



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:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,870,000
Co-financing:	\$18,032,888	Total Project Cost:	\$21,902,888
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 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.	
	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	

*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.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>in an adequate way. What is presented 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.</p> <p>Please revise and strengthen this section of the PIF.</p> <p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	<p>December 8, 2011</p> <p>NA</p>	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	<p>December 8, 2011</p> <p>No, not as currently presented.</p> <p>Please revise and strengthen this section.</p> <p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	<p>December 8, 2011</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	• the focal area allocation?	December 8, 2011	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Yes.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	December 8, 2011 NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	December 8, 2011 NA	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	December 8, 2011 NA	
	• focal area set-aside?	December 8, 2011 NA	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>December 8, 2011</p> <p>Yes it is aligned with BD 2 outcomes and outputs.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Priority will be given to establishing policy measures that reduce the impact of invasive species on the environment, including through prevention of new incursions, early detection and institutional frameworks to respond rapidly to new incursions."</p> <p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Adequate response provided.</p>	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>December 8, 2011</p> <p>Yes, a clear BD-2 project.</p>	
	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?	<p>December 8, 2011</p> <p>Yes. Control and management of IAS are prioritized in the 2003 NBSAP.</p>	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>December 8, 2011</p> <p>Yes, project has prioritized the development of financial sustainability 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.</p>	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>December 8, 2011</p> <p>It is not entirely clear from the presentation whether the National 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</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>regard. Please clarify this as there is ambiguity in the text and in the results framework.</p> <p>In addition, please clarify what is the Government's baseline commitment to the NSIAS including their financial commitment.</p> <p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>December 8, 2011</p> <p>Yes for components one-three.</p> <p>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 internationally accepted standards of humanely handling and disposing of animals and reference these methods.</p> <p>With regards to funding of component three, the GEF can support the development of protocols but GEF</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>funding should not be used in any pilot eradication efforts.</p> <p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>December 8, 2011</p> <p>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 strategy.</p> <p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>December 8, 2011</p> <p>Yes, for the most part, excepting the eradication activities as noted above. Please also clarify the baseline description of the existing investment in IAS.</p> <p>March 29, 2012</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous 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.	
	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.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	December 8, 2011 Please do not simply list every GEF project in Argentina, but explicitly 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.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	December 8, 2011 Yes, please ensure, given the complexity of natural resources	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		management in the country, that implementation arrangements at CEO endorsement are very clearly articulated.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
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.	
	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.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated	December 8, 2011	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Please try to increase the level of cofinance, particularly from the private sector. March 29, 2012 Adequate revision provided.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	December 8, 2011 Yes.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	December 8, 2011 Please respond as required.	
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• 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	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		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?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 08, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 29, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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. 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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	

	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.