

Strengthening the protected area network for migratory bird conservation along the East Asian-Australasian Flyway (EAAF) in China

GEF Secretariat Review for Full Sized Project

Basic Information

GEF ID

10073

Countries

China

Project Title

Strengthening the protected area network for migratory bird conservation along the East Asian-Australasian Flyway (EAAF) in China

GEF Agency(ies)

UNDP

Agency ID

UNDP: 6110

GEF Focal Area(s)

Biodiversity

Program Manager

Hannah Fairbank

[PIF](#)

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, October 10, 2018:

Yes.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, October 10, 2018:

Yes.

Agency Response

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, October 10, 2018:

No. Although the expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing are provided in Table C of the PIF the documentation is lacking a description of the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the identification of investment mobilized (per the requirements to provide of the new co-financing policy/guidelines). Please provide.

HF, November 14, 2018:

Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, 5 November 2018

The information on Investment Mobilized has been included and the indicative information on co-financing sources and types clarified. The following definitions have been used to define Investment Mobilized: Any budget that cannot be expected to be repeated into the future is considered as Investment Mobilized. Recurrent Expenditures are those at past or budget-increment levels (e.g. forming part of annual standard government budget allocations) or taken from ongoing funding allocations.

The portion of Government of China co-financing that is Investment Mobilized represents anticipated additional budgetary provisions for the implementation of the Wetland

Conservation and Restoration Programme and the Nature Reserve Development Programme. The estimated \$50,000,000 investment mobilized is based on an estimated additional \$10 million annually (for each year of project implementation) that can be allocated towards aligned wetland conservation activities for each year of project implementation. These indicative estimates will be confirmed during PPG phase and verified in official co-financing letters provided at the time of CEO Endorsement.

For co-financing from other partners, definitions have been applied conservatively. The term Recurrent Expenditure has been used to reflect existing aligned efforts/activities that are expected to continue during the project implementation timeframe. The term Investment Mobilized has been used to reflect potential increased efforts and new investment that will be leveraged alongside the GEF grant. For example, initial consultations between SFGA and Beijing Oriental Landscape Ltd Co. indicate their interest in providing funding for the protection of key flyway sites – interest that will be explored further in PPG discussions. Further sources of potential private sector funding will also be explored during the PPG stage.

The co-financing sources and amounts are indicative only at this stage and will be defined further during the PPG stage and verified in co-financing letters presented at the time of CEO Endorsement.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):
Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, October 10, 2018:

Yes, Agency fee equals 9.5%.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, October 10, 2018:

Yes. This is the first PIF reviewed for China's GEF-7 BD STAR allocation (\$33.85 million total).

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, October 10, 2018:

Yes. This is the first PIF reviewed for China's GEF-7 BD STAR allocation (\$33.85 million total).

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, October 10, 2018:

Yes. The PPG request is \$200,000 which is within the allowable cap for an FSP of this size.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, October 10, 2018:

Yes.

Note: Table F cannot be seen in Portal. Core Indicator template was submitted by Agency as a document and is complete and data is present in the uploaded PIF in Table F. No action needed.

Agency Response

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, October 10, 2018:

Please indicate in the project taxonomy section whether Rio Markers applicable.

HF, November 14, 2018:

Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, 5 November 2018

The project taxonomy was unfortunately not saved with the initial PIF submission. The project taxonomy section has been completed with the resubmission.

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, October 10, 2018:

Yes.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, October 10, 2018:

Yes. In the CEO endorsement phase, please ensure that the CER and ProDoc describes how C-PAR and this project fit within the new institutional structure for protected areas management and how the projects-and the Ministries (MEE and MNR) will work together to ensure that this project benefits directly from the work at the National level that C-PAR is doing. Also-please include discussion of how specifically the results of the project's MTE, TE and the "mainstreaming and site-based management successes and best practices" will inform the project.

Agency Response

UNDP, 5 November 2018

The new institutional arrangements and coordination with the C-PAR program will be defined further during the PPG phase and detailed in the project documentation and CEO Endorsement Request.

The child projects in the GEF-5 MSL wetlands program are starting to commence their terminal evaluations. These reports and the best practices and lessons learned will be reviewed during the PPG phase and used to define the detailed development of project activities. For example, the MSL projects have had success integrating wetland conservation into new Lake and River Chief cross-sector coordination mechanisms established by the Government of China; supporting the establishment of government policy that supports wetland threat reduction (e.g. cessation of fishing at critical wetlands); and in using standardized monitoring approaches to measure the ecological condition of wetlands. There is also useful information learned on managing programmatic approaches and how to maximize cross-programmatic learning and knowledge exchange. These lessons were also captured in the development of the C-PAR program and its program coordination and knowledge exchange approaches. This project will coordinate closely with the C-PAR program, share cross-representation on program governance bodies and participate in the knowledge exchange program of C-PAR (as detailed in the coordination section of the PIF).

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, October 10, 2018:

Yes.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, October 10, 2018:

Yes. There is clear alignment of this project with BD 1-1 on Mainstreaming Biodiversity and with BD 2-7 on Improving Financial Sustainability, Effective Management and Ecosystem Coverage of the Global Protected Area Estate.

Please correct Table A of the PIF that contains erroneous text next to BD 2-7 reading "Address direct drivers to protect habitats and species and..."

HF, November 14, 2018:

Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, 5 November 2018

At our end of the portal we cannot see any erroneous text in Table A of the PIF and therefore we are unable to respond to this comment.

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, October 10, 2018:

Yes.

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, October 10, 2018:

Yes.

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, October 10, 2018:

Given the previous and current level of GEF (and other donor) investment in protected areas and flyways in China we would expect there to be an increasing level of both (not just strategic) but public financial commitment to the effective management and conservation of protected areas—including those existing and proposed new sites under this project. This is not included explicitly in the sustainability section at this time, and the only reference to sustainable financing for the PAs is broadened investment of private sector and that of donor funds. Please include and further elaborate on financial sustainability plans for all sources: public, private sector and donor funds in the PIF and further with the CER/ProDoc submission.

During the PPG and in the CER/ProDoc submission please ensure the specific methods and mechanisms by which this investment in 5 project sites will be "scaled-up" within EAAF and China. In addition, this is critical to the sustainability of impacts of this investment.

HF, November 18, 2018:

Comment cleared. Please further develop financial sustainability plans for all sources: public, private sector and donor funds in the CER/ProDoc submission.

Agency Response

UNDP, 5 November 2018

The project will aim to increase public investment in wetland conservation and ongoing enhanced budgetary allocations for the management of wetland PAs including new PAs established with the support of the project. This has now been clarified in the sustainability section of the PIF. The project also seeks to capitalize on increasing private sector interest within China in supporting wetland conservation (including through increasing national donors, CSA and private sector interest in partnering on conservation projects). Thus, the project is seeking to support increased overall investment and a greater diversity of investment sources. The project's

aim of increasing and diversifying investment in wetland conservation has been added as an indicator for Component 1 in Table B of the PIF and added to the title of Component 1 to make sure that this is clearly captured in the project outcomes and strategy.

During the PPG phase the specific mechanisms for sustainability and for scaling up of project investment across China and the EAAF will be defined in detail. The potential for scaling up will be directly built into the project design and reflected in the project results framework as appropriate.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, October 10, 2018:

Yes.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, October 10, 2018:

- 1.) Please revise MEE section in Table 6 as it references MEP which is now outdated-correct?
- 2.) Please elaborate on stakeholder engagement for both local communities and ethnic minorities given the stated project risks. Additionally, please further articulate what is meant by: with application of FPIC "**as needed**" and justify in the context of the potential livelihood displacement and other project risks.

HF, November 14, 2018:

- 1.) Comment cleared.
- 2.) Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, 5 November 2018

The MEP oversight in Table 6 has been corrected to MEE.

Communities at project demonstration sites will be consulted during the PPG phase. During the PPG, the PPG team will conduct field visits to project demonstration sites to conduct consultations with provincial/local PA staff and other relevant government agencies, and consult with community representatives. This has been clarified in the stakeholder table of the PIF. A stakeholder engagement plan will be developed during the PPG phase for the engagement of stakeholders in project implementation.

There are ethnic minorities (Yi and Miao minority groups) at Dashanbao Black-necked Crane National Nature Reserve. PIF assessments indicate that no ethnic minorities are present at other proposed demonstration sites. Further social and environmental assessments will be conducted during PPG phase and UNDP SES Standard 6 on Indigenous Peoples applied. Ethnic minority groups at Dashanbao Black-necked Crane National Nature Reserve (and at any other sites if identified) will be consulted during the PPG phase including field visits by the PPG team. In accordance with UNDP's SES guidance note for Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples, UNDP will "seek FPIC on any matters that may affect rights and interests, lands, territories, resources, and traditional livelihoods". If the assessments conducted during the PPG determine that it is needed, an ethnic minorities plan will be developed, through which the FPIC process will be built into the project design for the relevant project activities. Note that in accordance with UNDP's Standard 6 FPIC is mandatory ("must be pursued and secured before") under three circumstances: when the project may affect rights, lands, territories, resources and/or traditional livelihoods; when resettlement may occur; and/or when cultural heritage may be affected. The text in the PIF and SESP pre-screening has been revised to provide better clarity of this process.

Note that based on the SESP pre-screening there is only the risk of economic (e.g. changed access to use of natural resources) not physical displacement at the Dashanbao Black-necked Crane National Nature Reserve that might impact ethnic minorities. There are no government plans for resettlement at this site.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, October 10, 2018:

Please further elaborate on the gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and empowerment of women for this project as the current treatment is cursory.

HF, November 14, 2018:

Comments cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, 5 November 2018

Additional information has been provided on the gender context in China related to this project, giving an indication of the ways in which gender mainstreaming will be included in the project.

There are some gender inequalities in China in rural areas, where rural women have less education than men and are less likely to participate in decision-making in public affairs, such as lower attendance at village meetings compared to men. Domestic duties and domestic care also tend to fall predominantly on women in rural communities. This means that women are less likely to participate in training and education opportunities as they have limited time availability. There are also differences in how men and women use coastal wetland resources. For example, men often rely on inshore fishing (by boat) for livelihoods, while women are more likely to rely on the intertidal zone. Women also devote more time than men to selling small handicrafts to tourists and are more likely to be employed in wetland tourism-related activities such as local home-stays and restaurants.

The gender mainstreaming context for the project is clarified as: opportunities for the project to support the enhanced role of woman in decision-making (including project decision-making), provide viable opportunities for women to engage in learning and training opportunities, and identify livelihoods activities for women in recognition of the ways in which they use coastal wetland resources and rely on them for their livelihoods. This will all be supported by the comprehensive gender analysis and gender mainstreaming plan developed during the PPG phase.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, October 10, 2018:

Private sector engagement is only discussed in the PIF at the ultra-local level via livelihoods and certification which is limiting. Please provide a wider view of the potential for private-sector engagement in this project, particularly given the emphasis on mainstreaming of the PIF. Further, given the goal of financial sustainability and business planning for protected areas management the role of the private sector in this needs to be explained more thoroughly.

Finally, Table C on co-financing references a \$3 million grant/investment mobilized from the private sector "Beijing Oriental Landscape Ltd Co" but this is not mentioned in the private sector section of the PIF. Please elaborate on this expected/potential private sector co-finance.

HF, November 14, 2018:

Comments cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, 5 November 2018

The private sector engagement parts of the PIF have been expanded to explain the project's approach to private sector engagement in more detail. The approach to private sector engagement will be two-fold: attempting to facilitate additional private sector donations and commitment to wetland conservation at national level, and through targeted partnerships with the private sector at demonstration sites.

At a national level the project will leverage the burgeoning philanthropic movement in China, spearheaded by philanthropists such as He Qiaonyu, founder of the Beijing Oriental Landscape Ltd Co. and the Qiaonyu Foundation. The project will support the establishment of a national donor alliance to bring together current and potential donors and private sector partners and tie funding commitments to the identified priority actions in the flyway business plan. This will help achieve broadened financing into wetland and migratory bird conservation, alongside the ongoing enhanced financial commitment of the Government of China to wetland conservation and PA management. The alliance will mirror the platform established at the 2018 Global Flyway Summit, of which Qiaonyu Foundation is a founding member.

At a demonstration site level there are a range of private sector partnership opportunities that will be explored in more detail during the PPG phase. This will include potential partnerships with the resource extraction sector (e.g. oil companies operating oil fields in Yellow River Delta and Liaohe River Estuary), tourism sector (e.g. tourism companies in Yellow River Delta, Liaohe River Estuary, Chongmingdongtan wetland and the Wing Flight company in Dashanbao) and also small-to-medium enterprises using wetland resources at demonstration sites (e.g. agriculture, aquaculture, mariculture, marine fishing enterprises). Local companies will be engaged in the delivery of livelihoods diversification and value-added opportunities for local communities, e.g. eco-tourism, marine product certification – both at demonstration site level and to establish market opportunities. Partnerships with electronic merchants such as JD.com and Taobao.com will be explored to see if there is potential for them to include the sale of certified wetland-friendly products under their e-merchant platforms (building on the example provided by the Global Protected Areas Friendship System Group which sells certified products via the baohudi.org platform).

The indicative co-financing commitment from Beijing Oriental Landscape Ltd Co. has been elaborated in co-financing, stakeholder, and private sector sections of the PIF. Initial discussions between SFGA and Beijing Oriental Landscape Ltd Co. confirm their interest in supporting the project including through protection of key wetland sites for migratory birds in China. The details of the co-financing will be confirmed during the PPG phase.

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, October 10, 2018:

Potential physical or economic displacement has been flagged as a potential project risk and rated "medium." Please address the following related issues:

1. The core indicators data sheet states that PA expansion sites are yet To Be Determined (presumably based on the results of the technical analysis included in the project description) whereas the Preventive Measures box in the Risks table indicates for this risk that "There are currently no indications that the Government of China will be conducting any voluntary resettlement of local communities at proposed PA sites or demonstration sites." This seems contradictory-what are the proposed PA sites referenced in this sentence? How is it that this risk has been rated "medium" when the PA creation or expansion sites have yet to be determined? This is particularly relevant given the experience under CPAR where during the PIF stage UNDP had no knowledge of potential or planned resettlement.
2. At what point will PA establishment/expansion sites be determined and how will the risk of physical or economic displacement factor into this decision making?
3. Given the presence of local communities and ethnic minorities at current and potential ethnic sites please address the use of FPIC (aligned with GEF minimum standards and UNDP safeguards concerning the issue).

HF, November 15, 2018:

All comments cleared. Please note: If changes/increases in these risks are revealed during the PPG phase, this may result in the project not being endorsed, or at a minimum trigger a GEF Council Review as a major amendment.

Agency Response

UNDP, 5 November 2018

Further information has been added to the PIF to provide further clarification on potential risks of displacement associated with PA establishment and enhanced PA management effectiveness. This is summarized below.

The discussion of the SESP pre-screening risks of potential economic and/or physical displacement has been clarified. The description of the risks has been more clearly worded as: Some indicative sites for PA expansion have already been identified: Dagang (Tianjin Province), Nanpu and Huanghua (Hebei), Rudong (Jiangsu), Dongshan (Fujian), and Dapeng Bay (Guangdong). There are no plans for government resettlement at any of these proposed PA sites. These new PAs are coastal wetlands, with no communities living within them (although some communities use wetland resources for fishing). Five project demonstration sites have been identified: Liaohe River Estuary National Nature Reserve (Liaoning), Yellow River Delta NNR (Shandong), Chongming Dongtan NNR (Shanghai), Zhanjing Mangrove Forest NNR (Guangdong), and Dashanbao Black-necked Crane NNR (Yunnan). There are no plans for government resettlement at any of these demonstration sites.

There is some uncertainty with PA expansion sites as these are not yet fully delineated and will not be confirmed until the PPG phase. Given this uncertainty the risk of potential physical displacement has been conservatively escalated to a rating of ‘high’ as a precautionary measure. This risk rating is expected to decline during the PPG phase when further information is confirmed on project sites. A safeguards specialist will be included in the PPG team to support these further assessments and the project’s consideration of potential social and environmental risks.

PA establishment/expansion sites will be confirmed during the PPG phase in consultation with the SFGA and based on the results of PPG assessments. Potential social and environmental risks at each site will also be identified at this stage. The SESP will be applied to all project sites, with potential social and environmental risks at each site identified and management measures defined in full alignment with UNDP SES policy and guidance notes for individual safeguards standards. The assessment will include any potential for physical and/or economic displacement through co-financing or government activities. The project will not support any resettlement or use GEF funds for resettlement.

Of the project sites that are currently identified, ethnic minorities are only present at Dashanbao. In accordance with UNDP’s SES guidance note for Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples, UNDP will “seek FPIC on any matters that may affect rights and interests, lands, territories, resources, and traditional livelihoods”. If the assessments conducted during the PPG determine that it is needed, an ethnic minorities plan will be developed, through which the FPIC process will be built into the project design for the relevant project activities. Note that in accordance with UNDP’s Standard 6 FPIC is mandatory (“must be pursued and secured before”) under three circumstances: when the project may affect rights, lands, territories, resources and/or traditional livelihoods; when resettlement may occur; and/or when cultural heritage may be affected. Please also see the response to the question on stakeholders. Revisions have been made to relevant sections of the PIF to clarify this.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with

relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, October 10, 2018:

Yes.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, September 10, 2018:

Yes, in addition to being consistent with current national planning/policy (13th 5-year plan), it is aligned with the CBPF (NB: which is now expired), NBSAP. Further, wetland conservation now being a priority for the newly restructured State Forest and Grassland Administration/State Administration of National Parks which is the EA for this project.

Please include in the CER and ProDoc for this project what Chinese government entities the project will work with to ensure mainstreaming of wetland conservation (including in the 14th 5-year plan) and the commitments herein of those entities to cooperate/collaborate with MNR and UNDP in this way. In addition inclusion in the project design itself via the PPG of those institutions/individuals that this project intends to "mainstream" into is highly recommended.

Agency Response

UNDP, 5 November 2018

Further information on mainstreaming across government and the commitments of these agencies will be confirmed during the PPG phase and detailed in the project documentation and CEO Endorsement Request.

The key national Ministries that will be targeted for mainstreaming efforts include the National Development and Reform Commission (lead for 5-year planning process), Ministry of Water Resources, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, Ministry of Housing and Urban-Rural Development. To help clarify the key national Ministries targeted for mainstreaming efforts, these Ministries are now all captured in the preliminary list of project stakeholders and their potential role in project mainstreaming efforts noted.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, October 10, 2018:

Yes. The project dedicates a substantial amount to KM which is appropriate given the need for scaling-up and sustainability of impact for this investment as well as the need to incorporate lessons from baseline and ongoing projects.

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

HF, September 10, 2018:

Yes.

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1. In the CEO endorsement phase, please ensure that the CER and ProDoc describes how C-PAR and this project fit within the new institutional structure for protected areas management and how the projects-and the Ministries (MEE and MNR) will work together to ensure that this project benefits directly from the work at the National level that C-PAR is doing. Also-please include discussion of how specifically the results of the project's

MTE, TE and the "mainstreaming and site-based management successes and best practices" will inform the project.

2. During the PPG and in the CER/ProDoc submission please ensure the specific methods and mechanisms by which this investment in 5 project sites will be "scaled-up" within EAAF and China. In addition, this is critical to the sustainability of impacts of this investment.
3. Given the previous and current level of GEF (and other donor) investment in protected areas and flyways in China we would expect there to be an increasing level of both (not just strategic) but public financial commitment to the effective management and conservation of protected areas-including those existing and proposed new sites under this project. Please include and further elaborate on financial sustainability plans for all sources: public, private sector and donor funds in the CER/ProDoc submission.

4. Please include in the CER and ProDoc for this project what Chinese government entities the project will work with to ensure mainstreaming of wetland conservation (including in the 14th 5-year plan) and the commitments herein of those entities to cooperate/collaborate with MNR and UNDP in this way. In addition inclusion in the project design itself via the PPG of those institutions/individuals that this project intends to "mainstream" into is highly recommended.

5. Please note: If changes/increases in risks are revealed during the PPG phase (in particular related to displacement, resettlement, IPs etc), this may result in the project not being endorsed, or at a minimum trigger a GEF Council Review as a major amendment.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)		