



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

GEF ID:	5506		
Country/Region:	Chile		
Project Title:	Strengthening and Development of Instruments for the Management, Prevention and Control of Beaver (Castor Canadensis), an Invasive Alien Species in the Chilean Patagonia		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,153,882
Co-financing:	\$9,070,000	Total Project Cost:	\$11,223,882
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	August 2, 2013 Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. It was endorsed on July 23, 2013.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	August 2, 2013 No. Please see note below about remaining funds in the STAR allocation. Climate Change is over-utilized by 410,999 and Land Degradation is over-	

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

Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>August 2, 2013</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>The project directly supports Aichi target 9 on invasive alien species.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>August 2, 2013</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>August 2, 2013</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>August 2, 2013</p> <p>Yes for the most part.</p> <p>However, please address the following issues in a revised PIF:</p> <p>1) This project will likely require significant funds in the future after the grant has finished however there is no</p>	

		<p>financed after the GEF investment is over. Please clarify.</p> <p>2) Elaborate more comprehensively on the role and engagement with the Argentine government (at different levels). These eradication efforts will require coordinated planning and implementation to achieve success. This project should try to build on the relationships and planning processes between the two countries that exist to ensure a sustainable intervention. Please clarify.</p> <p>August 30, 2013 - IG 1) Cleared. Additional information provided sufficient for PIF. 2) Cleared. Additional information provided sufficient for PIF.</p>	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>August 2, 2013</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	<p>August 2, 2013</p> <p>No. Please include more information about engagement with local communities in planning and implementation and other CSOs beyond the livestock association if this is</p>	

		August 30, 2013 - IG Cleared. Additional information on local community involvement provided.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	August 2, 2013 Yes.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	August 2, 2013 Yes.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	August 2, 2013 This is an innovative approach to a very difficult problem. If successful, taking it to scale could generate considerable national and global environmental benefits.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost- effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar		

Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	August 2, 2013 Yes.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	August 2, 2013 Yes.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	August 2, 2013 Yes.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	August 2, 2013 Yes.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	August 2, 2013 NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		

	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>August 2, 2013</p> <p>No.</p> <p>Please see comments above and resubmit and revised PIF.</p> <p>August 30, 2013</p> <p>Yes. This PIF is technically cleared and may be included in a future work program.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>1. Role and engagement with the Argentine government.</p> <p>2. Local community engagement with the project</p> <p>3. Eradication methodologies developed to follow best practice in terms of removal and disposal of carcasses.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	August 02, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 30, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

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