

# 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: 1 February 2010

Screener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley

### I. PIF Information

**Full size project**      **GEF Trust Fund**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 3992    **PROJECT DURATION:** 60 months

**GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:** PIMS 4179

**COUNTRY:** China

**PROJECT TITLE:** Strengthening the effectiveness of the protected area system in Qinghai Province, China to conserve globally important biodiversity

**GEF AGENCY:** UNDP

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** Qinghai Finance Bureau, Qinghai Provincial Government

**GEF FOCAL AREA:** Biodiversity

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMS:** BD1-SP3, BD1-SP1

**NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT:** CHINA BIODIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP AND FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION

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

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

### III. Further guidance from STAP

2. This is an ambitious project that might be strengthened by selecting the most important biodiversity areas within the PA network of Qinghai and focusing on these. The emphasis given in the PIF to field implementation with effective resource deployment is appropriate. Furthermore, the 'learning by doing' approach to capacity building is welcomed.
3. Given the weakness of coordination between institutions responsible for land management in the project area, strong and effective communication will be essential for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation through the different agencies. Appropriate budget and human resources are recommended for this component.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. <b>Consent</b>	STAP acknowledges that on scientific/technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasising any issues that could be improved and the proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. <b>Minor revision required.</b>	STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. One or more options that remain open to STAP include: (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (ii) Setting a review point during early stage project development and agreeing terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.
3. <b>Major revision required</b>	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. Normally, a STAP approved review will be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement. The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.