

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 11, 2010

Screeener: David Cunningham

Panel member validation by: Mary K. Seely; Sandra Diaz
Consultant(s): Paul Ferraro

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT GEF TRUST FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 4104

PROJECT DURATION :

COUNTRIES : Chile

PROJECT TITLE: Sustainable Land Management

GEF AGENCIES: World Bank

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: Office of Agrarian Studies and Policy (Ministry of Agriculture)

GEF FOCAL AREA: Multi Focal Area

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMS: LD-3;BD-4;CC-6;CC-6;

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): **Major revision required**

III. Further guidance from STAP

1. It is not at all clear what the incentives are. They are called 'existing land management incentive systems' and incentive laws are referred to. At some points SLM investments sound like infrastructure investment, at other points in may be training & workshops, extension, better organisation of government structures so as to better support strategic stakeholders? Efficient rainwater harvesting and groundwater recharge are also mentioned. increased on-farm control of soil erosion by beneficiaries - what benefits/ incentives? Both the outcomes sought and the actions planned to achieve them must be clarified during the development of the project document.
2. Payment for Environmental Services (PES) seems (1) to be not the objective, (2) to be something that is being planned, (3) to be an outcome of this project. This needs clarification in the full project document. The essential characteristics of a PES program are evident in the PIF and the key barriers to effectiveness will be the same if the incentive is cash or in-kind (in fact, if the incentive is given in-kind, a whole additional set of concerns arise).
3. The use of Conservation Districts is said to be innovative, and at other times a Watershed Approach is referred to. The PIF also points out that there are sometimes conflicts between these two approaches. What is really intended? This should be clarified.
4. It appears that the majority of this funding will be used at national level to provide top-down services. Participation by strategic stakeholders is mentioned occasionally but not as a major element. This should be explained more clearly.
5. With respect to cost, 1.5 million ha are part of private conservation initiatives - why is it so costly for the government to add 100,000 ha? The global environmental benefits (GEBs) appear very vague, especially considering the very high cost per hectare of the project. The GEBs must be explained far more clearly in the full project document.
6. Existing incentives are said to expire soon, necessitating this initiative, and elsewhere it seems they have been renewed for a decade or so. Please clarify the reasons for this in the project document.

| <i>STAP advisory response</i> | <i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i> |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Consent | 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. Minor revision required. | <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Opening a dialogue between STAP and the proponent to clarify issues (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 <p>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.</p> |
| 3. Major revision required | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> |