

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: October 06, 2011

Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Thomas Lovejoy
Consultant(s): Margarita Dyubanova

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT **GEF TRUST FUND**

GEF PROJECT ID: 4526

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : China

PROJECT TITLE: Securing BD Conservation and Sustainable Use in Huangshan Municipality

GEF AGENCIES: FAO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: The Municipal Government of Huangshan City
(Anhui Province)

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

STAP welcomes the proposal on "Securing Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use in Huangshan Municipality". The project goal, objective, outcomes and outputs are clearly defined. The project is comprehensive and covers all aspects of biodiversity conservation management in the context of protected areas. However, STAP looks forward to further clarification on a number of issues during the next phase of project development:

1. It would be helpful to identify in Expected outcome 1 (iii) the relationships of the committee for the sustainable management of biodiversity in Huangshan municipality with two other committees, as outlined in the PIF, that the Municipality has already created earlier, specifically the Nature Reserve Management Committee and Rare and Endangered Wild Life Protection Committee.
2. Please clarify Output 3 (iii) regarding whether alternative/sustainable livelihood options development will be developed for both the local communities living inside and those adjacent to PAs. Section B.2 of the project (paragraph 2, point (iv)) addresses sustainable livelihoods in communities affected by the creation of biological corridors. However, as stated in the PIF, a number of protected areas have local communities living inside of protected areas whose livelihoods depend on the extraction of natural resources. Further precision on how the project partners will engage with communities inside of protected areas would be useful. In addition, it would be helpful and beneficial with respect to the project's socio-economic benefits if the best practices for alternative livelihoods of local communities were described in greater detail.
3. The PIF states that the Bureau of Construction is responsible for national scenic reserves and the Bureau of Forestry is responsible for natural forest reserves and protected areas. Please clarify the support to project implementation (Outcome of Component 4) expected from these government entities. In addition, it would be useful to explain the relationship of both Bureaus with the Municipal and Provincial governments involved in this project as related to the management of the diverse protected areas across multiple jurisdictions in this intervention.
4. Finally, please describe how the new biodiversity conservation eco-tourism Master Plan will contribute to the existing Provincial Maser Plan, where Huangshan Municipality has been designated as an area to be managed primarily for water and biodiversity conservation (Expected Outcome 1 (ii)).

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
-------------------------------	---

1. Consent	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. Minor revision required.	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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 <p>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.</p>
3. Major revision required	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>