



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

GEF ID:	4811		
Country/Region:	China		
Project Title:	CBPF-MSL: Strengthening the Management Effectiveness of the Wetland Protected Area System in Hainan for Conservation of Globally Significant Biodiversity		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4597 (UNDP)
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;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,634,771
Co-financing:	\$18,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$20,634,771
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Yoko Watanabe	Agency Contact Person:	Midori Paxton

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, an appropriate endorsement letter dated Jan 21, 2012 is attached that notes \$3m total, including PPG and agency fee for this project.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes, UNDP's comparative advantage is recognized, particularly as the lead coordinating agency of the PFD, which is the parent program of this child project.	
	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?	Yes, the experience and capacity of the UNDP regional and country offices are well recognized.	
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the		

Resource Availability	available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	Yes, this is a sub-project of the China Wetland PA System Program (PMIS 4646). The project grant amount for this PIF has slightly decreased from what was stated in the annex 1 of the PFD document. The PFD notes an amount of \$2654771, while this PIF request is for \$2634771. Please kindly provide necessary information.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	Refer above.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	n/a	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes, the project conforms well with the GEF5 BD1 on PA system. The project will contribute in increasing new PA coverage for 40000ha. The component focused on mainstreaming biodiversity with the tourism sector also links with BD2. Please provide necessary information on the linkage.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes, please refer above comment.	
	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, the project is consistent with the recently approved China NBSAP and other key strategies and policies.	

	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes, capacity development activities at the institutional and individual levels and sustainable financing on PA management would contribute to the sustainability of the project outcomes.	
	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?	Yes, there are substantial baseline projects supported by the national and local governments, and also smaller support fincluding RARE, USAID, AUSAID, and EU.	
Project Design	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?	Yes, the incrementality of the GEF investment is well justified with the focus to systematically strengthen PA management of the coastal wetlands in Hainan.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	While the overall project framework is well developed, the linkage between the wetland PA management and the mangrove PA network development could be further clarified and explained. The project design and explanation is rather confusing to clearly understand the linkages, and justify the approach under a wetland PA system program.	

	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	With substantial investment already planned by the national and local governments on related initiatives, it would be helpful to receive further information on the scenarios with and without the GEF investment to clarify the incremental benefits.	
	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?	Please provide further information on the ethnic minorities that reside in and around the PAs. Information on the numbers of ethnic minorities was provided in the earlier section of the PIF, however, no further information has been provided on the involvement and benefits to these communities. Please provide further information. Adequate information has been provided on gender and other socio-economic benefits at this point.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Please refer to the above comment on the indigenous/ethnic minorities, and provide adequate information and strategy.	
	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)	Yes, appropriate information provided at this stage.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, adequate information provided at this stage. As noted in the PIF, it would be important to analyze and build on lessons from the GEF China South Sea project.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Please clarify the project implementation arrangement.	
	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?	The project management cost is slightly higher than the 5% of the Project Sub-total. Please revise as necessary.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The overall cofinancing ratio is approx 1 to 5.5 and considered adequate. Cofinancing ratio for each component are also considered adequate.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Yes. please refer above.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	UNDP will be providing \$700000 in cash and considered adequate.	
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:		
	• STAP?	Please provide adequate response once comments are being made.	
	• Convention Secretariat?	Please provide adequate response once comments are being made.	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	Please provide adequate response once comments are being made.	
Secretariat Recommendation			
	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being	No, please provide adequate response	

PIF Stage		<p>comments. Upon receipt of the revised PIF that adequately responds to the above comments, the PM will recommend the PIF for CEO clearance.</p> <p>15 March 2012 GEFSEC received a revised PIF that adequately responds and provides additional information based on earlier comments. The PM recommends the PIF for CEO clearance.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
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*	February 15, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 15, 2012	
	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 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?	The activities that are identified under the PPG are relevant. On activity 7, please further clarify and justify linkage with this particular sub-project in Hainan, while it could possibly cover and contribute for the entire China Wetland program.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	The local and international consultants fee are considered adequate. Please provide further detail on the travel cost.

		and revise as necessary. There is no cofinance identified for activity 7. Please reconsider and revise as necessary.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	No, please provide adequate responses and information based on above comments. Upon receipt of a revised PPG request that adequately responds to the comments, the PM will recommend the PPG for CEO approval. 15 March 2012 The GEFSEC received a revised PPG that adequately responds to the earlier comments. The PM recommends the PPG for CEO approval.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	February 15, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 15, 2012

* 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.