

**Part I: Project Information**

GEF ID: 10075

Project Title: **Strengthening the management and governance for the conservation and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity in coastal marine ecosystems in Chile**

Date of Screening: **November 28, 2018**

Screeener: **Virginia Gorsevski**

Panel Member: **Brian Child**

Minor

STAP regards this project proposing the mainstreaming of Chilean inshore fisheries as brave and insightful. The introduction to, and justification of, this project are strong and well-argued. The intention is also sensible in terms of the empowerment of local actors, and the coordinating role of the municipalities. However, the proposed alternative scenario and description of components shifts the proposal into natural resource governance.

STAP recommends that during PPG phase a concerted effort is made to clarify terms of governance objectives and plans. And STAP suggests that additional consideration is given to the configuration of new governance regimes, and which might combine the following:

1. Devolution of exclusive use rights to individual communities on a territorial basis. This, essentially, is community-based natural resource management (CBNRM);
2. Collective self-regulation between groups of communities (i.e. so that they have the rights and capacities to oversee each other);
3. Delegating zoning and oversight functions to municipalities, and zoning and enforcement through participatory multi-stakeholder forums.

**STAP Overall Assessment**

**Minor issues to be considered during project design**

**Part I: Project Information**

**B. Indicative Project Description Summary**

Project Objective: **Develop and implement a governance system that integrates, coordinates and articulates public, private and civil society institutions of the conservation and sustainable use of coastal marine ecosystems.**

**What STAP looks for**

Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?

This project seeks to 'develop and implement a governance system that integrates, coordinates and articulates public, private and civil society institutions for the conservation and sustainable use of coastal marine ecosystem.' The project seems to conflate the terms governance and management, with the former about power, relationship and accountability, whereas most of the activities have to do with improved overall management and coordination. The use of the METT to measure results confirms this. As a governance project, it is important to have issues like rights / tenure, authority, devolution, deconcentration, etc. clarified. To measure governance, a different tool (e.g. GAPA - <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/17632IIED.pdf>) would be more appropriate.

Project components

A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?

The activities listed are somewhat general and need to be made more specific with greater attention to technical detail. For example, project output 2.1.4 states "incentives developed to promote the participation of coastal communities...." however, it is unclear what types of incentives will be made available. Since the main idea behind this project is to decentralize, it is critical for coastal communities to be involved and they will need adequate incentives. Again, new governance capacities and concepts are needed to frame the issues.

Outcomes

A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.

Yes

Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental

Yes

Are the global environmental benefits likely to be generated?

Yes, if the project is re-framed and well executed.

Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project. Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	Yes
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	The implementation section would benefit from greater expertise on devolved and decentralized governance, perhaps at the PPG stage - provided it is flagged in the PIF. This project is an important experiment, and needs more academic input to define, advise on, and measure governance and its effects.
<b>1. Project description. Briefly describe:</b>		
1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)	Is the problem statement well-defined?	Yes. Essentially, the project contends that top down 'coordination' is not working. To rectify this, the project is proposing a meso approach (i.e. municipality), and encouraging community participation, without defining where participation falls on Arnstein's ladder of citizen participation. In addition, the main threats include poor fishing practices, poor planning, overexploitation, marine pollution. The proposed alternative scenario discusses spatial planning and improved production practices, which presumably will be incorporated into Components 1 on improved overall management, coordination and capacity building and Component 2 on BD mainstreaming. These links should be made more clear during PPG phase.
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	One problem is lack of spatial planning; however, the 2 project sites which were chosen had as a criteria that regional land use plans had to be developed already.
	For multiple focal area projects: does the problem statement and analysis identify the drivers of environmental degradation which need to be	N/A
2) the baseline scenario or any associated	Is the baseline identified clearly? Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	Prior and ongoing projects are described in detail. Component 3 is completely dedicated to developing an M and E strategy based on measurable and verifiable outcomes. The PIF doesn't provide detail on quantification techniques.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Information on baseline projects is provided.
	For multiple focal area projects: are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators;	N/A N/A
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	Numerous GEF and non-GEF projects and activities are described in great detail. There are clearly many things going on but it's difficult to understand how they relate to each other and how this project will effectively build on these efforts and tie everything together to add value, apart from the notion of decentralization which is generally a positive move; however, apart from 'community participatory mechanisms' (meaning what?) it is not clear how this will be done.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	See above
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	The TOC is presented in No. 49 which posits that local actors need to be empowered through a bottom up approach to address barriers to improved conservation and sustainable use of resources. The project would be strengthened if this idea were presented in a more clear and logical sequence in the PIF and evidence from Chile and elsewhere was used to justify the approach and expected results. Also the outcomes and outputs don't address one of the major unanswered questions (e.g. what incentive will local people and industry have to engage and change existing unsustainable practices?).

	<p>What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?</li> <li>· Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?</li> <li>· Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?</li> </ul>	<p>1) establish mechanisms to support ecosystem approach to fisheries (EAF); 2) stakeholders apply EAF principles in planning processes; 3) develop capacity building program; 4) improved marine protected area management through local agreements; 5) establish pilots communities to adopt BD-friendly practices; 6) develop capacity building program; 7) strengthen certification program; 7) develop incentives to promote community participation; 8) monitor and evaluate.</p> <p>See above for list of activities. The specific linkages and mechanisms need to be made more clear and flow logically from one step to the next. As it is, it reads like a list of many activities that lack clear definition.</p> <p>See above.</p> <p>Yes.</p>
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing	<p>GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?</p> <p>LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?</p>	<p>Maybe. More information is needed to directly link the activities to benefits. For example, No. 68c discusses benefits to the local economy by ensuring and improving livelihoods but little or no mention is made of how specifically this project will improve livelihoods and even how livelihoods is defined. How will communities gain economically from improved planning and conservation?</p> <p>N/A</p>
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	<p>Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?</p> <p>Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?</p> <p>Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?</p> <p>Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?</p> <p>What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?</p>	<p>The benefits related to the GEF indicators of the number of hectares protected and improved management effectiveness as measured by the METT. Also capacity building in terms the number of people trained and communities prioritized though this is somewhat unclear as one indicator has 10 people trained (under Component 1) and later under GEBs, the PIF discusses improved capacity of 200 people. Generally speaking, there is a lot of discussion about capacity building in the PIF; however, it is not always clear what type of capacity will be built (for planning? for better understanding of alternative fishing practices? for data collection?)</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>To be developed as part of Component 3 on Monitoring and Evaluation.</p> <p>Risks due to climate change is listed in Section 5 with mitigation measures related to training and incorporation of adaptation actions specific to coastal areas. However, there is no scientific information about the project impacts of climate change on the coastal areas, fisheries, biodiversity, etc. More critically, as it is in the Humboldt Current System, is this area is heavily influenced by El Nino and if so will this this impact coastal fisheries and the project? The World Meteorological Organization has stated that there is a 75-80% chance of an El Nino developing by February 2019.</p>
7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up	<p>Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?</p> <p>Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?</p>	<p>Not particularly.</p> <p>Not convincing. Just "systematization of lessons learned."</p>

<p>1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.</p>	<p>Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?</p>	<p>Since little detail is given as to the incentive for local communities to participate and the specific benefits in terms of livelihoods, it is likely that the project will need to adapt over time once these fundamental questions are answered.</p> <p>A map is provided, though somewhat blurry and hard to read. <b>The map is not georeferenced</b> and while it appears that there is some level of disaggregation of administrative units, it is difficult to discern. Also missing are the following: scale indicator, orientation, complete map credits (e.g. source of data, date of map creation, data of map data, projection, etc.)</p>
<p><b>2. Stakeholders.</b> Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities. If none of the above, please explain why. In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.</p>	<p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</p>	<p>Many stakeholders are listed. However, the TOC of this project rests on the notion of decentralization, improved livelihoods of local communities, etc. - yet the majority of stakeholders are public agencies and users are merely defined as "local organizations."</p>
<p><b>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.</b> Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis). Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? Yes/no/ tbd. If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: access to and control over resources; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services. Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd</p>	<p>What are the stakeholders' roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project design, to achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?</p> <p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Most of the stakeholders listed are government agencies, despite the fact that this project is focused on communities, which are not well defined in the PIF and will presumably be made specific during PPG phase.</p> <p>Yes</p>
<p><b>5. Risks.</b> Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design</p>	<p>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</p> <p>Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>Yes</p>
	<p>Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?</p> <p>For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately?</li> <li>· Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?</li> </ul>	<p>Possibly. More information is needed on the dynamics within and between stakeholder groups to determine additional social risks that could undermine project success.</p> <p>Not defined.</p> <p>No.</p>

· Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?

Not specifically.

· What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?

Given the potential impact of climate change and climate variability on coastal areas, including fisheries, there needs to be greater emphasis on scientific information and data collection that will inform not only current interventions but also long term planning strategies.

**6. Coordination.** Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives

Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?

Yes

Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?

Yes

Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?

No.

How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?

Only that numerous ongoing activities were not sufficient to lead to improved overall results.

Is there an adequate mechanism to feed the lessons learned from earlier projects into this project, and to share lessons learned from it into future projects?

No.

**8. Knowledge management.** Outline the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, and how it will contribute to the project's overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.

What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?

Knowledge management relies on systematizing and publishing lessons learned from this project, awareness raising and web-based platforms. Given the multiple activities underway and the focus of this project on integration, it seems an important opportunity to merge information into one database (preferably spatial since this project is related to planning) is being overlooked. Capacity building activities (of which there are many) could also stress collecting and analysing data by key stakeholders to improve overall 'ownership' of results and enhance the likelihood of sustainability.

What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?

See above

**STAP Notes**