



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

GEF ID:	4868		
Country/Region:	China		
Project Title:	Strengthening the Management Effectiveness of the Protected Area Network in the Daxing'anling Landscape		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4824 (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; BD-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$125,046	Project Grant:	\$3,544,679
Co-financing:	\$24,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$28,169,725
PIF Approval:	April 13, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	June 07, 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?	China has ratified the CBD and eligible for GEF BD finance.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, an appropriate endorsement letter from the OFP dated March 12 2012 is attached.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	UNDP's comparative advantage in managing PA system management project globally and in China is well recognized. UNDP is also the coordinating agency for the Programmatic Approach on China Wetland PA system management.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	n/a
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes, the country capacity to manage the project is recognized from past and ongoing related projects. The project is	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.

		strategy document.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes, refer below.	Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes, this is a sub-project of the Programmatic Approach on China Wetland PA system management which was approved by the council under the Nov 2011 Work Program.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	n/a
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	n/a
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	n/a
	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	n/a
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes, it is aligned with the GEF5 BD focal area results framework.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes, the project conforms well with the GEF-5 BD1.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
	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 area is identified as one of the priority site under the recently approved china NBSAP. It is also in line with other key policies and strategies.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes, the planning and capacity development activities under the project is expected to contribute to the sustainability of the project outcomes.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval. Component 2 particularly focuses on capacity development of key stakeholders.

Project Design	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 is a substantial baseline projects supported by the national and local governments.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
	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?		Yes, sufficient information provided.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	Yes, the incremental reasoning is reasonably clear with description on scenarios with and without GEF investment.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>The project framework and design is well developed.</p> <p>A few questions remain on:</p> <p>1) Feasibility on the alternative livelihood options. Please provide further information and clarification on the potential options, based on market opportunities and sustainability .</p> <p>2) The high funding allocation towards component 1 and 2, which is mainly focused on planning/strategy development and capacity building. Considering that there is need for robust site level activities, please review the allocation with a view to increase</p>	While the project framework is comprehensive, the project covers many outputs and activities which are very ambitious. Particularly component 3 covers wide range of activities, which requires further focus to ensure tangible results within the limited budget. For example, the project could focus on fewer, cost-effective, and most effective restoration measures as well as sustainable use activities with the community. Please further review the components and activities, and provide further focus.

		<p>further justify the current allocation.</p> <p>3) Please clarify whether indigenous peoples are involved in the project and if so, clarify how the project will ensure appropriate involvement of the communities in project designing and implementation.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>The information provided at this stage is appropriate. Further details are expected, with baseline and target data, at the time of CEO endorsement.</p>	<p>The global environmental benefits, i.e. targets related to biodiversity are unclear. While it is understood that the baseline information are lacking in the area (in terms of species distribution, population, etc), one wonders then why the area is known for its globally significant biodiversity, and how and when the species information have been collected.</p> <p>While the detail baseline targets may be identified during the first year of project implementation, the PM suggests that potential or indicative species and ecosystem benefits and targets are included in the project results framework. The coverage and EHI targets are not enough to understand the GEBs of the project.</p> <p>Further the project relies heavily on scorecards to show results, which do not clearly specify the GEBs. For example, it is not very clear what exactly it means with 4% increase in EHI scoring. The PM suggest that the results framework to include both scorecards (i.e. aggregated) and specific (e.g. species, ecosystem, etc) indicators for results.</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?	As noted above, further information on the feasibility and concrete approach towards the alternative livelihood options are required.	Further information is requested to further clarify socio-economic benefits through the project intervention, including identification of relevant results indicators. On indigenous peoples and gender mainstreaming, please provide further information on the relevant assessments and consultations that have been undertaken during project preparation in order to identify appropriate activities.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	As noted above, please clarify the involvement of indigenous peoples/ethnic minority in the project.	Please note comments above on item 16.
	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 is provided at this stage.	Yes, appropriate information provided.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, appropriate information provided at this stage. Concrete information on the lessons learned and coordination mechanism are expected at the time of CEO endorsement.	Sufficient information provided and coordination mechanisms identified.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes, adequate information provided at this stage.	Yes, it is considered adequate.
	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?		The pilot sites has decreased and focused, and some activities have shifted to different components. However, the project design is reasonably aligned to the PIF.
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes, the PMC is less than 5%.	The PMC is 5% of the total project cost.

Project Financing			
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes, the cofinancing level for each component is adequate. As noted above, please refer to the question on the funding allocation among the components.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Cofinancing ratio is 1 to 7 and considered appropriate.	Yes, the cofinance has been confirmed with letters, and the ratio to the GEF finance is considered adequate.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	UNDP is bringing in a cash cofinance of \$1m and considered appropriate.	Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation			
	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes, adequately completed TT has been attached.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes, adequate budgeted M&E plan is included.
Agency Responses			
	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		Adequate response and information provided.
	• Convention Secretariat?		No comment has been provided.
	• Council comments?		No comment has been provided.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		No comment has been provided.
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	No. Please provide additional information and clarification based on the comments made. Upon receipt of a revised PIF that adequately respond to the comments, the PM will recommend the project for CEO clearance. 11 April 2012 The GEFSEC received a revised PIF	

		additional information based on the earlier comments. The PM recommends the PIF for work program inclusion.	
	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?		Yes, adequate information provided.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		No, please provide additional information and necessary revision to the document based on the comments made above, and resubmit the CEO endorsement package. May 27 2013 Yes, the GEFSEC received a revised CEO endorsement package that adequately addresses the earlier comments. The PM recommend this project for CEO endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 27, 2012	April 19, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 11, 2012	May 27, 2013
	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?	Yes, following six activities are planned under the PPG: 1. Systematic and institutional capacity for managing the sub-system of wetland PAs. 2. Biodiversity status assement and assement of monitoring and reporting needs,

		<p>3. Assessment of PA information and data management system.</p> <p>4. Wetland PA financing needs and management effectiveness assessment.</p> <p>5. Profiling of wetland PAs and initial design of co-management activities.</p> <p>6. Feasibility analysis and budget.</p>
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>No, the local consultant fee rate is too high. The person weeks should include the cofinancing. Please revise.</p> <p>Please also provide details on the travel cost.</p> <p>11 May 2012 The local consultant fee rate has been adjusted incorporating the cofinancing. The fee is about \$1500 per week and considered adequate considering the standard rate in China.</p> <p>Regarding the travel cost, based on the discussion earlier, our understanding was that the project preparation will be coordinated among the different sub-projects under the Programmatic Approach to be cost effective and by using a team of experts working on multiple project development. Adding up PPG requests among only the three PPGs (anhui, hubei, and Daxing'anling), there are total of 10 international trips envisioned. This is far from cost effective. Please provide further information and revise as necessary.</p> <p>In addition, to be consistent with other PPG reviews, "micellaneous" is not an allowable cost item and it needs to be further specified. If the cost is mainly for communication purpose, please state it as communication cost.</p> <p>21 May 2012 UA: Addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	<p>No. Please revise the PPG based on the above comments on the budget.</p> <p>11 May 2012 No, please revise the PPG request based on above comments on international travel and miscellaneous costs.</p> <p>21 May 2012 UA: Yes. PM recommends the PPG for CEO approval.</p>
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (e)	First review*	April 11, 2012

	Additional review (as necessary)	May 21, 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.