



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

GEF ID:	4655		
Country/Region:	China		
Project Title:	CBPF-MSL: Strengthening the management effectiveness of the sub-system of wetland protected areas for conservation of globally significant biodiversity		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4391 (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:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,654,771
Co-financing:	\$16,800,000	Total Project Cost:	\$19,454,771
PIF Approval:	September 16, 2011	Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2011
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 endorsement letter dated 31 Aug 2011 is attached.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes, UNDP has demonstrated relevant capacity by managing the CBPF and sizable biodiversity and wetlands conservation projects in China.	
	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 project is in line with UNDAF and there are experienced staff in the country and region.	
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

Availability			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	<p>Yes. This project is part of and an umbrella project under the Programmatic Approach to strengthen China Wetlands Protected Areas System (PMIS 4646, GEF \$23 million in total).</p> <p>In order to distinguish from the CBPF under GEF-4, please change the title to "CBPF-MOL (Mainstreaming of Life)" or something relevant.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	Yes, pls 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 is well aligned with the GEF-5 Biodiversity focal area strategy on BD1 (protected areas system).	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes, as noted above.	
	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, it is consistent with key national strategies and policies, including the recently approved NBSAP.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes, the proposed policy and institutional development for wetland PA management could have a lasting impact on the overall improvement of wetland PA management.	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seeks to address	Additional information and clarification is required on the baseline project/initiative. There are multiple	

Project Design	sound data and assumptions?	collaboration and synergy with the proposed project remains unclear. It doesnot seem that many of these initiatives are also counted as cofinance to the project. Please provide further information and clarification on the linakge between the ongoing work and the proposed project.	
	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 information is required to clarify situations with and without GEF finance. What would happen without GEF funding? The Global Benefit of the GEF project, particularly under section B2 should be further elaborated with tangible information.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>The overall project framework and design is comprehensive, although ambitious. There are few additional information and activities that may require consideration:</p> <p>1) How would this project coordinate with the other sub-projects under the programmatic approach? How would this project coordinate with the CBPF and other wetland projects under it? How would this project coordinate with the new GEF-5 projects on wetlands that are not included in the programmatic approach? Some information are provided but please further elaborate the section under component 3 and include relevant activities under the project</p>	

		2) Would the budget and capacity sufficient to establish and operationalize four new wetland PAs, in addition to all the identified activities? How would the sustainability of these new PAs going to be ensured?	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	As also noted above, further tangible information is required on the global environmental benefits, including coverage and other biodiversity related indicators.	
	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?	The linkage is generally described, The proposal also adequately notes the necessary social and gender assessments and analysis that would be conducted during project preparation.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	While some CSOs work are described as baseline, it is rather unclear how the project will be coordinating and partnering with these organizations. Please provide further information.	
	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 risks are identified at this point. Measures to mitigate the risks, including dams and climate change impacts, should be further elaborated with appropriate activities within the project framework before CEO endorsement.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, however, as noted above, please further clarify how the coordination is envisioned with the related ongoing initiatives by the CSOs and other partners, in addition to the government led initiatives.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	In addition to the role of SFA as the executing agency, pls further clarify the roles and involvement of other related	

		and project implementation.	
	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?	Yes, it is identified as 5% of the project budget and proportionate to the cofinance.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Further cofinancing is expected for each objective. Please note below comment.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	The cofinancing ratio is 1 to 4 at this point. Considering China's capacity and its past and ongoing investment towards wetland management, it is expected that the cofinance is increased to at least to 1 to 5.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	UNDP is planned to cofinance \$900000 in cash 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:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> STAP? 	Please provide adequate response once comments are provided	

	• Convention Secretariat?	Please provide adequate response once comments are provided.	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	Please provide adequate response once comments are provided.	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>No, please provide additional information and revision based on the comments made above. Upon receipt of a revised document that adequately responds to the comments, the PM will recommend the PIF for CEO clearance.</p> <p>15 Sept 2011 GEFSEC received a revised PIF with adequate additional information and clarification which responds to all the comments made earlier. The cofinancing ratio has increased to 1 to 6.33 ratio. The information on the global environment benefit is sufficient for now, but will be further elaborated with tangible indicators and targets by the time of CEO endorsement. The PM recommends the PIF for Work Program Inclusion.</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*		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.