GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	**4768**		
Country/Region:	**Argentina**		
Project Title:	**Strengthening of Governance for the Protection of Biodiversity through the Formulation and Implementation of the National Strategy on Invasive Alien Species (NSIAS)**		
GEF Agency:	**FAO**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-2; Project Mana;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$130,000**	Project Grant:	**$3,870,000**
Co-financing:	**$18,247,901**	Total Project Cost:	**$22,247,901**
PIF Approval:	**March 30, 2012**	Council Approval/Expected:	**June 07, 2012**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Mark Zimsky**	Agency Contact Person:	**Rikke Olivera**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	December 8, 2011 Yes.	Oct 8 2014 Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	December 8, 2011 Yes in a letter dated November 29, 2011.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	December 8, 2011 The agency's comparative advantage on developing IAS management frameworks and developing eradication and control programs from a technical standpoint is not described or supported in an adequate way. What is presented	Oct 8 2014 Yes. The agency's comparative advantage of working with multiple IAS projects is described.

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

[1] Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		is information regarding other technical capacities of FAO related to agriculture and forestry, with little information on the capacity within FAO's headquarters or the country staff on this subject matter. Furthermore, please note that simply because FAO is developing a similar project in Chile does not speak to the comparative advantage issue on this particular technical area. Please revise and strengthen this section of the PIF. March 29, 2012 Adequate revision provided.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	December 8, 2011 NA	Oct 8 2014 NA
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	December 8, 2011 No, not as currently presented. Please revise and strengthen this section. March 29, 2012 Adequate revision provided.	Oct 8 2014 Yes.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	December 8, 2011 Yes.	Oct 8 2014 Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?	December 8, 2011 Yes.	Oct 8, 2014 Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	December 8, 2011 NA	Oct 8, 2014 NA
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	December 8, 2011 NA	Oct 8, 2014 NA
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	December 8, 2011 NA	Oct 8, 2014 NA
	• focal area set-aside?	December 8, 2011 NA	Oct 8, 2014 NA
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	December 8, 2011 Yes it is aligned with BD 2 outcomes and outputs. Please note however that the GEF-5 BD strategy does not mention eradication as a priority in GEF support to IAS and is focused on the development of management frameworks for the management and control of IAS invasion pathways. The GEF 5 BD Strategy states: "GEF will support interventions that address the issue of invasive alien species systemically through developing the sectoral policy, regulations, and institutional arrangements for the prevention and management of invasions emphasizing a risk management approach by focusing on the highest risk invasion pathways. Priority will be given to establishing policy measures that reduce the impact of invasive species on	Oct 8, 2014 Yes, it is aligned.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		the environment, including through prevention of new incursions, early detection and institutional frameworks to respond rapidly to new incursions." March 29, 2012 Adequate response provided.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	December 8, 2011 Yes, a clear BD-2 project.	Oct 8, 2014 Yes.
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	December 8, 2011 Yes. Control and management of IAS are prioritized in the 2003 NBSAP.	Oct 8, 2014 Yes.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	December 8, 2011 Yes, project has prioritized the development of financial sustainabilty strategies to continue implementation of the National Strategy for Invasive Alien species and in fact this is one of the more innovative aspects of the project.	October 19, 2014 No. This project will support engagement with several different agencies to tackle IAS. However, there is not a description of how the database of IAS will be maintained and updated after the end of the project. November 18, 2014 Thank you for providing more clarity on the long term management of the database as this is crucial for sustainability. Cleared.
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on	December 8, 2011 It is not entirely clear from the presentation whether the National	October 19, 2014 No, It was asked that a better justification for the selection of the

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	sound data and assumptions?	Strategy already exists and the project will implement this, or if the project will develop the strategy and implement the strategy as well. The verb choice and phrasing allows for ambiguity in this regard. Please clarify this as there is ambiguity in the text and in the results framework. In addition, please clarify what is the Government's baseline commitment to the NSIAS including their financial commitment. March 29, 2012 Adequate revision provided.	target species was provided as part of this project at CEO endorsement. For the American bullfrog, the primary reason listed is to prevent the spread of chytridiomycosis. While the American bullfrog may be a carrier of the fungus, many other potential carriers and hosts have been identified (including geese, reptiles and crayfish). The rapid spread of chytrid likely has many causes and in many cases had not linked to the spread of American bullfrogs. Thus, please provide a stronger justification of the choice to target this species that does better at explaining why chytrid is a particular concern in this case or other reasons for addressing this species. November 18, 2014 Thank you for providing more information in the review sheet. However, the project document has not been revised to reflect these changes and the issues raised above remain in the document. Please revise accordingly. November 26, 2014 Revision is adequate.
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		October 19, 2014 Yes. The project costs are reasonable.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	December 8, 2011 Yes for components one-three. However, please note that GEF resources should not be used for component four and the implementation of the beaver eradication program and cofinancing should pay for all of this component. Please provide text in the revised PIF that notes that all associated capture and destruction methods will follow internationaly accepted standards of humanely handling and disposing of animals and reference these methods. With regards to funding of component three, the GEF can support the development of protocols but GEF funding should not be used in any pilot eradication efforts. March 29, 2012 Adequate revision provided.	October 14, 2014 Yes, this information has been clarified.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	December 8, 2011 Yes, it is very clear for the most part, however, as noted above, please clarify if the project is implementing the NSIAS or actually developing it from the start as the text is not clear on this point. At times (see output 1.1.2 and para 22) it appears the project will develop it, in other parts of the text (see paras 14 and 15) it appears that the NSIAS has been developed and the project will begin to implement the	October 19, 2014 Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		strategy. March 29, 2012 Adequate revision provided.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	December 8, 2011 Yes, for the most part, excepting the eradication activities as noted above. Please also clarify the baseline description of the existing investment in IAS. March 29, 2012 Adequate revision provided.	October 19, 2014 Yes.
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?	December 8, 2011 Yes, appropriate control and management of IAS at a national level through the implementation of national strategy will deliver long-term socio-economic and global biodiversity benefits.	October 19, 2014 Yes. This project has through workshops during the PPG shown a commitment to gender engagement.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	December 8, 2011 Yes, and adequate mechanisms will be in place during implementation of the project to ensure appropriate stakeholder participation.	October 19, 2014 Yes.
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	December 8, 2011 Yes with well developed mitigation approaches for all risks.	October 19, 2014 Yes. This project has given serious thought to major risks.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the	December 8, 2011 Please do not simply list every GEF	Oct 8, 2014 Yes. This project is an important

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	region?	project in Argentina, but explictly discuss investments by all donors that are complementary and thus will require coordination with the proposed project. Describe what kind of coordination will be required and how it will be realized and paid for. March 29, 2012 Adequate revision provided.	complement to an IAS project in Chile (5506) as well as national initiatives.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	December 8, 2011 Yes, please ensure, given the complexity of natural resources management in the country, that implementation arrangements at CEO endorsement are very clearly articulated.	October 19, 2014 No. Please clarify how resources from CUDAP will be involved in the project (i.e. will staff be seconded to this project?). November 18, 2014 Please see the response to question 25.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		October 19, 2014 Yes.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		October 19, 2014 NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	December 8, 2011 It exceeds 5% of the total GEF grant, thus please adjust accordingly. March 29, 2012 Adequate revision provided.	October 19, 2014 No. It exceeds 5%, please adjust the budget accordingly. November 18, 2014 The justification is sufficient to clear for a slightly higher PMC.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Cleared.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	December 8, 2011 As noted above, no GEF resources are to be dedicated to the beaver eradication program in component four, nor any eradication efforts under component three. Please note for component five that costs for the midterm and final evaluation is paid for by the fee, thus, this should be taken out of this component. March 29, 2012 Adequate revision provided.	October 19, 2014 Yes.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	December 8, 2011 Please try to increase the level of cofinance, particularly from the private sector. March 29, 2012 Adequate revision provided.	October 19, 2014 Co-finance does not include any engagement with the private sector, which would have strengthened this project. As stated previously, it is unclear how CUDAP will provide support as the description makes it appear that CUDAP staff will support the project from their own unit and thus should be in-kind support. Please clarify the choice of exchange rate between Argentine pesos and American dollars. The exchange rate during most of project preparation, including when the co-financing letters were signed and currently is around 0.12:1. Please justify the use of a rate

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			of approximately 0.19:1 or adjust the dollar values accordingly. November 18, 2014 It is still unclear that CUDAP's resources will in fact be grant rather than in-kind. For example, providing part of someone's time to work on the project would be considered 'in-kind'. As these funds are a significant portion of total cofinance, please give greatly clarity on this issue. Thank you for providing for more information about the exchange rate status. No further clarification is needed on this point. November 26, 2014 Revision is adequate.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	December 8, 2011 Yes.	October 19, 2014' Yes.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		October 19, 2014 No, please attach the tracking tools. November 18, 2014 Thank you for provided completed tracking tools. Cleared.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators		October 19, 2014 Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	December 8, 2011 Please respond as required.	October 19, 2014 Yes.
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		October 19, 2014 Yes.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	December 8, 2011 No, not at this time. Please revise PIF per comments provided above and resubmit. March 29, 2012 Considerable and careful effort was taken to comprehensively address all issues in the first review and all revisions are deemed satisfactory. The PIF is being recommended for approval.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		October 19, 2014

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			The project is not currently recommended for CEO endorsement. Please address issues related to the tracking tool, co-financing, project management costs, project baseline, and project sustainability. November 18, 2014 This project still needs to be revised to address issues related to questions 11 and 25. November 26, 2014 All issues have been addressed. Project is recommended for CEO endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 08, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 29, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		October 19, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)		November 18, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)		November 26, 2014

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	September 4, 2012 Yes, needed design activities are identified for the most part. However, a number of activities appear to begin actual project implementation and we strongly recommend that the PPG activities focus on project preparation activities only.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	September 4, 2012

		Yes.
Secretariat Recommendation	**3. Is PPG approval being recommended?**	September 4, 2012 Yes.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 04, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.