GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	**9408**		
Country/Region:	**Global (Antigua And Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenadines)**		
Project Title:	**Preventing COSTS of Invasive Alien Species (IAS) in Barbados and the OECS Countries**		
GEF Agency:	**UNEP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-2 Program 4;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$133,333**	Project Grant:	**$3,747,945**
Co-financing:	**$6,627,412**	Total Project Cost:	**$10,375,357**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Sarah Wyatt**	Agency Contact Person:	**Kristin Mclaughlin**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	March 24, 2016 No. Please address the following issues. - Please include SMART indicators for the components of the project. - The GEF has a very specific approach to IAS. We are particularly concerned with IAS that are major sources of threat for threatened and	

[1] 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		endemic species. Therefore, while agricultural pests can drive support for policies and programs for prevention, they should not be the focus of GEF resources but receive a lot of attention in this proposal. - According to the GEF-6 Biodiversity strategy, eradication should only be undertaken when the IAS is a major threat to a threatened species, it is cost-effective and has a high likelihood of success. The Antigua and Barbuda activities seem to fit these goals, but a question remains about the sustainability of these activities. GEF support can help develop a long term management plan, but cannot be the funding source and provisions for the sustainability of these activities should be included. It would be helpful to include species names when specific species are the targeted beneficiaries of interventions. Barbados: - The biosecure site sounds like an interesting strategy to try to provide for the conservation of threatened reptiles. It seems like an option worth piloting through the GEF. However, what will be the long term sustainability of this activity? and how will sufficient population size and flow be achieved for the beneficiary species?	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		- The other eradication and control programs, however, sound like efforts that will require significant constant funding, which is not something the GEF supports. GEF supported efforts at lionfish control in the Bahamas have struggled. Even if all of these different activities were GEF eligible, it seems like this project is trying to attempt too many different activities. Please ensure alignment with the GEF-6 Biodiversity Strategy when revising these activities. Component 1 and 3: - Generally, the economic impact of IAS does not include the loss of threatened or endemic species. Please provide justification for how that generates GEBs. April 6, 2016 Yes. Thank you for the revisions. During PPG, please make sure to articulate the ties/logic of working on agricultural pests with IAS that threaten globally significant biodiversity.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	March 24, 2016 Yes. This project is consistent with national strategies and plans.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental	March 24, 2016	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	No. Please address the following issues: - Under the risk section, unsustainable financing is listed as a high risk and the proposed measure is "national co-financing". Yet, the national co-financing numbers are quite low (below 1:1). There are many existing activities on IAS, but yet the co-financing numbers remain quite low. Please find a different risk mitigation strategy or find more co-financing. The issue of financial sustainability of project activities is not adequately addressed. - Please address how this project is innovative. April 6, 2016 Yes. Thank for you these changes. Sustainability of many of these activities will be critical to the long term success of these efforts beyond the period of GEF funding, please ensure financial sustainability during PPG.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	March 24, 2016 No. Please address the following issues:	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		- The section on coordination simply lists existing initiatives without discussing how they will be engaged with this project. Please focus on how coordination will work. April 6, 2016 No. The budget for component 3 seems excessive, particularly given co-finance and that it seems to largely be the work of consultants. Please revise or provide justification for this budget or enhance the activities listed. April 11, 2016 Yes. Thank you for addressing these issues and providing more detail.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	March 24, 2016 No. Please address the following: - Global environmental benefits - The section on GEBs is mostly about the Caribbean in general and not the specific species, areas and values that will be protected through this project. Please revise. - UNEP is developing a project in the Pacific that is also requesting set aside resources. It seems like a natural opportunity for collaboration, but yet	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		there is minimal discussion of this. What efforts are being made to share lessons, strategies, and resources among these projects? - Generally, the GEF doesn't fund public awareness campaigns as they require consistent, on-going resources. Please clarify how these activities will be GEF eligible. - Throughout component 1, there seem to be some activities that should be baseline, such as National Invasive Species Strategies. What's the GEF role? - Please give some potential examples of cost recovery mechanisms. April 6, 2016 Yes. Thank you for the revisions. During PPG, special attention will need to be paid to ensuring the coherence and GEF-appropriateness of component 1 with activities such as "cost recovery mechanism" being fully fleshed out. Through a GEF supported project, Cuba has had quite a bit of success in developing a national invasive species strategy and may be a good opportunity for learning and collaboration.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects,	March 24, 2016	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes. However, at PPG please include specific plans relating to gender inclusion and gender responsive project development as well as inclusion of local CSOs.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	March 24, 2016 Yes. Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, and St. Kitts and Nevis all have sufficient funds in their STAR allocation.	
	• The focal area allocation?	March 24, 2016 Yes. Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, and St. Kitts and Nevis all have sufficient funds within their Biodiversity allocation.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• Focal area set-aside?	March 24, 2016 No. There are very limited resources in the Biodiversity set aside for projects that make a strong case for regional or global benefits from project activities. When granted, those resources rarely exceed a 2:1 STAR to Set Aside ratio. Please revise both	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		the proposal to strengthen the regional value as well as revise the request from the set aside. Please also ensure that activities funded in this area are not simply national activities grouped together - it could be helpful to justify why they will be more effective and cost effective at a national level and how non-participating countries will be involved. April 6, 2016 No. Please see the comments under question 4. April 11, 2016 Yes. This project makes a good case for use of FA set-aside resources for regional activities.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	March 24, 2016 No. Please address the issues listed in this review. April 6, 2016 Not at this time. Please address the issues around the budget. April 11, 2016 Yes. The PM recommends CEO PIF	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		clearance.	
Review Date	Review	March 24, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 06, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 11, 2016	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		

[3] If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		