

**Part I: Project Information**

GEF ID: 10073

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

Date of Screening: December 3, 2018

Screeener: Virginia Gorsevski

Panel Member: Brian Child

Concur. STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal and encourages the proponent to develop it with same rigor.

This is a well structured concept note. The background is comprehensive, but succinct. The three components, and 13 outcomes are solidly described and logical, with policy formation interlinked with pilot sites and knowledge management. The project may stretch the GEF allocation (\$9m) but is not unrealistic, especially if co-financing is real. This PIF should set the standard for GEF being brief, logical, and technically feasible, and displays a good knowledge of actors and processes.

**STAP Overall Assessment****Part I: Project Information****B. Indicative Project Description Summary**

**Project Objective:** To secure the conservation of endangered migratory water birds through the establishment of a robust, resilient and well-managed network of protected wetlands across the East Asian

Australasian Flyway (EAAF) in China.

Project components

Outcomes

Outputs

**Part II: Project justification****1. Project description. Briefly describe:**

1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)

**What STAP looks for****Response**

Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?

Yes

A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?

Yes

A description of the expected short-term and medium-term

Yes

Do the planned outcomes encompass important global

Yes

Are the global environmental benefits likely to be generated?

Yes

A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project. Is the sum of the outputs likely to

Yes

A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.

No theory of change is presented.

2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects

Is the problem statement well-defined?

Yes

Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?

Barriers and threats are well described and supported by data but no references.

3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project

For multiple focal area projects: does the problem statement and analysis identify the drivers of environmental degradation which need to be addressed through multiple focal areas; and is the objective well-defined, and can it only be supported by

N/A

Is the baseline identified clearly? Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?

Yes

Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?

Yes

Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?

Yes

For multiple focal area projects: are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators;

N/A

are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and

N/A

how did these lessons inform the design of this project?

N/A

What is the theory of change?

See above.

What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?

Expand PA system for migratory birds, develop conservation strategies and business plans including funding, strengthen national and regional policies to mainstream BD, develop pilot interventions involving communities and other stakeholders, monitor and adapt.

- What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?

See above (planning, followed by site level activities, and knowledge management).

- Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?

Yes

- Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?

"systematic and adaptive PA planning and mainstreaming"

5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	Yes
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change? Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable? Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment? Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined? Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation? What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A
7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up	Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning? Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors? Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	The project is innovative in that it proposes the concept of integrated wetland management at the flyway level for the first time in China.  Yes  incremental adaptation should be sufficient provided that the project is successful in working with sectors such as tourism, construction, fisheries, etc. to incorporate BD conservation actions into the long-term planning process.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		No map or georeferenced project sites provided through the PIF mentions shape file? Perhaps they have been transferred directly to the GEF?
<b>2. Stakeholders.</b> Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities. If none of the above, please explain why. In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.	Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation	Yes
<b>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.</b> Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis). Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? Yes/no/ tbd. If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: access to and control over resources; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services. Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd	What are the stakeholders' roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project design, to achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge? Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	Stakeholder roles are well defined.
<b>5. Risks.</b> Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design	Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed? Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?	Yes No
	Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?	Risks are well defined and comprehensive. The potential physical and/or economic displacement of people as a result of the project is of concerning.
	For climate risk, and climate resilience measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately?</li><li>- Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?</li><li>- Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?</li></ul>	Specific climate risks are not outlined in the PIF; however, scenarios will be evaluated during PPG phase.  Not at PIF stage No, apart from the assumption that project results (e.g. improved connectivity) will improve species ability to adapt to changing conditions. More specificity is needed on impacts and mitigation measures.

<b>6. Coordination.</b> Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?</li> </ul>	See above
	Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?	Yes
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	No
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	N/A
	Is there an adequate mechanism to feed the lessons learned from earlier projects into this project, and to share lessons learned from it into future projects?	Yes
	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	Component 3 is dedicated to knowledge management and will include the systematization of knowledge generated from this project and lessons learned.
<b>8. Knowledge management.</b> Outline the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, and how it will contribute to the project's overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling up results, lessons and experience?	Will rely in part on UNDP-GEF sponsored networks.

#### STAP Notes