



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

GEF ID:	4653		
Country/Region:	China		
Project Title:	CBPF - MSL: Strengthening the Management Effectiveness of the Protected Area Landscape in Altai Mountains and Wetlands		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4596 (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:	\$3,544,679
Co-financing:	\$22,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$25,544,679
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
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 <sup>1</sup>	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.	Yes, an endorsement letter
	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 to manage the project by also managing the CBPF and sizable biodiversity and wetlands conservation projects in China. This project is also a sub-project of a PA which will be managed by UNDP.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency	n/a	

\*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)
	capable of managing it?		
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes, the project is in line with the UNDAF and there are experienced staff in the country and region.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>Yes, This is a sub-project of the PA on strengthening wetland PA system in china (PMIS 4646), which is a program with total GEF funding of \$23 million.</p> <p>In order to distinguish from the CBPF PA under the GEF-4, please change the title to "CBPF-MOL" or something in that line.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	Yes, please refer above.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	n/a	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes, the project will contribute to the BD1 results target, with a new protected area coverage of 150000 ha.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes, the project conforms well with the GEF-5 BD strategy, particularly on BD1 objective.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant	Yes, the project is consistent with key national strategy and policy, including the recently approved NBSAP of China.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?		
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes, the capacity built at the site and provincial level, particularly with the development of regulations and institutional capacity will have lasting impact for the management of the wetland PA system.	
	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?	<p>The baseline projects of the government and UNDP are generally well articulated. WWF has been working on the Altai Sayan Ecoregion at the regional level with the government of China for more than a decade, however, nothing is mentioned on their plans and potential baseline project, if any. Please provide relevant information on efforts being made/planned by other partners and potential collaboration.</p> <p>3 Oct 2011 Adequate information provided.</p>	
Project Design	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 the scenario "With and Without GEF financing" so that the incremental reasoning could be much clearer. Moreover, clarify tangible global environmental/biodiversity benefit with the incremental financing with GEF finance. Please provide further information under the relevant section.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		3 Oct 2011 Adequate information provided.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>The three components: 1) regulatory and institutional framework; 2) management of PA system at the landscape level; and 3) piloting co-management, are all very relevant and clearly described. The threats and barriers, and the possible solutions with these project components are also well linked and articulated.</p> <p>Few questions remains on:</p> <p>1) Clarify the activities already been implemented in relation to component 2 (landscape level PA management in the Altai Mountains) with the previous and ongoing investment by the WWF, government, and partners, and how this project builds on them.</p> <p>2) What are the specific lessons from other co-management models in the province, country, and ecoregional levels? How is the project design built on these experiences?</p> <p>3) How will the transboundary coordination further promoted to enhance PA management and connectivity? Please provide further details in addition to the very brief information.</p> <p>4) Clearly define and provide detail information on any overlap and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>coordination with the GEF/WB Lake Aibi project, possibly in a table format to clarify there is no duplications of efforts, and potential coordination. Please also clarify the provincial capacity to manage two GEF projects in the province.</p> <p>3 Oct 2011            With the additional information provided on the complementarity with the Lake Aibi project and the incremental reasoning, it is understood that the important element of the proposed project is working at the PA system level in Xinjiang province that would provide provincial level framework and tools for systematic management of wetland PAs. Based on this understanding, it is further advised that this element (component 1) to be further strengthened with possible increase in budget and appropriate activities. Further activities to ensure long term financing of the wetland PA system may also be considered. The project title may be also revised to reflect the system level approach. Please revise the component as appropriate.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>As noted above, please provide further information on the GEB.</p> <p>3 Oct 2011            Adequate information provided.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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 socio economic benefits and linkages are generally articulated. It is important that through the social and gender analysis, tangible benefits are determined with appropriate indicators and incorporate in the project framework.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	As already indicated before, please clarify the role of and coordination with WWF and other relevant partners who has been active in the region as a whole.  Please also clarify any involvement of indigenous/tribal people in the project, and ensure appropriate consultation and consent development for project preparation.  3 Oct 2011 Adequate information provided.	
	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)	Political instability should be considered as higher risk considering the recent experience with the GEF financed project on Lake Aibi, and the delay that we experienced with project development. Please also identify specific measures to ensure strong attention and commitment by the provincial government towards this project in such unstable situation.  3 Oct 2011 Further information has been provided but considering the very recent experience with the Lake Aibi project, which had substantial delay in project development as well as in securing	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		cofinancing, please indicate how this proposed project would be conducted differently to avoid similar situations.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>General information and coordination are noted, however, as earlier noted, please also indicate coordination with CSOs and IPs that are involved in related activities.</p> <p>The GEF has financed not only the Mongolia and Kazakhstan's Altai Sayan Projects, but also one in Russia. Please also clarify the status and results from these investments, which was managed by the UNDP, and how the project design has build on them.</p> <p>3 Oct 2011 Please provide information on the second comment, ie investments in other parts of the Altai region.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>The project implementation arrangement requires further information for clarity.</p> <p>3 Oct 2011 Adequate information provided at this stage.</p>	
	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?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	The project management cost is identified as 5% and proportionate to the cofinance, and considered appropriate.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The overall cofinancing ratio is 1 to 4 and may considered appropriate considering the remoteness and condition of the province. However, all efforts should be made to increase the cofinance, possibly to 1 to 5.  The ratio per outcomes are generally adequate.  3 Oct 2011 Cofinancing ratio has been increased to 1 to 6.2.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	As noted above.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	UNDP's cash cofinance is identified as \$1 million, and considered adequate.	
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?	Please provide adequate response once comments are being made.	
	• Convention Secretariat?	Please provide adequate response once comments are being made.	
	• Council comments?		



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>	Please provide adequate response once comments are being made.	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>No, please provide further information and clarification based on the comments made above. Upon receipt of a revised document that adequately responds to the comments made, the PM will recommend the PIF for Work Program Inclusion.</p> <p>3 Oct 2011 Adequate information has been provided on most of the earlier comments, however, please provide additional information and revision, particularly related to component one of the project and few other comments made above. Upon receipt of further clarification and revised PIF, the PM will recommend the proposal for CEO clearance.</p> <p>20 Oct 2011, The GEFSEC received adequate responses to the earlier comments. This PIF is recommended for CEO clearance and future 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?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Additional review (as necessary)	October 03, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	October 20, 2011	
	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	<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.