



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

GEF ID:	4870		
Country/Region:	China		
Project Title:	CBPF-MSL: Strengthening the management effectiveness of the wetland protected area system in Hubei Province		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4823 (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:	\$2,654,771
Co-financing:	\$18,158,634	Total Project Cost:	\$20,813,405
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Yoko Watanabe	Agency Contact Person:	

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.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, an appropriate endorsement letter dated 12 march 2012 from the OFP is attached.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	UNDP's experience in working on PA management globally and in China is well recognized. UNDP also coordinates the programmatic approach on China wetland PA system. This is a sub-project of this Programmatic approach.	
	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, UNDP has a proven capacity and the project fits with the UNDAF and other strategy.	

Resource Availability	Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes, refer below.	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes, this is a sub-project of the Programmatic Approach on China wetland PA system which was approved at 2011 Nov Work Program.	
	• 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?	Yes, it is in line with the BD FA results framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes, the project approach conforms with the GEF-5 BD1.	
	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. However, please kindly confirm that this is an area that has been specifically identified as priority under the recent NBSAP. 11 April 2012 Additional information has been provided and considered adequate.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Institutional and individual capacity development activities are incorporated in the project design and should contribute to the sustainability of the project outcomes.	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the	There are substantial investments made in the province for in and outside the	

Project Design	sound data and assumptions?	<p>the project initiative, it would be useful to further clarify the scale and initiative at the "basin level," versus the initiatives at the provincial and PA levels.</p> <p>11 April 2012 Adequate information provided.</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>Further clarification would be useful with an explanation on with and without GEF investment, particularly considering the substantial investment already made by the provincial government on related activities.</p> <p>11 April 2012 Appropriate information provided.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>The project framework and design could be further revised and clarified by addressing the following issues:</p> <p>1) Further clarify the scale and linkages between the provincial, basin, and PA levels initiatives.</p> <p>2) The project is focused largely on planning and capacity building. The co-management on the ground seems to be a very limited component of the project. Please further clarify and strengthen the actual implementation activities on the ground to ensure strengthening of wetland PA management on the ground</p>	

		<p>3) The Hubei province has submitted another forest PA management project with UNEP, which is managed by the same Hubei forestry department. The GEF Secretariat considers that it is not very strategic to have two PIFs in the same province with the same agency, on a similar subject. Although the focused biomes are different, the two projects focus on PA management at the provincial level. It is suggested that UNDP and UNEP discuss with the national and local governments and review the PIFs, with a view to consolidate them. It could well be integrated as a PA system management project, with a overarching component to strengthen institutional and policy at the provincial level with additional components related to wetland and forest.</p> <p>11 April 2012 Adequate information and revision has been made. The GEFSEC considers that the UNEP proposal in Hubei requires further consideration on both project design and comparative advantage of the GEF Agency. Thus, considering that this PIF is under a larger programmatic approach, it is appropriate to move forward with this proposal separately at this point, while indicating possible synergy and coordination with the other proposal if it gets materialized in the future.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>As noted above, please further clarify the incremental benefit of the project.</p> <p>11 April 2012</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>While the description on socio-economic benefits are rather general at this stage, the GEF expects further details at the time of CEO endorsement. Further clarification on the activities and approach on NRM and income generation activities with the local communities would be useful.</p> <p>11 April 2012 Appropriate information provided.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>Please clarify whether any indigenous communities or ethnic minority groups are involved in the project, and if so clarify how the project will ensure appropriate involvement of these communities.</p> <p>11 April 2012 Appropriate information provided at this point. Further appropriate consultation and development of detail plan are expected during PPG.</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>The information provided is rather general. Are there any risk associated with lack of capacity and coordination at the provincial and municipal levels?</p> <p>11 April 2012 Appropriate information provided at this stage. Please provide further details at 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>No. The project does not mention coordination with the another GEF PIF that is under development with UNEP in the same province. As noted above, the GEF suggests that the two projects to be consolidated into one comprehensive project.</p>	

		As noted above, appropriate information has been provided at this stage.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	No. The different roles of provincial and municipal governments are not clear. 11 April 2012 Appropriate information provided.	
	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?	It is identified at 5% and considered appropriate.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The indicative funding and cofinancing identified for output2 on sustainable financing plan seems rather excessive. Please review. 11 April 2012 Budget has been revised and considered appropriate.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	The cofinancing ratio of the project is close to 1 to 7, and considered appropriate. The cash cofinance is about total \$12m and considered appropriate.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	UNDP is providing a cash cofinance of \$700000 and considered appropriate.	
Project Monitoring	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools		

	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?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>No, please review the comments made above and revise accordingly. The PM also strongly suggests that UNDP and UNEP discuss with the national and local governments on the two PIFs that are currently under development in the same province, with a view to consolidate them.</p> <p>11 April 2012 The GEFSEC received a revised PIF that adequately responds to the comments made earlier. With regards to the coordination with another PIF presented for the Hubei province, the other proposal requires further consideration on both project design and comparative advantage of the GEF Agency. Thus, it is appropriate to move forward with this proposal separately at this point, particularly considering that this PIF is under a larger programmatic approach. The PM recommends the PIF for work program inclusion.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO	Depending on the future status of the	

		strong coordination, including joint project implementation unit, steering committee, etc.	
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*	March 28, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 11, 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?	
	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.