



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

GEF ID:	5373		
Country/Region:	China		
Project Title:	Greening the Logistics Industry in Zhejiang Province		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5238 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-2; CCM-4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,913,700
Co-financing:	\$12,130,000	Total Project Cost:	\$15,143,700
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Hiroaki Takiguchi	Agency Contact Person:	Manuel L.Soriano

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 ?	HT, April 9, 2013: Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	HT, April 9, 2013: No. Please submit an endorsement letter signed by the operational focal point. HT, August 27, 2013: The endorsement letter has been submitted. Comment cleared.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	HT, April 9, 2013: Yes.	
	• the focal area allocation?	HT, April 9, 2013: Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of	N/A	

	<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>	<p>HT, April 9, 2013: Energy efficiency improvement in the logistics sector can be covered by CCM-4. Therefore, it seems reasonable to narrow down the FA objectives to CCM-4 unless there are no specific reasons to bring up CCM-2.</p> <p>HT, August 27, 2013: The reason to include CCM-2 has been provided. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<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>	<p>HT, April 9, 2013: Please explain that the PIF has relevance to the 2nd National Communication submitted by the Government of China in November, 2012.</p> <p>HT, August 27, 2013: Relevance to the 2nd National Communication has been added. Comment cleared.</p>	
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>HT, April 9, 2013: Yes.</p>	

	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>HT, April 9, 2013: Please address the following comments:</p> <p>a) Role of the national government is unclear, while the National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC) is listed as one of the executing partners. Involvement of the national government seems necessary to replicate the outcomes and outputs in other provinces and cities.</p> <p>Component 1: b) Please describe how many provinces and cities are envisaged to replicate the green logistics policies.</p> <p>Component 2: c) Please add quantifiable outputs in the Indicative Project Framework (e.g., GHG emission reductions, reduction of empty load rates).</p> <p>Component 3: d) Case studies of international best practices in green logistics duplicate with research report on green logistics systems developed and implemented in other countries (Component 1). Please streamline the activities without duplication.</p> <p>HT, August 27, 2013: a) b) Explanation has been provided. Comment cleared. c) Quantifiable outputs (reduction of empty load rates and estimated GHG emissions reduction) have been added in the Project Framework. Comment cleared. d) The difference between the activities</p>	
--	---	--	--

		explained. Comment cleared.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	HT, April 9, 2013: Yes. Please provide detailed estimation of GHG emission reductions, including the effects of water transport systems, by the CEO Endorsement stage.	
	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?	HT, April 9, 2013: The description on the stakeholders (page 11, "Science & Technology, and ... the International Copper Association (ICA)") is not understandable. Please correct it. HT, August 27, 2013: The irrelevant text has been removed. Comment cleared.	
	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)	HT, April 9, 2013: Yes.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	HT, April 9, 2013: Yes.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.	HT, April 9, 2013: The proposal is innovative because it seeks to maximize GHG emission reductions by optimizing the combination	

	<p>innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>systems. Regarding the replication, please address the comment in box 7b).</p> <p>HT, August 27, 2013: The comment in box 7b has been addressed. Comment cleared.</p>	
	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?	<p>HT, April 9, 2013: Please address the following comments: a) Given the important role of the national government, please explore possibilities to receive co-financing from the national government. b) Please bring down the PPG amount to \$100,000 as well as the Agency Fee for PPG.</p> <p>HT, August 27, 2013: a) The co-financing from the national government is to be explored in the project preparation stage. Comment cleared. b) While the PPG amount has been brought down, the total of the project cost, PPG and Agency fees (\$3,300,002) exceeds the amount in the endorsement</p>	

		Agency fee for the project (\$276,802) to \$276,800. HT, August 29, 2013: The Agency fee has been revised. Comment cleared.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? 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?	HT, April 9, 2013: Please provide information on the UNDP's budget for China and justify the level of co-financing (\$250,000). HT, August 27, 2013: The information on the UNDP's co-financing has been provided. Comment cleared.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	HT, April 9, 2013: Yes.	
	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?		
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	HT, April 9, 2013: There is no non-grant instrument.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately		

	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>HT, April 9, 2013: Not at this stage. Please address the above comments.</p> <p>HT, August 27, 2013: As in the comment in box 16, please revise the Agency fee for the project (\$276,802) to \$276,800.</p> <p>HT, August 29, 2013: All comments are cleared. The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>HT, August 29, 2013: Please address the following items at the CEO Endorsement stage: a) detailed estimation of GHG emission reductions, including the effects of water transport systems; b) exploration of possibilities to receive co-financing from the national government.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	April 09, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 27, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 30, 2013	

* 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.