

# Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel

The Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel, administered by UNEP, advises the Global Environment Facility



## STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF)

Date of screening: September 29, 2008

Screener: Lev Neretin

Panel member validation by: Meryl Williams

### I. PIF Information *(Paste here from the PIF)*

**Full size project      GEF Trust Fund**

**GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 3749**

**GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 4147**

**COUNTRIES: CHILE, PERU**

**PROJECT TITLE: TOWARDS ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT OF THE HUMBOLDT CURRENT LARGE MARINE ECOSYSTEM**

**GEF AGENCY: UNDP**

**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): IFOP, IMARPE**

**GEF FOCAL AREA (S): INTERNATIONAL WATERS, BIODIVERSITY**

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMS: IW/SP1, BD SP2 & INDIRECTLY SP4**

**NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: NA**

### II. STAP Advisory Response *(see table below for explanation)*

1. 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 this proposal from UNDP aimed at ecosystem-based management of the HCLME and establishment of the coordinated framework to deal with interlinked environmental and fisheries transboundary issues facing Chile and Peru. Nevertheless, STAP requests minor revisions that will be reflected in the full project brief, further details are discussed below.
3. STAP encourages the Implementing Agency and partners to think more broadly of conservation and sustainable fisheries strategies. STAP questions whether the MPAs are going to prove to be the best or should be the main fisheries and ecosystem conservation tool, especially when dealing with the major HCLME fisheries which have a major effect on the survival of other marine fauna (e.g., birds, seals). For fishing, Aguero and Gonzales (World Bank Discussion Paper No. 329, 1996) argued that a cooperative management agreement between Chile and Peru aimed at establishing a common fishing zone would be the optimal policy for managing transboundary stocks of small pelagic fish in the HCLME. This project should consider such an agreement within the context of a wider range of conservation and management tools. Also for fisheries, relevant regional fisheries management organizations would need to be consulted, including the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission and the newly established South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management organization, which seeks to manage the Chilean jack mackerel fishery on the high seas.
4. In using MPAs as the chief tool for conservation in the HCLME, the project should distinguish between and link conservation benefits for fished stocks and for biodiversity conservation. We agree that fishing is the number one threat to sustaining fished species and that MPAs will theoretically provide multiple benefits for biodiversity conservation and restoration of depleted fish. However, the main species (Peruvian anchovy, South American sardine, and Chilean jack mackerel) are transboundary pelagic fish stocks with quite different spatially located life-cycle stages, including the Chilean jack mackerel that is exploited also on the high seas. STAP questions the validity of the proposed MPAs (component 4) in protecting such major fish stocks and recommends that other measures be also investigated for containing fisheries exploitation. The decline of SE Pacific fisheries is caused by several factors such as overdevelopment of fishing efforts, critical habitat modification of estuaries, land-based sources of pollution and the lack of integrated fishing management (GIWA, 2006). These immediate causes cannot or can only partially be addressed by the project's piloted interventions. STAP recommends establishing a dialogue with the Implementing Agency during project preparation to design a more effective set of interventions aimed at linking biodiversity protection with improved management of industrial and artisanal fisheries.
5. Reference is made to multiple-use PAs and to uses such as artisanal and industrial fishing, aquaculture, offshore oil and gas exploration. All of these uses are forces that tend to act against establishing strong

protection regimes including in MPAs. Conservation efforts will confront strong economic interests and therefore a strong case for conservation will be needed. The project should also canvass additional uses that rely more on biodiversity maintenance, such as marine tourism, particularly in Chile.

6. Artisanal fishing is an important contributor to the local economy and is also a significant factor regulating pelagic and demersal fish stocks as well as overall productivity of coastal ecosystems in the HCLME. The Project's interventions in this sector are limited to awareness raising and some capacity building, but additional cross-sectoral targeted interventions for improving environmental status of coastal habitats and sustainability of artisanal fisheries are required. For example, Chile has some interesting community rights based systems for sustainable management of coastal shellfisheries that could be investigated for adaptation on a wider scale (see example of the abalone fishery in Grafton *et al* 2008, Marine Policy 32:630-634).
7. STAP welcomes the attempt to develop an integrated information system (IIS) that takes into account ENSO variability. When working on the component, the project is encouraged to build linkages with GOOS (IOC) and its partners, including FAO.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. <b>Consent</b>	STAP acknowledges that on scientific/technical grounds the concept has merit. However, STAP may state its views on the concept emphasising any issues that could be improved and the proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.
2. <b>Minor revision required.</b>	STAP has identified specific scientific/technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. One or more options that remain open to STAP include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues</li> <li>(ii) Setting a review point during early stage project development and agreeing terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review</li> </ol> The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.
3. <b>Major revision required</b>	STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical omissions in the concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. Normally, a STAP approved review will be mandatory prior to submission of the project brief for CEO endorsement. The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.