GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR PROGRAMMATIC FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT*

GEF Program ID:	**4646**		
Country/Region:	**China**		
Program Title:	**CBPF-Main Streams of Life (MSL) â€“ Wetland PA System Strengthening for Biodiversity Conservation**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-1; BD-1; Project Mana; BD-1;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Project Grant:	**$23,010,915**
Co-financing:	**$142,600,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$165,610,915**
PFD Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
		Expected Program Start Dt:	
Program Manager:	**Yoko Watanabe**	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments on Program Framework Document
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes, China has ratified the CBD and eligible for GEF BD finance.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the program?	Yes, the endorsement letter dated Aug 31 2011 is attached
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Are the Agencies' comparative advantages for this program clearly described and supported?	UNDP will be the coordinating agency and has also been managing the programmatic approach of China Biodiversity Partnership Facility (CBPF) since GEF4. UNDP has substantial experience in PA and wetland management in China and elsewhere. UNDP also has a large biodiversity portfolio in China with necessary capacity to manage the program. UNDP is expected to manage 6 of the 7 sub-projects under this program. Please provide a brief summary information on how the CBPF implementation is going on so far, and how UNDP has shown its comparative advantage in managing the program effectively (or some problems). FAO is identified as the agency for one of the sub-project under this program, on Poyang Lake. FAO has been working on two wetland biodiversity projects in China and increasing its capacity and expereince on the issue. It is not clear why this one project should be managed by the FAO. Is there specific comparative advantage (technically, politically, etc) for FAO to manage this sub-project?

	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the program, is the GEF Agency(ies) capable of managing it?	n/a
	5. Does the program fit into the Agencies' programs and staff capacity in the country(ies)?	Yes, the program fits with the UNDAF of China, and there is already sizable biodiversity portfolio with UNDP China and good capacity to manage the program.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	China has a GEF-5 BD STAR allocation of 52.67million, and used 3.3 million so far. While there are number of projects in the pipeline, the program amount is within the envelope. Considering the sizable BD allocation and also the sizable investment requested for this program, if possible, it would be useful to have a draft pipeline list of BD projects that are currently considered in China to understand the entire portfolio and see the overall fit of the program.
	• the focal area allocation?	refer above.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?	n/a
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a
	• focal area set-aside?	n/a
Program Consistency	7. Is the program aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	Yes, the program is aligned very well with the BD focal area strategy on PA management (BD1), and will substantially contribute to the focal area target.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	Yes, the relevant objective is identified, as BD1.
	9. Is the program consistent with the recipient country(ies)' national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Yes, the program is consistent with the key national strategy and policies, including the recently approved NBSAP.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any,	Yes, particularly the policy and institutional development through the project has a potential to substantially contribute on the capacity development of the country

	program outcomes?	
Program Design	11. Is the description of the baseline scenario/baseline project – what would happen without GEF financing – reliable, and based on sound data and assumptions?	The program is generally well justified with the need to address the wetland PA management issue in a more strategical and systematic manner in China. Although there are substantial site level investment on wetland management in china, including GEF financed projects, the need for systematic and relevant framework and tools for wetland PA management, i.e. regulations, guidelines, and institutions, continues to be weak without systematic intervention. This GEF investment, although small compared to the substantial national investment already made on the issue, could provide a useful national/provincial framework rather than tackling the issue independently from each other. The project will also introduce a landscape approach to strengthen PA management, introduce innovatice co-management approach, and eco-compensation scheme (PES) in key critical wetland PA sites. The GEF has made some investment in the past in some of the selected sites, including the Poyang Lake. Considering that the GEF has made substantial investment already on wetland conservation in China, and in order to clarify and justify further investment, please provide an annex with a list/table of all GEF wetland projects, clarify any provinces/sites that are also suggested under this program, and lessons learned. It is particularly important that the program initiatives are build on the former investment.
	12. Are the activities to be undertaken by the program partners (or for which they will provide funding) sufficient given the nature of the program and is it likely that these activities (or funding) **will not** materialize if the GEF does not fund this program?	As noted, the national investment towards wetland management is substantial, however, the cofinancing to this project is only 1 to 4. Please further explain where the national investments are being made and possibility to increase further cofinancing of the program activities. Please provide brief information on the national investment been made/planned in the selected provinces that the program will be working in.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	Yes, as also noted above, the incremental reasoning and GEF niche is well understood. However, it is also good to understand the scale of investment already made/planned in the selected provinces to ensure strong cofinancing and coordination.
	14. Is the program framework sound and sufficiently clear?	The program framework is generally clear with necessary information and targets. The priority of wetland sites and selection of the six sub-projects should be further clarified. The selection criteria and significance of the area/importance of urgent intervention should be further defined. It is still not clear which sites are identified as priority wetlands under the recently approved NBSAPs, and why other sites are selected that are not in the list

		The title of the program could be revised to something like "CBPF-MSL" in order to show clear linkage to the CBPF, but has a clear distinction considering the GEF-5 investment and nature of the proposal. The associated sub-project could also use the same abbreviation in the title.
	15. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the program, and b) how they will support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?	Yes, general information is provided, however further detail information should be assessed at the sub-project level.
	16. Is public participation taken into consideration, and the roles of the various stakeholders identified and addressed properly?	Please provide further information on the CSOs and other groups that are active on wetland PA management, and potential partnership for the program and sub-projects.
	17. Does the program take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	Yes, the risks are generally defined with possible measures.
	18. Is the program consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Please further clarify what is planned by other donors and NGOs on wetland PA management at the system level, if any, and potential coordination at the project levels.
	19. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes, the coordination machanism is defined, and further details are also provided in the umbrella sub-project.
Program Financing	20. Is funding level for program management cost appropriate?	The program management cost is identified at 5% and considered appropriate.
	21. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The cofinancing is about 1 to 4 ratio at this point. As noted also above, every efforts are requested to reach at least a cofinancing ratio of 1 to 5 considering the country capacity and all the work that are ongoing on the issue.
	22. Comment on the indicated co-financing.	Refer above.
	23. Are the co-financing amounts that the Agencies are bringing to the	UNDP is bringing in $5 million for cofinance and considered appropriate.

		of FAO, all efforts should be made to increase the cofinance during project preparation.
Program Monitoring and Evaluation	24. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	
	25. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	
Agency Responses	26. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:	
	• STAP?	Please provide responses when comments are provided.
	• Convention Secretariat?	Please provide responses when comments are provided.
	• Council comments?	
	• Other GEF Agencies?	Please provide responses when comments are provided.
Secretariat Recommendation		
PFD Clearance	**27. Is PFD clearance being recommended?**	No, please provide additional information and clarification based on above comments made. Upon receipt of revised document that adequately respond to the comments, the PM will recommend the PFD for work program inclusion. 14 Sept 2011 GEFSEC received a revised PFD with additional information and clarification which adequately respond to the earlier comments. Cofinancing ratio is has now been increased to 1 to 6.2 ratio. Comprehensive information on past and ongoing investments on wetland PAs, including investment made by the GEF, has been provided and further clarifies that there is no overlap and ensures complimentality and incrementality of the initiatives. The PM recommends the PFD for Work Program Inclusion.
	28. Items to consider at subsequent individual project submissions for CEO endorsement.	
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 13, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 14, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	
	Additional review (as necessary)	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

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

REQUEST FOR PROGRAM COORDINATION BUDGET/PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
Program Coordination Budget/Project Preparation Grant for Program	1. Are the proposed activities for program coordination appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	**3. Is PCB/PPG for Program approval being recommended?**	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

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