

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: September 24, 2014

Screeener: Veronique Morin

Panel member validation by: Anand Patwardhan

Consultant(s):

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

FULL SIZE PROJECT SPECIAL CLIMATE CHANGE FUND

GEF PROJECT ID: 6955

PROJECT DURATION : 3

COUNTRIES : Chile

PROJECT TITLE: Strengthening the Adaptive Capacity to Climate Change in the Fisheries and Aquaculture Sector

GEF AGENCIES: FAO

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNERS: -Chile's Fisheries and Aquaculture Undersecretariat,

-Chile's Ministry of the Environment

GEF FOCAL AREA: Climate Change

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 issues to be considered during project design

III. Further guidance from STAP

STAP welcomes the proposal from the FAO for strengthening the adaptive capacity of the fisheries sector in Chile. STAP notes the importance of this sector for the Chilean economy and for providing livelihood support to many coastal communities. STAP recommends consideration of the following issues during the course of project development:

1. The PIF appears to draw from IPCC's fourth assessment report. The IPCC's fifth assessment report (now released) has more recent information on climate change outcomes and impacts, and should be the primary source of relevant scientific / technical material. Other recent relevant references are provided below..

2. STAP welcomes the efforts in the project to link to research and training institutions. In this regard, given the extensive seminars and workshops in both components (1) and (3) STAP encourages the project developers to further develop how local and traditional knowledge could be incorporated into the design of the project and into the interventions targeted through the project, so that information flow can work in both top-down and bottom-up directions.

3. STAP appreciates the efforts to identify pilot communities in a way to support further replication. STAP suggests that vulnerability to climate change may be another factor used for the identification of pilot communities, noting that vulnerability includes aspects of exposure and adaptive capacity. In this regard, artisanal fisheries may be quite different from industrial fisheries and from commercial aquaculture " consequently an appropriate differentiation between different target segments would be helpful to incorporate as part of project design. .

5. Some of component 3 appears to be similar to component 1. For example, the components both appear to address strengthening knowledge, and building capacity, about the effects of climate change through workshops targeting multiple stakeholders. Please clarify how the knowledge sub-component in component 1 and 3 will differ, and complement each other.

6. STAP suggests adding as a separate component the monitoring and performance evaluation system. This is an important aspect of the project, given its ability to generate learning and knowledge to inform (and improve) monitoring systems on climate change on fisheries/aquaculture in the proposed 7 sites.

Some recent sources of relevant scientific / technical material:

Yáñez, E., Barbieri, M. A., Plaza, F., & Silva, C. (2014). Climate Change and Fisheries in Chile. In Vulnerability of Agriculture, Water and Fisheries to Climate Change (pp. 259-270). Springer Netherlands.

Canales, T. M., Law, R., Wiff, R., & Blanchard, J. L. (2015). Changes in the size-structure of a multispecies pelagic fishery off Northern Chile. *Fisheries Research*, 161, 261-268.

Defeo, O., Castrejón, M., Ortega, L., Kuhn, A. M., Gutiérrez, N. L., & Castilla, J. C. (2013). Impacts of climate variability on Latin American small-scale fisheries. *Ecol Soc*, 18(4), 30.

Brochier, T., Echevin, V., Tam, J., Chaigneau, A., Goubanova, K., & Bertrand, A. (2013). Climate change scenarios experiments predict a future reduction in small pelagic fish recruitment in the Humboldt Current system. *Global change biology*, 19(6), 1841-1853.

Aravena, G., Broitman, B., & Stenseth, N. C. (2014). Twelve Years of Change in Coastal Upwelling along the Central-Northern Coast of Chile: Spatially Heterogeneous Responses to Climatic Variability. *PloS one*, 9(2), e90276.

<i>STAP advisory response</i>	<i>Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed</i>
1. Concur	STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. 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 issues to be considered during project design	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.</p> <p>(ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</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>
3. Major issues to be considered during project design	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p> <p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised.</p> <p>(ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required.</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>