

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: February 20, 2014

Screeener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Sandra Diaz
Consultant(s): Paul Grigoriev

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5429

PROJECT DURATION : 3

COUNTRIES : Chile

PROJECT TITLE: Mainstreaming the Conservation, Sustainable Use and Valuation of Critically Threatened Species and Endangered Ecosystems into Development-frontier Production Landscapes of the Arica y Parinacota, and Biobio Regions

GEF AGENCIES: FAO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS:

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

2. STAP welcomes the submission of this concept for a project intended to promote the integration of the conservation and sustainable use of critically threatened species and endangered ecosystems in two "development-frontier landscapes" through the development and implementation of a package of supportive measures.

Overall, the proposal is well structured, demonstrating logical linkages and coherence between the problem, root causes, barriers, proposed outcomes and outputs. Having said that, one must question whether the sustainable use of critically threatened species really ought to be part of the project's objective. Conservation, yes, but sustainable use (e.g. hummingbirds)? All four species, particularly the three animals, are present in such low numbers (according to the project document) that "sustainable use" does not appear as a reasonable strategy in the short term. Similarly one wonders if the delivery of ecosystem services such as water regulation and pollination, typically dependent on the abundance of species, and their valuation, are a reasonable approach here. If the species are present in such low numbers, their capacity to provide economically important ecosystem services at the moment is likely to be low, with perhaps the exception of the aesthetic and touristic value. The avoidance of the extinction of four unique species, that is, an objective more explicitly and directly based on the protection of biodiversity as a global environmental benefit, appears as a more realistic and credible approach, rather than one based on valuation of ecosystem services.

Throughout the text as well, the terms critically threatened and critically endangered appear to be used interchangeably, whereas they are not descriptive of the same level of threat and thus management prescription. This inconsistency should be addressed. Outcome indicators will be required for Component 1. For the other Outcomes, the indicators should be changed to indicate what will be measured. The targets indicate what will be achieved.

The titles of the Components could certainly be shortened. The problem, threats, root causes and barriers are well defined and described. Barrier 2, referred to as a "gold-rush mindset" is noted but it is an unspecific umbrella term and thus not particularly useful in terms of focusing on specifics which define this term. The key aspect(s) of this mindset that is/are driving change should be teased out and clearly defined. The wording of Barrier 3 could also be refined somewhat. Paragraphs 33-39 really describe the baseline but are presented under Barrier 3. On p. 7, the last word should be either promoting or increasing rather than

favoring. The anticipated GEBs could be fleshed out and presented more effectively using a table which presents the baseline, alternative and resulting GEBs.

The use of some additional headings would be useful in organizing the presentation, for example in par. 40. Headings for Incremental cost reasoning, Innovation, Sustainability and Replicability or Scaling-up would also be useful. These subjects are summarily addressed in the text but they are somewhat dispersed and it would be advisable to use the headings and rearrange the text accordingly.

Mention is made of the scaling up potential of the results but more details would be appreciated. This will require more attention during the PPG, as will sustainability for the same reason.

The paragraph numbering gets mixed up after par. 71.

The listing of stakeholders does not include the national government, research institutions, NGOs/CSOs for some reason whereas they would have important contributions to the project. More details will be required on local communities' and indigenous groups' participation. Likewise, more specifics will have to be provided on how gender considerations will be addressed.

Considering the importance given to labelling and certification in the project, more detail on precisely what products are expected to have good potential for these types of schemes should be given. In addition, we recommend considering the STAP Advisory Document on Environmental certification (http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.39.Inf_.15%20STAP%20-%20Environmental%20Certification.pdf).

The primary risks are adequately defined and the proposed mitigation measures are reasonable. Both should be reassessed in the future stages of project development though.

Coordination with other projects and initiatives is presented in a general manner but the specific mechanisms or structures and processes to be employed should receive more consideration during the PPG.

Finally, the project's proposed 3 year timeframe may prove to be too short to achieve the desired outcomes and could be reconsidered

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Consent	<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>
2. Minor revision required.	<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: (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>STAP has identified significant scientific or technical challenges or omissions in the PIF and recommends significant improvements to project design.</p> <p>Follow-up: (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.</p>