



**REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT**  
**PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project**  
**TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND**

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

**PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION**

Project Title: Strengthening and development of instruments for the management, prevention and control of beaver ( <i>Castor canadensis</i> ), an invasive alien species in the Chilean Patagonia			
Country(ies):	Chile	GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup>	5506
GEF Agency(ies):	FAO (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	639984
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Environment (MMA), National Forest Corporation (CONAF), Wildlife Conservation Society-Chile (WCS), Agriculture and Livestock Service (SAG)	Submission Date:	20 July 2016
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	36
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	n/a	Project Agency Fee (\$):	204,619
➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/>			

**A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK<sup>2</sup>**

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD-2	Outcome 2.3: Improved management frameworks to prevent, control and manage invasive alien species	Output 2.1. Policies and regulatory frameworks	GEF TF	2,153,882	5,636,703
<b>Total project costs</b>				2,153,882,	5,636,703

**B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK**

<b>Project Objective:</b> Improve sub-national institutional frameworks to effectively control, prevent and manage IAS in highly valuable ecosystems for biodiversity in the Region of Magallanes and the Chilean Antarctica.						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. Management and governance framework, information, monitoring, early warning, participation and	TA	<u>Outcome 1.1</u> Management and governance framework ensure effective management and control of the invasion in the	<u>Output 1.1.1.</u> Strategic and financial plan for the management of beaver as an invasive species	GEFT F	1,047,816	3,304,132

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to the Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework when completing Table A.  
 GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc

communication in the Region of Magallanes and the Chilean Antarctica		<p>Magallanes Archipelago and the Brunswick Peninsula.</p> <p>Targets</p> <p>a) <i>6/13 points on the GEF tracking tool (section VI on IAS, questions 1,2,3)</i></p> <p>b) <i>A mechanism for the control and eradication of beaver in the Region of Magallanes and the Chilean Antarctica, designed and validated with the participation of all stakeholders<sup>3</sup></i></p> <p>c) <i>13,229,700 ha (Region of Magallanes excluding the Antarctic territory) vulnerable to beaver invasion, under effective management and control of beaver invasion</i></p> <p><u>Outcome 1.2.</u> Decision makers have updated, systematized and available information about beaver management in Magallanes, including data on operational zoning, spread, monitoring, early detection, recovery-restoration and research.</p>	<p><u>Output</u> <u>1.1.2.</u> Coordination and governance plan of beaver management as an invasive species</p> <p><u>Output</u> 1.1.3. Evaluation of current and potential economic impact of beaver in Chilean Patagonia</p> <p><u>Output</u> 1.1.4. Validated regulatory framework for beaver management at municipal and regional level</p> <p><u>Output</u> 1.2.1. Coordinated Information, Monitoring and Early Warning System (CMWS).</p> <p><u>Output 1.2.2.</u> Spread and adaptive zoning model per management unit</p> <p><u>Output 1.2.3.</u> Sub Antarctic ecosystems recovery indicators applied in control and eradication pilot sites</p> <p><u>Output 1.2.4.</u> Information exchange protocols between</p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

<sup>3</sup>The plan includes budget and financing methods, regulatory and normative aspects, governance mechanism and procedure protocols. Lead by the MMA, CONAF, SAG, Regional Government, with the participation of WCS, civil society. The plan is designed within the framework *Strategic Plan of Beaver Eradication Project in Southern Patagonia* (BECF)

		<p>Target</p> <p><i>a) 13/16 points on the GEF tracking tool (section VI on IAS, questions 4,5,6);</i></p> <p><i>b) Coordinated Information, Monitoring and Early Warning System (CMWS), designed and under implementation.</i></p> <p><u>Outcome 1.3</u> Regional institutions and civil society recognize the importance of beaver eradication practices and restoration in the Region of Magallanes, including the recovery of riparian forests with endemic species.</p> <p>Target</p> <p><i>a) 75% of the MMA, SAG and CONAF staff recognize the importance of the eradication of invasive species to biodiversity and productive areas of the Region (30% are women);</i></p> <p><i>b) Personnel of the MMA, SAG and CONAF assigned to control, management and eradication of beaver, implements best practices;</i></p>	<p>Chile and Argentina at the regional, national and binational level</p> <p><u>Output 1.3.1.</u> Communication and awareness raising programmes for different target audiences</p> <p><u>Output 1.3.2.</u> Capacity building programme for key stakeholders<sup>4</sup> for the management and eradication of beaver</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

<sup>4</sup>Key regional actors are officials from the MMA, CONAF, SAG, WCS, including technical staff at the office and field activities.  
GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc

		<i>c) Members of civil society improved their knowledge and attitude on the impact of beaver as an invasive species in agricultural systems and vulnerable ecosystems (30% are women).</i>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

2. Demonstration activities of control, management and restoration in pilot areas	TA	<p><u>Outcome 2.1</u> Beaver invasion is under effective control in selected areas of native forest and peatlands ecosystem in the Region of Magallanes and in the recovery process of riparian forests with endemic species.<sup>5</sup></p> <p>Target</p> <p><i>a) Eradication of beaver and basic restoration of at least 68,543 ha/574km of channels (i. watercourses freed from beavers recovered to similar conditions as those watercourses not affected by beavers; ii. organic matter in sediments diminishes in the basins freed from beavers).</i></p> <p><i>b) Early detection of invasion of 1,499,100 ha/13,660 km of channels.</i></p> <p><u>Outcome 2.2.</u> Beaver invasion is under effective control in multifunctional private property in the Region of Magallanes.</p>	<p><u>Output 2.1.1.</u> Beaver eradication and basic restoration method designed and implemented in Karukinka Park</p> <p><u>Output 2.1.2.</u> Beaver eradication and basic restoration method designed and implemented in Laguna Parrillar National Reserve and downstream private lands.</p> <p><u>Output 2.1.3.</u> Early Warning System (EWS) Method to be implemented in the Southeast area of Ultima Esperanza province, including the Torres del Paine National Park.</p> <p><u>Output 2.1.4.</u> Systematization of best practices for beaver eradication, invasion monitoring and early warning</p> <p><u>Output 2.2.1.</u> Sustained control and restoration methodologies for multiple-use private property.</p> <p><u>Output 2.2.2.</u> Systematization of a 'best practices' model for multifunctional private property</p>	GEFT F	796,588	1,938,103
---	----	--	--	-----------	---------	-----------

<sup>5</sup>Indicators of biodiversity recovery in terrestrial environments are applied to periods longer than those of the project (10-20 years).  
GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc

		<p>Target</p> <p><i>a) 45,243 ha/450 km of channels in multifunctional private property free of beaver and under restoration;</i></p> <p><i>b) 1,000 ha of forests in process of recovery (recovery of lenga trees Nothofagus pumilio and Antarctic beeches Nothofagus Antarctica in progress in affected areas)</i></p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

3. Outcome based management, monitoring, evaluation and dissemination	TA	Outcome 3.1. Project implementation based on a results-based management approach and application of project findings and lessons learned in future operations facilitated.	Output 3.1.1 Project progress assessment and monitoring system.  Output 3.1.2 Mid-Term Independent Review (MTR) and Final Independent Evaluation (FIE).  Output 3.1.3 Publication and dissemination of best practices and lessons learned	GEFT F	206,912	110,127
Subtotal					2,051,316	5,352,362
Project management Cost (PMC) <sup>6</sup>				GEFT F	102,566	284,341
<b>Total project costs</b>					<b>2,153.882</b>	<b>5.636.703</b>

### C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount <sup>7</sup> (\$)
Government	Ministry of Environment (MMA)	Cash	124,760
Government	Ministry of Environment (MMA)	In kind	1,425,040
Government	National Forest Corporation (CONAF)	Cash	114,200
Government	National Forest Corporation (CONAF)	In kind	1,676,000
Government	Agriculture and Livestock Service (SAG)	Cash	16,965
Government	Agriculture and Livestock Service (SAG)	In kind	1,149,405
NGO	Wildlife Conservation Society-Chile (WCS)	Cash	89,614
NGO	Wildlife Conservation Society-Chile (WCS)	In kind	803,858
Private sector	TERAIKE S.A.	In kind	2,243
Private sector	Estancia Entre Ríos	Cash	2,493
Private sector	Estancia Entre Ríos	In kind	12,125
GEF Agency	FAO	Cash	20,000
GEF Agency	FAO	In kind	200,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>5,636,703</b>

<sup>6</sup> PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

<sup>7</sup> The exchange rate used is the official UN rate for July 2016: USD 1 = CLP 674, unless specified differently in co-financing letters.  
GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc

**D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY<sup>1</sup>**

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total c=a+b
FAO	GEFTF	BD	Chile	2,153,882	204,619	2,358,501
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				2,153,882	204,619	2,358,501

<sup>1</sup> In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

<sup>2</sup> Indicate fees related to this project.

**F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:**

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	0		0
National/Local Consultants	468,200	513,400	981,600

**G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? NO****PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION****A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>8</sup>****A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.**

No changes from PIF. Please refer to the Section 1.5. a. of the FAO-GEF Project Document for further details.

**A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.**

No changes from PIF. Please refer to the Section 1.5 b and c of the FAO-GEF Project Document for further details.

**A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage**

No changes from PIF. Please refer to the Section 1.1.2 of the FAO-GEF Project Document for further details.

**A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address**

The baseline project and barriers that the project seeks to address have been further analyzed and detailed during project preparation. Please refer to the FAO-GEF Project Document, section *1.1.1 Rationale, a) Baseline Initiatives* for further details.

**Remaining barriers to address threats on GEB**

The Chilean government has long recognized the IAS threats to national development, but is currently focused on the protective sanitary regulation of export-oriented economic sectors such as agriculture, forestry, livestock and aquaculture. The system does not cover all IAS that could jeopardize the biodiversity and ecosystems of the country, nor includes

<sup>8</sup> For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.



systematic control programmes for IAS already established in the country like the beaver, providing good examples of management and control.

Likewise, the Strategic Plan for the Eradication of the Beaver Project in Southern Patagonia (EECP) requires support to establish mechanisms and roles that, without undermining the competences of national institutions, allow these to coordinate at domestic and binational level. Such mechanisms and roles must contribute to capacity building at sub-national and local levels.

The main barriers to be tackled by the project are:

**1. Deficiencies in the institutional mechanisms and absence of protocols to manage beaver control and eradication practices, and inadequate coordination among sectors.** So far, efforts to control and eradicate the beaver, lack of a comprehensive approach to prevent the impact on environmental goods of global significance. The current institutional approach does not address uncertainties, set goals and objectives or propose effective measures in terms of time, funds and human resources.

**2. Little and outdated information of the economic value of beaver impact on ecosystems.** There are rough estimates of the economic damage caused by beavers in the productive forestry sector of Isla Grande de Tierra del Fuego. It is necessary to have detailed information about the scale and nature of the problem, to develop an action plan and municipal and regional regulations, for local productive sectors, that addresses the problem.

**3. The local regulatory framework does not include measures to address beaver threats.** Chile has inadequate legal framework to manage IAS at regional and municipal levels. There are 34 rules (laws and others) to control alien species, which stipulate inspection procedures and practices governing various economic sectors considered as main entry points. Although there are restrictions to some IAS brought into continental Chile, the focus is primarily put on prevention and control of pests that could affect the national economy (especially the agrifood sector), while existing invasions, as beaver, which have direct economic impact on the productive sectors, remain neglected, like those affecting the biodiversity of native species and ecosystems. There is no comprehensive cross-sectoral approach and different regulations overlap and cancel each other out, reducing its effectiveness.

**4. There is no systematic process of monitoring and early warning to ensure timely detection of beaver invasion.** Although baseline investment includes control actions, there is no early warning system being implemented for new invaded areas and prevention of re-invasion of invasion-free areas. This results in greater difficulties to control the invasion and set priorities at the strategic level, what means that so far, the invasion is not even contained. An early warning system has been designed, but has not been implemented yet. Sporadic monitoring is performed without an operational framework. There is no operational zoning for beaver management. There is no reference framework to measure the recovery of ecosystems when actions are performed. Binational information sharing is not systematically performed. Based on the information gathered during the design phase, it was clear the need to identify the spread of the beaver in the intervention areas.

**5. Lack of communication and awareness of the problem generated by beavers.** Uncoordinated efforts of communication and public awareness resulting in low or no collaboration from the general public at local but mainly at national level to the eradication efforts. The main barrier is related to the beaver's potential charming (charismatic) appearance, which leads to the ungrounded assumptions of a harmless animal, whose existence would entail no negative environmental risks, or need for control actions. At the same time, personnel in charge of planning and management of the Beaver as IAS lacks the necessary knowledge (sub-national policy makers, professionals, technicians and operators).

**6. Fragmented approach to the management of beaver as IAS and few evidentiary tools about the effectiveness and management cost (prevention, control, containment and eradication):** Effective management of

IAS requires the application of different approaches simultaneously or sequentially. There have been isolated attempts to control IAS on islands in Chile, but they did not respond to a comprehensive approach and the scale of beaver invasion well exceeds partial approaches to stop the threat to biodiversity in Tierra del Fuego and Patagonia. No demonstration activities aimed to strengthen existing capacities and clear up uncertainties have been carried out. These uncertainties are: (i) at technical level, the effectiveness and certainty of eradication; (ii) at institutional level, the regulatory and governance mechanisms necessary for the eradication and (iii) at financial level, budget and funding sources necessary for the eradication, especially in difficult access areas. There are no effective and permanent methods for an adaptive mapping of the presence, density, detection and early action or prevention of re-invasion, all measures that are part of the state of art approach concerning invasive species management. This lack of a comprehensive approach prevents taking actions against the impact on environmental goods of global importance.

**7. Local producers' limited capacities to control the invasion.** Private landowners do not have the technology and knowledge to deal with the beaver invasion on their property.

**A. 5. Incremental reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund) activities requested for GEF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) to be delivered by the project:**

Considering the aforementioned barriers, without GEF investment, under the 'business as usual' scenario biodiversity and wild and productive ecosystems in Patagonia and others in Chile (and Argentina), including globally important biodiversity as the world's southernmost ecosystem, the Torres del Paine National Park and the Chilean biodiversity *hotspot* of the winter precipitation Valdivian Forest, will remain threatened by the growing population of beavers. Ongoing investments will keep focusing on eliminating individuals, with little effect on the total population. The lack of a coherent, coordinated and well-funded national and binational approach based on the systematization of experiences, best practices and lessons learned would hinder efforts towards eradication.

In addition, deficiencies in the sub-national regulatory framework and institutional mechanisms to manage productive practices and inadequate intersectoral coordination would result in a growing threat of beaver with the aforementioned consequences. Furthermore, in the absence of a project, efforts will be made in terms of investments and bilateral cooperation to manage the invasion, whose effectiveness can be estimated as insufficient as previous actions.

The incremental GEF funding will address the shortcomings of the regulatory framework and governance for effective management of beaver as an invasive species and protection of Patagonian biodiversity. An early warning system will be developed for new invaded areas and prevention of re-invasion of beaver-free areas, in support of the implementation of the *Binational Action and Contingency Plan for the invasion of the North American beaver in the continental sector of Southern Patagonia* - PACB. The system will provide more information about the socioeconomic impact of beaver, produce eradication methodologies and protocols to be put into practice and develop local-institutional and population capacities to effectively manage beaver invasion.

To achieve this incremental impact, the project includes two technical components according to the following rationale:

**Component 1: Management and governance framework, information, monitoring, early warning, participation and communication in the Region of Magallanes and the Chilean Antartica.** Based on the binational strategic plan and existing feasibility studies, the incremental contribution will support the creation of space for dialogue and negotiation between different stakeholders, to agree on coordination mechanisms for the design and implementation of management and governance frameworks to control the beaver as an invasive species, prevention and early warning of new invasions and eradication in identified areas. These instruments of governance will include (i) protocols of action to generate and share information among and with stakeholders, (ii) proven and validated management and funding plans, (iii) protocols

of national coordination between national and binational agencies in Argentina (in synergy with project # 4768), including best practices, and (iv) generation and dissemination of data and communication to different audiences. Governance frameworks will also consider economic estimates of the damage caused by the invasive species in different production systems in the Region.

Additionally, the design of a monitoring and early warning system, which is one of the main objectives of the project and one of the key pillars of the PACB implementation will be financed. The early warning system will be implemented and adjusted to assess their effectiveness, based on the different ways of land management in the region. The warning system would help containing the degree of spread of the beaver and monitor the areas where it is already present, which, in turn, will influence in recovery area and ecosystem restoration. This warning system will include budget assessment to ensure sustainability.

Investment will be made to raise awareness and influence in the perceptions of people and sectors (forestry, agriculture, tourism fishing, academics, civil servants, armed forces), about beaver as an invasive species and the need to eradicate it from fragile ecosystems. A communication, sensitivity and education strategy will be developed, in addition to defining the appropriate dissemination mechanisms including media.

Finally, investment will be made in training the staff of the participating institutions on issues related to the biology and ecology of beavers, safety use of the eradication equipment and technical aspects, including data collection, processing, monitoring, security, soil restoration techniques, customer service and health of personnel in remote areas.

**Component 2: Demonstration activities of control, management and restoration in pilot areas.** As an incremental contribution to the binational process for the control and eradication of beaver under the PACB, investment will be made in technical assistance (training workshops, participation and planning) and equipment to plan the eradication of beaver in pilot areas, representing different ecosystems and types of land tenure. The aim is, on the one hand, to identify cost-efficient methodologies for the eradication and monitoring and prevention of re-invasion, and, on the other, methodologies to support the restoration of ecosystems and riparian forests of *Nothofagus*. Activities will be carried out to develop capacities and implement techniques and methodologies for control, monitoring, eradication, re-invasion prevention, as well as restoration, including private land. These pilot activities will be carried out in basins of Karukinka protected area, Laguna Parrillar National Reserve and in private lands which were identified during the design phase. The existing experience will be systematized with special emphasis on eradication and restoration techniques and the necessary public-private partnership, with a view to be replicated by the Government in other areas once the project is over. To this end, SAG will request funds to the National Fund for Rural Development (FNDR) to carry out complementary activities of the Project in Brunswick Peninsula, Dawson Island and Isla Grande de Tierra del Fuego.

The process aims at demonstrating that it is feasible to eradicate the beaver from the Patagonian region through an appropriate control mechanism, the establishment of an early warning system and permanent monitoring of the area. Thus, necessary financial resources will be managed, capacities that are currently lacking will be generated and effective technologies will be tested to be applied at different scales. This comprehensive approach is a challenge that would not be properly addressed with current government investment.

The alternative scenario represents a major contribution to the protection of this globally significant biodiversity, reducing the vulnerability of native fauna and flora and contributing to the protection and restoration of riparian forests in Patagonia. The project will test a systemic approach for the management of biological invasions and will contribute to Chile's efforts to have a coherent institutional framework to manage beaver as IAS, thus proving feasible the eradication of beaver. Mechanisms for coordination and exchange of information and improved sub-national capabilities will optimize the use of existing capacities, beyond the beaver, and provide a demonstration guide for the implementation of management plans for other cases of IAS.

#### ***Changes in the results framework compared to the PIF***

GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc



The objective of the project remains unchanged. The Project Results Framework has been streamlined to facilitate project implementation and M&E. The full project framework is described in detail in the FAO-GEF Project Document (Sections 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4) and Annex A of this CEO Endorsement request. The adjustments introduced into the project results framework and the rationales are described below:

<b>PIF</b>	<b>CEO Endorsement</b>
<p>Component 1. Governance and management framework</p> <p>Component 2. Information, monitoring, early warning and communication/participation systems</p>	<p>Component 1 and component 2 were merged into a single new component in order to guarantee that the management framework and the information system (SCIAT, in Spanish) are fully integrated and information flows without any problem between them. The new component is now called:</p> <p>Component 1 Management and governance framework, information, monitoring, early warning, participation and communication in the Region of Magallanes and Chilean Antarctica.</p>
Output 1.1.4 Municipal and regional rules and regulations proposed for beaver control in local productive sectors	Output 1.1.4. Validated regulatory framework for beaver management at municipal and regional level
Outcome 2.1 Early warning, prevention and spread control is in place in the Patagonian islands and the Brunswick peninsula.	Included into Component 1 as new output 1.2.1. Coordinated Information, Monitoring and Early Warning System (CMWS).
<p>Output 2.1.1 A common, comprehensive information system (remote sensing, GIS, surveys, terrestrial prospection, development/validation of spread models) established</p> <p>Output 2.1.2 An Early Warning System (EWS) established.</p>	<p>During the implementation of the PPG, partners identified the specific information needs for proper management, control, early detection and monitoring areas for restoration. Therefore, the outputs were adjusted as follows:</p> <p>Output 1.2.1. Coordinated Information, Monitoring and Early Warning System (CMWS)</p> <p>Output 1.2.2. Spread and adaptive zoning model per management unit</p>
Output 2.1.3 Recovery indicators for sub-antarctic ecosystems applied to the existing control and eradication pilot areas	Output 1.2.3. Sub Antarctic ecosystems recovery indicators applied in control and eradication pilot sites
Output 2.1.4 Protocols for information sharing developed and applied at regional (Magallanes) and binational (Chile-Argentina) levels	Output 1.2.4. Information exchange protocols between Chile and Argentina at the regional, national and binational level
Outcome 2.2 Knowledge on IAS and beaver is increased amongst regional key actors.	Outcome 1.3 Regional institutions and civil society recognize the importance of beaver eradication practices and restoration in the Region of Magallanes, including the recovery of riparian forests with endemic species.
Output 2.2.1 Communication and awareness-raising programme (for livestock breeders, rural workers, touristic sector, public servants, artisanal fishermen, armed forces and local politicians) designed and implemented	A communication strategy for different publics (including those not direct affected by beaver) will be developed. This is to build public awareness on the negative impact of invasive species in the country. Thus the output was adjusted as follows:

	1.3.1 Communication and awareness raising programs for different target audiences.
Output 2.2.2 Relevant public servants and partners' key staff (trappers, operation managers, information managers, decision makers) trained both theoretically and in the field.	A capacity building program for key partners will be developed for the active participation of these partners on the implementation of the activities. Thus the output was adjusted as follows: 1.3.2 Capacity building programme for stakeholders for the management and eradication of the beaver.
Component 3. Demonstration activities	<p>Since the original Component 2 was merged with Component 1, Component 3 is now re-numbered as Component 2.</p> <p>There will be two new pilot areas, one related to control and eradication lead by CONAF and the second related to Early Warning System lead by SAG. Thus, component 3 was adjusted as follows: Component 2: Demonstration activities of control, management and restoration in pilot areas</p> <p>The targeted area for this component has substantially increased. At PIF stage, targets were calculated considering only existing technology, staff and strategy (business as usual scenario). During the preparation of the project calculations were revised taking into consideration improved technologies (monitoring, communication, data storage, trapping among others) and intervention strategy, which will allow a more cost-efficient intervention.</p>
Outcome 3.1 Scalable control and eradication model has been validated in at least 2000 ha. under restoration from the damages caused by the beaver including recuperation of riparian forest with endemic species.	<p>The project aims at keeping the beaver invasion under control and the control and eradication model is the means to achieve it. Thus this outcome was adjusted as follows: Outcome 2.1 Beaver invasion is under effective control in selected areas of native forest and peatlands ecosystem in the Region of Magallanes and in the recovery process of riparian forests with endemic species.<sup>9</sup></p>
3.1.1 Scalable control and eradication model (including detailed design of control and eradication practices, monitoring of reinvasion and restoration) demonstrated in at least one basin in Tierra del Fuego (within Karukinka Natural Park).	<p>2.1.1 Beaver eradication and basic restoration method designed and implemented in Karukinka Park</p> <p>2.1.2 Beaver eradication and restoration methods designed and implemented in Laguna Parillar National Reserve and downstream private lands.</p> <p>2.1.3 Early Warning System method to be implemented in the Southeast area of Ultima Esperanza province, including the Torres del Paine National Park.</p>

<sup>9</sup>Indicators of biodiversity recovery in terrestrial environments are applied to periods longer than those of the project (10-20 years).  
GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc

3.1.2 Best-practice manuals for detection, control and basin-level eradication developed and validated	2.1.4 Systematization of best practices for beaver eradication, invasion monitoring and early warning.  Protocols, and best practices from the pilots are to be documented for upscaling actions in the region.
3.2.1 Practice on sustained control in multiple-use private property developed and tested with the participation of private landholders of Timaukel municipality.	2.2.1 Sustained control and restoration methodologies for multiple use private property. During the implementation of the PPG stakeholders suggested to work on the Marazzi basin area rather than an administrative area-
3.2.2 Validation by landholders and systematisation of a sustained control best-practice model for multiple-use private property	2.2.2 Systematization of best practices model for multifunctional private property.
Component 4 Project progress monitoring and information dissemination.	Component 3: Outcome based management, monitoring, evaluation and dissemination. 3.1.1 Project progress assessment and monitoring system. 3.1.1 Mid-Term independent review and Final Independent Evaluation. 3.1.3 Publication and dissemination of best practices and lessons learned.

As a consequence of the regrouping of some Outputs and more detailed development of the project interventions there have also been changes in the resources distribution between the PIF and CEO endorsement stages. Please refer to the Results Budget in Appendix 3 of the FAO-GEF Project Document for further details.

#### **A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks**

Risks identified in the PIF for the achievement of the project objective and results have been further analysed, and additional risks have been identified and analyzed during the design of the full Project Document. Mitigation measures have in each case been developed and incorporated into the project components. Please see below the Risk Matrix, that is also attached to the FAO project document in section 3.2.

Risk	Level	Mitigation measures
National and subnational authorities do not include IAS management measures, including beaver, in the institutional priorities.	Low	The NBSAP, developed through a participatory process, identifies the impact of IAS and establishes the need for IAS management. The project deals specifically with the barriers that impede the implementation of management measures by regional institutions of Magallanes. Specifically, the project mitigates the risk through awareness-raising and specific training for target audiences, including officials and decision makers of the institutions involved in the eradication of the beaver. The consultation processes carried out during the design stage, allowed the regional authorities of Magallanes to work in planning activities during project implementation, and agree on field activities related to staff training needs (according to their responsibilities, as mentioned above), the identification of pilot sites, recognition of the ecological diversity of the territory, land tenure and social conditions to classify the different realities that exist in Magallanes. Consultation and awareness raising programmes with municipalities will facilitate the implementation of local practices. Awareness, information and outreach programmes for the civil society will also help to position the need for IAS control in the territory. Coordination with the GEF 4330 project in Chile and GEF 4768 project in Argentina will allow a better positioning at the local, national and international policy level.
Potential funding gaps in the next EECF phase	Low	The project will consider the necessary steps to agree on a participatory design of the action plan which includes a financial component in terms of costs as well as funding sources. Furthermore, the economic impact study of the beaver will provide the elements to negotiate additional resources. The participation of the private sector (breeders, forest and tourism) is an additional source of funding. The adoption of practices on private lands, based on the interest of eradicate IAS, will lead to the restoration of the same. Once these groups are trained in best practices implementation, they may apply them to their own territories with the assistance of government agencies.

Risk	Level	Mitigation measures
Climate change could increase the rate of invasion or lead to other beaver-related threats	Moderate	IAS's threat to vulnerable ecosystems increases when they adapt to new conditions posing a risk of introduction or re-invasion, augmented by an increase in the number of extreme events (floods, droughts, etc.) or higher stress on native species which increases vulnerability. The Second National Communication to the UNFCCC (MMA, 2011) provides good detailed prospective models for the whole country, including the region of Magallanes, reporting on the prioritization of activities in the future management system. The project develops capacities for proactive and adaptive management enabling a more robust response to less favourable conditions as the ones projected in future climate scenarios. Climate change variables are monitored over relatively longer periods of time, beyond the PPG implementation, making difficult, during the design phase, to draw conclusions for the implementation phase. However, some conditions were identified that will help to develop strategies, namely, the role of tides and currents in the spread of the beaver, which enables to identify spread models and vulnerable sites, and hence, propose actions for beaver invasion control, management and early warning.
Local communities and/or key stakeholders are not fully committed or do not adopt the practices proposed	Low	The project supports and coordinates efforts to ensure that the plan integrates key stakeholders and understands their motivation and interests (Outcome 1.3). On the other hand, increasing institutional capacities and a thorough review of the institutional framework should reduce the number of practices against the objective of the project. Communication activities during the project aim at raising stakeholders' awareness of the IAS problem. Stakeholders of local communities, private sector, civil society, academia, were invited to participate in the design phase of this project. Workshops, site visits and landowners' visits were made to define training needs to address the problem recognized by these groups. At the local level, no stakeholders opposed to the project implementation were identified. There may be some resistance from animal defenders' groups, mainly based in the Metropolitan Region. During the implementation of the project, all internationally agreed standards in terms of humanitarian measures will be observed, because of conviction of the staff involved and to reduce the negative connotation that such intervention may have on people.
There is no access to private properties.	Low	Consultations during the PPG phase and those foreseen in the project, suggest that the incorporation of farmers, as partners of the institutions participating in the project, would help to mitigate risks. By way of example, two private landowners have committed their participation in pilot activities. Agreements with private landowners were achieved during the implementation of the PPG (including project endorsement letters), but given the nature of the property, their interest may lessen or the property may change ownership what would end up in new negotiations.



Risk	Level	Mitigation measures
Restoration of ecosystems does not occur spontaneously or cannot be carried out after successful control and eradication operations	Low	There are enough pristine ecosystems in Patagonia that can provide genetic material within proximities, including the same watersheds, for the reproduction of the main plant species. The project includes restoration activities to demonstrate the most appropriate and cost-effective methods. The scientific evidence compiled during the design phase of the project provides the basis to estimate this risk as minimal. The workshop 'Designing pilots to manage beaver invasion in Patagonia' was held in Punta Arenas, March 2015, during the PPG phase. Reference states for ecological restoration of ecosystems and management practices were analysed. During the session, input was received from the experience of forest restoration in Torres del Paine after the fire in 2010, the restoration plan of Cohiue forest in Magallanes, the work experience of SEREMIS of the Ministry of Agriculture and the MMA with seeds and the experience of the Centre for Agricultural and Environmental Studies of Magallanes. However, it is worth noting that restoration of temperate forests takes time before showing any changes, which may not be in line with the time framework of this project. Nevertheless, if there is no negative impact caused by flooding, the ecosystem will tend to restore itself. If there is an intervention, the process may be speeded up, but the forest will not be fully recovered within three years, which is the time framework of the project.

#### **A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives**

No changes from PIF. Please refer to the Section 4.1 of the FAO-GEF Project Document for further details

#### **B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:**

##### **B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.**

The stakeholder mapping carried out during project preparation is presented in the table below, including their roles and participation in project implementation.

Stakeholder	Interest in the project according to area of activity	Role in the project
Ministry of Environment (MMA)	Coordination and implementation of environmental policies, plans and programmes	Manager, coordinator and main executing party of the project. The MMA leads the process of establishing a management and governance framework. It coordinates actions and working agreements with the Government of Argentina. It facilitates opportunities for coordination with other GEF projects, specifically project # 4330 in the country. The MMA Regional Ministerial Secretariat - SEREMI facilitates the implementation and coordination of the early warning system. It contributes to the development of the monitoring system protocol and ensures its distribution among stakeholders
National Forestry Corporation (CONAF)	Management of protected areas in the Region of Magallanes and control of beavers in Laguna Parrillar National Reserve	Manages Protected Areas in the region. CONAF participates in activities of Component 1, particularly in the development of a management plan and governance of beaver. CONAF leads the control, monitoring and early warning processes in pilot areas located in protected areas of its jurisdiction, in the Region of Magallanes. It leads the pilot area in Laguna El Parrillar
Wildlife Conservation Society Chile (WCS)	Management of Karukinka, the largest private protected area in Magallanes	Manages important experiences regarding beaver, eradication, monitoring and restoration. It participates in the activities of Component 1 to establish the management framework and governance and the management plan. WCS leads the implementation of the pilot area in Karukinka, develops sustained beaver control methodologies and habitat restoration processes.
Livestock and Agricultural Service (SAG)	It is a public institution in charge of the Hunting Law and inspection activities and quarantine	Manages the EECP on the Chilean side and has the legal authority to implement the project. SAG has the greatest experience in the Region of Magallanes, to implement practices proposed in this project. Based on the experience gained during more than 20 years, basic criteria will be established for early warning, control and eradication. It participates in the activities of Component 1 to establish the management framework and governance and the management plan.
Landowners and local producers	Mainly farmers livestock producers (sheep and cattle).	They will be the target population of awareness raising activities and will be trained to participate in pilot activities carried out in multiple-use private properties under Component 2, ensuring access to land, participation of staff in eradication activities, logistics support and supplies for the field work.  During project preparation several landowners have expressed interest in control and eradication activities and some have confirmed commitment to participate in project implementation through co-financing letters.

During the design stage of the project the presidents of the Commissions for the Environment, Science and Technology of the Regional Council and the Regional Development Division of the Regional Government of Magallanes, the SEREMIs of Environment and Agriculture and the Regional Intendency of Magallanes participated in the design process.

In addition, the following beneficiaries were identified during the design stage:

- The Chilean Navy and Army Work Corp (CMT) of the Ministry of Defence, specifically in the Dawson Island, where CMT have been involved in monitoring beavers since 1984. This group is one of the main beneficiaries of control and monitoring training.
- The Chilean Public Roads, Hydraulic Works and Water Administration of the Ministry of Public Works, have been affected in their activities due to beaver dams located on roads, which must be destroyed to ensure free traffic in the area. Their participation in this project is mainly related to the elimination of beaver dams in the area.
- The National Tourism Service (SERNATUR) will participate in public sensitivity processes, tourist information in protected areas and informal education in the region.
- The Municipalities of Timaukel, Primavera, Porvenir, Rio Verde, San Gregorio, Laguna Blanca, Punta Arenas and Puerto Williams will be beneficiaries of this project in aspects related to training, monitoring and beaver control.
- The University of Magallanes and the private agents ASOGAMA, Asociación Hereford, Asociación Corriedale, Asociación de Ganaderos de Tierra del Fuego, Forestal Russfin, OMORA and COMAPA, will participate in training processes according to management protocols developed in the project.

At the national level, the Operating Committee for the Control of Invasive Species (COCEI), where the MMA acts as Executive Secretariat, will ensure, a higher level of coordination. At the Magellan region level, a Project Management Committee (see details in section 4) will be established, to ensure that all capacities and needs are taken into account.

Finally, at a binational level, the Treaty on the Environment signed by the Republic of Argentina and the Republic of Chile (1991) on the Restoration of the Southern ecosystems affected by the North American beaver (*Castor canadensis*), has a political monitoring mechanism, the Southern Integration Committee, which is a formal technical-political body for the exchange of information and coordination on border affairs. The relationship with the Argentine government will be entrusted to the MMA.

## **B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund)**

Generally speaking, the social sustainability of the project has structural bases in the participatory process and consensus reached during the design stage of the project. The workshops held in Punta Arenas with CONAF, MMA, SAG NGOs, academia, private sector and municipalities, have eased a broad interinstitutional participation, which is reflected in the project objectives and expected outcomes, mainstreaming participants and key stakeholders identified in the process.

Another social sustainability factor will be the active participation of farmers in the pilots (private landowners), who will take ownership of techniques and methods and will disseminate them among peers in zones than will not be covered by the output.

Specifically, the project will support:

- the gender approach at every decision making stage and activities in the project, in special, the selection of staff for training and eradication activities. Given the nature of the project, the gender dimensions will be included by (i) ensuring participation of women in the capacity development and awareness raising activities and (ii) promoting participation of women in the eradications activities.
- the active participation and empowerment of local communities in the expansion and accreditation of best practices and its application;
- the active participation of the communities in the development process of beaver management plans. As stated on subsection 1.1, beaver activities affect producer because of streaming diversions harm livelihoods of the communities. Socioeconomic benefits will be delivered by reducing the constant threat to farmer's livelihoods.

The project, through output 1.1.3 will provide further information and analysis of the costs and impacts of the beaver invasion and thus the link between benefits for biodiversity and the local socio-economic conditions will be clearer. This information will strengthen decision makers' capacities, which will result in greater sustainability for the implementation of the IAS management and governance.

Moreover, the Communication Strategy of output 1.3.1, which addresses the general public and stakeholders who work as multipliers of information and source of opinion, will support the local understanding of the negative impact of the beaver in the productive sector and the ecosystem of the region. This level of awareness will result in supporting the continuation of the Binational Strategic Plan for the Eradication of the Beaver Project in Southern Patagonia - EECPP after project completion.

The effort undertaken in Chile and Argentina contributes to the local effectiveness and prevents the spread on the mainland. The Binational Strategic Plan will continue beyond project completion. The binational joint work, that has already six years of implementation, is a strong stimulus to sustain the environmental benefits, in special, due to the implementation of a governance system that will endure the passing of time beyond project completion.

Thanks to the project, the beaver invasion will be under control. Thus, the ecosystems affected by it will be restored. The disruption of water coursed and the subsequent flooding will stop. This will benefit small landowner's plots that area constantly under risk of losing their crops due to these water disruptions. Livelihoods will be guaranteed.

### **B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design**

With funding from the GEF and co-financing, the project aims to develop local capacities for the eradication in selected areas, which in turn will allow replication in the rest of the Chilean Patagonia. This initial investment will allow the development of methodologies and protocols that will be tested on the field, thus making is possible to identify economic efficiency and reduction of operational costs. Based on these results, the intervention strategy will be adjusted, thus guaranteeing sustainability and replicability of the initial investment.

Cost-efficiency and effectiveness of the project is achieved by involving the various stakeholders related to beaver management as a IAS in a systematic manner, by establishing a binational, national and regional institutional framework. The involvement of SAG will allow to build upon its experience, human resources and risk mitigation and control system, to avoid the introduction of pests in the agricultural and forest sectors and take early steps in case of failing check points.

The training of public and private staff and of important segments of the rural population in the region of Magallanes, ensures the efficient use of human resources, infrastructure and resources already available and higher efficiency in the prevention of introduction, detection and early warning. Training and sensitivity of people living in the zone and

affected by the beaver, will expand the group of observers in the prevention and early warning system in a cost-efficient manner.

On the other hand, the pilot areas have been defined depending on the impact of beaver on native biodiversity of global significance, and its aim is to represent various scenarios and situations regarding management of biological invasions, to validate protocols and communication and awareness strategies to manage, contain and/or eradicate them. These interventions should allow to learn about the cost-efficiency of beaver management practices and techniques. Beavers have not yet spread in a way that makes impossible to control, contain and/or eradicate them. Coordination with Argentina and the binational process in stages will ensure cost-efficiency and cost-effectiveness of actions.

### **C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN**

Monitoring and evaluation of progress in achieving project results and objectives will be done based on the targets and indicators established in the Project Results Framework (see Appendix 1 of the Project Document, also described in sections 2.3 and 2.4 of the Project Document). The project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan has been budgeted at USD 96,000 (see section 4.5.4 of the Project Document). Monitoring and evaluation activities will follow FAO and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and guidelines.

The Project Results Framework indicators and means of verification will be applied to monitor both project performance and impact. Following FAO monitoring procedures and progress reporting formats, data collected will be sufficiently detailed that can track specific outputs and outcomes, and flag project risks early on. Output target indicators will be monitored on a six-monthly basis, and outcome target indicators will be monitored on an annual basis, if possible, or as part of the mid-term and final evaluations. The project output and outcome indicators have been designed to monitor on-the-ground impacts and progress in building and consolidating capacities to manage the beaver as invasive species both at the municipal institutional level, as well as at the level of local farmers and communities. The baseline and target for these indicators are established in the Project Results Framework and will be fine-tuned and included in the M&E plan.

#### **Summary of main monitoring and evaluation activities**

<b>M&amp;E activity</b>	<b>Responsible institutions</b>	<b>Periodicity</b>	<b>Estimated costs</b>
Inception workshop	PMU; FAO (ETG with the support of the LTO, BH and the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit)	Three months as of project inception	2,150
Project inception report	PMU and ETG approved by the LTO, BH and the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit	15 days after project inception	3,000
Monitoring of 'field' impact	PMU; institutions and organizations participating in the project	Continuous	21,600
Project supervision and valuation visits in PIR	PMU; FAO (LTO, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit)	Annual, or as requested	3,600
Project Progress Report (PPR)	PMU, with inputs from the institutions participating in the project	Quarterly	14,400



M&E activity	Responsible institutions	Periodicity	Estimated costs
Annual Project Execution Review Report (PIR)	FAO (LTO and ETG) with the support of the PMU. Approval and submission to the GEF by the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit	Annual	3,450
Evaluation of technical reports	PMU; FAO (LTO)	As appropriate	n.c.
Co-financing reports	PMU with inputs from other co-financing institutions	Annual	1,800
Mid-term Independent Review (MTR)	External consultant, project team, including the GEF Coordination Unit and other stakeholders	Halfway through the project implementation	23,450
Final Independent Evaluation (FIE)	External consultant, FAO Independent Evaluation Unit in consultation with the project team, including the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit and other stakeholders	At the end of the project implementation	50,000
Final report	PMU; FAO (ETG, LTO, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, the Report Unit TSCR)	Three months before the end date of the Execution Agreement	6,550
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>130,000</b>


**PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)**

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter(s) with this form. For SGP, use this OPF endorsement letter).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Ximena George-Nascimento	Operational Focal Point	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT	7/23/2013

**B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

<b>Agency Coordinator, Agency Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date (Month, day, year)</b>	<b>Project Contact Person</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Email Address</b>
Gustavo Merino Director, Investment Centre Division, Technical Cooperation and Programme Management FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153, Rome, Italy		20 July 2016	Hivy Ortiz,  Forestry Officer, FAO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean	+56 2 29232137	<a href="mailto:Hivy.OrtizChour@fao.org">Hivy.OrtizChour@fao.org</a>
Jeffrey Griffin Senior Coordinator,  FAO GEF Coordination Unit. Investment Centre Division. FAO				+3906 57055680	<a href="mailto:faogef@fao.org">faogef@fao.org</a>

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK** (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Outcomes chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term target	Final goal	Means of verification	Assumptions
<b>Global environmental objective:</b> improve sub-national institutional frameworks to effectively control, prevent and manage IAS in highly valuable ecosystems for biodiversity in the Region of Magallanes.						
<b>Development objective:</b> incorporate biodiversity conservation into the management of productive landscapes, through the development of skills that allow for adequate risk management of biological invasions.						
<b>Component 1: Management and governance framework, information, monitoring, early warning, participation and communication in the Region of Magallanes</b>						
<b>Outcome 1.1</b> Management and governance framework to ensure effective management and control of the invasion in the Magallanes Archipelago and the Brunswick Peninsula.	a) Score on the GEF tracking tool (section VI on IAS, questions 1,2,3)  b) Presence of mechanism for the control and eradication of beaver in the Region of Magallanes, designed and validated with the	a) 1/13  b) Absence of institutional mechanisms	a) 3/13	a) 6/13  b) Control and eradication mechanism in place  c) 13,229,700 ha covered by the beaver management framework.	GEF tracking tool completed during mid-term and final evaluation  Summary report of beaver management mechanisms and governance arrangements  Validation meeting minutes  Field monitoring reports.  PIR	National and regional authorities consider the introduction of IAS management, including beaver, in its institutional priorities in a coordinated manner  Awareness of the value of biodiversity and threats posed by beaver, ensure that communities and key government stakeholders adopt beaver management mechanisms.



Outcomes chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term target	Final goal	Means of verification	Assumptions
	<p>participation of all stakeholders<sup>10</sup></p> <p>c) Number of hectares (Region of Magallanes excluding the Antarctic territory) vulnerable to beaver invasion, under effective management and control of beaver invasion</p>				M&E reports	The binational agreement with the Republic of Argentina is maintained and strengthened with parallel projects in both countries. Coordinated binational actions and goals are implemented.
Output 1.1.1. Strategic and financial plan for the management of beaver as an invasive species	Designed and validated strategic and financial plan	Incipient approach and few probatory evidence of management cost-efficiency	1 (draft)	1 (final version)	<p>Plan document published and disseminated</p> <p>Validation meeting minutes</p>	
Output 1.1.2. Coordination and governance plan of beaver	A designed and implemented coordination and governance plan and procedures	There is a Binational Strategic Plan for the Eradication of Beaver in	1 (draft)	1 (final version)	Plan document published and disseminated	

<sup>10</sup>The plan includes budget and financing methods, regulatory and normative aspects, governance mechanism and procedure protocols. Lead by the MMA, CONAF, SAG, Regional Government, with the participation of WCS, civil society. The plan is designed within the framework *Strategic Plan of Beaver Eradication Project in Southern Patagonia* (BECF)

Outcomes chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term target	Final goal	Means of verification	Assumptions
management as an invasive species	protocol for national and binational coordination	Southern Patagonia (EECP), but it does not have the necessary elements for effective implementation			Validation meeting minutes	
Output 1.1.3. Evaluation of current and potential economic impact of beaver in Chilean Patagonia	Economic impact study including analysis of sectors (forestry, farming and cattle, protected areas and tourism, water resources and infrastructure) and submitted to decision makers	Little and out of date information on the economic value of the impact of beaver on ecosystems and biodiversity. Only estimates of productive forestry in Isla Grande de Tierra del Fuego are available	1	1	Study document published and disseminated	
Output 1.1.4. Validated regulatory framework for beaver management at municipal and regional level	Municipal and regional regulatory framework ready for approval	There is no local regulatory framework that includes beaver threat.	1	1	Documents with normative proposals  Validation meeting minutes	

Outcomes chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term target	Final goal	Means of verification	Assumptions
<b>Outcome 1.2.</b> Decision makers have updated, systematized and available information about beaver management in Magallanes, including data on operational zoning, spread, monitoring, early detection, recovery-restoration and research.	a) Score on the GEF tracking tool (section VI on IAS, questions 4,5,6);  b) Coordinated Information, Monitoring and Early Warning System (CMWS), designed and under implementation.	a) 3/16  b) There is no systematic and permanent monitoring and early warning system to ensure timely detection of beaver invasion.	a) 8/16  b) 1	a) 13/16	GEF tracking tool completed during mid-term and final evaluation  CMWS platform  PIR  M&E reports	National and regional authorities include information on beaver presence and spread to their institutional action plans
	Output 1.2.1. Coordinated Information, Monitoring and Early Warning System (CMWS)	Monitoring is carried out according to budgetary and operational capacity. There is no systematic monitoring. SAG (in agriculture areas) and CONAF (protected areas) do some monitoring but	(i) Designed platform structure (ii) Designed EWS (iii) 75 people trained	(i) Approved and operational platform (ii) Operational EWS (iii) 150 people trained (iv) Four pilot areas monitored	Platform design protocol  Monitoring protocol  Participants minutes  Monitoring report	

Outcomes chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term target	Final goal	Means of verification	Assumptions
	(iii) 150 people from 12 institutions/organizations trained in EWS,  (iv) Four pilot areas monitored	the information is not shared				
Output 1.2.2. Spread and adaptive zoning per management unit	A. designed potential distribution and spread model of species	There is no operational zoning for beaver management	1 proposal	1 validated final version	Beaver distribution map.  Document of spread trends	
Output 1.2.3. Sub Antarctic ecosystems recovery indicators applied in control and eradication pilot sites	A. matrix of recovery indicators	There is no reference framework to measure the recovery of ecosystems after eradication	1 proposal	1 validated final version	Document of criteria	
Output 1.2.4. Information exchange protocols between Chile and Argentina at the regional, national and binational level	Protocol and procedures protocol to be formalized via administrative decision.	Binational information exchange is not systematic	1 proposal	1 approved and validated final version	Official records of binational agreements  Administrative decisions	

Outcomes chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term target	Final goal	Means of verification	Assumptions
<b>Outcome 1.3</b> Regional institutions and civil society recognize the importance of beaver eradication practices and restoration in the Region of Magallanes, including the recovery of riparian forests with endemic species.	a) MMA, SAG and CONAF staff recognize the importance of eradication of invasive species to biodiversity and productive areas of the Region; b) Staff of the MMA, SAG and CONAF assigned to control, management and eradication of beaver, implement best practices; c) Number of members of civil society with improved knowledge and attitude on the impact of beaver as an invasive species in agricultural systems and vulnerable ecosystems.	Little knowledge and insufficient institutional and citizens' capacities to control invasion. Lack of communication and awareness of beaver problem	a) 50% staff aware of the problem (20% are women) b) 100% implementing and validating best practices c) 2,000 people have improved their knowledge and attitude on the impact of beaver (20% are women)	a) 75% staff aware of the problem (30% are women) c) 3,000 people have improved their knowledge and attitude on the impact of beaver (30% are women)	Design and sampling of Knowledge, Attitude and Practices (KAP) surveys Report of surveys results PIR M&E reports	Willingness of key stakeholders (CONAF, SAG, MMA) to train their staff in beaver management and early warning techniques Civil society is receptive to project activities







<b>Outcome 2.1</b> Beaver invasion is under effective control in selected areas of native forest and peatlands ecosystem in the Region of Magallanes and in the recovery process of riparian forests with endemic species. <sup>12</sup>	a) Number of hectares and kilometres free of beaver and under basic restoration (i. process of recovery of watercourses; ii. quantity of organic matter in basins)  b) Number of hectares and kilometres under proven early detection of beaver invasion.	a) Beaver control in Karukinka and Laguna Parrillar National Reserves according to budget and operational availability  i. Watercourses affected (baseline to be defined in year 1 through satellite images, as part of a cooperation agreement between FAO and Google Earth)  b) 0	a) 34,271 hectares/278 km free of beaver and 34,271 hectares/278 km in process to be free of beaver	a) 68,543 ha/574km of channels free of beaver (i. watercourses freed from beaver recovered to similar conditions as those watercourses not affected by beaver; ii. organic matter in sediments diminishes in the basins freed from beavers)  b) Early detection in 1,499,100 ha/13,660 km of channels hectares	Verification reports of areas free of beaver  PIR  M&E reports  Satellite images (agreement FAO – Google Earth)	Support from public and private agencies involved in control and eradication activities
Output 2.1.1. Beaver eradication and basic restoration method designed and	(i) A demonstration pilot activity of beaver eradication in La Paciencia sub-basin (132 km of channels, 18,481	0	(i) Inception of pilot activity (ii) Identify vulnerable spread sites identified	(i) Pilot activity is executed (ii) Vulnerable spread sites are identified	Verification of positive eradication in pilot areas	

<sup>12</sup>Indicators of biodiversity recovery in terrestrial environments are applied to periods longer than those of the project (10-20 years).  
 GEF5 CFO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc



implemented in Karukinka Park	ha), that includes the disappearance of new ditches monitored during six months after the end of the pilot; (ii) Protecting and monitoring vulnerable spread sites; (iii) A basic restoration monitoring system		(iii) Design a basic monitoring system	(iii) Basic monitoring system is established	Sites maps  Monitoring protocol, monitoring reports, systematization document	
Output 2.1.2. Beaver eradication and basic restoration method designed and implemented in Laguna Parrillar National Reserve and downstream private lands	(i) A demonstration pilot activity for beaver eradication from Laguna Parrillar National Reserve (442 km of channels, 50,062 ha), including the elimination of new ditches monitored during six months after the pilot is finished; (ii) Public-private cooperation strategies	0	(i) Inception of pilot activity (ii) Design and validate public-private cooperation strategies	(i) Pilot activity is executed (ii) Public-private cooperation strategies are assessed	Verification of positive eradication in pilot areas  Summary document of strategies, agreement minutes  Systematization document	
Output 2.1.3. Early Warning System (EWS) Method to be implemented in	(i) An EWS in the southeast area of the Última Esperanza	0	(i) Inception of an EWS	(i) EWS is executed (ii) A set of early detection	EWS platform (within CMWS framework)	

the Southeast area of Ultima Esperanza province, including the Torres del Paine National Park	Province (13,660 km of channels, 1,499,100 ha); (ii) A set of assessed early detection strategies; (iii) A set of assessed public-private cooperation strategies;		(ii) A set of early detection strategies identified (iii) A set of public-private cooperation strategies identified	strategies under implementation (iii) A set of public-private cooperation strategies under implementation	Minutes of agreements on strategies  Systematization document	
Output 2.1.4. Systematization of best practices for beaver eradication, invasion monitoring and early warning	Four beaver management manuals: (i) detection, (ii) control and eradication in public property, (iii) monitoring, (iv) restoration, control and eradication in multifunctional private property.	0	4 proposals of beaver manuals in the validation phase	4 validated	Published manuals	
<b>Outcome 2.2.</b> Beaver invasion is under effective control in multifunctional	a) number ha/ number km of channels in multifunctional private property	Private landowners perform occasional incipient	a) 22.621 ha /225km free of beaver and in process to be free of beaver	a) 45,243ha/ 450km hectares free of beaver b) 1000ha forest in	Verification reports of areas free of beavers PIR M&E reports	Commitment of rural landowners to achieve local eradication objectives is maintained

private property in the Region of Magallanes.	free of beaver and under restoration; b) number ha of forests in process of recovery (recovery of lenga trees <i>Nothofagus pumilio</i> and Antarctic beeches <i>Nothofagus Antarctica</i> in progress in affected areas)	eradication activities Significant impact on farming systems		process of recovery		
Output 2.2.1. Sustained control and restoration methodologies for multiple-use private property.	(i) A pilot of species eradication in the main bed of Marazzi river (453 km of beds, 45,243 ha), monitored according to the number of empty ditches six months after the end of the pilot; (ii) A designed and implemented data model on spread and reinvasion;	0	i) Inception of pilot (ii) A data model on spread and reinvasion in process of validation (iii) A set of public-private cooperation strategies in process of validation (iv) A basic restoration monitoring system in process of validation	i) Pilot is executed (ii) A data model on spread and reinvasion is implemented (iii) A set of public-private cooperation strategies is implemented and assessed (iv) A basic restoration monitoring	Verification of positive eradication in pilot areas Spread map Minutes of agreements on strategies  Monitoring protocol, monitoring report  Systematization document	

	(iii) A set of implemented and assessed public-private cooperation strategies; (iv) An established basic restoration monitoring system				system is established		
Output 2.2.2. Systematization of a 'best practices' model for multifunctional private property	A public-private cooperation strategies manual for the management of beaver in multifunctional property	0			1	Manual Published	
<b>Component 3: Results based management, monitoring, evaluation and dissemination</b>							
<b>Outcome</b> Project implementation based on a results-based management approach and application of project findings and lessons learned in future	<b>3.1.</b> Achievable and sustainable project outcomes	Project Outcomes Framework with indicators, baseline and goals of outcomes and outputs validated with key actors	30-40% progress in the achievement of project outcomes	Project outcomes are achieved and show sustainability	Mid-term and final evaluations  PIRs	Key actors adopt management and governance framework for the eradication of beaver and implement the CMWS	

operations facilitated.						
Output 3.1.1 Project progress assessment and monitoring system	6 Biannual Project Progress Reports (PPR).		3 biannual PPRs	3 biannual PPRs	PPR document	
Output 3.1.2 Mid-Term Independent Review (MTR) and Final Independent Evaluation (FIE)	a) mid-term review report, b) final evaluation report		1 Mid-term review	1 final evaluation	Evaluations report	
Output 3.1.3 Publication and dissemination of best practices and lessons learned	Manuals of standardized information on invasive species for project partners' staff. Best early warning, control, management, eradication and restoration practices manuals for field staff		Systematization of experiences	Publication of manuals	Published texts	

**ANNEX RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Responses to the GEF Secretariat

GEF SEC Comments	Responses
Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval:	
1. Role and engagement with the Argentine government.	<p>The project has been designed to facilitate binational cooperation on the management of Beaver as an IAS, under the <i>Binational Strategic Plan for the Eradication of the Beaver Project in Southern Patagonia</i> (EECP). In particular under Output 1.2.4 the project will develop a protocol for information sharing between the two countries for the transfer of information and data at binational level, using the virtual mechanisms included in Coordinated Information, Monitoring and Early Warning System, in close coordination with Outcome 4.2 (<i>Binational Programme for Beaver Eradication under implementation (at least in Argentine territory of Tierra del Fuego)</i> of the GEF project #4768 <i>Strengthening governance for the protection of biodiversity through the formulation and implementation of the National Strategy on Invasive Alien Species (ENEEL)</i>. In addition, Outputs 1.1.2 Coordination and governance plan for the management of beaver as an invasive species, 1.3.1 Communication and awareness raising programmes for different target audiences and 1.3.2 Capacity building programme for key stakeholders<sup>13</sup> for the management and eradication of beaver have been designed to be implemented in close coordination with the mentioned project.</p> <p>The Ministry of Environment (MMA) will be responsible for coordinating actions and working agreements with the Government of Argentina.</p>
2. Local community engagement with the project.	<p>The project has been designed through a participatory process, involving institutional stakeholders, NGOs and local landowners. During project preparation several landowners have explicitly request support from project to develop capacities for beaver control and eradication and early warning, monitoring and restoration. Some have confirmed commitment to participate in project implementation through co-financing letters. They will participate in demonstration activities (Component 2), including training to hunt and dispose beavers, and in methodologies to carry out monitoring to prevent reinvasion. In addition, local communities will be engaged through awareness raising activities (Component 1).</p>

<sup>13</sup>Key regional actors are officials from the MMA, CONAF, SAG, WCS, including technical staff at the office and field activities.  
GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc

<p>3. Eradication methodologies developed to follow best practice in terms of removal and disposal of carcasses.</p>	<p>Methods and tools to be use during the Project implementation are selected based on the standards of humane trapping (standards AIHTS), which ensures immediate death beaver without suffering as is the case of snap traps. Similarly, it is ensures that the disposal of dead animals will not cause water pollution problems, or threat to human health. Personnel will be trained to guarantee that dead animals will be removed from roads, access path, and no closer than 30 meters from the body or watercourse and out of sight of carrion birds, either in the forest or under bushes that limit their visual detection. The large extension of Tierra del Fuego, the geographical and the climatic conditions existing in the area guarantee that there is no risk on public health by leaving the carcasses in the place where they have been captured. According to the existing experience, the geographic and climatic difficulties to access to beaver affected areas make more efficient to leave animals in place and allow natural decomposition cycle. The existing experiences documented in Argentina 5-7 individuals are capture by wild land sites and leaving the animals in place will not have negative impact in nature. In private land, hunting/capture will be done individually. In private areas there is sufficient knowledge on appropriate disposals of dead animal and skin utilization, as it has been a practice already implemented in the area.</p>
--	---

#### Responses to STAP comments

<u>STAP comments</u>	<u>Responses</u>
<p>1. The wording of the project objective can certainly be simplified and thereby shortened, and made more related to and consistent with the project title. Whereas the title refers to strengthening and development of frameworks, the objective refers to subnational frameworks and capacities being" in place". It is suggested that the frameworks will be strengthened through the piloting to be done in a test site.</p>	<p>The objective has been modified from <i>Subnational regulatory frameworks and institutional capacities are in place for the Magallanes region to manage and control the spread of invasive alien species (IAS) through piloting a comprehensive management and control framework for a high-value biodiversity environment threatened by the beaver as an aggressive IAS in the Chilean Patagonia to Improve sub-national institutional frameworks to effectively control, prevent and manage IAS in highly valuable ecosystems for biodiversity in the Region of Magallanes and the Chilean Antarctica</i>. In section 2 it is described how this will accomplished through piloting at test sites.</p>



<p>2. While the structure of the proposed project is logical and coherent, some modification is required in the wording of the Outputs. For example, Output 1.1.3 is presented as a study on the potential economic impacts of beaver on various economic sectors. A study is a study. The result of the study is more important and what is of concern. Similarly for Output 1.1.4. Rules and regulations for beaver control are proposed. This should be more affirmative and focused.</p>	<p>Point taken. The log frame has been modified as described in section A.5 above, the wording of outputs 1.1.3 and 1.1.4 has been modified and reflects accurately the results expected.</p>
<p>3. Regarding Outcome indicators, baseline values are not presented. It should also be made more clear what the actual empirical indicators are that are proposed. The indicator presented for Outcome 2.2 (key actors are aware of the problem and willing to undertake the next phase of the beaver management plan) is weak. A baseline should also be provided for a more specific, meaningful and measurable indicator. Outcome 4.1, as stated, is also weak and not specific enough. More concrete information should be presented, accompanied by appropriate indicators.</p>	<p>Baseline levels for Outcome indicators were developed during the PPG and are included in the results framework. The current results framework includes appropriate baseline and SMART indicators per outcome and output that will be confirmed and refined at project inception. Indicators for Outcome 1.3 (previous Outcome 2.2) have been strengthened to measure more accurately capacity development and awareness raising and will be measured through KAP (knowledge, attitude and practice) surveys.</p>
<p>4. The strategy for stakeholder involvement should be explained further, in particular in the case of landowners, hunters, and the general public. How will these stakeholders become engaged?</p>	<p>Regarding civil society, Output 1.3.1 Communication Strategy aims to work with the general public and with stakeholders in charge of disseminating information and capacity builders. This output will support understanding at the local level of the negative impact of the Beaver in the productive sector and the ecosystem of the region. The level of awareness aimed to be achieved will result in the support to the continuation of the EECOP when the project finishes. At the same time, commitment for active participation of the landowners of pilot sites has been achieved through the workshops that were organized during project design phase. They will participate in training to hunt and dispose beavers, and in methodologies to carry out monitoring to prevent reinvasion.</p>
<p>5. The GEBs are presented in a general way. While the project should yield GEBs, more specificity regarding GEBs would be welcome. These should be defined and focused upon early on, and guide</p>	<p>Sections 1.1 and 2.5 include appropriate descriptions of the ecosystem and species the project will aim to conserve through the eradication of the beaver and descriptions of the global environmental benefits that the project will help achieve.</p>



<p><i>future project development. A summary mention to the "unique Patagonian landscape" is too general and unsatisfactory.</i></p> <p>6. <i>Climate change risk is recognized. However, STAP recommends elaborating these further, including their mitigation responses, during the project development phase.</i></p>	<p>The study prepared by the FAO (<i>Wildlife in changing climate</i>) makes it clear that climate change may favor the conditions for exotic species to spread. Thus, changing tides and water heating that causes currents are aspects to be considered in the implementation of the pilots. Specifically in the case of the beaver, the change of tides and currents facilitates rodent access to new islands. The analysis of climate change scenarios (current and tidal tendencies) defines sites with increased vulnerability to invasion.</p> <p>The threat of IAS in vulnerable ecosystems is increased when the IAS are better adapted to new conditions and there is also the increased risk of re-invasion due to the increment of extreme events (flooding, droughts, etc) or by greater stress on native species that increases vulnerability. The project faces this through the inclusion of mitigation measures in climate change risk analyses. The Second National Communication to the UNFCCC (MMA, 2011) provides good prospective detailed models for the whole country, including the region of Magallanes, which shall inform the prioritization of activities in the future management system.</p> <p>The project will develop capacities for proactive and adaptive management that will enable a more robust response to less favorable climate conditions.</p> <p>Aspects of climate change are monitored in relatively longer periods than those of the PPG phase, not allowing to draw precise and exact conclusions for the implementation phase. However, during the PPG some conditions were identified that will allow to develop action strategies, and that is basically the role played by tides and currents in the dispersion of the beaver, which allows to identify models of dispersion and vulnerability sites. This in turn will enable the design of scenarios to control and manage and mainly for early warning of invasion of the beaver</p>
---	--

#### Responses to Council comments

Council comments	Responses
<p><b>Germany</b></p> <p><i>Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:</i></p>	<p>Point taken, the stakeholder engagement strategy has been strengthened and will be addressed through awareness raising activities (Component 1) and demonstration activities</p>

<p><i>Germany suggest that during the design of the final project proposal consideration is given to a clearer design of the participation system and stakeholder engagement both in demonstration activities (component 3) and in information, communication and monitoring (component 2) in order to enhance sustainability and preventing re-invasion.</i></p>	<p>(Component 2). Output 1.3.1 aims to work with the public in general and with stakeholders in charge of disseminating information and capacity builders. This output will support understanding at the local level of the negative impact of the Beaver in the productive sector and the ecosystem of the region. This level of awareness will result in the support to the continuation of the EECF when the project finishes. At the same time, commitment for active participation of landowners of pilot sites has been achieved through the workshops that were organized during project design phase. They will participate in training to hunt and dispose beavers, and in methodologies to carry out monitoring to prevent re-invasion.</p>
<p><i>Output 1.1.3 needs to be sharpened with regard to the aim of the study as well as to the use and users of the results to ensure policy uptake.</i></p>	<p>The wording of Output 1.1.3 has been modified to properly reflect the action and its purpose. The aim of the study is to obtain detailed information that will allow appropriate political decisions to address the issue of beaver invasion in Magellanic territory. The main users will be decision makers of the different sectors.</p>
<p><b>United States</b></p> <p><i>The United States is supportive of this project, but recommends the following be clarified in the final project proposal: "</i></p> <p><i>We note that \$8.75 million in co-financing has been requested from various institutions, but only \$1.5 million of that amount is committed as "cash." The other co-financing is "in kind" or "unknown at this time." We recommend the Secretariat review carefully the co-financing at CEO endorsement, as this project is ambitious in its scope and will need a solid resource base to succeed.</i></p>	<p>Confirmed co-financing from the Government of Chile, the Wildlife Conservation Society and the private sector amounts to USD 5,636,703.</p> <p>Government investments are related to the staff assigned to eradication tasks (trapping, disposal of dead individuals), field verification of the eradication and control of re-invasions, technical teams in charge of monitoring activities and movement within protected areas, staff training workshops in CMWS protocols and management, staff assigned to early warning activities, involvement of the authority in the governance frameworks created by the project for decision-making.</p> <p>Co-financing from the NGO WCS includes allocation of staff, operational costs, database and other assets for the programme 'Conservation in action: control of alien species and recovery of native ecosystems in Tierra del Fuego', as well as access to assets and infrastructure and to different capacities. WCS contributes with experience in control and restoration monitoring.</p> <p>Two private properties, Teraike SA and Estancia Entre Ríos, contribute with co-financing for control and eradication pilot activities in multifunctional private property through man hours of farm workers, logistics and supplies.</p>

	<p>At PIF stage, co-financing considered funding from regional competitive funds of territorial management in Magallanes. The Chilean Government provides funding through this fund on a competitive basis. Regional and municipal governments need to apply for it, specific proposals are to be developed and presented to the authorities for approval. Three priority main areas to be supported by the funds are related to this project: Tourism (high relevance in protected areas); animal production (including landscape sustainable management); forest and agriculture (management of native forest products and sub-products and promoting agriculture in cold and increase value chain). Although the Chilean Government is strongly committed to support this proposal through the regional competitive funds of territorial management, co-financing letters cannot be provided due to the very nature of this financing sources at this stage. Competitive funds requests will be prepared by project coordinator in collaboration with regional partners and will be presented to approval commission following the official guidelines.</p>
<p><i>Additional specific information about the “early-detection system” or “early warning system” mentioned in the paper (under project component 2) should be included.</i></p>	<p>Additional information has been included in the project document. Under Output 1.2.1 the project will develop a Coordinated Information, Monitoring and Early Warning System (CMWS) to serve as the basis for adaptive management and public awareness. A common platform following international standards will be designed and implemented, including at least one geographical support, a monitoring and alert data repository, a recovery/restoration data repository, a studies repository and other references and information and communication protocols.</p> <p>Under Output 2.1.3, the project will implement an early warning pilot area in the Southeast area of Ultima Esperanza province, including the Torres del Paine National Park. This will include including field activities for preventing invasions (identification of ditches, individuals, and dams), categorization and register invasions, generating information that will inform the CMWS.</p>



**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>14</sup>**

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: <b>USD100,000</b>			
<i><b>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</b></i>	<i><b>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</b></i>		
	<i><b>Budgeted Amount</b></i>	<i><b>Amount Spent To date</b></i>	<i><b>Variance</b></i>
1. Development of the governance and management framework component	17,832	13,686	4,146
2. Development of the information, monitoring, early warning and communication/participation systems component	24,682	26,216	-1,534
3. Development of the demonstration activities component	2,750	5,140	-2,390
4. Development of the project progress monitoring and information dissemination component	9,932	5,814	4,118
5. Analysis and definition of execution arrangements	18,682	16,807	1,857
6. Detailed description of full project and preparation of project documents	26,122	29,078	-2,956
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>100,000</u></b>	<b><u>96,741</u></b>	<b>3,259</b>

<sup>14</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

**ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)**

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

NA





