



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

GEF ID:	4896		
Country/Region:	China		
Project Title:	CBPF-MSL: Strengthening the Management Effectiveness of the Wetland Protected Area System in Anhui Province		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4868 (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:	\$18,147,255	Total Project Cost:	\$20,802,026
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Yoko Watanabe	Agency Contact Person:	Doley Tshering

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 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):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	Yes, refer below.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.	
	<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, 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, it is unclear whether this is a region that has been specifically been identified as one of the priority biodiversity significant area under the recent NBSAP. Please confirm.	
	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 baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	There are substantial investments made in the province for in and outside the PAs by the government. However, the scale of the basin level initiative is not commensurate in relation to the	

Project Design		initiative. Please clarify and justify the specific needs working at the basin level versus the initiatives at the provincial and PA levels.	
	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?	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.	
	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 project design is very similar to the one submitted for Hubei province. There should be unique threats and barriers for each province and different</p>	

		revise as necessary.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	As noted above, please further clarify the incremental benefit of the project.	
	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>Please provide further information on the indigenous communities that are involved in the project, and also provide further information how the project will ensure appropriate involvement of these communities.</p> <p>Further clarification on the activities and approach on NRM and income generation activities with the local communities is requested and clarify whether feasibility and sustainability of the initiative has been adequately considered.</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	The role of indigenous communities are not mentioned. Please clarify.	
	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)	The information provided is rather general. Are there any risk associated with lack of capacity and coordination at the provincial and municipal levels?	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	General information has been provided. Further details on lessons learned and coordination mechanism are expected at the time of CEO endorsement.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes, general information has been provided and considered adequate at this stage. Further detail on the institutional arrangement is expected at the time of CEO endorsement.	

	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.	
	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 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?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		

Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	No, please review the comments made above and revise accordingly. Upon receipt of the revised PIF that adequately respond to the above comments, the PM will recommend the proposal for CEO clearance. 11 April 2012 The GEFSEC received a PIF that adequately responds and provides additional information based on the earlier comments. The PM recommends the PIF for work program inclusion.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please ensure appropriate consultation with the ethnic minorities during project preparation and submit an appropriate strategy/plan at the time of CEO endorsement.	
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*	April 02, 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	

	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.