



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

GEF ID:	<b>4882</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>China</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Enabling China to Prepare Its Third National Communication (3NC) and Biennial Update Report to the UNFCCC</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5032 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCM-6; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$7,280,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$900,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$8,180,000</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>October 01, 2012</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>November 15, 2012</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Rawlestone Moore</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Manuel L Soriano</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	China is eligible to receive resources.	Yes, China is eligible to receive resources.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	An endorsement letter from the operational focal point is on file.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	UNDP has effectively described the comparative advantage. Globally UNDP has effectively implemented many of these types of projects	Same as PIF stage.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	NA
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity	The project fits into the Agency's program in the country.	Same as PIF stage.

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

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	in the country?		
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	The resources are available from the STAR allocation of China.	Same as PIF stage.
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?		US\$852,000 is available from the focal area set-aside for this project.
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	The project is aligned with GEF CCM results framework. The project once successfully implemented will assist China to prepare its third national communications.	Same as PIF stage. The project once completed will allow China to submit its third national communications and first biennial update report.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	The relevant GEF 5 focal area objective, CCM -6 support enabling activities and capacity building are identified.	Same as PIF stage.
	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?	The project is consistent with the Outline of China's 12th Five-Year Plan for National Economic and Social Development. National communications are a requirement by the UNFCCC for developing countries.	Same as PIF stage.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	The activities of of the project will assist China to (1) Improve further the country's capability in the development, systematic renewal and utilization of national communications as an important tool in guiding policies and	Yes same as PIF stage.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		actions to meet China's climate change mitigation and adaptation goals; (2) Enable China to make new contributions to mitigation global climate change based on national conditions and sustainable development strategy and policy; and, (3) Improve the country's capacity to meet new requirements to the obligations under the Convention.	
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?	The project responds to a requirement which countries have, to prepare national communications to the UNFCCC. The project consists of the following components (i) GHG Emissions Inventory, Updating and Enhancement of GHG Inventory Database and Forecasting & Modeling Methodologies, (ii) Assessment on impacts of, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change, (iii) Updating of summary and assessment of policies, measures and actions on climate change mitigation, (iv) Further enhanced public awareness on climate change issues, (v) Inventory of GHG emissions and other relevant information on climate change for Hong Kong and Macao SAR, and (vi) Supplementary support for achieving Convention objectives and publication and dissemination of the third National Communication Report,	Yes, save as PIF stage.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		Please provide additional information on the cost effectiveness of the project design.  Update RM-June 26th 2014. The explanation provided is satisfactory
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	The project will assist in preparing the national communications for China and thus it is not necessary to demonstrate additional reasoning.	Same as PIF stage.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>There is a need for clarification on some issues in the project.</p> <p>In Component 3 of the project assessments will be carried out to determine the feasible policy and technology options for the country in mitigating climate change, as well as the social and economic costs to achieve these mitigation targets. A GEF financed technology needs assessment project has been approved for China (GEF PMIS 4188). Given that a technology needs assessment has been approved, it would appear that this component of the project may duplicate efforts in the area of technology needs assessment. Clarification is requested as to how the technology needs assessment project (GEF PMIS 4188) will be coordinated with the national communications.</p> <p>Component 1 notes that there will be an update of inventory GHG emissions to 2010. Clarification is requested as to whether this will include all of the years</p>	The project framework is sufficiently clear. The biennial update report will prepare the greenhouse gas inventory for the year 2 of , while the third national communication will complete the inventory for 2012.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>for the period 2000-2010, or whether it will only be the year 2010.</p> <p>The project proposes to improve the country's capacity to meet new requirements under the convention, yet there is no component in the project for the biennial update reports. A component on the biennial update reports should be included.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>The applied methodology for this project is appropriate.</p>	<p>Same as PIF stage.</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>There is a description of the socio-economic benefits. The third National Communication project will address gender concerns by building adaptation capacities of both men and women (and children) to equally cope with the adverse impacts of climate change and reduce negative effects on household welfare and environmental sustainability. More specifically, the project will: 1) Systematically analyze and address the specific needs of both women and men; identify targeted interventions to enable both genders to participate in -and benefit equally from - development efforts; and, 2) Address any gaps in attaining gender equality particularly in the context of adaptation to impacts of climate change by designing strategies and policies to close these gaps.</p>	<p>Same as PIF stage.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	All of the relevant government institutions are involved in the project along with , social groups research institutes, as well as colleges and universities. By CEO Endorsement further information should be provided on the social groups, the specific research institutes and other groups participating in the project.	Please provide further information on the social groups, the specific research institutes and other groups participating in the project.  Update RM-June 26th 2014. Further information has been provided on the social groups and research institutes participating in the project.
	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 project takes into account potential risks and identifies possible mitigation measures.	Yes. Same as PIF stage.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	The project will strengthen coordination with other relative projects in China, such as the Carbon Balance Research to Address Climate Change Project by Chinese Academy of Sciences, Climate Change Special Research Program organized by Ministry of Science and Technology (MOST) and National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC), and cooperative research project with other international organizations.  The project should be fully coordinated with the technology needs assessment of China.	Same as PIF stage.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	The project implementation execution arrangements are adequate. The national implementation partner is the National Development and Reform Committee.	Same as PIF stage.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		The project is sufficiently close to what is presented at the PIF stage.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	No. The project management cost should be 5% of the total project costs in line with recent GEF policy on the issue of project management.	The level of funding for project management is appropriate.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The funding per objective is appropriate and adequate.	Please provide clarification on the exact resources for components 2 and 3 of the project. Please include the exact resources allocated to components 2 and 3 in table b-project framework.  Update RM-June 26th 2014. Information on the exact amount of resources allocated to components 2 and 3 has been provided
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	The proposed co-finance is adequate.	The proposed co-finance is appropriate however, co-finance is not required for this type of activity.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	The co-finance amount that the agency is bringing to the project is in line with its role.	Same as PIF stage.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes a budgeted M&E plan is included.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>The PIF is not currently recommended for clearance.</p> <p>Please address the issues raised in boxes 14 and 23.</p> <p>A component on the biennial update report should be included in the project proposal.</p> <p>An indication of the proposed date of the submission of the second national communications should be provided. The project will not be CEO endorsed unless China's second national communications is submitted to UNFCCC.</p> <p>Update 16th April 2012</p> <p>Although clarification has been provided on the issue of technology needs assessment the project is not recommended for clearance. A component on biennial update reports should be included in the project.</p> <p>Update May 3rd 2012</p>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>The component on biennial update reports should be included in the project. The project is not recommended for clearance.</p> <p>Update September 13 2012</p> <p>A component has been added to include the biennial update report. The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	The Second National Communications of China needs to be submitted to the UNFCCC in order for the project to be CEO endorsed.	
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?		NA
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		<p>The project is not yet recommended for CEO endorsement.</p> <p>Please provide the following: (i) An indicative timeline of the submission of the biennial update report, and the third national communications to the UNFCCC; (ii) Information on the cost effectiveness of the project; (iii) Information on the on the exact resources for components 2 and 3 of the project, with the exact resources allocated to components 2 and 3 reflected in table b-project framework; and (iv) Specific information on the social groups, CSOs/NGOs and the specific research institutes participating</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>in the project.</p> <p>Please also inquire whether China wishes to include activities related to the determination of national contributions in this project. There appears to be some remaining GEF-5 STAR resource availability if no other MSPs or enabling activities are being considered. For specific updated remaining resource availability, please consult with the GEF Secretariat.</p> <p>Update RM-June 26th 2014. The project is not yet recommended for CEO endorsement. Please include the timetable for completion of the national communications and the biennial update report in the Request for CEO endorsement documentation. China does not intend to use GEF 5 resources for activities related to the preparation on intended national contributions.</p> <p>Update RM.July 16th 2014. An indicative timetable for the submission of the NC and BUR has been included. The project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.</p>
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**

<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Decision Points</b>	<b>Program Manager Comments</b>
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	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.