



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4651		
Country/Region:	China		
Project Title:	A Landscape Approach to Wildlife Conservation in Northeastern China		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	122383 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,000,000
Co-financing:	\$15,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$18,000,000
PIF Approval:	January 11, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	February 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Yoko Watanabe	Agency Contact Person:	Jiang Ru

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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 project?	Yes, the endorsement from the OFP dated September 7 2011 is attached with a total STAR allocation of \$3.3 million to this project	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	No, the comparative advantage of the WB should be further articulated with concrete examples of related work in China. Staff capacity and expertise in country to manage such a project should also be clarified. There is also no cofinancing from the World Bank. Please explain this further and how you would be addressing the issue. 13 Dec 2011 Adequate additional information has been provided. Linkage with the Global	

		management project supported by the WB is noted.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	No. As noted above, please clarify this point further. 13 dec 2011 Adequate further information provided.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes, the project is requested for a GEF BD amount of \$3.18 million. China has an allocation of \$52.6 million and \$27.9 million has been utilized or pending for Council approval. The project is with in the remaining BD STAR allocation.	
	• the focal area allocation?	Refer above.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	
	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	The project could be consistent with the FA results framework. However, please include quantitative information in table A, in terms of number and coverage of PAs and others. 13 dec 2011 The actual numbers (hectare coverage	

		provide adequate information based on the information provided elsewhere in the proposal.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>Although the project relates to PA management and mainstreaming, the approach that is currently proposed is species centric, requires an ecosystem approach. As we discussed at the upstream meetings, tiger could be a flagship species for the improved ecosystem of the landscape but not as a goal in itself. Major revision in approach is required to ensure fit with the BD FA strategy.</p> <p>13 dec 2011 The revision on project design and approach are considered appropriate. The project now takes a landscape approach for wildlife conservation with further prioritication and focus on project components and activities.</p>	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Yes, it is consistent with the recently approved NBSAP and other key national strategies and plans.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>Please further articulate this point in the revised PIF.</p> <p>13 Dec 2011 Relevant information has been provided on institutional and site levels capacity building activities.</p>	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	The project should describe the situation, threats/barriers, gaps, and proposed project solution at the landscape or protected area system level, rather than just providing	

Project Design		<p>related habitat. The baseline project should be described in a concrete manner as well as the alternative scenario with the GEF financed project.</p> <p>Please also refer to the GEF Lao PA management project in terms of project design, which was also developed with the World Bank, and has used tiger as the key flagship species to determine the overall health of the PA and address need for wildlife management.</p> <p>13 Dec 2011 Adequate information provided at this stage. Further detail information and analysis are expected at the time of CEO endorsement.</p>	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>The incremental reasoning is very weak. Please provide further information on the scenario with and without GEF finance with tangible information so that the reasoning would be further clarified.</p> <p>13 Dec 2011 Adequate information provided.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>The overall project framework is comprehensive but overly ambitious, including PA management, mainstreaming, forest management, livelihood improvement, tourism etc. We suggest that the project prioritizes and focuses on fewer components and activities thus produce concrete results</p>	

		<p>As also noted above, the project should review its approach in its entirety with an ecosystem approach in mind. Tiger could be placed as a flagship species to improve the overall health of the ecosystem/landscape of the targeted area.</p> <p>As many literatures have proven, it is rather unclear how the suggested alternative livelihood initiatives could really make a difference for conservation. Further long term measures, such as possible incentive mechanism, co-management agreement, needs to be explored.</p> <p>Estimated budget breakdown for each outcomes should be provided, considering the components are described in a very general manner.</p> <p>13 Dec 2011 Substantial revision has been made and considered adequate.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Please also refer above comments and provide necessary information.</p> <p>13 Dec 2011 Adequate information provided.</p>	
	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?</p>	<p>No, please provide further information not only on the income generation through the project but potential negative and positive impacts, and how the project will deal with them. Further appropriate information is required also on the gender issue, including the approach that the project will undertake to properly address these issues.</p>	

		<p>13 Dec 2011 Adequate information has been provided at this stage. Please provide further details and results of the analysis at the time of CEO endorsement.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>Please provide further information on "how" the listed CSOs and other groups would be participating in the project.</p> <p>13 Dec 2011 Adequate information provided.</p>	
	<p>18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>No, please provide brief but comprehensive information on the risks that are identified, as well as possible mitigation measures.</p> <p>13 Dec 2011 Adequate information provided at this stage. Further detail analysis should be conducted by the time of CEO endorsement.</p>	
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>Rather than listing all the ongoing projects, please clarify how this project will build on the past and ongoing initiatives, lessons learned, and how it would coordinate with them.</p> <p>13 Dec 2011 Additional information has been provided, however, please further clarify potential linkages and complementarity of the project with the past and ongoing GEF projects in the provinces, which also focused on PA and landscape level conservation initiatives.</p>	
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>Please further clarify how the PMU would be internalized/coordinated with the existing institutions for sustainability and ownership purposes. Moreover, how would the mainstreaming issue be</p>	

		<p>Please briefly describe how the overall coordination mechanism is envisioned.</p> <p>13 Dec 2011 Adequate additional information provided at this stage.</p>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>No, the project management cost should be reduced to 5% of the project budget, unless strong justification is provided.</p> <p>13 Dec 2011 The project management cost is still identified at 8%. The justification provided would not be sufficient for a increased budget. Please reduce the management cost to 5% per recent guidance. In addition, the project management cost is a distinguished budget line under the table B, and should not be listed together under project components. The management cost should be determined at 5% of the sub-total.</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>The overall cofinancing amount could be further explored and increased during project preparation. Please try to clarify the type of cofinance from the provincial levels, which could be a good indication of their commitment to the project initiative.</p> <p>For each outcome, as noted above,</p>	

		<p>further assessment.</p> <p>The Agency fee is identified as more than 10%. Please make necessary revision.</p> <p>13 Dec 2011 Based on recent guidance on cofinance, pls kindly make all efforts to increase the cofinance level to 1 to 5 or 6, in line with other BD projects in remote areas of China.</p> <p>The agency fee has been reduced appropriately at 10%.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Please refer above.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>World Bank is not providing any cofinance. Please clarify the reason and how the issue would be mitigated/addressed.</p> <p>13 Dec 2011 Additional information provided.</p>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 	Please provide responses once comments are provided.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 	Please provide responses once comments are provided.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 	Please provide responses once comments are provided.	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<p>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</p>	<p>No, please revise the PIF and provide necessary clarification and information based on the comments made above. Particularly, please reexamine the project approach on species conservation in line with the BD focal area strategy. Upon receipt of a revised PIF that adequately address the comments, the PM will recommend the PIF for CEo clearance.</p> <p>13 Dec 2011 Substantially revised PIF has been received that addresses most of the comments made earlier. Please kindly address the still missing elements, including the targets under table A, coordination with other GEF projects in the provinces, project management cost, and cofinance. Upon receipt of a revised PIF that adequately addresses these comments, the PM will recommend the PIF for work program inclusion.</p> <p>10 Jan 2012 The GEFSEC received a revised PIF that adequately responds to the earlier comments. The cofinancing ratio is improved to 1 to 5, and the proponents will explore further and take necessary steps to increase the ratio to 1 to 6 by the time of CEO endorsement. The PM recommends the PIF for CEO clearance for work program inclusion.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO		

Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 27, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 13, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 10, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG 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.