

STAP Response:

|                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <b>GEF ID</b>                  | 10075  |
| <b>Project Title</b>           | Strengthening the management and governance for the conservation and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity in coastal marine ecosystems in Chile. |
| <b>Country</b>                 | Chile  |
| <b>GEF Agency</b>              | FAO  |
| <b>STAP Overall Assessment</b> | Minor issues to be considered during project design  |

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.

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. Please see Addendum below for more information:

## Addendum

There are two forms of mainstreaming.

- Administrative mainstreaming through regulation and planning, often at sub-national levels of government (i.e. deconcentration).
- Economic mainstreaming through property rights and producer associations (i.e. devolution), which includes community based natural resource management.

Administrative deconcentration and economic devolution are often confused. Clear articulation of communities as production units, groups of communities or associations as self-governing production associations, and municipalities as administrative regulation/zoning (even enforcement) agencies is sensible.

For a good reference to the different types of decentralization, see Rondinelli et al., 1989. For a wonderfully elegant discussion of how to scale the control of resources, see Murphree, 2000 who proposes that the best way to scale is to devolve rights to the bottom, and then allow some functions to be delegated upwards (where their effects cannot be fully internalized at the lower scale). For proof of concept of the wisdom of devolving rights to land units, and then devolving regulatory responsibility to neighborhoods of landholders, see the Zimbabwean terrestrial example (Child and Child, 2015).

There are good arguments for devolving exclusive fishing rights to clearly defined communities. However, it should not be forgotten that the internal governance of communities is also critical. Here, Elinor Ostrom's principle that "all people affected by rules/decisions should be involved in making these rules/decisions" has stood the test of time (Ostrom, 1990). Finally, this project is at the forefront of global experiments in devolved governance and regulation. An academic partner to assist in defining approaches, and then measuring them would be helpful.

Child, G. and Child, B. 2015. The conservation movement in Zimbabwe: An early experiment in devolved community based regulation. *Southern African Journal of Wildlife Research*.

Murphree, M. 2000. Constituting the Commons: Crafting Sustainable Commons in the New Millennium. Multiple Boundaries, Borders and Scale at the Eighth Biennial Conference of the International Association for the Study of Common Property (IASCP). Bloomington, Indiana, U.S.A.

Ostrom, E. 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*, Cambridge University Press.

Rondinelli, D.A., McCullough, J.S. and Johnson, R.W. 1989. *Analysing Decentralization Policies in Developing Countries: a Political Economy Framework*. Development and Change 20.