

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 09, 2013

Screener: Thomas Hammond

Panel member validation by: Brian Huntley
Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 5135

PROJECT DURATION : 5

COUNTRIES : Chile

PROJECT TITLE: Protecting Biodiversity and Multiple Ecosystem Services in Biological Mountain Corridors in Chile's Mediterranean Ecosystem

GEF AGENCIES: UNEP

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Environment Ministry Chile
Sendero de Chile Foundation

GEF FOCAL AREA: Multi Focal Area

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

1. STAP acknowledges this proposal from UNEP focusing on biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management in the threatened Mediterranean ecosystem in Chile. Implementation of the project as described should make a positive contribution to the conservation of this ecosystem. However, STAP wishes to point out a number of issues which may help to further strengthen this proposal during the PPG phase.
2. It is noted that the project is requesting a significant level of funding from the biodiversity and land degradation portfolios in the GEF Trust Fund. It would be useful if the PIF outlined explicitly how this initiative will address the Aichi Targets and the UNCCD Zero Net Degradation strategy respectively.
3. The overall framework and strategy for this project is sound, and based on extensive experience, existing proven technologies, and well developed approaches. As described, the project should make a reasonable contribution to GEBs and to sustainable land management in the Maipo River Basin. However, STAP believes that the proponent has proposed an initiative that is very tentative in many ways and which is potentially missing significant opportunities. It is proposed that the project will "significantly help ensure multiple ecosystem services for the Metropolitan [Santiago] region" (pg. 4, repeated verbatim on pg 16). Although the project stresses the importance of drinking water, irrigation, hydro power, and flood regulation, strikingly it does not focus on water itself as an ecosystem service that will be specifically addressed in this initiative. Many urban areas in the Andes region have developed or are in the process of developing payments for ecosystem service models in partnership with rural communities in surrounding watersheds, whereby a portion of water user fees are directed towards sustainable land management and conservation activities which help to ensure future water supplies (see TNC led initiative in Quito, Ecuador). Given the economic importance of this region to the Chilean economy, it is surprising that a PES approach focusing on water in conjunction with the regional government of the metropolitan region of Santiago has not been proposed. The GEF has also proposed a future strategic focus on sustainable cities, along with the private sector. This project may well be able to explore important aspects associated with both of these proposed thematic areas in future GEF programs.
4. It is noted that climate risks in this initiative have been rated as low (B.4). This is surprising, as recent research places the risks of significant water flow fluctuations (flash floods, extremely low water levels) as quite high in this region (Ahumada, G. et al, 2013). Earlier in this year, flash floods resulting in water supplies being cut to over 2 million people in the Metropolitan area. Moreover, a World Bank proposal entering this work program (Andes

Adaptation to the Impact of Climate Change in Water Resources - Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru) suggests that the risks of climate change impacts in this region, particularly to water supplies in urban areas, is extremely high.

5. In developing the full project brief, STAP urges that the proponents consult the STAP advisory document on Payments for Ecosystem Services and Certification .

<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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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.
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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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.