

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 08, 2013

Screener: Paul Grigoriev

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

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5506

PROJECT DURATION : 3

COUNTRIES : Chile

PROJECT TITLE: Strengthening and Development of Instruments for the Management, Prevention and Control of Beaver (Castor Canadensis), an Invasive Alien Species in the Chilean Patagonia

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): **Consent**

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the submission of this proposal to undertake this important project intended to control, manage and prevent the spread of this IAS (Castor canadensis) in the Chilean Patagonia. The following summarizes the overall assessment of the PIF and identifies specific items that will require further clarification or elaboration. Suggestions to take into consideration moving forward during the PPG are provided as well.

1. The wording of the project objective can certainly be simplified and thereby shortened, and made more related to and consistent with the project title. Whereas the title refers to strengthening and development of frameworks, the objective refers to subnational frameworks and capacities being "in place". It is suggested that the frameworks will be strengthened through the piloting to be done in a test site.
2. While the structure of the proposed project is logical and coherent, some modification is required in the wording of the Outputs. For example, Output 1.1.3 is presented as a study on the potential economic impacts of beaver on various economic sectors. A study is a study. The result of the study is more important and what is of concern. Similarly for Output 1.1.4. Rules and regulations for beaver control are proposed. This should be more affirmative and focused.
3. Regarding Outcome indicators, baseline values are not presented. It should also be made more clear what the actual empirical indicators are that are proposed. The indicator presented for Outcome 2.2 (key actors are aware of the problem and willing to undertake the next phase of the beaver management plan) is weak. A baseline should also be provided for a more specific, meaningful and measurable indicator. Outcome 4.1, as stated, is also weak and not specific enough. More concrete information should be presented, accompanied by appropriate indicators.
4. The strategy for stakeholder involvement should be explained further, in particular in the case of landowners, hunters, and the general public. How will these stakeholders become engaged?
5. The GEBs are presented in a general way. While the project should yield GEBs, more specificity regarding GEBs would be welcome. These should be defined and focused upon early on, and guide future project development. A summary mention to the "unique Patagonian landscape" is too general and unsatisfactory.
6. Climate change risk is recognized. However, STAP recommends elaborating these further, including their mitigation responses, during the project development phase.

<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>