Green Infrastructure: enhancing ecosystem services of planted forests in China through forest landscape restoration and governance innovation		
GEF Agency:	IUCN	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4 Program 9; LD-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$183,486	Project Grant:	\$6,422,019
Co-financing:	\$54,047,570	Total Project Cost:	\$60,653,075
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Yan Zhang

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	01/05/2018 UA: Not fully. 1) Please enter the objective "SFM-3" in Table A so that it is in line with what was approved at PFD level. 2) Please enter the respective focal areas into Table D (not the objectives).	Requested revisions have been made to Tables A and D of the CEO Endorsement Request

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		- Biodiversity - Land Degradation - Multifocal Area (SFM) Please use the drop down menu.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Yes	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Yes	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Yes	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	Yes	
	• The focal area allocation?	Yes	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? Focal area set-aside? 	Yes	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>July 1, 2016 UA:</p> <p>The PPG is within the allowed limits and it recommended for CEO approval.</p> <p>The parent PFD was approved by Council June 8, 2016.</p>	
Review Date	Review	January 05, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	<p>01/05/2018 UA:</p> <p>Yes, comparison has been made with the PFD level child project brief.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	01/05/2018 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	01/05/2018 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	01/05/2018 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	01/05/2018 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	01/05/2018 UA: Yes. However, clarification is requested: 1) Please provide estimates for carbon benefits. Table E in the CEO ER template does not provide a target for carbon benefits. Because the PFD is funded in parts by the SFM incentive mechanism, all child projects under the TRI should provide target estimates based on FAO EX-ACT tool.	EX-ACT methodology has been used to calculate the carbon benefits. Please see attached file detailing the calculation of anticipated carbon benefits. The carbon target has been added to Table E in the CEO Endorsement Request

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	n/a	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	01/05/2018 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	01/05/2018 UA: Yes. Cleared	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	01/05/2018 UA: Yes. Cleared	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	01/05/2018 UA: Yes, at PFD level. Cleared	
	• STAP	01/05/2018 UA: Yes, at PFD level. Cleared	
	• GEF Council	Will be checked after circulation to Council.	
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	01/05/2018 UA: No. Please address comments in	

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>ALL boxes (including PIF review boxes).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minor data entry issues in template found. - TBD: carbon benefit calculation 	<p>Ex-Act has been used and provided to explain the carbon calculations</p> <p>All other comments have been addressed</p>
Review Date	Review	January 05, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		