

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: September 11, 2014

Screener: Virginia Gorsevski

Panel member validation by: Ralph E. Sims
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 6919

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : China

PROJECT TITLE: Upgrading of China SHP Capacity Project

GEF AGENCIES: UNIDO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Ministry of Water Resources,
Ministry of Finance
International Centre for Small Hydro Power (ICSHP)

GEF FOCAL AREA: Climate Change

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):
Concur

III. Further guidance from STAP

Overall this is a good project.

1. Technical upgrades of existing SHP plants is well understood and this project encompasses water use, biodiversity, and land use as well as power generation.
2. Each plant is unique, but finding lessons learned from upgrading of a selection of "demonstration" plants makes good sense.
3. It is not clear who owns the plants and whether the owners could increase their existing tariffs in order to pay for the plant upgrades and gain the benefits GEF support is for meeting ecological and safety criteria to an international standard but perhaps innovative funding mechanisms could possibly be explored to maximise the benefits.
4. It is assumed that "intelligent monitoring systems" will be able to be remotely controlled from a centre covering several SHPs, but details are not given. The concept is well understood and could be beneficially applied.
5. Capacity building in Component 3 is fine but what exactly will be taught and who will be used as the trainers is not evident. Linking to the international low impact hydro certification scheme is commendable.
6. Monitoring of increased power output above the current baseline is easy to achieve, but the criteria to be used for assessing improvements in ecological and safety issues will need some careful thought.
7. The GHG assessment appears sound (assuming 6,455.750tCO₂e is intended to represent ~6.4Mt).

STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed
------------------------	--

<p>1. Consent</p>	<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>
<p>2. Minor revision required.</p>	<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"> (i) GEF Agency should discuss the issues with STAP to clarify them and possible solutions. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the GEF Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP's recommended actions.
<p>3. Major revision required</p>	<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"> (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. (ii) In its request for CEO endorsement, the Agency will report on actions taken in response to STAP concerns.