



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

GEF ID:	5533		
Country/Region:	China		
Project Title:	Developing and Implementing the National Framework on Access and Benefit Sharing of Genetic Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5310 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$130,000	Project Grant:	\$4,436,210
Co-financing:	\$22,236,000	Total Project Cost:	\$26,802,210
PIF Approval:	February 05, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	March 03, 2014
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 ¹	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 endorsement letter signed by the OFP is attached.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes, the total PIF/PPG amount of \$5m is within the remaining BD STAR allocation for China.	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes, refer above.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	n/a	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	Yes, the project well align with the BD-4.	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	Yes, the project well align with the NBSAP and other key national strategies and plans.	
Project Design	<p>6. 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?</p>	<p>Baseline activities that are carried out by related ministries are sufficiently described.</p> <p>How do National and Provincial ABS regulations relate to each other? There is mention of "developing provincial level ABS legislation" in the baseline activities, when there is no national legislation yet. Please elaborate.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>The components, outcomes, and outputs are sufficiently clear, in line with the Nagoya Protocol.</p> <p>However, please clarify the following</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>issues:</p> <p>Component 1. a. The GEF (and NP) do not cover "public health" issues (under component 1, output 1.3). Please remove from the PIF.</p> <p>Component 2 a. Is the project going to focus on five provinces or is it six? There are inconsistency in text and the table. Please clarify.</p> <p>Component 3. a. What are the legal bases on which China and multinational companies in the pharmaceutical, agricultural and food & beverage industries (listed in the table on p.8) will stand to engage in the proposed 6 pilots on ABS Agreements? If there are no sufficient laws and regulations on ABS that give international companies legal certainty, they are unlikely to engage.</p> <p>b. Related to the point above. How can the project develop an "overall legislative framework for the national law" during PPG, so the development of the national level legislation does not slow down the pilots? What legal value is going to have this framework develop during PPG?</p> <p>c. Do the multinational companies mentioned by name on p.8 (i.e. L`Oreal, Cocacola, Pepsi, Nestle, Roche) know that they have been cited in the PIF and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>that they are expected to engage on ABS Agreements in China? Please include only those that have been notified of this project.</p> <p>d. The baseline information on Research and Development for the pilots (p. 6-7) rather weak, particularly for pilots 3,4 and 6. The information provided on p.8-9 under "Final Products" suggest that there are baseline activities. Please elaborate.</p> <p>e. Remove paragraph on poultry and livestock, keeping references to wild relatives (p.6).</p> <p>f. Page 8. Pilot 1. Include "heart disease and empyrosis" under final product. Pilot 3. What are the companies? If not identified yet, please remove. Pilot</p> <p>g. The PIC/community protocol will be developed under this project or this is a separately planned activity? If it is part of the project, this should be included as part of the output. It also needs to be clearly noted that this will be developed in line with the Nagoya Protocol.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>a. The decribed GEB is still vague. Please provide further information on the tangible benefits.</p> <p>b. Incremental reasoning is not sufficiently provided. Please provide information on scenarios with and without GEF finance. In relation to this question, please provide what the substantial cofinancing from the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		government is focused on, or it is fully blended with the GEF finance.	
	9. 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	While the issue of PIC and TK are sufficiently covered in project description, we would like to see concrete explanation on the appropriate engagement of ethnic minorities in the stakeholder section. While there is some description on local communities, it is not sufficient. Please provide further information on the ethnic minorities that are involved (such as Dong people that are noted) and the process of engagement.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Some key risks have been identified. It is expected that further analysis and mitigation measures would be detailed by CEO endorsement.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Please inform on the specific related ABS initiatives (other than GEF-funded) that are ongoing in the country, and potential coordination. While related activities are quite limited, there seem to be involvement of both national and international organizations, including	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Chinese Academy of Science, ICIMOD, etc?	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	On the innovation and scale up, while the potential of ABS agreement in China is well noted, it is not well articulated how this project is applying innovation and a scaled up approach. Please further erabolate.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Cofinancing ratio is approximately 1 to 4. It is considered adequate, but could be more considering the capacity of the country.
17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate?		The cash cofinance from the national and provincial governments are well noted. Is there any cofinance expected from the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>private sector that are named and involved in the project? It would be desirable to mobilize private sector financing to the project. Please clarify.</p>	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, it is less than 5% and proportionate to the cofinance.</p>	
	<p>19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u>, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?</p>	<p>Yes, \$130000 is requested and it is within the norm.</p>	
	<p>20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	<p>n/a</p>	
<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		
	<p>22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		
<p>Agency Responses</p>	<p>23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
<p>Secretariat Recommendation</p>			

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	No. The project framework is sufficiently clear, however, please provide additional information based on the comments made above, and revise the PIF. 30 Aug 2013 The GEFSEC received a revised PIF that adequately respond to the earlier comments. The PMs recommend the PIF for future Work Program inclusion.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	August 23, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 30, 2013	
	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.