

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: May 11, 2012

Screener: Douglas Taylor

Panel member validation by: Meryl Williams
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4811

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : China

PROJECT TITLE: CBPF-MSL: Strengthening the Management Effectiveness of the Wetland Protected Area System in Hainan for Conservation of Globally Significant Biodiversity

GEF AGENCIES: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Forestry Department of Hainan Province, Dongzhaigang Nature Reserve

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

1. STAP welcomes this PIF which is submitted under the Program (GEF ID 4646) CBPF-MSL Main Streams of Life & Wetland PA System Strengthening for Biodiversity Conservation. The project is well-aligned to the Program and STAP commends the proponents for including in the Project Framework some quantitative targets for the listed outcomes and notes that the PPG will be used to prepare the remaining targets.

2. STAP understands that the Project Preparation Grant for this project will enable ecosystem valuation work for the entire parent Program. This being the case, STAP requests that the project developers consult STAP or its GEF advisory documents (STAP, 2010a,b) regarding GEF's application of Payments for Environmental Services and Community Forest Management to ensure that best practice is applied and opportunities taken for sound experimental design regarding eco-compensation and co-management proposals within this and other projects of the Program.

3. The proposal, in addressing objective 1 of the BD Focal Area Strategy, focuses upon improving management effectiveness of existing and expanded protected areas within a network. This is a viable approach, which if consolidated within a more effective catchment-based framework should result in a more sustainable ecosystem. In general the threats and barriers cited in the PIF are well addressed within the project Components. There are two obvious exceptions summarized below.

4. The loss of upstream catchment forest and conversion to agriculture will have led to large scale changes in water flow and quality as well as microclimate and one presumes loss of connectivity for terrestrial biodiversity within the remaining 20% of original forest cover. The PIF does not address these upstream land degradation-based threats or impacts of these threats on biodiversity or environmental status at the coast. STAP suggests that the full project brief at least reviews these threats and how they affect the wetland PA system, even if the project does not intend to address them directly.

The attention to increasing the area of mangrove protection for coastal security in the face of climate and climate change threats is welcomed. Although the area increase targeted is modest, the challenges are large due to ongoing uses and threats. However, STAP welcomes the strong approaches to including co-management approaches. In the full project, attention should also be given to ensuring that adequate technical expertise is given to replanting technologies (species, husbandry, hydrological studies, etc) to ensure success.

5. Arising from upstream catchment and surrounding coastal waters is the threat from pollution and its impacts upon the coastal PAs. The analysis in the PIF does not distinguish between local point source or diffuse pollution vs. distant

sources, and it would be helpful to be more specific about what the baseline is and the actions to be taken. The South China Sea within which Hainan is embedded is known to have an excess of nutrients and consequent hypoxia problems and the project should address the relative impacts of distant vs. Hainan catchment sources and address actions to each. In this regard the proponents are advised to review the Key Advice for Stakeholders in the GEF advisory document Hypoxia and Nutrient Reduction in the Coastal Zone (STAP, 2011).

References

STAP. 2010a. Payments for Environmental Services and the Global Environment Facility: A STAP advisory document. http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/publication/STAP_PES_2010.pdf

STAP. 2010b. The Evidence Base for Community Forest Management as a Mechanism for Supplying Global Environmental Benefits and Improving Local Welfare: A STAP advisory document http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/publication/STAP_CFM_2010.pdf

STAP. 2011. Hypoxia and Nutrient Reduction in the Coastal Zone. Advice for Prevention, Remediation and Research. A STAP Advisory Document. Global Environment Facility, Washington, DC. http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/publication/STAP_Hypoxia_low.pdf

<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.	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"> (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. Major revision required	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.