

# 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: January 19, 2012

Screeener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Thomas Lovejoy  
Consultant(s): Douglas Taylor

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

**FULL SIZE PROJECT    GEF TRUST FUND**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 4651

**PROJECT DURATION :** 4

**COUNTRIES :** China

**PROJECT TITLE:** A Landscape Approach to Wildlife Conservation in Northeastern China

**GEF AGENCIES:** World Bank

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:** State Forestry Administration of PRC, Forestry Administration of Jilin Province, Forestry Administration of Heilongjiang Province, Heilongjiang Forest Industry General Corporation, WCS, WWF

**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): **Minor revision required**

### III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes this project as part of a global initiative to sustain and restore tiger populations through landscape scale management and to act as a replicable pilot for further actions within China in collaboration with adjacent range states. STAP notes that the project also contributes to the Global Tiger Recovery Plan and is broadly consistent with the approach used within similar projects in Russia, e.g. the recent Medium Size Project (GEF ID 1303) Strengthening Protected Areas Network for Sikhote-Alin Mountain Forest Ecosystems Conservation in Khabarovsk Krai, which also included the Amur Tiger as a key indicator species.

1. STAP notes that the project title and objective has been modified during successive iterations of the PIF from an emphasis primarily upon recovery of the Amur Tiger towards an emphasis on broader threatened biodiversity recovery within which the tiger would be expected to benefit. With an indicator species as prominent as the Amur Tiger and with its range and prey needs STAP nevertheless expects that the overall target setting for actions to sustain priority landscapes in favorable conservation status would remain closely associated with the recovery of the chosen indicator species, and the project brief could usefully emphasize this point.
2. STAP encourages the proponents to apply standards for impact measurement consistent with those agreed within the Global Tiger Recovery Program to maximize replicability. Section B5 of the PIF lists key stakeholders but does not indicate their assigned roles and long term responsibilities regarding the project objective. STAP therefore asks the proponents to state clearly how monitoring, wildlife poaching reduction, and balancing conservation with local economies can be assessed and sustained for the long term beyond the life of the project within the forthcoming full project brief.
3. One strategy that has been proposed in the PIF is the application of payments for ecosystem services (PES), such as clean water, etc. It is unclear from the description of local communities associated with the target landscapes whether sufficient access or land rights are at the disposal of these communities that could accommodate a market-based mechanism such as PES, thus STAP recommends that the project brief identifies criteria for use of PES after review of the GEF/STAP guidance published in 2010.
4. STAP draws the attention of the proponents to the China Biodiversity Partnership Framework (CBPF), which acts as a programmatic umbrella for 13 GEF projects, including actions within landscapes supporting tigers. The project brief should indicate how its methodologies and actions can be coordinated with the CBPF.

5. Finally, STAP notes that the related projects delivered within Russia emphasized the need to address tiger poaching as a priority action. The present PIF however, does not specifically address this threat except as one amongst many pressures experienced by the target ecosystems. With the exception of snare removal the PIF is silent about measures whether official or community-based to address this threat. STAP acknowledges that the use of SMART Monitoring and Enforcement software and systems is likely to act as an effective framework for countering poaching in general, but the economic drivers of tiger poaching in particular are sufficiently powerful to justify a sub-component of Component 3 to address poaching at strategic level.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
<b>1. 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.
<b>2. 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(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</li> </ul> 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.
<b>3. 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.