

# Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility  
(Version 5)

## STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: February 21, 2014

Screener: Paul Grigoriev

Panel member validation by: Sandra Diaz

Consultant(s): Thomas Hammond

### I. PIF Information *(Copied from the PIF)*

**FULL SIZE PROJECT    GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 5665

**PROJECT DURATION :** 4

**COUNTRIES :** China

**PROJECT TITLE:** A New Green Line: Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation Objectives and Practices into China's Water Resources Management Policy and Planning Practice

**GEF AGENCIES:** FAO

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:**

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** Biodiversity

### II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency(ies):  
**Consent**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

2. STAP welcomes the submission of this concept for a project intended to help mainstream biodiversity conservation into China's water resources planning and management. This is clearly a timely and very important initiative. It is also one that is well nested within the baseline activities and can prove to be an important catalyst in promulgating significant change in the water management sector in the country at different levels. It also has great potential for leveraging ongoing activities and initiatives to maximize synergies and returns on investment.

The proposal is logically structured and is well presented. The large scale problem and specific threats are clearly outlined. The baseline is described well and underlines the timeliness and opportunities available for incremental GEF support. For example, the project could certainly leverage the work being conducted by TNC, and others. The project is designed to effectively fill known important gaps in the planning and management within the water sector at multiple levels. It can also serve to amplify the work of others.

The barriers are clearly defined and assessed and are reflected in the project structure. The incremental reasoning is clear as well and the expected GEBs are well summarized. More specific baseline values with regard to aquatic biodiversity and socio-economic conditions will be required prior to the commencement of the project.

The project is innovative in several areas as described in the proposal and the sustainability rationale is based upon more than just wishful thinking. The scaling-up potential is large, although it is described somewhat scantily.

The definition of stakeholders is comprehensive but more detail on the specific roles of some of them should be provided during the PPG phase. The risks are well presented and the proposed mitigation measures are realistic. Climate change is recognized as a risk due to melting glaciers, but no rating is provided. This is recognized as something that will require further attention moving forward.

Coordination with other projects does not present an issue but more specific mechanisms and processes ought to be developed during the PPG phase.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. Consent</b>	<p>STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasizing any issues where the project could be improved.</p> <p>Follow up: The GEF Agency is invited to approach STAP for advice during the development of the project prior to submission of the final document for CEO endorsement.</p>
<b>2. Minor revision required.</b>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific or technical challenges, omissions or opportunities that should be addressed by the project proponents during project development.</p> <p>Follow up: One or more options are open to STAP and the GEF Agency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions.</li> <li>(ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.</li> </ul>
<b>3. Major revision required</b>	<p>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) The Agency should request that the project undergo a STAP review prior to CEO endorsement, at a point in time when the particular scientific or technical issue is sufficiently developed to be reviewed, or as agreed between the Agency and STAP.</li> <li>(ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.</li> </ul>