



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

GEF ID:	5506		
Country/Region:	Chile		
Project Title:	Strengthening and Development of Instruments for the Management, Prevention and Control of Beaver (Castor Canadensis), an Invasive Alien Species in the Chilean Patagonia		
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;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,153,882
Co-financing:	\$5,636,703	Total Project Cost:	\$7,890,585
PIF Approval:	September 12, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	November 07, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Hivy Ortiz,

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 ?	August 2, 2013 Yes.	June 14, 2016 As at PIF stage.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. It was endorsed on July 23, 2013.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	August 2, 2013 No. Please see note below about remaining funds in the STAR allocation. Climate Change is over-utilized by	June 14, 2016 As at PIF stage.

*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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>410,999 and Land Degradation is over-utilized by 89,163, for a total over-utilization of 500,162. However, Chile has an allowed marginal adjustment of 1,000,000, so this excess of 500,162 must come from the unused resources of the Biodiversity focal area, which will in turn reduce its available funds. Remaining funds available for programming, for Biodiversity are 4,532,773.</p> <p>FAO has submitted two biodiversity projects (PMIS #5429 and #5506) in Chile that together would exceed the total available allocation by \$685,228. We request that the Chilean government and FAO work together to make a decision about how to proceed.</p> <p>August 30, 2013 As at 08/30/13 BD STAR resources remaining are \$5,922,935. Sufficient funds are available. Cleared.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	<p>August 2, 2013</p> <p>No. Please see note about remaining funds in the STAR allocation.</p> <p>August 30, 2013 - IG Cleared.</p>	<p>June 14, 2016</p> <p>As at PIF stage.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	<p>August 2, 2013</p> <p>NA</p>	<p>June 14, 2016</p> <p>As at PIF stage.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	<p>August 2, 2013</p> <p>NA</p>	<p>June 14, 2016</p> <p>As at PIF stage.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	<p>August 2, 2013</p>	<p>June 14, 2016</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		NA	As at PIF stage.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	August 2, 2013	June 14, 2016
		NA	As at PIF stage.
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>August 2, 2013</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>The project directly supports Aichi target 9 on invasive alien species.</p>	<p>June 14, 2016</p> <p>Indicators fully in line with BD strategy focal area objectives with good complementary use of the GEF tracking tools along with project level monitoring at a higher level of granularity.</p>
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>August 2, 2013</p> <p>Yes.</p>	<p>June 14, 2016</p> <p>As at PIF stage.</p>
Project Design	<p>6. 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>	<p>August 2, 2013</p> <p>Yes.</p>	<p>June 14, 2016</p> <p>yes.</p>
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>August 2, 2013</p> <p>Yes for the most part.</p> <p>However, please address the following issues in a revised PIF:</p> <p>1) This project will likely require significant funds in the future after the grant has finished however there is no</p>	<p>June 14, 2016</p> <p>Yes, with a stronger overall results framework/logframe. However, we note the absence of any biological indicators that might be measured or how we will know if globally important biodiversity is benefitting by reducing the threat from beavers. The logframe notes the "process of recovery" as one indicator</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>discussion on how the activities will be financed after the GEF investment is over. Please clarify.</p> <p>2) Elaborate more comprehensively on the role and engagement with the Argentine government (at different levels). These eradication efforts will require coordinated planning and implementation to achieve success. This project should try to build on the relationships and planning processes between the two countries that exist to ensure a sustainable intervention. Please clarify.</p> <p>August 30, 2013 - IG 1) Cleared. Additional information provided sufficient for PIF. 2) Cleared. Additional information provided sufficient for PIF.</p>	<p>but is silent on what will be measured biologically to inform us about the status of this "process of recovery". In addition, in the area measure indicator that will be benefitting from the intervention, it is not clear what biological condition will be measured within the area as changing with the removal of the pressure and damage created by beavers. Please clarify these elements in the logframe with a particular focus on the global biodiversity benefit that will be measured during and after the project.</p> <p>July 7, 2016</p> <p>Adequate revisions provided.</p>
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>August 2, 2013</p> <p>Yes.</p>	<p>June 14, 2016</p> <p>Yes with clear justification and reasoning. However, as noted in question 7 above, we are concerned by the absence of any biological indicators that might be measured or how we will know if globally important biodiversity is benefitting by reducing the threat from beavers. The logframe notes the "process of recovery" as one indicator but is silent on what will be measured biologically to inform us about the status of this "process of recovery". In addition, in the area measure indicator that will be benefitting from the intervention, it is not clear what</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>biological condition will be measured within the area as changing with the removal of the pressure and damage created by beavers. Please clarify these elements in the logframe with a particular focus on the global biodiversity benefit that will be measured during and after the project.</p> <p>July 7, 2016</p> <p>Adequate revisions provided.</p>
	<p>9. 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?</p>		<p>June 14, 2016</p> <p>While the gender dimension is addressed in terms of how the project will be implemented, and the cost effectiveness analysis is presented, no information is provided on whether the project will deliver any socioeconomic benefits. Please clarify if this is an oversight or intentional given the nature of the project design and if there will be measurable socio-economic benefits.</p> <p>July 7, 2016</p> <p>Adequate revisions provided.</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>August 2, 2013</p> <p>No. Please include more information about engagement with local communities in planning and implementation and other CSOs beyond the livestock association if this is germane.</p>	<p>June 14, 2016</p> <p>Adequate.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		August 30, 2013 - IG Cleared. Additional information on local community involvement provided.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	August 2, 2013 Yes.	June 14, 2016 Adequate.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	August 2, 2013 Yes.	June 14, 2016 Yes.
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	August 2, 2013 This is an innovative approach to a very difficult problem. If successful, taking it to scale could generate considerable national and global environmental benefits.	June 14, 2016 The project addresses all of these issues adequately and it has the potential to be a technically robust example in the GEF portfolio on IAS prevention, control and management.
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		June 14, 2016 There have been changes but all within reason as the result of the project design process.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		June 14, 2016 The cost-effectiveness of the project has been adequately demonstrated.
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	August 2, 2013 Yes.	June 14, 2016 The cofinancing has dropped since PIF. We understand, after discussions with the GEF OFP, that the project is likely to be successful in the competitive grant process that it will apply to and that while this money can not be guaranteed in a cofinance letter that the confidence of securing additional cash cofinance is high. Thus, during project implementation and at each PIR, we request that FAO provide ongoing updates on cofinance realized per requirements, and in particular provide updates on this element of the cofinance package. If necessary, justifications for project implementation adjustments if the cofinance is not realized should be provided.
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	August 2, 2013 Yes.	June 14, 2016 The cofinancing has dropped since PIF. We understand, after discussions with the GEF OFP, that the project is likely to be successful in the competitive grant process that it will apply to and that while this money can not be guaranteed in a cofinance letter that the confidence of securing additional cash cofinance is high. Thus, during project

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			implementation and at each PIR, we request that FAO provide ongoing updates on cofinance realized per requirements, and in particular provide updates on this element of the cofinance package. If necessary, justifications for project implementation adjustments if the cofinance is not realized should be provided.
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	August 2, 2013 Yes.	June 14, 2016 Yes.
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	August 2, 2013 Yes.	June 14, 2016 Please clarify how the unspent PPG funds will be used for. July 7, 2016 Adequate revisions provided.
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	August 2, 2013 NA	June 14, 2016 NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		June 14, 2016 Yes.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		June 14, 2016 Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		June 14, 2016

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Yes. Adequate responses to all STAP observations.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		June 14, 2016 NA.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? 		June 14, 2016 Yes. Adequate responses to all Council observations.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		June 14, 2016 NA
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>August 2, 2013</p> <p>No.</p> <p>Please see comments above and resubmit and revised PIF.</p> <p>August 30, 2013</p> <p>Yes. This PIF is technically cleared and may be included in a future work program.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>1. Role and engagement with the Argentine government.</p> <p>2. Local community engagement with the project</p> <p>3. Eradication methodologies developed to follow best practice in terms of removal and disposal of carcasses.</p> <p>June 14, 2016</p> <p>The three issues above have been addressed adequately.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>June 14, 2016</p> <p>A number of outstanding issues have been identified.</p> <p>In addition, please sure to enclose the OFP endorsement letter, and reduced the project agency fee to 9.5%.</p> <p>July 7, 2016</p> <p>Adequate revisions provided. Project is recommended for CEO endorsement.</p>
	First review*	August 02, 2013	June 14, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 30, 2013	July 07, 2016
	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.