



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

|  |   |                              |                   |
|--|---|------------------------------|-------------------|
| GEF ID:                                    | 4330  |                              |                   |
| Country/Region:                            | Chile   |                              |                   |
| Project Title:                             | Strengthening National Frameworks for IAS Governance - Piloting in Juan Fernandez Archipelago |                              |                   |
| GEF Agency:                                | UNDP  | GEF Agency Project ID:       | 4272 (UNDP)       |
| Type of Trust Fund:                        | GEF Trust Fund  | GEF Focal Area (s):          | Biodiversity      |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | BD-2;   |                              |                   |
| Anticipated Financing PPG:                 | \$0   | Project Grant:               | \$4,000,000       |
| Co-financing:                              | \$6,900,000   | Total Project Cost:          | \$10,900,000      |
| PIF Approval:                              | September 21, 2010  | Council Approval/Expected:   | November 01, 2010 |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval                   |   | Expected Project Start Date: |                   |
| Program Manager:                           | Mark Zimsky   | Agency Contact Person:       |                   |

| Review Criteria                | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|--------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Eligibility                    | 1. Is the participating country eligible?   | September 13, 2010<br>Yes, Chile ratified the CBD in 1994.   |  |
|                                | 2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it? | September 13, 2010<br>NA   |  |
|                                | 3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?  | September 13, 2010<br>Yes in a letter dated August 27, 2010.   |  |
| Agency's Comparative Advantage | 4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?      | September 13, 2010<br>Yes, UNDP has global experience in biodiversity mainstreaming and extensive country-level, island-focused experience in the design and implementation of IAS frameworks. |  |

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

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 9-8-2010

|                       |  |   |  |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|
|                       | 5. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?                              | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>No amount is presented. Please provide an indicative amount of cofinance that the Agency will bring to the project.</p> <p>September 17, 2010</p> <p>UNDP will provide grant of \$50,000. In addition, helped gather cofinancing commitments to the project of \$ 6.9 million total.</p>   |  |
|                       | 6. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?   | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>Project is in line with the UNDAF for Chile.</p> <p>Please specify the size of the environment team in the country office in Chile and their specialties that will be involved in the supervision of this project.</p> <p>September 17, 2010</p> <p>Environment team in Chile has experience in project supervision and a strength in environmental economics and staff numbers appear adequate. Expertise in biodiversity and IAS will be drawn from other parts of UNDP.</p> |  |
| Resource Availability | 7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): |   |  |
|                       | • the STAR allocation?   | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>Yes, this is the first project from Chile in GEF-5 and within their STAR allocation.</p>   |  |
|                       | • the focal area allocation?   | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>NA</p>   |  |
|                       | • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?  | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>NA</p>   |  |
|                       | • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?  | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>NA</p>   |  |

|                     |   |  |  |
|---------------------|---|--|--|
|                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>   | September 13, 2010<br>NA   |  |
| Project Consistency | 8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?  | September 13, 2010<br>Yes it is fully aligned with Outcome 2.3.  |  |
|                     | 9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/ LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?  | September 13, 2010<br>Yes, Objective Two on BD mainstreaming and within that objective, the development of invasive alien species (IAS) frameworks.  |  |
|                     | 10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA? | September 13, 2010<br>Yes, IAS are prioritized in Chile's NBSAP.   |  |
|                     | 11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes?                                  | September 13, 2010<br>Yes, project has an adequate focus on training individuals in IAS control and management and strengthening systems for IAS management within existing institutions.  |  |
| Project Design      | 12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?  | September 13, 2010<br>Please provide greater detail on current baseline investments in IAS management and control within the project boundary that the GEF investment will build upon and complement. This is addressed only in one sentence in the box on page 5, but please provide a more ample description of the activities and an estimate of the amount of resources being invested.<br><br>September 17, 2010<br>Sufficient detail has been provided including an estimate of the financial baseline investments in the components of the project within the project boundary. |  |

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  | <p>13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>                                   | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>The problem statement provided is adequate but not well linked to current activities and investments. Please elucidate the link more clearly.</p> <p>September 17, 2010</p> <p>Improved and adequate problem statement linked to the baseline investments and projects.</p>   |  |
|  | <p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>   | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>Yes, well developed with clear outcomes and outputs.</p> <p>Given that the GEF-5 BD strategy does not place a strong emphasis or priority on control and eradication of IAS as it is not particularly cost-effective, please specify how much of the GEF budget and cofinancing is being directed toward these activities under project component two.</p> <p>September 17, 2010</p> <p>Adequate clarification provided.</p>      |  |
|  | <p>15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem?</p> | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>Yes, the incremental activities are appropriate to address the identified problem, however, only if the focus of the intervention is appropriately targeted to the establishment of systems. Thus, clarification on the level of investment being placed in systemic solutions as opposed to site eradication is important, as noted above. Please clarify.</p> <p>September 17, 2010</p> <p>Adequate clarification provided.</p> |  |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate?</p>   | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>No, the PIF describes benefits to all of Chile, which may happen sometime in the future if the experiences from this project are replicated in other islands and the mainland and if the NIAPIS is fully implemented. However, it appears that the project is only focusing on establishing the NIAPIS, establishing protocols etc. Therefore, given the targeted focus on the Juan Fernandez Archipelago please augment the current global benefits description and provide more details on the global benefits to be generated from the intervention on JFA.</p> <p>September 17, 2010</p> <p>Clarification has been provided on the systems focus of the response to the IAS problem in Chile.</p> |  |
|  | <p>17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p> | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>Yes, the design is smartly designed to build on a significant baseline investment and is nested within existing institutional structures thus ensuring a cost-effective investment.</p>   |  |
|  | <p>18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)?</p> | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>Yes, IAS control and management will potentially generate employment opportunities as well improve local quality of life. Maintaining nature tourism appeal of JFA through maintaining the BD uniqueness of the island through IAS control will help secure medium and long-term revenues for businesses.</p>   |  |
|  | <p>19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?</p>   | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>Yes. The demonstrations on IAS control provide opportunities for wide civil-society engagement.</p>   |  |

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  | <p>20. 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)</p> | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>Yes but please also discuss whether climate change is seen as a risk and how the project proposes to address it vis a vis IAS control and management within the action plan that the project will develop.</p> <p>September 17, 2010</p> <p>Climate change risk has now been addressed and will be integrated into early warning systems and protocols the project is establishing.</p>                        |  |
|  | <p>21. Is the provided documentation consistent?</p>   | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>Yes.</p>   |  |
|  | <p>22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?</p>                       | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>PIF refers to footnote 5 as a reference to the key stakeholders. Since footnote 5 does not exist, are you referring to footnote 4 as the list of stakeholders? Please clarify.</p> <p>Please be more specific as to what entities are the key stakeholders outside the Government agencies.</p> <p>September 17, 2010</p> <p>Adequate clarification has been provided and roles of stakeholders described.</p> |  |
|  | <p>23. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>  | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>Please more clearly describe the proposed collaboration with existing projects at the higher level of the NIAPIS and the work in the JFA.</p> <p>September 17, 2010</p> <p>Adequate clarification provided.</p>  |  |
|  | <p>24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>  | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>Yes, the project appears well-nested</p>   | <p>September 13, 2010</p> <p>Please describe the institutional</p> |

|                   |   |   |  |
|-------------------|---|---|--|
|                   |   | within existing national and JFA-based implementation structures for the management of IAS.   | sustainability plans for the implementation of the NIAPIS post-project at the time of CEO endorsement. |
|                   | 25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?  |   |  |
|                   | 26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?  |   |  |
| Project Financing | 27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost appropriate?   | September 13, 2010<br>Yes.  |  |
|                   | 28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the incremental/additional cost reasoning principle? | September 13, 2010<br>Yes, but please clarify, as noted above, the amounts invested in component two on control and eradication and the biodiversity outcomes that will be generated through this investment.<br><br>September 17, 2010<br>Adequate explanation provided.   |  |
|                   | 29. Is co-financing confirmed?  | September 17, 2010<br><br>Cofinancing identified at PIF stage.  |  |
|                   | 30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?   | September 13, 2010<br>Yes, but please clarify how much funding is being invested in eradication as mentioned above.<br><br>In addition, please provide an indicative amount of cofinancing UNDP will provide to the project.<br><br>September 17, 2010<br>Adequate answers provided with the main focus of the investment on systemic responses to manage IAS pathways. |  |

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation          | 31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?                        | September 13, 2010<br>NA at PIF stage for biodiversity.  |  |
|  | 32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?           |  |  |
| Agency Responses                           | 33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:   |  |  |
|  | • STAP?   | September 13, 2010<br>NA at this stage.  |  |
|  | • Convention Secretariat?   | September 13, 2010<br>NA.  |  |
|  | • Council comments?   |  |  |
| • Other GEF Agencies?                      | September 13, 2010<br>NA at this stage.   |  |  |
| Secretariat Recommendation                 |   |  |  |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage                | 34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?  | September 13, 2010<br>No, not at this point.<br>Please address all issues raised above and resubmit.<br>September 17, 2010<br>All issues have been adequately addressed.<br>The PIF is recommended for CEO approval. |  |
|  | 35. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.  |  |  |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/Approval | 36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG? |  |  |
|  | 37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?  |  |  |
| Review Date (s)                            | First review*   |  |  |
|  | 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.

## 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 | <b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>                        |                          |
|                            | 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.