



**REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL**  
**PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project**  
**THE GEF TRUST FUND**

**Submission Date:** 17<sup>th</sup> August 2011

**PART I: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION**

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 3957 **PROJECT DURATION:** 48 months  
**GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:** 0515  
**COUNTRY (IES):** Indonesia, Cambodia, Philippines, Vietnam  
**PROJECT TITLE:** Removing Barriers to Invasive Species Management in Production and Protection Forests in SE Asia  
**GEF AGENCY (IES):** UNEP  
**OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S):**  
**INTERNATIONAL:** CAB International  
**NATIONAL: Cambodia** – General Department of Administration for Nature Conservation and Protection (GDANCP), Ministry of Environment;  
**Indonesia** - Conservation and Rehabilitation Research and Development Centre - Forest Research and Development Agency (FORDA), Ministry of Forestry; **Philippines** – Foreign Assisted and Special Projects Office (FASPO), Department of Environment and Natural Resources; **Vietnam** – Biodiversity Conservation Agency (BCA), Vietnam Environment Administration, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment.  
**GEF FOCAL AREA (S):** Biodiversity  
**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAMME(S):** BD SP7: Prevention, Control and Management of Invasive Alien Species  
**NAME OF PARENT PROGRAMME/UMBRELLA PROJECT:** N/A

INDICATIVE CALENDAR*	
Milestones	Expected Dates
Work Programme (for FSP)	March 2010
CEO Endorsement/Approval	Sept 2011
Agency Approval Date	Nov 2011
Implementation Start	1 Dec 2011
Mid-term Evaluation	Nov 2013
Project Closing Date	30 Nov 2015

**A. PROJECT FRAMEWORK**

<b>Project Objective:</b> To manage SE Asian forests and biodiversity sustainably by reducing negative environmental, economic and human health consequences of invasive alien species								
Project Components	TA, or STA	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	GEF Financing <sup>a</sup>		Co-Financing <sup>a</sup>		Total (\$) c = a + b
				(\$ a)	%	(\$ b)	%	
1. Establishing National Policy and Institutional Frameworks	STA	(1a) Enabling policy and institutional environment for cross-sectoral prevention and management of IAS strengthened. (1b) Cost-recovery recognized by national agencies as key to long term IAS programming. (1c) Strengthened national regulatory and legal frameworks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ National multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms for cross-sectoral invasive species management</li> <li>▪ National invasive species strategies and action plans agreed</li> <li>▪ Identification of cost recovery mechanism and action plan (only Indonesia)</li> <li>▪ IAS Risk Analysis procedures for quarantine authorities</li> <li>▪ Early detection and rapid response system established (only Indonesia and Vietnam)</li> </ul>	420,000	35	775,635	65	1,195,635
2. Regional Cooperation in SE Asia	STA	(2a) Enhanced transboundary coordination and programming on IAS control for priority forest IAS and pathways.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regional IAS Biocontrol Working Group established including development of Action Plan for biocontrol of shared IAS.</li> <li>▪ Strengthened/developed regional IAS tools for improved management of IAS including database/website (APFISN) and regional IAS Identification Guide</li> </ul>	152,500	21	583,959	79	736,459

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthened regional IAS learning network and information exchange mechanisms, including short-term project staff exchange, between countries.</li> </ul>					
3. National Capacity Building and Institutional Support	STA &TA	(3a) Enhanced collaboration and capacity built through training and other means for multisectoral prevention and management of IAS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National IAS training programmes developed and implemented for different stakeholders (e.g. policy makers, scientists, quarantine officers, extensionists, etc.). (limited in Cambodia and the Philippines)</li> <li>Provision of equipment and material support to quarantine departments, border crossings, etc. (only Indonesia)</li> <li>Support to expanding national capacity in IAS research and related fields (project staff in Cambodia and the Philippines will not attend international meetings)</li> </ul>	565,000	46	650,758	54	1,215,758
4. National Pilots on the Prevention, Control and Management of Priority Forest IAS	TA/ STA	(4a) Improved national field management experience with implementing IAS prevention, control and management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pilot sites established through effective local partnerships, ecosystem management plans developed and implemented and EIA's undertaken if required.</li> <li>Pilot IAS management implementation – maps of distribution of target species produced for each pilot site, testing of at least three control/management strategies at each site, habitat rehabilitation showing increase in biodiversity from baseline, followed by dissemination of results</li> </ul>	624,000	44	788,033	56	1,412,033
5. Information and Awareness Programme	TA& STA	(5a) Enhanced capture and use of information and willingness of stakeholder groups to be involved in IAS management and resource mobilization.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of a national IAS database based on surveys to document presence and absence and impacts of selected forest IAS (limited in Cambodia and the Philippines)</li> <li>Regional standardized communication strategy developed with national activities and regional targets.</li> <li>Undertake comprehensive national and regional awareness/communication campaigns, including development and dissemination of awareness</li> </ul>	882,350	68	420,200	32	1,302,550

			material (limited in Cambodia and the Philippines)					
6. M&E Plan		(6a) Ability to track and monitor project progress and impact performance against prior agreed indicators & benchmarks (6b) Enhanced protection of forest biodiversity hotspots and its associated local community livelihood. (6c) Strengthened national public awareness on IAS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Establish and implement Project M&amp;E Plan</li> <li>▪ Develop and implement pilot site monitoring plans to show improvement in biodiversity and socioeconomic levels from baseline</li> <li>▪ Changes in (national) awareness levels monitored to show increased in IAS awareness across all sectors</li> <li>▪ Midterm review (UNEP independent study)</li> <li>▪ Terminal evaluation (UNEP independent study)</li> </ul>	129,090	45	158,092	55	287,182
7. Project management				308,105	44	385,000	56	693,105
<b>Total project costs</b>				<b>3,081,045</b>		<b>3,761,676</b>		<b>6,842,721</b>

#### B. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT (\$)

<i>Name of Co-financier (source)</i>	<i>Classification</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Cash</b>				
<b>Cambodia government</b>	National government	Grant	200,000	5.3%
<b>Indonesia government</b>	National government	Grant	508,471	13.5%
<b>The Philippines government</b>	National government	Grant	274,034	7.3%
<b>Vietnam government</b>	National government	Grant	269,000	7.2%
<b>Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF) (Australia)</b>	Government Department	Grant	30,000	0.8%
<b>SAMEO BIOTROP (Indonesia)</b>	Regional Agency	Grant	40,681	1.1%
<b>UNEP – Regional Office – Asia Pacific (ROAP)</b>	UN Agency	Grant	37,250	1.0%
<b>World Conservation Society (WCS) (Indonesia)</b>	NGO	Grant	31,000	0.8%
<b>WWF – Asian Rhino and Elephant Action Strategy (AREAS)</b>	NGO	Grant	20,000	0.5%
<b>Sub-total</b>			<b>1,410,436</b>	<b>37.5%</b>
<b>In-kind</b>				
<b>Cambodia</b>	National government	Grant	200,000	5.3%
<b>Indonesia</b>	National government	Grant	659,268	17.5%
<b>The Philippines</b>	National government	Grant	424,851	11.3%
<b>Vietnam</b>	National government	Grant	670,000	17.8%
<b>ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (ACB)</b>	Regional Agency	Grant	25,000	0.7%

<b>Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF) (Australia)</b>	Government Agency	Grant	15,000	0.4%
<b>Kerala Forest Research Institute</b>	National Agency	Grant	40,000	1.1%
<b>Biosecurity Queensland (DEEDI) (Australia)</b>	Government Agency	Grant	40,000	1.1%
<b>CAB International</b>	Executing Agency	Grant	150,000	4.0%
<b>Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (CSIRO) (Australia)</b>	Government Agency	Grant	40,000	1.1%
<b>SAMEO BIOTROP (Indonesia)</b>	Regional Agency	Grant	12,121	0.3%
<b>UNEP – Regional Office – Asia Pacific (ROAP)</b>	UN Agency	Grant	45,000	1.2%
<b>World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC)</b>	UN Agency	Grant	20,000	0.5%
<b>WWF – Asian Rhino and Elephant Action Strategy (AREAS)</b>	NGO	Grant	10,000	0.1%
<i>Sub-total</i>			<b>2,351,240</b>	<b>62.5%</b>
<i>Total</i>			<b>3,761,676</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### C. FINANCING PLAN SUMMARY FOR THE PROJECT (\$)

	<i>Project Preparation a</i>	<i>Project b</i>	<i>Total c = a + b</i>	<i>Agency Fee</i>	<i>For comparison: GEF and Co-financing at PIF</i>
GEF financing	237,500	3,081,045	3,318,545	308,105	3,081,045
Co-financing	275,000	3,761,676	4,036,676		3,646,650
<b>Total</b>	<b>512,500</b>	<b>6,842,721</b>	<b>7,355,221</b>		<b>6,727,695</b>

#### D. GEF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY(IES)<sup>1</sup>

GEF Agency	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
			Project (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total c=a+b
UNEP	Biodiversity	Cambodia	404,545	40,455	445,000
„	„	Indonesia	1,300,000	130,000	1,430,000
„	„	Philippines	522,500	52,250	574,750
„	„	Vietnam	854,000	85,400	939,400
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>			<b>3,081,045</b>	<b>308,105</b>	<b>3,389,150</b>

#### E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

<i>Component</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks</i>	<i>GEF amount(\$)</i>	<i>Co-financing (\$)</i>	<i>Project total (\$)</i>
Local consultants	534.44	292,895	188,802	481,697
International/regional consultants	248.26	147,500	187,250	334,750
<b>Total</b>	<b>783</b>	<b>440,395</b>	<b>376,052</b>	<b>816,447</b>

## F. PROJECT MANAGEMENT BUDGET/COST

<i>Cost Items</i>	<i>Total Estimated person weeks/months</i>	<i>GEF amount (\$)</i>	<i>Co-financing (\$)</i>	<i>Project total (\$)</i>
Local consultants*	208	30,000	0	30,000
International consultants*	208	240,000	14,000	254,000
Office facilities, rental, equipment, vehicles, etc.		2,000	307,000	309,000
Travel and other costs*		36,105	64,000	100,105
<b>Total</b>	<b>416</b>	<b>308,105</b>	<b>385,000</b>	<b>693,105</b>

\* Include project communication costs - reporting/office supplies.

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? yes  no

## H. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M&E PLAN:

Monitoring and evaluation of the project will address project execution, delivery of outputs, project performance and project impact. It will follow UNEP standard monitoring, reporting and evaluation processes and procedures and is consistent with the GEF M&E policy. Narrative and financial project reporting requirements are summarised in Appendix 8 of the UNEP Project Document. Reporting requirements and templates are an integral part of the UNEP legal instrument to be signed by the EA and UNEP. The Project Results Framework presented in Appendix 4 of the Project Document includes SMART indicators for each expected outcome as well as mid-term and end-of-project targets. These indicators, along with the key deliverables and benchmarks listed in Appendix 6, will be the main tools for assessing project implementation progress and whether project results are being achieved. The means of verification and the costs associated with obtaining the information to track the indicators are summarized in Appendix 7 (Costed M&E Plan) of the Project Document. Other M&E related costs are also presented in the costed M&E Plan; some of them integrated in the overall project budget. The most significant of these relate to the assessment of public awareness about IAS at the beginning of the project (baseline) in comparison with that at the end, i.e. the degree of attitude change generated by the project. The M&E plan will be reviewed and revised as necessary during the project inception workshop to ensure that project stakeholders understand their roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis project M&E. Indicators and their means of verification may also be fine-tuned at the inception workshop. Day-to-day project monitoring is the responsibility of the project management team but other project partners will have responsibilities to collect specific information to track the indicators.

It is the responsibility of the International Project Coordinator (Manager) to inform UNEP of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that the appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely fashion. The ISC will receive periodic reports on progress, meet physically at least once annually, and will make recommendations to UNEP concerning the need to revise any aspects of the Results Framework or the M&E plan. Project oversight to ensure that the project conforms to UNEP and GEF policies and procedures is the responsibility of the UNEP-GEF Task Manager, who will also review the quality of draft project outputs, provide feedback to the project partners, and establish peer review procedures to ensure adequate quality of scientific and technical outputs and publications. Project supervision will take an adaptive management approach. The Task Manager will develop a project supervision plan at the inception of the project which will be communicated to the project partners during the inception workshop. The emphasis of the Task Manager supervision will be on outcome monitoring but without neglecting project financial management and implementation monitoring. Progress vis-à-vis delivering the agreed project global environmental benefits will be assessed with the ISC at agreed intervals. Project risks and assumptions will be regularly monitored both by project partners and by UNEP. Risk assessment and rating is an integral part of the annual Project Implementation Review (PIR). The quality of project M&E will also be reviewed and rated as part of the PIR. Key financial parameters will be monitored quarterly to ensure cost effective use of financial resources. The principal means of assessment of project performance will be the mid-term and terminal evaluations. These will provide an opportunity to apply the (new) GEF Tracking Tool for BD Objective II (Part VI on IAS attached as Appendix 15 of the Project Document), and to verify the information it provides. The tracking tool will be updated at mid-term and at the end of the project and will be made available to the GEF Secretariat along with the project PIR report. The mid-term management review (MTR) will take place halfway through the project, at the end of year 2. This will include all parameters

recommended by the GEF Evaluation Office for terminal evaluations. The MTR will be carried out using a participatory approach whereby parties that may benefit or be affected by the project will be consulted. The ISC will participate in the mid-term review and develop a management response to the evaluation recommendations along with an implementation plan. It is the responsibility of the UNEP Task Manager to monitor whether the agreed recommendations are being implemented. An independent terminal evaluation (TE) will take place at the end of project implementation. This will again make use of the GEF Tracking Tool Draft. The Evaluation and Oversight Unit (EOU) of UNEP will manage the TE process. A review of the quality of the evaluation report will be done by EOU and submitted along with the report to the GEF Evaluation Office not later than 6 months after the completion of the evaluation. The standard terms of reference for the TE are included in Appendix 9 of the Project Document. These will be adjusted to the special needs of the project.

**Table G1. Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, with Indicative costs**

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget (GEF & co-finance)	Time Frame
<b>Component 6</b>			
Inception Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ International Project Coordinator</li> <li>▪ UNEP</li> </ul>	GEF US\$12,000	Within 2 months of project start-up
Inception Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ International Project Coordinator</li> </ul>	None	1 month after project inception meeting
Measurement of project indicators (outcome, progress and performance indicators, GEF tracking tools) at national and global level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ International Project Coordinator</li> <li>▪ Consultants/Task Teams to be hired by the NCUs and local implementing agencies</li> </ul>	Total US\$70,090 GEF US\$10,090 Co-finance US\$60,000	Outcome indicators: start, mid and end of project Progress/perform. Indicators: annually
PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ International Project Coordinator</li> <li>▪ NCUs</li> <li>▪ UNEP</li> </ul>	No additional M&E costs	Annually, part of reporting routine
Semi-annual Progress Reports to UNEP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ International Project Coordinator</li> <li>▪ NCUs</li> </ul>	No additional M&E costs	
International Project Steering Committee meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ International Project Coordinator</li> <li>▪ NCUs – national meetings</li> </ul>	Total US\$20,000 GEF US\$10,000 Co-finance US\$10,000	Once a year minimum
Mid Term Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ International Project Coordinator</li> <li>▪ UNEP</li> <li>▪ NCUs</li> <li>▪ Domestic &amp; External consultant(s)</li> </ul>	GEF US\$30,000	At mid-point of project implementation
Terminal Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UNEP</li> <li>▪ External consultant(s)</li> </ul>	GEF US\$20,000	Within 3 months of end of project implementation
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ PMU</li> <li>▪ NEAs</li> </ul>	GEF US\$14,000	Annually
Project Final Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ International Project Coordinator</li> <li>▪ PMU</li> <li>▪ NCUs</li> </ul>	No additional M&E costs	2 months after project completion date
Publication of Lessons Learnt and other project documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ NCUs</li> <li>▪ International Project Coordinator</li> </ul>	No additional M&E costs	Annually, part of Semi-annual reports & Project Final Report
Visits to field sites and NEA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ NCU</li> <li>▪ International Project Coordinator</li> </ul>	Total US\$40,000 GEF US\$5,000 Co-finance US\$35,000	Quarterly for PY 1&2, half yearly for PY3&4
Develop and implement pilot site monitoring plans (BD & socio-economic)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ International Project Coordinator</li> <li>▪ NCUs</li> </ul>	Total US\$48,000 GEF US\$19,000 Co-finance US\$29,000	From year 1
Awareness impact survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ International Project Coordinator</li> <li>▪ NCUs</li> </ul>	Total US\$33,000 GEF US\$9,000 Co-finance US\$24,092	From year 1
<b>Indicative budget for M&amp;E Plan</b>		<b>Total US\$287,182 GEF US\$129,090</b>	

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget (GEF & co-finance)	Time Frame
		Co-finance US\$ 158,092	

## **PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

### **A. STATE THE ISSUE, HOW THE PROJECT SEEKS TO ADDRESS IT, AND THE EXPECTED GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS TO BE DELIVERED:**

Invasive alien species (IAS) are recognized as one of the major threats to global biodiversity. In SE Asia, invasive alien species (IAS) are adversely affecting local and globally significant biodiversity, and are invading and threatening forest habitats, species and their production capacity, as well as, indirectly, the livelihoods of millions of people depending on forests for food, commodities & energy security, as well as a healthy living environment. Some IAS have proven health impacts on humans and livestock (skin, respiration). Invasive species are distinct from 'pests' in specifically having additional negative impacts on ecosystem services including stable hydrology for water supply and containment of floods; soil productivity, pollination functions, and containment of crop diseases for food crop production. Forest industries, particularly (Dipterocarp) hardwood production, tree crop plantations, and other monoculture stands are losing significant production potential and incurring high forest maintenance costs (e.g. invasive plant clearing, replanting). Logged-over forests in particular have problems with natural regeneration because their disturbed state allows easy access for IAS. Some of the damage caused by IAS is irreversible, particularly to biodiversity in protected natural areas. Invasions are also associated with 'disturbance' through human impacts along forest margins and waterways, on logged-over sites, and in buffer zones surrounding protected areas and forest.

Partially as a result of large-scale deforestation and forest degradation in this region, the problem has become more serious over the last few decades. This has been compounded by inadequate awareness and available information, lack of national IAS management and monitoring policies and mechanisms, and the impacts of globalization such as increasing trade, tourism and transport. Since the problem is global and trans-boundary in nature, it requires both international and regional level cooperation to supplement the actions being taken by governments, private and non-governmental sectors at the national and local levels. Southeast Asia remains one of the most heavily forested regions of the world: over 48 percent of the land area is under forest cover compared to only 18 percent for Asia as a whole and less than 30 percent globally. Southeast Asia is home to about half of the world's terrestrial and marine biodiversity. Compared to other regions in the world little has been done in SE Asian countries to contain the invasive species problem, not only in production forests but also in protected forests and buffer zones. Again, this can be traced back to a weak institutional environment, low awareness about the present day scale of the problem, unavailability of critical information or exchange mechanisms, inadequate implementation of prevention and control, and lack of the necessary science and management capacity in IAS. Additionally few if any countries in the region have developed cost recovery mechanisms to deal with the growing cost of invasive species prevention and control. Reportedly this is also an issue in developed countries like Australia where ongoing invasive species control is paid for by public funding rather than through mechanisms such as the 'consumer or polluter pays' principle.

The Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP) supported countries in South and SE Asia in 2002 to summarize species, threats and impacts of IAS in the region, including recommended actions (see e.g. Pallewatta, N., J.K. Reaser, and A.T. Gutierrez, 2003, 'Invasive Alien Species in South-Southeast Asia: National Reports & Directory of Resources'; or from same authors: 2003, 'Prevention and Management of Invasive Alien Species: Proceedings of a Workshop on Forging Cooperation throughout South and Southeast Asia'). This project responds directly to those identified needs and priorities. For the region, due to the serious negative impacts of IAS especially on biodiversity, economy and livelihoods, strong national and regional institutions working in a collaborative way with high capacity are needed to reduce the negative impacts of IAS. The project will target four SE Asian countries which have not yet established effective IAS programmes, and which will act as pilots to test new mechanisms to assess key national and regional pathways for forest infestations; to develop technical as well as institutional prevention and control mechanisms to remove capacity and knowledge barriers; and to work towards replication and expansion to neighbouring countries through capturing and dissemination of best practices. The project will be supported by the Asia-Pacific Forest Invasive Species Network (APFISN) and the ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (ACB), and will also provide training and regional workshops. Higher priority should be given to IAS control and management in national policies, and more funding allocated through specific cost recovery mechanisms.

Lack of awareness of the negative effects of IAS, as well as insufficient coordination between related departments, sectors and stakeholders, are additional issues to be addressed in the four project countries, with a focus on better cooperation, shared priority IAS and effective control mechanisms, as well as increasing resource mobilization.

This project aims to assist the countries through capacity building, awareness raising, development of efficient national policies, IAS control & management field testing, and sharing knowledge and experiences through collaborative working. Expected global benefits include contributions to reducing the loss of forest biodiversity and the damage to natural forest ecosystems, as well as reducing the negative impacts of IAS on national economies and local livelihoods.

Project implementation will be based on five inter-related components that will directly address the identified barriers through the following components and associated outcomes: (full details of Component activities etc. can be found in UNEP document Section 3.3. such as e.g. on pilot IAS prevention and control activities, as well as the habitat rehabilitation scheduled under Component 4).

**Component 1: *Establishing National Policy and Institutional Frameworks***

- Outcome 1a. Enabling policy and institutional environment for cross-sectoral prevention and management of IAS strengthened
- Outcome 1b. Cost-recovery recognized by national agencies as key to long-term IAS programming
- Outcome 1c. Strengthened national regulatory and legal frameworks

During the PPG, countries assessed their national needs, priorities and actions concerning IAS, all major related sectors and all major potential introduction pathways. Using the baseline of existing sector strategies, and following a multisectoral consultative process, recommendations for national IAS policy and legal frameworks will be developed by national teams assisted by the project. Key stakeholders from all relevant sectors will be involved in the development of national IAS strategies, which will make reference to the management of all IAS, not just those affecting forest biodiversity. The active participation of policy makers and government institutions will also be crucial to their agreement and implementation. At the beginning of the project a National Steering Committee (NSC) will be set up in each country to oversee development of a National Invasive Species Strategy and Action Plan (NISSAP) as well as to guide the overall strategic direction of the project and to ensure coherence and integration of the project components. The role of the NSC in project management is discussed further in Section 4 of the UNEP project document. At the end of the project a cross-sectoral working group, based on the NSC and including representatives of the major IAS stakeholders, will be formally constituted to continue coordination of actions relating to IAS at a national level. By the end of the FSP, all four countries are thus expected to possess a functional coordination mechanism as well as a NISSAP. One of the most important outputs of this component will be the identification of cost recovery mechanisms which will contribute to the sustainability of IAS activities in each country. Adequate resources are required to implement many of the policies/strategies developed during the project period.

Prevention is a key component of IAS management, and is considered to be the most cost-effective management option because it prevents the introduction of a plant or animal species which, if given the opportunity to establish, would have a negative impact on biodiversity, agriculture, water resources, and/or human and animal health. The best way to prevent the introduction of a potential pest is to undertake a Pest Risk Assessment (PRA) prior to importation, an activity which is generally undertaken by national quarantine departments. The development of a PRA system, in the four countries, to include an analysis of all imported plants will largely contribute to a reduction in the importation of invasive and potentially invasive plant species. However, in many cases plant species are inadvertently introduced and establish in the field where they proliferate and spread undetected. The early detection of new pest incursions and a rapid response to their presence is therefore critical to any management programme. To this end an early detection and rapid response (ED & RR) mechanism will be developed. However, an ED & RR mechanism can only be implemented if the invasive species is detected and its distribution known. To this end national surveys will be conducted to detect the presence and impacts of selected IAS, under Component 5.

One of the outcomes of the UNEP/GEF MSP “Development of Best Practices and Dissemination of Lessons Learned for Dealing with the Global Problem of Alien Species that Threaten Biological Diversity” was to develop best practice guidelines which included “Climate Change & Invasives; and Early Warning Systems” as part of the ‘Toolkit for Best Prevention and Management Practices of Invasive Alien Species’. The national working groups responsible for strategy development will draw upon these guidelines to ensure that the key elements are fully considered within each strategy.



**Component 2: *Regional Cooperation in SE Asia***

Outcome 2a.: Enhanced transboundary coordination and programming on IAS control for priority forest IAS and pathways

The main aims of this component are to benefit from increased information exchange; to build capacity on priority IAS shared by the countries; to build the case for more effective and cost efficient IAS control methods (specifically on biocontrol); and to expand the partnership on applying ‘best practice’ methods through cooperation with regional networks and organizations, specifically APFISN as well as ACB. APFISN has already drafted a Regional Forest Invasive Species Strategy but it is considered more effective and beneficial to the countries’ national programmes to focus on a few aspects of the regional strategy only (e.g. priority shared IAS and biocontrol) rather than developing a comprehensive action plan for the region.

The regional dimension of the project will be coordinated by CABI and overseen by an International Steering Committee (ISC) which will meet at least once a year throughout the project period. Regional cooperation will enhance the focus as well as the capacity of countries to manage IAS more effectively, especially in regions where the cross-border movement of goods and services is difficult to monitor effectively. In addition, the costs of IAS management, especially for invasive species present in more than one country, can be shared, a considerable cost saving. This is especially relevant in cases where the introduction of host-specific and damaging biocontrol agents can benefit a number of countries. The project support towards establishment of an ‘IAS Biocontrol Working Group’ and development of an Action Plan for the biocontrol of IAS will contribute to regional cooperation and more cost-effective IAS management. Support for this initiative will be enhanced by working with the International Organization of Biological Control (IOBC) and specifically its regional section – Asia and the Pacific (APRS). Economies of scale as well sharing of best practice will greatly benefit the countries in their efforts to manage forest IAS.

Building the case for the acceptance of biological control as one of the most cost-effective management strategies will be further enhanced by working closely with agencies in the region that have considerable experience in this field. These include Australian organizations such as Biosecurity Queensland (DEEDI) and CSIRO who have been involved in biocontrol programmes in SE Asia in the past and have worked with regional partners such as SEAMEO BIOTROP. Regional training workshops will enhance countries’ understanding of the benefits of this “technology” while a staff exchange programme will allow researchers to gain insights into biocontrol firsthand. Capacity in IAS management will be further enhanced by developing e-learning modules/training courses which will be made accessible to learners, teachers/lecturers and other stakeholders on the APFISN website. This will clearly benefit those countries and territories not participating directly in the project.

**Component 3: *National Capacity Building and Institutional Support.***

Outcome 3a.: Enhanced collaboration and capacity built through training and other means for multisectoral prevention and management of IAS

A capacity building programme will be implemented based on the needs expressed by project partners during the PPG and identified through a review of various documents, including the NBSAPs and national reports to the CBD. The primary focus of the programme will be on human resources, with necessary training provided to existing staff who are involved directly or indirectly in the management of IAS. Training will include modules on IAS in existing courses, short courses on topics such as IAS awareness, risk analysis, control methods and identification skills, longer post-graduate training in areas such as IAS impact and management, environmental economics and environmental law. The project will also facilitate and support (as far as GEF resources allow) additional IAS research projects linked to pilot site activities. Some suggested research projects to be undertaken at pilot sites include impacts of selected IAS on biodiversity (plants, insects, birds, small mammals). The efficacy of various control methods could also be determined, including their cost effectiveness.

Training modules or courses will be developed by national and/or international specialists using the ‘Toolkit for Best Prevention and Management Practices of Invasive Alien Species’ and other resources developed by GISP. In addition, the agencies in Australia mentioned under Component 2, and the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF) (Australia), will host or contribute to regional training workshops which will include training in the identification of IAS to enable the development of national IAS inventories and monitoring programmes under Component 4. To further contribute to sustainability, countries will also need to ensure that IAS training/research programmes/modules are

integrated into the curricula of 1-2 national universities in each country. These universities will contribute to building a better understanding of the impacts and management of IAS.

This capacity building programme is typically multisectoral and not restricted to forestry only. Some essential equipment will be provided to quarantine services (particularly inspection units at border points such as air and sea ports), and to IAS control units, including a rapid response team if requested by the countries. Equipment could include plant identification guides, microscopes, hand lenses and GPS.

**Component 4: National Pilots on the Prevention, Control and Management of Priority Forest IAS.**

Outcome 4a. Improved national field management experience with implementing IAS prevention, control, and management.

The main purposes of Component 4 are to give the country teams first-hand experience of techniques and tools for IAS management and control, to monitor the spread of IAS in and around high conservation value forests, to establish national partnerships, and to raise awareness of the importance of field level action. However these pilot programmes are not specifically aimed at achieving significant levels of IAS control or clearing large areas in these sites, as the available project resources do not allow for that. The main purpose is to test effective mechanisms which, combined with the national frameworks, will enable the countries to take more effective national action, replicate best practice, and sustain the project outcomes.

An important first step and baseline will be to document the status and impact of selected IAS already present in each country through surveys addressing biological, social, and economic impacts, building on some of the baseline information provided during the PPG. Information, including indigenous knowledge on various management options used by communities, will be compiled in a database which will be easily accessible to stakeholders and updated on a regular basis (APFISN website). Control programmes will adopt participatory approaches where appropriate, to allow resolution of potential conflicts, to improve sustainability and to contribute to awareness raising. The impact of control operations will be monitored and documented to allow improvement to procedures in the future, and to provide evidence of the value of IAS control. Pilot sites for practical control operations on existing invasive species were identified during the PPG, and surveys conducted to assess the extent of the invasion. Monitoring protocols will be developed at the initiation of the project in order to provide baseline data. The monitoring will continue throughout the project as the control programmes are implemented, providing indicators of progress with respect to both the invasive plants and the biodiversity at the site.

The pilot sites were selected based on a number of criteria (further details on the pilot sites and programmes are given in Section 3.3. of main UNEP document, and on the selection criteria in Appendix 16):

- Importance in terms of forest biodiversity
- Presence of well-established and well-known invasive plant species
- Amenable to control activities

The five pilot sites, Prek Toal Bird Sanctuary in the TSBR (Cambodia); Baluran N.P. and Bukit Barisan Selatan N.P (Indonesia); Allah Valley Watershed Forest Reserve (Philippines); and Cuc Phuong N.P. (Vietnam), are all rich in forest floral and faunal diversity and host a number of endemic and endangered species, all of which are threatened, amongst others, by one or more invasive alien plant species including *Mimosa pigra*, *Acacia nilotica*, *Merremia peltata*, *Piper aduncum*, and *Mimosa diplotricha*. Management trials will focus on the development of best practice and contribute to a better understanding of the impacts of IAS on biodiversity and in some cases rural livelihoods, and of how best to manage them, including restoration. Although the resources available to the project will not allow clearance of large areas of IAS, these combined activities should restore biodiversity in the targeted sub-areas and contribute to overall improved IAS management in the surrounding areas, nationally, and regionally by disseminating information on the most cost-effective management strategies. These activities will all be undertaken by a number of collaborating actors, including government departments/agencies, NGOs, private sector, and communities, all working together to enhance biodiversity conservation.

**Component 5: Information and Awareness Programme.**

Outcome 5a. Enhanced capture and use of information and willingness of stakeholder groups to be involved in IAS management and resource mobilization

Based on the experience of UNEP and CABI in similar IAS initiatives, one of the most important activities of national IAS programmes will be the development of a national awareness/communication strategy to ensure that all information on IAS gleaned from other sources and as a result of project activities is effectively shared among all stakeholders. The regional learning network planned under Component 2, the national IAS coordination units (Component 1), and the specific target groups within government, universities and research agencies, as well as local communities in pilot sites, are the main clients. We anticipate that national lessons and best practices specifically related to effective control measures will be disseminated and adopted by other countries through the communication services. The communication strategy will be updated regularly based on midterm and end-of-project assessments/reviews of the various awareness techniques and material used during the FSP.

A multisectoral approach to knowledge management and dissemination is key to the successful uptake of the project outputs. This component will target a wide range of stakeholders to ensure that the project findings are translated into accessible messages, recommendations and guidelines that will lead to positive action against forest IAS at every stakeholder level from senior policy makers to the general public. The pilot sites, including the project activities with local stakeholders, will act as effective media for promoting IAS management and control with site managers (from, for example, the Forest Department), protected area staff and local government, as well as at the local/community level. The management trials will be conducted in such a way that the participant groups (e.g. community members or government departments/agencies) will be able to compare various strategies. Factsheets will be developed for distribution amongst key stakeholder groups so that they can implement effective strategies for the control of selected IAS. Importantly, local schools will also be targeted, with lectures about IAS issues and visits to the pilot sites.

At the regional and global level, the project outcomes will be channeled through ACB, APFISN, and other strategic partners. National and regional delegates will also be encouraged to attend regional and international symposia, including the Asia-Pacific Weed Science Society Conferences, which will provide the opportunity for an exchange of experiences.

#### ***Component 6: Monitoring and Evaluation Plan***

- Outcome 6a. Ability to track and monitor project progress and impact performance against prior agreed indicators and benchmarks
- Outcome 6b. Enhanced protection of forest biodiversity hotspots and its associated local community livelihood.
- Outcome 6c. Strengthened national public awareness on IAS

Monitoring protocols will be developed at the initiation of the project in order to provide baseline data. The monitoring will continue throughout the project as the control programmes are implemented at the pilot sites, providing indicators of progress with respect to both the IAS and the biodiversity at the site. Monitoring changes in awareness levels is also critical to determine the efficacy of the awareness strategy. This will be determined by undertaking regular surveys of various stakeholder groups which have been targeted in the awareness campaign.

#### **B. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH NATIONAL/REGIONAL PRIORITIES/PLANS:**

**Regional:** All four countries covered by this proposal have identified the threat of IAS to their ecosystems, biodiversity, agriculture, community health and economic growth as a major concern. They also mention the need to manage IAS invasions in their NBSAPs and in their various National Reports to the CBD in which they state that a lack of policy, awareness, capacity, and resources hampers any effective implementation of Article 8(h) of the CBD. In a synthesis of eight regional workshops on invasive species held around the world, including SE Asia, by GISP and three of its partners, every region identified six major gaps in common: insufficient technical capacity, institutional coordination, political will, public awareness, policy and legal frameworks, and financial resources<sup>1</sup>. Representatives from South and SE Asia identified the following priority actions in terms of improved coordination (GISP, 2003):

- Provide greater co-ordination between national institutions to permit consensus on IAS management;
- Establish or strengthen IAS focal points at all levels;
- Identify and define the roles of existing national and regional institutions;
- Identify lead agencies and prioritize programmes;
- Establish regional coordination mechanisms.

---

<sup>1</sup> Barnard, P. and Waage, J.K. (2004) Tackling species invasions around the world: regional response to the invasive alien species threat. Global Invasive Species Programme, Cape Town, South Africa.

The lack of capacity/awareness on IAS issues at a regional level is also evident. According to Peh (2010), “The lack of research capacity and financial support from governments, and the inability to disseminate scholarly data in international journals are the possible reasons for the dearth of research literature on biological invasions from the region.”<sup>2</sup> For example, from 2006 to 2008, invasive species in SE Asia were the subject of less than 0.5% of scientific publications on biological invasions in a number of relevant journals. None of the research papers on biological invasions in SE Asia that were published during this time had invasive plants as their subject, even though invasive plant species in the whole of SE Asia make-up more than one-third of the known total invasive biota.

However, some action is being taken to enhance cooperation and build awareness/capacity at a regional level. The APFISN, coordinated by the FAO, has already written a draft Regional Invasive Species Strategy and Action Plan and established national focal points to coordinate the work within countries. The project will build upon this and enhance national programming and capacity.

#### Specifically per country:

The project will also contribute to information which will be included in the revised or new NBSAPs pertaining to IAS policies; increased awareness; and the distribution and impacts of IAS and their management. The project will seek to increase the number of references and actions pertaining to IAS in the NBSAP. The project has also linkages with some of the set priority programs under the UNDAF frameworks in Indonesia and Cambodia. More details on this to be found in Section 3.6 of UNEP project document

**Cambodia:** Cambodia has ratified and endorsed several international conventions/agreements in relation to IAS (CBD, IPPC, IMO, RAMSAR, WTO) in an effort to mainstream conservation, management and utilization of biodiversity, natural resources and associated assets. Some national legislation also makes reference to IAS issues and the NBSAP (2002) mentions IAS and the threat they pose to biodiversity. Under “Theme 2 - Animal Wildlife Resources” invasions of exotic species are seen as a key issue and a reduction in the impact of IAS on indigenous animal species as a strategic objective. However, IAS are not seen as a key threat to forest and wild plant resources (Theme 5) despite evidence that there are many invasive plants in Cambodia that are known to threaten forests elsewhere.

According to the 4th National Report to the CBD (2010), “there do not seem to be any documented cases of detrimental effects caused by alien invasive species in Cambodia.” The report does not list IAS as a threat to forests but does mention other species that pose a threat to freshwater biodiversity. It states that “Cambodia has not taken nationwide action to control potential IAS”, that control measures are carried out individually, ad-hoc and case-by-case, and that Cambodia “does not have a plan or concrete policy to get rid of potential invasive species.” It goes on, “Limited studies have been undertaken on the presence, distribution and impacts of pests on crops but not on their threats to other biodiversity” and “A few training workshops were organized to enhance awareness of the presence and potential impact of alien weeds.” The section ends by stating that there is limited knowledge of and capacity to explore the potential impacts of alien species.

The 4<sup>th</sup> Report to the CBD also acknowledges that “institutional capacity of some agencies is not sufficient and needs to be strengthened and developed”. The MoE is not “adequately empowered as the lead agency in biodiversity conservation and protection in general.” The lack of human and financial resources, capacity and support for the CBD is evident, according to the Report. There also seems to be little coordination between government departments to protect biodiversity: “There appear to be no mechanisms for coordinating environmental protection between competing agencies, at least not at functional levels.”<sup>3</sup> There is also little or no lateral linkage between agencies and corporate or collaborative management is almost entirely absent. Based on this analysis it would be fair to say that there is currently little coordination with regard to the management of IAS in Cambodia. Recently, however, key government institutions namely the Ministry of Environment (MOE), Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), Ministry of Commerce and other relevant stakeholders undertook to collaborate in order to prevent and control any further IAS infestations in Cambodia. The intention is also to review the laws and regulations pertaining to IAS.

---

<sup>2</sup> Peh, K S.-H (2010) Invasive species in Southeast Asia: the knowledge so far. *Biodiversity Conservation* 19: 1083-1099.

<sup>3</sup> Clarke, J.E. (1999) Biodiversity and Protected Areas – Cambodia. Regional Environmental Technical Assistance 5771, Poverty Reduction & Environmental Management in Remote Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS), Watersheds Project (Phase 1) at <http://mekonginfo.org>

In addition, the recent promulgation of sub-decree no. 15 on Plant Quarantine aims to prevent the introduction of exotic or alien pest species into the territory of Cambodia, the spread of pests from one territory to another or to other countries through any means of transportation in order to protect agricultural production and biodiversity. The Protected Area Law, Chapter 8, Article 41, Permit and Prohibition, and Environmental and Social Impacts Assessment of the Law of Protected Areas, states that “Each protected area shall be protected against destructive practices or harm caused by illegal land claims, collection, commercialization, pollution in the areas containing valuable biological resources, forest fires, swidden agriculture, **transmission of diseases and pests including invasive plants and animals**”. The National Forest Programme does not refer directly to invasive species, but to the conservation of biodiversity and natural resources.

There have been limited efforts to manage invasive plant species in Cambodia, and most if not all are restricted to the aquatic IAS in the Tonle Sap Biosphere Reserve (TSBR). This is probably largely as a result of lack of policy, awareness, and capacity. The WCS report on IAS in the TSBR stated that, “Managers also lacked the knowledge on how to control invasive alien species and a lack of prioritization meant that there was very little funding available for any eradication efforts.” However, there have been some efforts by the Wildlife and Wetlands Trust of BirdLife International to initiate some mimosa control activities in Beoung Prek Lapouv in the TSBR.

The success of national forestry programmes is largely dependent on the outcomes of the proposed IAS project. The National Forestry Programme (NFP) for 2010-2030 aims to establish a workable social and policy framework for the sustainable management of all forests. The NFP comprises strategies as well as mechanisms for their implementation, monitoring and evaluation. It aims to set directions and milestones for the development of the forests of Cambodia and their management to help society gain maximum, long-term sustainable benefits from the forests, in term of livelihoods and environmental services, as well as contributing to overall socioeconomic development. One of the main aims of the NFP is to maintain and recognize ecosystems and environmental services provided by forests, and the biological diversity within them. The intention is to increase the size of community forests from 400,000 ha to 2 million ha, and that of protection forests from 1.5 to 3 million ha.

**Indonesia:** The NBSAP (2003) acknowledges that the introduction of exotic species has often been done with little consideration for their ecological aspect and negative impacts on local species: “Consequently their competition with local species often led to the loss of the latter.” Despite this reference to IAS the NBSAP only refers in any detail to the problem of *Acacia nilotica* in Baluran N.P. However, in the National Biodiversity Action Plan (2003-2020) to enhance institutional capacity and policy instruments for biodiversity management, a need is expressed to develop a programme for “controlling and preventing the spread of invasive wild as well as cultivated species” with a performance indicator that the spread of invasive species is controlled, starting in 2003. In the 4th National Report to the CBD (2009) the introduction of alien species is seen as one of the main threats to biodiversity. According to the report there are approximately 339 invasive alien plant species in Indonesia. Progress with regard to the management of IAS by 2010 indicates that inspections for potential IAS are undertaken at ports in accordance with the IPPC and that lists of some invasive alien plants and animals have been produced but that there are still no plans in place to effectively manage IAS, a programme which was supposed to be initiated in 2003. A related target was to have invasive species under control in Baluran, Wasur and Yosefa Strait – the former is one of the selected pilot sites where control efforts to date have been unsuccessful. Based on some of these experiences the Indonesian government and research officials (GISP, 2003) recognized the need to:

- Conduct applied research to find alternative control methods;
- Develop strategies and guidelines to control and eradicate IAS;
- Establish national legislation on prevention and control of IAS;
- Involve local people around national parks and managed forests to mitigate the impacts of IAS.

The Indonesian government has already initiated some of these activities. Since early 2009, the Quarantine Agency (MoA), in collaboration with other institutions involved in IAS management such as BIOTROP, the Ministries of Forestry, Agriculture, Environment and Fish and Marine, and some scientists, have been developing a document that will be used as a basis to develop or draft a Presidential Decree regarding the prevention, control and eradication of invasive species. In June 2011, it was agreed that the evolving Decree on the National Strategy and Action Plan for Invasive Species Management would be coordinated under the MoE. Once it is drafted and endorsed, this policy document will be used as the basis for each relevant sector to develop their own policies and regulations dealing with IAS issues.

The project will also support and strengthen efforts by the Ministry of Forestry which listed five national priorities for forest development and management over the period of 2005-2009, including priority programmes such as the acceleration of reforestation, an activity which will be hampered without effective IAS management systems. In May 2010 the Indonesian government also signed a letter of intent to conduct REDD implementation activities in preparation for full implementation of REDD. IAS contributes to forest degradation and inhibit restoration efforts.

**Philippines:** Protection of natural forests from the impacts of exotic species is partially covered under the 1996 'Risk Assessment Tool for Potentially Harmful Exotic Species' developed by the NCBP-DOST, a general policy which prohibits the introduction of exotic species into Protected Areas. The DENR's rule on the use of indigenous species in reforestation projects and nature enhancement projects may also reduce the intentional introduction of IAS. Except in the case of Protected Areas, however, the use of invasive plant species is not specifically prohibited. Despite this the 4th report to the CBD lists IAS as one of the main threats to forest ecosystems. This can probably be attributed to a host of factors. In 2006 a multi-stakeholder conference/workshop on IAS was convened by the DENR-PAWB and WorldFish Centre in collaboration with partners from various stakeholder groups. As a result the Marikina Resolution to develop and strengthen partnerships for the management of IAS was adopted. The Resolution identified four major areas for action:

- Research on IAS and government support for such research;
- Information and education to build public awareness;
- Networking for information sharing and capacity building; and
- A national policy and management strategy for IAS.

Taking note of the Resolution, the Philippines is drafting an IAS national framework that will improve collaborative efforts involving government, private industry, academic institutions, LGUs, local communities and interested stakeholders in the management of IAS. This has come about after it was recognized that there are no known management plans in place for major alien species that threaten biodiversity. Quarantine regulations are also being addressed but need strengthening to include risk analysis of all introduced plants.

These activities will contribute to those outlined in the current Philippine National REDD+ Strategy (PNRPS) which aims to promote productive forestry activities to maintain and enhance forest ecosystem services, "including carbon retention capacity and biodiversity protection, while adequately and equitably addressing human needs, especially of forest-dependent communities and in consideration of the Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act." In order to achieve this, the PNRPS proposes to identify and improve on forest management regimes for both protection and production forests and to expand the protected areas network in a way that a local communities and multiple use.

**Vietnam:** There are a number of invasive species in Vietnam including the yellow snail (*Pomacea caniculata*), coypu (*Myocastor coypus*), khapra beetle (*Trogoderma granarium*) and giant mimosa (*Mimosa pigra*) which pose a threat to biodiversity, agriculture, and human health. Studies undertaken during the PPG suggest that in addition to these species water hyacinth (*Eichhornia crassipes*), lantana (*Lantana camara*), the white butterflyfish (*Piaractus mesopotamicus*) the tybe fish (*Hypostomis punctatus*), the red-eared turtle (*Trachemys scripta*), the coconut leaf eating insect (*Brontispa longissima*) and the pine caterpillar (*Dendromilus punctatus*) are known to be significant issues in the country. The management of these species is acknowledged in the 4<sup>th</sup> Report to the CBD, which states the need to develop IAS inventories as well as to develop and implement strategies to prevent, control and manage IAS. Some studies have already been undertaken on prevention and management of IAS, and the agriculture and fishery sectors have released "examination procedures" for imported alien species.

The management of IAS is enhanced by the Vietnamese regulations on Plant Quarantine (Article 16) which state that "it is strictly forbidden to introduce into Vietnam live parts of any growth stage of plant species covered by the plant quarantine list, or potentially harmful alien species....." Various Departments including Crop Production, Forestry, Plant Protection, and Animal Health within the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD) are currently responsible for the screening associated with the importation of all plant and animal species. MARD also takes overall responsibility for the management of introduced plants and animals within Vietnam. The General Department of Customs and local customs authorities are responsible for the control and inspection of permitted species in accordance with current legislation. In addition, the Vietnamese Law on Forest Protection and Development (2004) states that it is illegal to keep, plant, or release non-native animal and plant species into Special Use Forests without permission from the relevant authorities. The

management of IAS is further strengthened in the Biodiversity Law (2008) which has a section devoted to IAS management.

Vietnam also has a reasonable history and experience with IAS inventories and management, although there does not seem to be coherence in national methodologies, focused efforts, or reports on their success or failure (important for replication). Significant efforts have been made to control *Mimosa pigra* throughout Vietnam, including the introduction of biocontrol agents. There have also been attempts to control *Merremia boissiana* and agents have been introduced for the control of water hyacinth. Despite these successes with regard to IAS management, national partners defined the following priorities for Vietnam during an ACB workshop in Hanoi (December 2008):

- Collecting information on IAS present in Vietnam;
- Gaining experience with successful IAS control measures
- Raising awareness on the threat and impacts of invasive species in Vietnam;
- Enacting regulations on biosecurity and IAS;
- Strengthening measures by controlling the import and release of biocontrol agents.

The proposed IAS project will support and strengthen the Forest Development Strategy (2006-2020) which aims to sustainably establish, manage, protect, and utilize 16.24 million ha. of forest land; to increase forest cover to 43% by 2010 and to 47% by 2020; to increase the contribution of forests to socioeconomic development, environmental protection, biodiversity conservation and environmental services supply; and to reduce poverty and improve the livelihoods of rural mountainous people. Sustainable IAS management could also benefit from Decree 99, Payments for Forest Environment Services Policy, which was introduced in 2010 and mandates payments for ecosystem services, since IAS diminish the capacity of forests to provide ecosystem services.

#### **C. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH GEF STRATEGIES AND STRATEGIC PROGRAMMES:**

IAS potentially affects all ecosystems and their related biodiversity, as well as many human production systems such as agriculture, fisheries and forestry. The project will target national frameworks, strategies, funding and capacity building in all these ecosystems and production sectors, although due to restricted resources the project pilot sites will be specific to forest ecosystems, particularly protection and production forests. The proposed intervention thus fits particularly well with the BD Strategic Programme 7 (SP-7), 'Prevention, control and management of invasive alien species', which has as its objective 'to halt or reverse ecosystem degradation and reduction in biodiversity due to the spread of invasive alien species'. The intervention will also contribute to achieving the SFM Strategic Objective SO-2: 'sustainable management and use of forest resources by developing institutional and organizational capacity to build cross-sectoral partnerships'. These GEF Focal Area Strategies highlight the findings of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment as well as CBD guidance, which identified the spread of invasive species as one of the five major direct drivers of change in biodiversity and ecosystems. All four countries in Southeast Asia participating in this project have important and vulnerable high biodiversity ecosystems.

The proposed project builds upon the experience and best practices gained through other GEF-supported IAS projects (see also section E below), and draws on GEF guidance to apply the growing knowledge base of GEF in biodiversity conservation globally as well as nationally. One such example is to focus more on building understanding of and willingness to adopt biocontrol rather than mechanic and chemical control methods, as well as focusing on good data (e.g. taxonomy of IAS), national baselines, and monitoring programmes, including economic impacts of key selected species.

#### **D. JUSTIFY THE TYPE OF FINANCING SUPPORT PROVIDED WITH THE GEF RESOURCES:**

This is a capacity building project with a strong emphasis on learning from demonstration/pilot activities that can attain tangible biodiversity benefits in both the forestry production and conservation sectors. The non-refundable GEF financial support will be used to strengthen human and institutional capacity, as well as to test small-scale prevention, control and monitoring measures in a well-planned and strategized fashion.

#### **E. OUTLINE THE COORDINATION WITH OTHER RELATED INITIATIVES:**

Although there are no other ongoing GEF-funded IAS projects in the four countries, several regional/global GEF projects are underway elsewhere, in various stages of development and implementation, with which linkages and exchange of best practices will be sought. These include the UNEP-GEF Project, "Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in

Africa” which will be completed in mid-2011 but will still have strong relevance as it will provide the opportunity to share experiences and lessons learnt during the implementation of this project. There is considerable overlap between the Africa and proposed SE Asia projects, with a focus on strengthening policy, building capacity, and creating awareness. The Africa project also focused on invasive plants at pilot sites, and these will be targeted in SE Asia. Another very relevant project is the regional UNEP-GEF Project, “Mitigating the Threats of Invasive Alien Species in the Insular Caribbean,” which unlike the SE Asia project, targets various taxonomic groups at pilot site level but is similar in that it has a large regional component. Another UNEP-GEF Project is about to start in Cameroon, “Development and Implementation of a National Monitoring and Control System (framework) for Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) and Invasive Alien Species (IAS)” under the GEF Biosafety Programme. There is also currently a UNEP-GEF Project, “Prevention, Control, and Management of Invasive Alien Species in the Pacific Islands.” CABI is involved in most of these initiatives or in close collaboration through its former GISP partners such as IUCN and TNC. In most of these projects UNEP has been the Implementing Agency since it has a comparative advantage as an IA compared to other agencies because the problem of IAS is trans-boundary in nature and as such its management justifies a regional approach, to integrate and harmonise policy and management procedures, share information and experiences, and develop strongly science-based tools for decision-making and planning. UNEP has been at the forefront of establishing IAS programmes under GEF, and has successfully completed a number of IAS projects such as the Best Practices for Dealing with IAS. The project put invasives on the agenda of the CBD, established increased awareness on invasive species globally, particularly in the developing world; enacted the institutionalization of the GISP, developed scientific and early response capacity, and strengthened international agreements on invasive species. UNEP is developing a series of highly innovative IAS projects which will be part of the planned UNEP-wide IAS programme under the global Ecosystem Management Programme strategy.

In addition to the above mentioned projects and initiatives the latest database records from the GEF<sup>4</sup> shows that there are a number of projects related to forest conservation or sustainable forest management in SE Asia which are of relevance. The project will attempt to establish linkages with some of them:

- Cambodia:
  - SFM strengthening sustainable forest management and the development of bio-energy markets to promote environmental sustainability and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Cambodia (UNDP)
- Indonesia:
  - Promoting sustainable production forest management to secure globally important biodiversity (WB/IBRD)
  - SFM strengthening community-based forest and watershed management (SCBFWM) (UNDP)
  - SFM rehabilitation and sustainable use of peatland forests in SE Asia (IFAD)
  - SFM sustainable forest and biodiversity management in Borneo (ADB)
  - Expanding Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification at landscape level through incorporating additional ecosystem services (UNEP). Linkages could be established with regard to species selection for certified forest plantations, cost recovery mechanisms and development of national certification standards.
  - Greening the Cocoa Industry (UNEP, GEF Earth Fund). Potential linkages in the fields of certification of sustainable cocoa production and attention to invasive species management.
- Philippines:
  - SFM rehabilitation and sustainable use of peatland forests in SE Asia (IFAD)
  - Expanding and diversifying the national system of terrestrial Protected Areas (UNDP)
- Vietnam:
  - SFM rehabilitation and sustainable use of peatland forests in SE Asia (IFAD)
  - SFM promotion of sustainable forest and land management in the Vietnam uplands (IFAD)
  - Expanding Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification at landscape level through incorporating additional ecosystem services (UNEP). Linkages could be established with regard to species selection for certified forest plantations, cost recovery mechanisms and development of national certification standards.

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.gefonline.org>



The project will work closely through sub-contracts with existing programmes such as APFISN and ACB. APFISN, established in 2003 and supported by the FAO, is active in inter-country cooperation, running national workshops, information dissemination, and strengthening capacity of the 30 member countries in the management of forest IAS. Recent activities include the development of a regional strategy for implementing activities of the network, and assistance to countries in the preparation of reports on forest invasive species. Activities to date have included the 2007 workshops in Vietnam and Cambodia and the 2008 workshop in Malaysia, “Forest Health in a Changing World”, organized with IUFRO. The project will strengthen the activities initiated by APFISN to coordinate the management of IAS across the region.

A number of private sector organizations are involved in the management of forests (concessions) and in the importation of exotic species such as the horticultural industry and the pet and aquaria trade. These companies will be consulted during the development of national policies pertaining to the management of IAS.

ACB has been involved in awareness creation and capacity building with regard to IAS and was one of the organizers of a regional workshop on IAS in SE Asia in 2008. The joint workshop between the ACB and the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment, Vietnam, sought to enhance the capacity of AMS to protect the environment against IAS. ACB has also offered to assist with awareness creation for the GEF project.

Full additional details on related non-GEF national initiatives which involve IAS, forest management and/or related research can be found in Section 2.7 of the UNEP project document.

#### **F. DISCUSS THE VALUE-ADDED OF GEF INVOLVEMENT IN THE PROJECT DEMONSTRATED THROUGH INCREMENTAL REASONING :**

Forest invasive species issues have increasingly raised global and regional concerns, while remaining an important focus of national biosecurity for individual countries. The negative impacts of invasive species include losses to biodiversity and ecosystem services alike, as well as other economic, poverty and health consequences. The impact of invasive species on biodiversity in SE Asia is of serious concern because of the area’s rich fauna and flora. Despite occupying only 3% of the earth’s surface, the ASEAN region hosts 20% of all known species. The region includes three mega-diverse states (Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines); several bio-geographical units including Malesia, Wallacea, Sundaland, Indo-Burma and the Central Indo-Pacific; and numerous centres of concentration of restricted-range bird, plant, and insect species. Forests and protected areas within this mega-diverse region are under increasing threat from invasive plants, exacerbated by increased levels of disturbance and climate change. Furthermore, many local communities are dependent on forests and forest products for their survival and IAS have therefore also increasingly been recognized as a direct threat to livelihoods in SE Asia. A major concern is that natural forest regeneration can no longer occur in areas that have been disturbed as a result of human action, or even natural disturbance events such as tree falls, in the presence of invasive plants. Reforestation and afforestation efforts are also hampered and inhibited by the presence of invasive plants, necessitating the use of herbicides or other controls.

Management of IAS is hampered by a weak legislative, policy and institutional framework with no functional NISSAPs or effective National IAS Coordination Units. There are no systems in place to generate significant resources for IAS management, no clear procedures to analyze the risks associated with the importation of plants, and a lack of systematic procedures for the early detection and management of IAS. There is also a general lack of capacity with regard to IAS management which frustrates attempts to implement effective national IAS strategies. This is compounded by a serious lack of awareness of the IAS present in each country and their impacts.

International collaboration such as the project’s regional activities (Component 2), as well as involvement of regional and international bodies such as ACB and GISP, can play an important role in managing the risks of invasive species. Region-wide sharing of early warnings about potential invaders, their rapid detection and identification, as well as the sharing of biological information, risk assessments and monitoring and control techniques, are invaluable tools to help prevent the spread and establishment of potentially invasive species. This project will complement and enhance existing national invasive species activities in the four countries by assisting the process of regional information exchange, promoting best practice, and providing more efficient and effective capacity building on shared themes and needs. By improving their access to applied IAS research and management mechanisms, whilst building national capacity and helping establish financial sustainability for invasive species management, it is expected that the target countries, as well others across the

region, will be better motivated, equipped and able to act on IAS management. The benefits and support derived from combining national and regional interventions would not arise in the absence of GEF and UNEP support. Likewise, the project's emphasis on multisectoral action, national and regional information sharing and extracting lessons learnt from pilot experiences elsewhere in the world would likely be lost if countries were to act individually. The project also aims to make national policies on IAS more efficient. Strengthened national action plans and regional information-sharing systems will play a strong role in achieving global environmental benefits. Without GEF support, all four countries would be likely to focus their efforts on developing regulations and setting priorities, but their linkages to development plans would be weak, as would productive sector involvement. Since the rural population is highly dependent on forests, stronger action on the negative impacts of IAS will certainly help to reduce poverty. The aim of this project is to address the IAS issue by mainstreaming the prevention of invasive species issues into national and regional policy-making, building adequate capacity, providing tools, and promoting inter-sectoral and cross-boundary cooperation both in management of existing IAS and to prevent new invasions.

Overall the project countries' baseline situation is one of very restricted investments and programme attention to the risks and management of IAS. With GEF financial support the project could create a minimum threshold towards specific national IAS policy, strengthened institutions and field experience with (IAS control) tools, as well as increasing national awareness levels to the point of achieving higher and more sustained levels of national funding and programming on IAS. Working with ACB and APFISN, as well as UNEPs regional and country programmes on ecosystem management (including the outputs related to IAS), will further direct regional attention and investments towards IAS work.

**G. INDICATE RISKS, INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS, THAT MIGHT PREVENT THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) FROM BEING ACHIEVED, AND IF POSSIBLE INCLUDING RISK MITIGATION MEASURES THAT WILL BE TAKEN:**

The key risks and mitigation measures are detailed in the following table:

<b>RISK</b>	<b>RISK RATING*</b>	<b>RISK MANAGEMENT MEASURES</b>
Governments' commitment to regional collaboration is low, focusing their efforts on national concerns only, outside of the project.	M	The work with APFISN as well as cooperation with ACB provides the basis for regional exchanges and strengthening collaboration. The project will feed into these initiatives. The project ISC will also have members from each country's NEA, allowing a broader platform for regional collaboration, identification of additional shared interests, as well as build the case for increased investments in IAS regionally.
Lack of interest and support from key national stakeholder groups and organizations	M	The project's communications programmes (Component 5) will strengthen understanding and support by national stakeholders, and involve them in training and awareness raising activities. It will facilitate the joint establishment of national IAS coordination bodies, consultations, and decision making.
Lack of cross-sectoral communication and coordination between national agencies	H	The establishment of an inclusive, multisectoral NPSC in each country, as well as the targeted establishment of coordination mechanisms during the last two years of the project, will provide a forum for communication between agencies and different sectors.
Co-finance inadequate due to non-delivery on previous commitments	M	The Project Management Unit and CABI will monitor co-finance delivery, as well as targeting additional fundraising during the FSP. Adaptive management measures will be taken to compensate for any lack of scheduled resources.
Poor implementation of regulations on IAS	H	This is a common problem in most countries. To lessen this risk the project includes a range of activities targeting information and knowledge generation, management, and dissemination, as well as institutional support, equipment, and staff training. Monitoring and controlling regulatory compliance is also essential and will be built into the strengthening of regulatory frameworks.
Conflicts of interest where certain	M	Where this is the case, the project will provide

forest IAS provide benefits to particular individuals or groups (e.g. for firewood)		comprehensive information regarding the pros and cons of IAS, as well as cost benefit analysis to better inform the public and governments regarding the true costs involved of maintaining and utilizing IAS. Additionally, at the pilot sites, participatory and consultative approaches will be used to reach consensus among the stakeholders and to raise awareness of alternative natural resources other than IAS.
Public not receptive to environmental information and display no interest in IAS control.	L	The communication campaigns in each country will focus on the benefits of IAS control and will engage with school groups, a potentially more receptive audience.
Inability to demonstrate impact of project interventions due to complex natural interactions and a long time span until impacts are noticed.	M	The project will establish the necessary national systems, make available appropriate tools, and raise awareness, rather than targeting large scale impacts (at the pilot sites). The available GEF budget is insufficient to allow clearance of IAS from large areas of forest land from invasives, but will demonstrate that it is necessary and feasible. Stakeholders will be informed through awareness raising programmes, training/exchange programmes, and participatory monitoring about immediate and long-term developments and the impacts of IAS, motivating them to continue the work tested at the pilot sites.
Changes in key project personnel and partner agencies during the life of the project.	M	A full time national co-coordinator, funded by the project, will be appointed in each country. Robust, well-documented management systems will be established which are not dependent on individuals
Potential of climate change to impact project objectives by altering forest ecosystems, growth of IAS, and related ecosystem services such as water supply or biodiversity.	L	Although climate change impacts to forests are likely to be significant, their time scale is well beyond the life of the project. Nonetheless,, best practice guidelines, “Climate Change & Invasives” and “Early Warning Systems” from the ‘Toolkit for Best Prevention and Management Practices of Invasive Alien Species’ will be integrated into IAS management strategies and methodologies for pilot activities. Managing forest IAS will in principle strengthen the health of the forest and therefore its resilience to short- and long-term changes and impacts of climate change. This is related to the concept of ecosystem-based adaptation which is a cost-effective means of protecting human and ecological communities against the impacts of climate change. <sup>5</sup> <sup>6</sup> Ecosystem based-adaptation is described as “building nature’s resilience to the impacts of climate change, while also helping to meet people’s basic needs.” These ecosystem-based approaches are therefore not just about protecting ecosystems, but also about using ecosystems to help sustain people and the resources on which they depend. Such an approach can also provide an integrative framework to address impacts from both climate change and invasive species.” <sup>7</sup>

**H. EXPLAIN HOW COST-EFFECTIVENESS IS REFLECTED IN THE PROJECT DESIGN:**

<sup>5</sup> |Heller, N.E. and Zavaleta, E.S. (2009) Biodiversity management in the face of climate change: A review of 22 years of recommendations. *Biological Conservation* 142:14-32.

<sup>6</sup> World Bank (2009) Convenient solutions to an inconvenient truth: Ecosystem- based approaches to climate change. Environment Department, The World Bank, Washington, DC, US

<sup>7</sup> |Burgiel, S.W. and Muir, A.A. (2010) Invasive Species, Climate Change and Ecosystem-Based Adaptation: Addressing Multiple Drivers of Global Change. Global Invasive Species Programme, Washington, DC, and Nairobi, Kenya

The scale of the threat posed by biological invasions is alarming in both environmental and economic terms. For example, globally, UNEP has estimated that invasive species represent a major factor in the potential extinction of 30% of threatened bird species, and 15% of threatened plant species. Overall, approximately two-thirds of species extinctions may involve competition with invasive species. Although no national estimates on the costs of IAS, in terms of impact and management, have been published, based on reports from other countries the estimated costs of inaction in the prevention and control of IAS in the four pilot countries could easily reach millions of US\$ annually. By investing resources in IAS management now, a considerable amount of money will be saved in the long term.

At the national level, the project addresses policy issues which include the development and implementation of a NISSAP in each country, and the creation of an IAS Coordination Unit. The development of cost recovery mechanisms is also envisaged, which will contribute to the sustained management of IAS and reduce the need for future donor interventions. The development of risk analysis systems and mechanisms to reduce or stop IAS entering countries will also be developed. Risk analyses are largely based on the precautionary principle of “guilty until proven innocent”. Those IAS that are not detected prior to or during entry will be detected as soon as they establish, through an early detection and rapid response programme. Both of these mechanisms will contribute to a considerable saving as well as protecting biodiversity from IAS. Prevention is without a doubt the most cost-effective measure to manage IAS, compared to post-invasion measures such as control, eradication and restoration. It is also a key element of the CBD Guiding Principles.

Capacity building and public awareness raising are important elements of the proposed project, and will have benefits lasting far beyond the end of the project. Pilot site activities will not only contribute to capacity building and awareness creation, especially amongst local communities, but the development of the most cost-effective management strategies will contribute to a considerable cost saving in managing a target species in other areas.

The project will also establish and strengthen regional support mechanisms that will reduce duplication losses, transaction costs, and limited economies of scale in dealing with management of invasive species in SE Asia. It will strengthen the coordination of different IAS programmes in the region and promote cooperation between regional organizations and countries, offering a cost-efficient alternative to continuing to run programmes individually. In the absence of a strong regional framework, stand-alone national invasive species management efforts would be inefficient and less effective, with limited convening power to governments, productive sectors and communities to prevent the introduction and spread of invasives. The proposed project is the first time that the participating countries will embark on a cooperative and comprehensive GEF-assisted forest IAS initiative, with project components covering all the strategic areas that require strengthening. The cost effectiveness of the proposed project is a function of the potential damage caused by IAS in SE Asia in the absence of any project intervention (the ‘business as usual’ scenario).

### **PART III: INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT**

#### **A. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS:**

Based on existing GEF policies, UNEP is the IA for this project. It will be responsible for overall project supervision to ensure consistency with GEF and UNEP programmes and procedures, as well as providing guidance on linkages with related UNEP- and GEF-funded activities. CABI will be contracted as lead EA and sub-contract country NEAs as well as coordinating and supervising the four country programmes.

#### **B. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS:**

CABI, as the EA, will be responsible for the implementation of the project in accordance with the objectives and activities outlined in Section 3 of the Project Document. UNEP, as the GEF IA, will be responsible for overall project supervision. The UNEP/GEF Task Manager will monitor implementation of the activities undertaken during the execution of the project, and will also be responsible for clearance and transmission of financial and progress reports to the GEF.

CABI, as the lead EA, will cooperate with UNEP as well as providing free access to all relevant information, findings or concerns during project implementation. CABI will work closely with the Kerala Forest Research Institute, which currently has the mandate to manage and coordinate all APFISN (FAO) activities. The collaboration with the Kerala Forest Research Institute, and indirectly with the FAO will be formalized through a sub-contract with CABI. The research institute has also agreed to provide co-finance support to the project.

CABI will set up a Project Management Unit (PMU) at its regional office in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, which is ideally situated to serve all four project countries. CABI will also co-finance a senior IAS advisor, based in Nairobi, to provide technical backstopping to the countries through their Kuala Lumpur office. Both the UNEP TM as well as the CABI staff based in Nairobi will enable coordination with the various UNEP task managers based in UNEP/DEPI, who work on various IAS initiatives such as the GEF-funded Caribbean, Pacific, as well as the African Barriers projects. The PMU will include the International Project Coordinator (IPC) and a full time administrator/accountant. The PMU will be assisted by a project advisory panel which will include Technical Advisors from the EA. The PMU will establish reporting guidelines for all partners and ensure that they submit quality reports, prepare biannual progress reports, quarterly financial reports and annual summary progress reports for UNEP. The IPC will also carry out a programme of regular visits to project countries and organize regular regional stakeholder meetings, hosted in rotation by the participating countries, to share experiences and visit each other's pilot sites.

CABI will contract the four NEAs who will be fully responsible for the country programme implementation. On a day to day basis this will be managed and reported on by the NCU, headed by a National IAS Expert/Project Coordinator (NPC), usually a staff member from the NEA, a national administrative/accounting assistant (to be hired by the project part time or full time), and technical staff or consultants. The NCUs will manage the country pilots, and CABI will provide backstopping to NCUs, pilots and consultants through its Project Management Unit (PMU) in Malaysia. CABI will enter into a contractual agreement with each of the four NEAs and arrange to have the NPCs (government employees) seconded to CABI in terms of reporting – they will continue to be based in their respective countries. This will contribute to sustainability in that the NPC will return to his/her previous position once the project comes to an end. NCUs will also establish any necessary sub-contracts with partner institutions in the country. National Steering Committees (NSCs) will play an important role in project oversight and advisory services, as well as supporting the development of the national policies and NISSAPs. These will include a National Project Director nominated by the NEA.

Further project management and operational arrangements are detailed in Section 3.3 (Component 7), Section 5 and Appendix 5.

An International Steering Committee (ISC) will provide political and strategic guidance for the project. The ISC will meet at least once a year and will be responsible for overseeing and approving annual work plans and budgets, solving issues, and all strategic decisions. Membership of the ISC will include UNEP, CABI and representatives of the four NEAs (preferably the National Project Directors), as well as other key technical partners. The ISC will also enable through the UNEP task manager, as well the CABI senior technical advisor on IAS, the exchange of best practices, and lessons from related IAS projects managed by UNEP as well as CABI elsewhere in the world.

The project will be part of CABI's "Invasive Species" Global Theme, and as such international specialist additional input as well as information services will be made available when needed (co-financed).

#### **PART IV: EXPLAIN THE ALIGNMENT OF PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF:**


The FSP project design is closely aligned with the approved PIF. The overall goal and objective remain unaltered, as do country high-level priorities. Similarly, the executing agencies and the project components' content are unaltered. However, expected outputs have been slightly revised, combined or moved to another location in the results framework in order to make them more consistent with the workplan design. All outcomes and outputs remain the same under Component 1. With regard to the regional dimension (Component 2), APFISN has developed a draft Regional Forest Invasive Species Strategy (RFISS) but it is considered more effective and beneficial to the countries' national programmes to focus on a few aspects of the regional strategy only (e.g. priority shared IAS and biocontrol) rather than developing a comprehensive action plan for the region. To this end the output pertaining to the development and agreement on a regional Action Plan under the RFISS has been replaced with an expected output of "Regional IAS Biocontrol Working Group established including the development of an Action Plan for biocontrol of shared IAS." The remaining two outputs under Component 2 have been expanded to include the development of an IAS Identification Guide and a regional IAS learning network. The focus on biocontrol is largely because this is the most cost-effective IAS management tool available. Most countries do not have the resources for large-scale mechanical and chemical clearing operations. There can be a considerable cost saving by sharing the costs of developing agent/s for shared invasive plants

across the region. Capacity building will also be enhanced by developing and placing e-learning IAS modules on the APFISN website. The development of a regional IAS Identification Guide is also critical since it will allow for the improved identification of IAS across the region and enhance the detection of expanding IAS populations and new weed incursions. IAS Identification Guides are one of the most useful tools in IAS management especially if they also include information on management.

Outcome (ii) is largely captured under Outcome (i) in Component 3 and has therefore been removed. The outputs under this Component remain largely unaltered, although the reference to “organizing IAS inventory programmes” has been removed because it is already captured under Component 5 which includes database development and national IAS surveys. Two of the outcomes under Component 4 have been removed because Outcome (iii) is largely captured under Outcome (i) in the sense that IAS management includes rehabilitation, while Outcome (ii) has been moved to the M&E Plan (Component 6) since this activity mainly involves the monitoring of biodiversity and socio-economic levels. The first output under Component 4 has been removed since it pertains to biosecurity systems such as risk analysis and ED & RR covered under Component 1 while some of the other outputs have been combined. Outcomes (i) and (ii) under Component 5 have been combined while Outcome (iii) has been moved to the M&E Plan since it pertains to monitoring awareness levels. The outputs linked to the outcomes have also been adapted. Based on the above the outcomes and outputs under the M&E Plan(Component 6) have been expanded. These changes have not in any way altered the objectives and goals of the project.

**PART V: AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO Endorsement.

Agency Coordinator, Agency name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Maryam Niamir-Fuller, Director, Division of GEF Coordination, UNEP, Nairobi, Kenya.		July 5 <sup>th</sup> 2011	Max Zieren, UNEP/GEF Regional Focal Point & TM BD and LD	+66- 228802101	max.zieren@unep.org

## ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Intervention Logic						
<b>Project Objective:</b> To manage SE Asian forests and biodiversity sustainably by reducing negative environmental, economic and human health consequences of Invasive Alien Species						
Outcomes	SMART Indicators					
	Indicator	Baseline	Mid-term target (PY2, Q4)	End of Project target	Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
<b>Component 1: Establishing National Policy and Institutional Frameworks</b>						
1a. Enabling policy and institutional environment for cross-sectoral prevention and management of IAS strengthened	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of operation and programming of the national IAS coordination mechanism</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None of the project countries has operational multi-agency coordination mechanisms for IAS. Philippines has draft mechanism but not formalized.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project national steering committee (NSC) operational and meeting regularly in all countries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NSCs have become formal cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms (PY4; Q1)</li> <li>At least 3 meetings in PY4; agenda includes national IAS funding, private-public partnership, national control programmes (PY4; Q4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project reports and NSC minutes</li> <li>Terms of Reference for national coordination mechanisms</li> <li>Coordination mechanism meeting minutes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agencies concerned with IAS participate in NSC</li> <li>Enabling political environment</li> <li>Private sector recognizes long term benefits of IAS management</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of implementation of the National Invasive Species Strategies and Action Plans (NISSAPs)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No country has a NISSAP (being developed in Indonesia)</li> <li>No IAS projects are based on national policy and strategy guidance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Content of NISSAP developed and in draft in 2 of 4 countries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NISSAP finalized, promoted, and disseminated to stakeholders in 3 countries (PY4; Q1)</li> <li>Two national-level IAS programmes/projects in each of 3 countries, based on new NISSAP (PY4; Q4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NISSAP documentation</li> <li>Meeting minutes of National IAS Coordination Units</li> <li>Project/programme documents</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Governments willing to adopt NISSAP</li> <li>Stakeholders recognize need for unified national strategy</li> </ul>
1b. Cost-recovery recognized by national agencies as key to long-term IAS programming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funds from cost-recovery for the sustainable management of IAS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No cost-recovery mechanisms exist</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cost-recovery mechanisms identified in 1 of the 4 countries (Indonesia)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cost recovery mechanisms for IAS management in place in at least 1 country (PY4; Q4)</li> <li>Income from cost recovery included in budgets of relevant agencies (PY4; Q4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting minutes of national IAS coordination mechanisms</li> <li>Government agency budgets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant stakeholders are willing to contribute financially to cost-recovery mechanism</li> <li>Costs recovered are allocated to IAS management</li> </ul>

Ic. Strengthened national regulatory and legal frameworks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proportion of legally imported species that are subject to Pest Risk Analysis (PRA) including assessment of environmental risk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regulatory bodies are aware of risk analysis guidelines (ISPM11) but apply them sporadically and do not include risks to biodiversity or forests</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current risk analysis procedures reviewed</li> <li>• Technical guidelines on IAS risk analysis drafted for 2 of the 4 countries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PRA conducted for at least 25% of legally imported plant species (non-crop) in at least 2 of 4 countries (PY4; Q4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project progress and technical reports</li> <li>• Records of regulatory bodies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sufficient capacity to implement revised risk analysis procedures</li> <li>• Sufficient information available on the distribution of invasive species in each country.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identified risks managed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No management of invasive plant risks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk management strategies developed for 2 of 4 countries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All PRAs conducted in these 2 of 4 countries include risk management measures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notifications to plant importers</li> <li>• Early detection and rapid response plans (Indonesia and Vietnam)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk management actions can be enforced</li> </ul>

**Outputs for Component 1:**

- 1.1. National multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms for cross-sectoral invasive species management
- 1.2. National Invasive Species Strategy and Action Plan agreed
- 1.3. Identification of cost-recovery mechanism and action plan (only Indonesia)
- 1.4. IAS Risk Analysis procedures for quarantine authorities
- 1.5. Early detection and rapid response system established (only Indonesia and Vietnam)



**Component 2: Regional cooperation in Southeast Asia**

<p>2a. Enhanced transboundary coordination and programming on IAS control for priority forest IAS and pathways</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of transboundary cooperation on biocontrol</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little or no regional collaboration on biocontrol</li> <li>• Weed biocontrol: Philippines and Cambodia: 0 species; Vietnam 1 species; Indonesia 3 species</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional IAS Biocontrol Working Group established</li> <li>• Target IAS agreed and agents identified</li> <li>• Application for import of agents made in 2 countries.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional plan for biocontrol supported by countries (PY3; Q2)</li> <li>• At least 2 Bilateral cooperation agreements (PY3; Q4)</li> <li>• 2 biocontrol agents redistributed; 1 introduced (PY4;Q4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional biocontrol action plan</li> <li>• Signed agreements</li> <li>• Agents present in countries of introduction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information on safety and efficacy of biocontrol agents is adequate</li> <li>• Potential conflicts of interest can be minimized</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amount and accessibility of information on regionally prioritised IAS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some information available on shared invasive plants on APFISN website but no priorities set for region, and not supported by field identification</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional IAS priorities agreed</li> <li>• Website structure developed</li> <li>• Links (&gt;4) between APFISN website and IAS databases</li> <li>• Draft IAS Identification Guide</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• APFISN website has information on all priority forest invasive plants of the region (PY3; Q4)</li> <li>• Number of hits on APFISN website increases by 10% per annum (PY3; Q4)</li> <li>• Guide disseminated and in use</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional IAS website and website counter</li> <li>• Identification Guide</li> <li>• Project progress reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• APFISN maintain willingness to strengthen regional IAS website</li> <li>• Countries agree on priority species</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional learning mechanisms for IAS management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• APFISN facilitates some information sharing but not learning materials</li> <li>• No exchange of individuals or expertise in IAS management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 2 IAS e-learning modules developed</li> <li>• Two countries take part in exchange visits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 4 IAS e-learning modules on APFISN website; 50 users registered (PY2;Q4)</li> <li>• All countries in exchange visits in region (PY4;Q3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project reports</li> <li>• Training impact assessments at end of courses</li> <li>• APFISN website</li> <li>• Visit reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individuals are given time to undertake e-learning</li> </ul>

**Outputs for Component 2:**

- 2.1. Regional IAS Biocontrol Working Group established including development of Action Plan for biocontrol of shared IAS
- 2.2. Strengthened/developed regional IAS tools for improved management of IAS including databases/website (APFISN) and regional IAS Identification Guide
- 2.3. Strengthened regional IAS learning network and information exchange mechanisms, including short-term project staff exchange between countries.

<b>Component 3: National Capacity Building and Institutional Support</b>						
3a. Enhanced collaboration and capacity built through training and other means for multisectoral prevention and management of IAS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge of stakeholders on IAS risks, impacts, prevention, management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No IAS training plans in any of the 4 countries; no IAS modules in university curricula</li> <li>• Researchers have some knowledge; other staff lack knowledge on IAS identification, impact assessment, and management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training strategy developed, promoted and adopted by relevant stakeholders</li> <li>• Measured increase in knowledge of &gt;35 trained staff in specific IAS issues, risk analysis, identification skills (Reduced number of training courses developed in Cambodia and Philippines)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measured increase in knowledge of &gt;100 trained staff in specific IAS issues – all countries taken together (PY4; Q2).</li> <li>• Universities/tertiary institutions identified and IAS courses developed and implemented in at least 1 tertiary institution per country (PY4, Q3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report on training strategies</li> <li>• Training impact assessment</li> <li>• University curricula</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained staff stay in post and use new knowledge</li> <li>• University authorities approve curriculum changes</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Output of demand-led research on IAS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Few students currently undertake post-graduate studies on IAS – baseline will be determined at initiation of activity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Post-graduate students registered and undertaking research on priority IAS –2 from each country.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 postgraduate theses submitted from each country. At least one paper per student accepted for refereed journal (PY4; Q3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Theses</li> <li>• Course certificates</li> <li>• Paper acceptance letters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• University authorities supportive</li> <li>• Sufficient students available or interested to undertake studies on IAS</li> </ul>

**Outputs for Component 3:**

3.1. National training programmes developed and implemented for different stakeholders (e.g. policy makers, scientists, quarantine officers, extensionists, etc.) (limited in Cambodia and the Philippines based on funds and needs)

3.2. Provision of equipment and material support to quarantine departments, border crossings, etc. (only Indonesia)

3.3. Support to expanding national capacity in IAS research and related fields (project staff in Cambodia and the Philippines will not attend international meetings)

**Component 4: National Pilots on the Prevention, Control and Management of Priority Forest IAS**

<p>4a. Improved national field management experience with implementing IAS prevention, control and management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lessons on ‘best IAS management’ practices captured &amp; disseminated nationally and regionally (selected IAS only), including rehabilitation after IAS control.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 pilot sites identified during PPG; Cambodia to be reconfirmed.</li> <li>No ecosystem IAS management plans available for pilot sites or elsewhere in project countries</li> <li>Control practices have been applied at some pilot sites but generally in an <i>ad hoc</i> manner</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pilot sites established in each of the 4 countries.</li> <li>Ecosystem Management Plans (EMP) developed and endorsed by stakeholder agreements</li> <li>At least 2 different control practices initiated for each pilot site, based on EIAs if required</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lessons on IAS management disseminated and applied in all pilot sites (PY4;Q2)</li> <li>Control practices tested in at least 4 of the 5 pilots (PY3, Q4)</li> <li>Management of target IAS mainstreamed in 3 of the 5 pilots (PY3;Q4)</li> <li>Habitat rehabilitation tested and evaluated in at least 3 of the 5 pilots (PY3, Q4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pilot site management plans</li> <li>Project theme papers on IAS control practices</li> <li>MTR reports (country &amp; consolidated)</li> <li>Project progress reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conflicts of interest can be reconciled</li> <li>Support for IAS management plans is maintained by stakeholders</li> <li>At least some control trials effective</li> </ul>
---	---	---	---	--	--	---

**Outputs for Component 4:**

- 4.1. Pilot sites established in each country through effective local partnerships, ecosystem management plans developed and implemented and EIA’s undertaken if required
- 4.2. Pilot IAS management implementation - maps of distribution of target species produced for each pilot site, testing of at least three control/management strategies at each site, habitat rehabilitation showing increase in biodiversity from baseline, followed by dissemination of results

<b>Component 5: Information and Awareness Programme</b>						
5a. Enhanced capture and use of information and willingness of stakeholder groups to be involved in IAS management and resource mobilization.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Countries' IAS programmes informed by national invasive plant lists, including data on distribution, and biological &amp; socioeconomic impact of priority IAS.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No national monitoring of IAS</li> <li>Few data on distribution and impact of IAS (APFISN database)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Distribution and impact of invasive plants in and around pilot sites determined</li> <li>Surveys and mapping of all forest IAS at a national scale initiated in Indonesia and Vietnam - limited in Cambodia and Philippines</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed information on pilot site IAS on APFISN website (PY3;Q4)</li> <li>Information on distribution and impact of all forest IAS per country on APFISN website (PY4; Q2) (restricted to forests in selected areas/regions in Cambodia and Philippines)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project reports</li> <li>APFISN website</li> <li>Distribution maps</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff trained by the project continue to be available to undertake surveys</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasing stakeholder awareness &amp; related activities of risks and impacts of IAS.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Awareness low; baseline to be determined in 2 countries in PY1.</li> <li>No current plans for improving awareness of IAS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baseline awareness of selected stakeholders determined ( in 2 of 4 countries), incl. knowledge of risks, impacts, and actions</li> <li>Regional standardized communication strategy developed with national activities and regional targets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key national and regional communication messages set, in follow up to National Communications Strategies</li> <li>Stakeholder surveys show increased average awareness by 50% over baseline, and demand for response (PY4;Q4)</li> <li>Pilot site stakeholders show increased knowledge of prioritized IAS and their role in management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baseline and project completion awareness impact survey reports (see 6.c)</li> <li>National communication strategies</li> <li>Mass media broadcasts</li> <li>Communication products and materials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communication strategy supported and implemented by all stakeholders</li> <li>Communication messages received positively</li> </ul>
<b>Outputs for Component 5:</b>						
5.1. Development of a national IAS database based on surveys to document presence and impacts of selected forest IAS (limited in Cambodia and the Philippines)						
5.2. Regional standardized communication strategy developed with national activities and regional targets						
5.3. Undertake comprehensive national and regional awareness/communication campaigns, including development and dissemination of awareness material (limited in Cambodia and the Philippines)						

<b>Component 6: Monitoring and Evaluation Plan</b>						
6a. Ability to track and monitor project progress and impact performance against prior agreed indicators and benchmarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>M&amp;E plan finalized and implemented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No M&amp;E Plan</li> <li>Some baselines yet to be set</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Missing baselines determined (see components above)</li> <li>M&amp;E Plan being implemented</li> <li>Mid-term evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>M&amp;E Plan being implemented</li> <li>Terminal evaluation completed (within 3 months of project completion)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>M&amp;E Plan</li> <li>Mid-term evaluation report</li> <li>Terminal evaluation report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partners avail M&amp;E data as agreed</li> </ul>
6b. Enhanced protection of forest biodiversity hotspots and its associated local community livelihood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity and socioeconomic indices in pilot sites maintained or improved from baseline data and projections</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No site monitoring plans exist</li> <li>Baseline biodiversity and socio-economic indices will be set during first six months of the project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site monitoring plans developed and implemented, as part of EMPs</li> <li>Biodiversity and socio-economic indices sustained or improved from baseline</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site monitoring plans followed</li> <li>Biodiversity indices at pilot sites improved from baseline (PY4;Q4)</li> <li>Socio-economic impact in pilot sites improved from baseline (PY4;Q4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baseline data is available or can easily be obtained through research</li> <li>Pilot sites not destroyed by natural events or vandalism</li> <li>Communities and other stakeholders continue to be supportive of project</li> </ul>
6c. Strengthened national public awareness on IAS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Average IAS awareness levels across selected target groups increased from baseline</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Awareness of IAS is poor, but no baseline studies have been conducted. Quantitative surveys will be designed &amp; conducted in 2 of 4 countries during 1<sup>st</sup> PY.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Awareness levels showing an increase from baseline at pilots (based on informal data)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Average IAS awareness levels across a total of 5 selected target groups in 2 of 4 countries (communities, national and provincial governments, etc.) increased by at least 50% above baseline</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baseline and project completion awareness impact survey reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for the project from policy makers and private sector is maintained.</li> <li>Stakeholders participate in awareness-raising campaigns</li> </ul>

**Outputs of Component 6:**

- 6.1. Establish and implement Project M&E Plan
- 6.2. Develop and implement pilot site monitoring plans to show improvement in biodiversity and socioeconomic levels from baseline
- 6.3. Changes in (national) awareness levels monitored to show increase in IAS awareness across all sectors
- 6.4. External audits
- 6.5. Midterm evaluation (UNEP independent study)
- 6.6. Terminal evaluation (UNEP independent study)

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

**RESPONSE TO GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW**

**Review date:** received 27 January 2010

Issue #	GEF Secretariat Review at PIF/ Work Programme Inclusion	UNEP Response
<b>ELIGIBILITY - Question no. 3</b>		
	<p>“We will accept these letters for the PIF stage as the amount for the concerned country is correct, however, pls provide an updated endorsement letter that has coherent project budget and allocation by the time of CEO endorsement.”</p>	<p>This was indeed a problem. New correct endorsement letters have been issues and include in Appendix 13</p>
<b>PROJECT DESIGN - Question no. 7</b>		
	<p>“The establishment and enhancing national policy and institutional capacity building as well as regional cooperation on IAS are expected to results in protecting the countries' rich forest biodiversity and generate tangible GEB. Further details on measurable outcomes on GEB is expected at the time of CEO endorsement.”</p>	<p>The projects results framework outlines a number of measurable outcomes on GEB. At policy level these involve the development and implementation of a NISSAP, cost-recovery, risk analysis, and early detection and rapid response systems all of which will contribute to protecting biodiversity from the threats of IAS. Increasing awareness levels with regard to the impacts and management of IAS will be monitored as will enhanced capacity (knowledge) building initiatives. Enhanced regional cooperation will result in the shared management of IAS, a considerable cost saving, allowing for additional initiatives to protect GEB.</p> <p>All pilot sites have high biodiversity values, are legally protected sites, and close to HCVMs. The project M&amp;E Plan has a specific Outcome 6b to measure and monitor, through biodiversity and socioeconomic indices, achievement of GEB at pilot sites, throughout the project period. These will be reported on at start, midterm and end of project, in order to ascertain how the project has contributed to conservation and livelihoods.</p>
<b>PROJECT DESIGN - Question no. 9 (1)</b>		
	<p>“The project design is holistic and outcomes are eligible, however, it seems rather too ambitious by covering every aspect of policy and institutional capacity building on IAS with a limited resources for each country. It would be useful to target few expected outcomes per country, particularly for the country with less budget allocation. ‘</p>	<p>Further to the response during PIF approval the PPG phase has been used to establish country specific workplans commensurable with available budgets. This for example has led to having just one pilot site in Cambodia, Philippines, and Vietnam yet two in Indonesia. Additionally the focus in Cambodia will be on the development of some national policies and awareness, including some activities related to capacity building, but basically a subset of what e.g. will be done in Indonesia. There will be no development of cost-recovery mechanisms and provision of equipment and material support to quarantine departments in Cambodia, the Philippines and Vietnam. The number of training programmes/modules developed in Cambodia and the Philippines will also be limited based on available funds and needs. No project staff from these two countries will be attending any international meetings/conferences unless they can get additional funding during the project period. National IAS surveys in Cambodia and the Philippines will only include those in forests in protected areas while surveys in Indonesia and Vietnam will be nationwide. The amount of awareness material developed will also be determined by the financial resources available. There will also be considerable cost-saving as a result of the regional component. For example, instead of countries developing stand-alone national IAS websites all IAS information will be collated and made available on the APFISN website. Countries will all contribute to the development of one regional communication strategy which will</p>

Issue #	GEF Secretariat Review at PIF/ Work Programme Inclusion	UNEP Response
		have national activities and regional targets. Much of the awareness material developed will also be shared between countries, especially in the case of shared IAS. All countries will also contribute to a regional IAS Identification Guide covering all species within the respective countries a considerable cost saving.
<b>PROJECT DESIGN – Question no. 9 (2)</b>		
	“Moreover, for component 4 on pilot initiatives at the site level, the intervention needs to be cost effective, targeted, and clear criteria are established for site selection. Please provide further information to ensure such elements in the activities	In addition to the response at PIF clearance, we have developed and applied an extensive baseline and site selection process based on multiple selection criteria during the PPG. See Appendix 16 for more details. We are very aware of the very restricted project budget (especially after the budget cut in Cambodia) and will focus on just a few IAS, most shared by several countries, and as such ‘best practice’ methods will benefit countries through the regional and communications component activities. Additionally the project is not targeting clearing large areas from IAS but rather establishing the capacity, information and regional partnership on access and applying best practice IAS control, e.g. at pilot sites and beyond. CABI as lead EA has a strong record in knowledge management, partner network and experience in IAS, further enabling this process.
<b>PROJECT DESIGN - Question 10</b>		
	Is the project consistent with the recipient country’s national priorities and policies? “The linkage between the NBSAP and some of the development plans and strategies are noted. Further details need to be provided by the time of CEO endorsement for each participating country”	<p>All project countries share the need to manage IAS more effectively. In addition, countries have developed a number of strategies and development plans that require effective IAS management in order for them to achieve their goals. Additional text on project linkages to countries plans and strategies has been added to Section 3.6 of UNEP document, as well as a summary in Section B &amp; E of CEO document above.</p> <p>Additionally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Indonesia, Papua New Guinea and Vietnam are the original UN-REDD pilot countries in SE Asia, while Cambodia, Solomon Islands, Philippines, Nepal and Sri Lanka have recently joined the programme. REDD+ includes activities aimed at reducing emissions due to deforestation and forest degradation, boosting forest carbon stocks, and sustainable forest management. In the context of this project forests can only be managed sustainably if there are effective mechanisms in place to control forest IAS.</li> <li>ii) In Bali, Indonesia in 2003, the AMS issued the Declaration of ASEAN Concord II, a framework to achieve a dynamic, cohesive, resilient and integrated ASEAN Community. The ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community Plan of Action expressed the need for coordinating responses to MEA’s since it strives for the “harmonization of environmental policies, legislation, regulations, standards and databases, taking account the national circumstances of Member Countries, to support the integration of the environmental, social and economic goals of the region</li> <li>iii) The Cambodian National Forestry Programme (NFP) (2010) which covers the period 2010-2030 has as its purpose to establish a workable social and policy framework for the sustainable management of all forests. One of its main aims is to maintain and recognise ecosystems and environmental services provided by forests, and the biological diversity within them.</li> <li>iv) The Vietnamese Forest Development Strategy (2006-2020) which aims to sustainably establish, manage, protect, and utilize 16.24 million ha. of forest land, to increase the ratio of land with forest up to 43% by 2010 and to 47% by 2020; to increase their contributions to socioeconomic development, environmental protection, biodiversity conservation and environmental services supply, as well as to reduce poverty and improve the livelihoods of rural mountainous people. Sustainable IAS management could also benefit from Decree 99:</li> </ul>



Issue #	GEF Secretariat Review at PIF/ Work Programme Inclusion	UNEP Response
		Payments for Forest Environment Services Policy which was introduced in 2010 and mandates payments for ecosystem services – IAS diminish the capacity of forests to provide ecosystem services.
<b>PROJECT DESIGN - Question 11</b>		
	<p>“Coordination among APFISN, GISP, and ASEAN are noted as well as other UNEP/GEF IAS projects. Brief summary information on ongoing initiatives under the partner organizations on IAS in Southeast Asia should be provided as noted in the project design section. Concrete coordination mechanisms with the other UNEP/GEF projects should be identified before CEO endorsement</p>	<p>Please see also response to previous point above: Additional text on project linkages to countries plans and strategies has been added to Section 3.6 of UNEP document, as well as a summary in Section B &amp; E of CEO document above. The project has various activities which build directly on these or would cooperate with national agencies with identified previous experience in e.g. IAS control, taxonomy, or field management, e.g. BIOTROP in Indonesia, APFISN etc.</p> <p>Additionally: Although there are no other ongoing GEF-funded IAS projects in the four countries, several regional/global GEF projects are underway elsewhere, in various stages of development and implementation, with which linkages and exchange of best practices will be sought. These include the UNEP-GEF Project, “Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa” which will be completed in mid-2011 but will still have strong relevance as it will provide the opportunity to share experiences and lessons learnt during the implementation of this project. There is considerable overlap between the Africa and proposed SE Asia projects, with a focus on strengthening policy, building capacity, and creating awareness. The Africa project also focused on invasive plants at pilot sites, and these will be targeted in SE Asia. Another very relevant project is the regional UNEP-GEF Project, “Mitigating the Threats of Invasive Alien Species in the Insular Caribbean,” which unlike the SE Asia project, targets various taxonomic groups at pilot site level but is similar it that it has a large regional component. Another UNEP-GEF Project is about to start in Cameroon, “Development and Implementation of a National Monitoring and Control System (framework) for Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) and Invasive Alien Species (IAS)” under the GEF Biosafety Programme. There is also currently a UNEP-GEF Project, “Prevention, Control, and Management of Invasive Alien Species in the Pacific Islands.” CABI is involved in most of these initiatives or in close collaboration through its former GISP partners such as IUCN, TNC etc.</p>
<b>PROJECT DESIGN - Question 12</b>		
	<p>“Is the proposed project likely to be cost-effective? General information provided. Further details are expected at the time of CEO endorsement. ‘</p>	<p>Please see the updated Section H in CEO document above, as well as Section 7.3 in UNEP Project Document.</p>
<b>PROJECT DESIGN - Question 15</b>		
	<p>“Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and includes sufficient risk mitigation measures? General information provided. Further details and analysis are expected at the time of CEO endorsement.”</p>	<p>Section 3.5 of ProDoc and section G of CEO have been expanded, and mitigation measures indicated.</p> <p>Many of the actual component activities deal with risk mitigation in itself such as conducting EIA on new IAS control measures, building adequate understanding as well as capacity with government agencies, establishing monitoring and control measures at field level to reduce the risks of IAS expanding their range as a result of the long term impacts of climate change.</p> <p>Although climate change impacts to forests may be significant their time scale is well beyond the life of the project. Additionally, best practice guidelines for “Climate Change and Invasives; and Early Warning Systems”, from the ‘Toolkit for Best Prevention and Management Practices of Invasive Alien Species’ will be integrated into IAS management strategies and methodologies for pilot activities.</p>

Issue #	GEF Secretariat Review at PIF/ Work Programme Inclusion	UNEP Response
		Managing forest IAS will in principle strengthen the health of the forest and as such its resilience to short and long terms changes and impacts of climate change, such as e.g. in. levels of precipitation.
<b>JUSTIFICATION GEF GRANT - Question 21</b>		
	‘The cofinance of the project is about 1 to 1.2. Considering that the project includes countries such as Indonesia and Philippines, further co-financing is expected. Increased co-financing is expected at the time of CEO endorsement.’	Co-finance is still around 1 to 1.2, which given the lack of private sector involvement, lack of loan funds, as well as lack of core government programmes dealing with IAS in all four countries is not a bad record. The already ongoing fund raising and expanding network – e.g. with new research partners in and abroad of the project countries is expected to generate additional sources of funds. However, all countries’ government NEAs had great problems in securing large co-funding sources and only through clever partnerships with related initiatives such as small NGOs and research institutions co-financing delivery may be strengthened during the life of the project. Further explanation on the on-the-ground funding situation in the countries is given in the PIF review response, specifically related to the ‘hard’ reality that government environment budgets have been cut in e.g. Indonesia. The GEF RAF budget cut in Cambodia has also given problem in motivating government to put additional resources in the project right now, but it is expected to become better once the project starts its work and results show the benefits of the approach.

## RESPONSE TO COUNCIL COMMENTS

**Council:** March 2010

Comments from Swiss Council Members	UNEP Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Inconsistencies regarding project costs</b> The project costs shown in the PIF and the endorsement letters as well as between the endorsement letters themselves are not consistent. There is an urgent need to clarify the cost estimations of the project.</li> </ul>	Cost estimates have never been an issue, and country endorsements did accurately indicate and endorse the exact needed amount of that particular country. However indeed these endorsements did incorrectly quote the amounts needed for other countries. New country endorsement letters have been issued, also to compensate for the reduced RAF amount made available to Cambodia on this project (see Appendix 13 for details).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Progress in PIF development cannot be traced</b> After the initial submission of the PIF in April 2009, a total of three subsequent resubmissions were necessary. The three resubmissions indicate that major changes have been applied. Are the project's objectives still comparable to those of the proposal at the date of endorsement by the four countries? We further regret that, due to the missing STAP review, neither can project development be traced nor progress assessed.</li> </ul>	<p>The project PIF was actually (re-)submitted three times, once for work programme entry, once as revised PIF based on the GEFSEC review, and once in early 2010 after its initial clearance to correct for the reduced RAF amount available to Cambodia. The recorded additional re-submissions only dealt with the ‘frozen pipeline’ with GEFSEC due to cash flow problems. The objective and targeted outcomes of the project at PIF clearance as well as this CEO submission are similar to the concept which was endorsed by countries except, based on the review of GEFSEC, project work programmes and outputs have been reduced, and some outcomes reduced in scope to make the project stronger and more feasible.</p> <p>A STAP screening of PIF was conducted on 29 January 2010 (pls see below).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Inconsistencies regarding the project objectives</b> Even though we recognise the very early stage of project development with so far only little project preparation activities (according to request for PPG) the description of the basic problems that the four countries face with IAS in their forest ecosystems is insufficient. Most of the information provided regarding the four countries</li> </ul>	This is recognized and considerable time and resources have been put in establishing a proper baseline on forests and forest IAS during the PPG. In addition, brief surveys during the PPG by the International Project Coordinator confirmed that a large number of invasive plants had invaded forests and forest margins in all four countries. In addition, a review of current IAS in the region includes species which are known to invade

Comments from Swiss Council Members	UNEP Response
<p>describes problems encountered in wetlands and not in forests.</p> <p>In general, it is rather difficult to relate the statements regarding project justification to the components of the project framework. For instance, the project title clearly addresses IAS in production and protection forests. However, project component no. 1 (national policy and instrumental frameworks) addresses explicitly IAS in general and the capacity building programmes (component no 3) target agriculture, forestry, transport, tourism etc.</p> <p>We share the view that IAS management requires a broad as well as multi-stakeholder approach. Nevertheless, some prioritisation is urgently needed to set the baseline for a further coherent project development. Does the project address predominantly IAS in forests or does it address capacity building in a more general manner?</p>	<p>forests and as such pose a significant threat to biodiversity. These include various <i>Passiflora</i> spp., <i>Thunbergia grandiflora</i>, <i>Mikania micrantha</i>, <i>Broussonetia papyrifera</i>, <i>Chromolaena odorata</i>, <i>Mimosa pigra</i>, <i>M. diplotricha</i>, <i>Acacia nilotica</i>, <i>Merremia peltata</i>, etc. etc. The lack of relevant capacity means that most IAS in forests are generally not noticed. For example, in many parts of Africa and Asia <i>Lantana camara</i> is considered to be native because it has been widely established for decades.</p> <p>Sections 2.3 and 2.6 in the Project Document describe in more details the specific problems, impacts and needed project approach with regards forests and related IAS. However, the project was always meant to establish country-wide IAS frameworks, encompassing all IAS, all relevant sectors and all major habitats affected in the target countries and not restrict to forests or forestry only, Although the pilots solely target forest habitats and related IAS, effective IAS prevention and control has to follow the approach as given above. This is based on considerable experience with previous GEF and non-GEF funded IAS programmes, as well as CBD guidance. IAS are mostly not habitat specific, do affect multiple sectors, and need multi-disciplinary approaches. That approach has been built into the project. However, due to the acknowledged reality of restricted budget and other resources, the project focuses its pilots and knowledge resources on forest habitats and related IAS.</p> <p>To be more specific: Components 1 (Policies), 3 (Capacity), and 5 (Communications) do have a necessary broad and multisectoral approach, whilst Component 2 (Regional) and Component 4 (Field pilots) focus on forests and forest related IAS. IAS are a cross-sectoral issue and as such it is not cost effective to only deal with IAS in one habitat type especially when it comes to policy issues.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Involvement of key stakeholders needs to be addressed in a strategic way</b></li> </ul> <p>We fully support the view expressed in the PIF that the lack of interest and support from key stakeholders and a subsequent inadequate financial support to the project are key risks in the achievements of its goals.</p> <p>We recognise an urgent need to tackle the issue in a proactive way and request that the involvement of key stakeholders is to be addressed strategically within the project framework. Indeed, it seems not acceptable that the main project outcome, i.e. the establishment of national policy and institutional frameworks, is anticipated to fail in 50% of the countries, or that strengthening the implication in IAS of the productive sector is used as a main criterion to justify GEF support, but no project component is dedicated to this issue.</p>	<p>We plan to have a higher success rate in getting countries to adopt national policies and institutional frameworks as they relate to IAS. We aim to involve as many stakeholders as possible in this project in order to make it a success including a range of individuals from policymakers to community members. It is important to note that the project has components dealing with awareness creation and capacity building, two activities which will focus on a wide range of stakeholders in order to improve/enhance buy-in. The IAS coordination mechanism will include individuals/ representatives from all sectors affected by IAS including health and trade while the NISSAP will be developed in consultation with stakeholders from government to community representatives. Pilot site activities will be undertaken by representatives from government agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and community groups. The regional component will also make a significant contribution to creating awareness. All of these activities involve a range of key stakeholders and will lead to stronger understanding, willingness and the forging of long-term and sustainable partnerships in the countries, thereby reducing the risk that policy and institutional frameworks will not be supported and endorsed.</p>

## RESPONSE TO STAP REVIEW

Date of screening: 29 January 2010

Guidance from STAP	UNEP Response
<p>1. Based on this PIF screening, STAP's advisory response to the GEF Secretariat and GEF Agency:</p> <p><b>Consent</b></p>	
<p><b>III. Further guidance from STAP</b></p> <p>2. STAP supports this project and notes that the Invasive Alien Species problem is a poorly acknowledged global threat to biodiversity and human well being. The project addresses the urgent need for coordinated, regional responses, within existing networks and experience such as that of the Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP).</p>	<p>Thanks for recognizing the growing threat and impacts from IAS.</p>
<p>3. The difficulties of mobilising a regional programme with participating countries at differing levels of institutional, legal, policy and technical capacity is recognised in the PIF, but the full proposal will need to indicate how the synergies of collaboration between differentiated needs and capacities, especially in technological/scientific and data management areas, will be accomplished.</p> <p>.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. The large differences between countries have led us to have differentiated country work programmes and outputs. E.g. Cambodia, Philippines and Vietnam will only run one pilot site with one IAS each, whilst Indonesia has two sites and two-three different IAS species as targets. Additionally the following differentiation in approach, activities and anticipated outputs are with countries such as Cambodia only undertaking one or two activities in some of the components, focusing on awareness creation and capacity building. A regional approach also allows countries with superior capacity and information to contribute to the needs of others – for example, the development of a regional database and web-based IAS information system means that countries can have access to information developed by other neighbours with superior capacity. In addition, the fact that countries such as Indonesia have released many biocontrol agents when compared to Cambodia means that the latter can benefit immensely from a regional project such as this – sharing of information of best practices including the introduction and release of biocontrol agents.</p> <p>This is further enabled by the project's focus (as against supporting all elements of the draft Asia Pacific Forest IAS Strategy) as well as support for establishing a Regional Biocontrol Working Group, and a regional IAS learning network, instead of going for formalized and bureaucratic processes of agreed Regional Action Plans etc.</p>
<p>4. The PIF includes, as component I(ii), cost recovery as a key motivating strategy for government support. However, it does not indicate how cost recovery will be approached. IAS control projects can be extremely labour intensive, and the funding of such operations needs to be linked to benefits not only to biodiversity but also to ecosystem services such as water yield, flood abatement, Non-Timber Forest Products, etc. Indications of how such benefits will be achieved in the pilot projects should be given in the full proposal</p>	<p>A number of invasive species have the ability to invade a range of habitats on which communities depend for fuelwood, building materials, medicinal plants, food, fodder for livestock and other resources. In some cases communities share income with park authorities accrued from tourism – reduced biodiversity or inaccessibility may drive tourists away. In a large number of cases communities willingly remove IAS at their own expense if they are aware of the impacts and best forms of management – providing communities with the information and tools is often all that is required to enhance IAS removal. This is especially the case in areas where people practice slash-and-burn agriculture – the inability to manage invasions hampers crop production and forest recovery.</p>

In cases where IAS are known to affect ecosystem services, such as the provision of water, a levy can be placed on downstream water use. Similar levies have been implemented with good effect in many parts of the world and will be developed and implemented in this project, especially in PA's that encompass important water catchments such as the Allah Watershed Forest Reserve in the Philippines. It would largely be based on the Working-for-Water Programme in South Africa which employs people to remove woody invaders from water catchments where they reduce water run-off – it is cheaper to employ people to remove IAS than build new dams – water users pay for this “service.” This Programme employs up to 30,000 people per year and makes a significant contribution to job creation and poverty alleviation. With rising unemployment in developing countries governments can benefit from initiating public works programme's which create jobs and restore ecosystem function.

Additional revenue for IAS management can also be accrued from tourists. Most of the pilot sites in this project are in protected areas which rely on tourism revenues. Since most park managers do not have the resources to pay for IAS management other sources of revenue will have to be identified. Surveys in some PA's in Africa have indicated that most visitors are willing to pay a levy on top of existing park entry fees provided that they are to be used for IAS management.

Additional revenue can also be accrued at a national level. Payment for services such as Risk Analysis on all imported goods that pose a risk to biodiversity or agriculture – in theory these include all imports since packaging material and containers may be vectors for pests and diseases. Additional charges can be imposed on the issuance of Phytosanitary Certificates and other inspections. Money accrued through fines as a result of non-compliance to national regulations pertaining to pest management can also be used for IAS management.

**RESPONSE TO GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW**

**Review date:** received 12 July 2011

Issue #	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Response
<b>Question 9: Is the project design sound, its framework consistent and sufficiently clear (in particular for the outputs)?</b>		
	<p>12/7/2011</p> <p>The project has benefitted from targeting resource allocation and not all project components are fully applied in each country. Links to existing regional organizations have been clarified. The PDD stresses the importance of exclusion and detection of IAS as the two key elements for success. The project includes elements of strengthening national quarantine systems in Component 4 and IAS survey and database in Component 5 – however, neither of these elements are addressed in the detail their importance would warrant. For example, Component 3 appears to be limited to training and equipment and material support without implementation; Component 5’s IAS surveys are not well described in terms of how these will be carried out or the outputs. Please provide additional information</p>	<p><i>Prevention and Early Detection and Rapid Response (ED&amp;RR) are indeed the most cost-effective IAS management strategies. As such they are therefore addressed in detail under several components:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Component 1. Output 1.4 “IAS Risk Analysis procedures for quarantine authorities” where one of the main activities is to establish or strengthen appropriate risk analysis procedures and guidelines for IAS.” Implementation of RA procedures is therefore addressed here and supported by activities under Component 3.</i></li> <li>• <i>Component 3: Output 3.1 “National IAS training programmes developed and implemented for different stakeholders (e.g. policy-makers, scientists, quarantine officers, extensionists)” which makes provision for the training of quarantine staff on topics such as IAS awareness, risk analysis, IAS identification, etc. These training courses will provide quarantine staff with the necessary skills/information to prevent the introduction of IAS.</i></li> <li>• <i>Component 3: Output 3.2 “Provision of equipment and material support to quarantine departments, border crossings, etc”. If needed, and funds are available, quarantine departments will also be provided with equipment and material support</i></li> <li>• <i>Component 4 “National Pilots on the Prevention, Control, and Management of Priority IAS” deals specifically with prevention at pilot site level. “Preventing the further proliferation of target species within the pilot sites will be a priority, enhanced by the roll-out of the most effective management techniques, one of the outputs of pilot site trials. Prevention will be further enhanced through the implementation of an awareness campaign targeting local communities as to the threats posed by the target species and its management and increased vigilance and awareness with regard to the introduction of foreign species to the pilot sites. Building capacity and increasing awareness amongst local communities and other stakeholders at pilot sites will contribute to a reduction in the</i></li> </ul>

Issue #	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Response
		<p>introduction, establishment and proliferation of exotic species” (see paragraph 271 in FSP document).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <i>Component 5: Output 5.1</i> “Development of a national IAS database based on surveys to document presence and impacts of selected forest IAS.” <i>Information will be gathered on all invasive plants threatening forests in Indonesia and Vietnam but due to a lack of resources this will be restricted to forests in Protected Areas only in Cambodia and the Philippines.</i> “The status and impact of selected IAS already present in each country will be documented through surveys addressing biological, social, and economic impacts, building on some of the baseline information provided during the PPG. Information, including indigenous knowledge on effective management systems used by local communities, will be compiled in the regional APFISN database which will be easily accessible to stakeholders and updated on a regular basis. However, lack of resources in Cambodia and the Philippines will limit the extent of surveys in each of these countries. Surveys in these two countries will be limited to forests in protected areas only with little to no research on impacts and management other than at pilot sites. The latter information will be obtained from other sources including other countries in the region, many of which share the same invasive plants. Surveys to determine the presence and distribution of invasive plants will be undertaken by foot or by vehicle. The presence of invasive plants will be logged on a GPS. This information will then be used to develop distribution maps and made available on the APFISN website and national IAS databases. The information will be used to develop management strategies and form the basis of an early detection and rapid response system.” (see paragraph 283 in FSP document). </li> </ul>

**13.Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated in project design?**

	<p>07/12/11 The project does demonstrate the cost effectiveness of collaborating at regional level wherever possible in the project to gain efficiencies. However, please demonstrate the cost-effectiveness</p>	<p>The pilot sites where there will be active trials to determine best management practices for invasive plants will be confined to an area of 26 ha. To this end a number of methodologies will be trialled to determine cost-effectiveness. Prior to undertaking any management activities Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA’s) will have to be undertaken – consultants/Task Teams will have to</p>
--	--	--

Issue #	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Response
	<p>of the Component 4 expenditure (\$1.25 M) relative to the area directly impacted by the project (26 ha).</p>	<p>be employed to do this. A range of specialists/consultants/Task Teams will also be required to determine impacts of the targeted invasive plants and their management on plants, soil microbes, insects, birds, small mammals and other fauna. Nurseries will also be established and consultants employed to assist in developing the most effective restoration techniques. In addition, biological control will be implemented in many countries – this means that the NCU’s will have to upgrade and rent quarantine facilities, hire staff to acquire test plants, mass rear the agents, and undertake host-range tests. Once trials have been completed EIA’s will need to be undertaken and submitted to the relevant authorities in order to obtain permission to release the agents. Once permission has been granted, agents will have to be mass reared, released and consultants appointed to undertake post-release evaluation. The above trials require significant inputs from experts, hence the costs. However, it should be noted that the development of the most cost-effective management strategies, which enhance biodiversity conservation, will result in a considerable cost-savings when implemented outside of pilot sites, at national and regional level. This is especially relevant to the release of host-specific and damaging biocontrol agents - biocontrol agents released in one area will eventually benefit the whole country and region. Reference to the cost effectiveness of pilot site activities has been included under Section 7.3 “Project cost-effectiveness” Paragraph 381:  “The development of the most cost-effective and environmentally friendly management strategies for selected invasive plants at pilot site level will significantly reduce the costs of management of targeted species and enhance biodiversity conservation at a national and regional level. There are significant differences in the costs and impacts of various management strategies such as manual vs chemical control or between various chemicals (herbicides) and different application methods. Biological control also offers good returns on research investments. For example, in South Africa the benefit:cost ratios of biocontrol ranged from 50:1 for invasive sub-tropical shrubs to 3,726:1 for invasive Australian trees<sup>8</sup> The costs were based on those associated with the development of the biocontrol agent while the benefits were the estimated value of ecosystem services protected by weed biological control”.</p>

<sup>8</sup> De Lange, WJ and van Wilgen, BW (2010) An economic assessment of the contribution of biological control to the management of invasive alien plants and to the protection of ecosystem services in South Africa. *Biological Invasions* 12: 4113-4124.



Issue #	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)	Response
<b>22.Are the confirmed co-financing amounts adequate for each project component?</b>		
	<p>07/12/11</p> <p>Co-financing has dropped from the PIF stage from 1:1.18 to 1:1.09. Higher levels of UNEP co-finance (currently less than 1%) would be expected given the project's importance to UNEP as explained in the PDD. The requirement for additional cofinancing remains.</p>	<p><i>We have received additional co-financing from the following sources:</i></p> <p><i>1) UNEP contribution: ROAP had initially contributed US\$22,750 (US\$15,000 in cash and US\$7,250 in-kind – see co-finance letter dated 22 June 2011). ROAP have subsequently increased their contribution by US\$60,000 (US\$30,000 in cash and US\$30,000 in-kind – see co-finance letter dated 29 July 2011). WCMC has contributed US\$20,000 in-kind (see WCMC co-finance letter dated 26 July 2011). <b>The total UNEP contribution is now US\$102,750.</b></i></p> <p><i>2) Philippines revised contribution: The Republic of the Philippines has increased its cash contribution from US\$255,430.23 to US\$274,034.88, an increase of US\$18,604.65, and its in-kind contribution from US\$317,874.42 to US\$424,851.16, an increase of US\$106,976.74. The Philippines will therefore be contributing an additional US\$125,581.39 to the project – total contribution is now US\$698,886.05.</i></p> <p><i>3) Indonesia revised contribution: The Ministry of Forestry will be contributing an additional US\$195,571 (US\$174,471 in cash and US\$21,100 in-kind) to the project.</i></p> <p><b><i>Co-financing at the PIF stage was 1:1.18 – with the additional co-funding commitments it is now 1:1.22</i></b></p>

**ANNEX C: CONSULTANTS TO BE HIRED FOR THE PROJECT USING GEF RESOURCES**

<i>Position Titles</i>	<i>\$/ person week*</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks**</i>	<i>Tasks to be performed</i>
<b>For Project Management</b>			
<b>International:</b>			
International Project Coordinator (IPC)	1153.85	208	Working in close collaboration with UNEP to ensure project management meeting GEF and UNEP standards. In addition, the IPC has to work closely with all members of the National Coordination Units (NCUs) in the four participating countries (see Appendix 11 in FSP document for TOR)
Justification for Travel, if any: The International Project Coordinator will have to travel in order to attend International Steering Committee Meetings as well as regularly visit the National Coordination Units and pilot sites. All these travels have been planned and budgeted for. According to the budget in Appendix 1 of the Project Document:			
1601	International travels		
1621	National travels (Cambodia)		
1622	National travels (Indonesia)		
1623	National travels (Philippines)		
1624	National travels (Vietnam)		
<b>Local</b>			
Project administrator	144.23	208	Manage and control the project's financial resources and other assets; ensure technical assistance to develop the financial operational systems for the project; ensure general successful execution of project implementation activities
SUB TOTAL		416	
<b>For Technical Assistance</b>			
<b>International</b>			
Consultants on policy development	1,350	37	Assist with the development/strengthening of national IAS policy and institutional frameworks in all countries
Regional cooperation consultants: • Communication specialists/experts • IAS training experts, etc.	1,350	72.26	Assist with the development/strengthening of regional and national communication and awareness with respect to IAS; develop and implement various IAS training modules/courses, etc.
SUB TOTAL		109.26	
<b>Local</b>			
National capacity building and institutional support: • Trainer • Course developer, etc.	900	200	Undertake surveys at pilot sites to determine distribution and impact of IAS on plants
National information and awareness consultants: • Communications specialists	900	125.44	Undertake surveys in forests at a national level to collate information on IAS – distribution, etc.
SUB TOTAL		325.44	

\* Provide dollar rate per person week. \*\* Total person weeks needed to carry out the tasks.

## ANNEX D: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS

### A. EXPLAIN IF THE PPG OBJECTIVE HAS BEEN ACHIEVED THROUGH THE PPG ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN.

All PPG objectives have been achieved. The PPG started with the Inception Workshop which was held in Kuala Lumpur in August 2010 where partners were identified for the project design phase as well as foreseen NEA's. The following activities were completed as part of the PPG:

- Initial national and site consultations;
- National and regional baseline studies and analysis:
  - Identification of priority forest IAS, their impacts, and pathways;
  - Agreement on site selection criteria;
  - Selection of pilot sites
  - Identification of draft interventions, including management/control options;
  - Development of profiles on national regulations, policies and programmes;
  - Analysis of threats, causes, and associated barriers to effective IAS management;
  - Calculate budget needs for FSP
- Drafting information and social marketing campaigns
- Institutional capacity and stakeholder assessments:
  - Assess training and capacity needs;
  - National and regional project execution arrangements agreed;
  - Final consensus on project design;
  - Final consensus on project document
- Design project M&E plan;
- Project design, proposal preparation, and co-finance mobilization

### B. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

Potential risks during project implementation have been described in section G of this document (expanded from those indicated during PIF concept). It is important to note that the workplans have been significantly adjusted for the countries based on available resources, which greatly vary between the countries. This amongst others means that not all the same sets of outputs will be established in the countries, however all will to a certain extent contribute to achieving the project outcomes, and definitely establish the frameworks for sustainability and replication beyond the life of the project. In addition to strengthen sustainability of IAS programmes by countries' technical agencies, the project will aim to strengthen existing mechanisms/systems such as the regional APFISN website instead of developing national stand-alone IAS websites. The APFISN website will be developed into an IAS information hub reducing costs at a national level. Awareness material will be developed and shared amongst the countries. Biological control also offers a considerable cost saving especially if it is promoted at regional level – by sharing limited resources countries can develop one agent for release throughout the region. Although the benefits may only become apparent after project closure the development of regional cooperation in biocontrol offers a long-term sustainable solution to the management of IAS.

PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

<i>Project Preparation Activities Approved</i>	<i>Implementation Status</i>	<i>GEF Amount (\$)</i>				<i>Co-financing (\$)</i>
		<i>Amount Approved</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>	<i>Uncommitted Amount*</i>	
Initial national and site consultations	Completed	35,000	35,000			40,000
National and regional baseline studies and analysis	Completed	112,500	112,500			100,000
Draft information and	Completed	35,000	35,000			20,000

social marketing campaigns						
Institutional capacity and stakeholder assessments	Completed	45,000	45,000			40,000
Design project M&E Plan	Completed	10,000	10,000			15,000
Project design, proposal preparation, and co-finance mobilization	Completed	0	0			60,000
<b>Total</b>		<b>237,500</b>	<b>237,500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>275,000</b>

\* Any uncommitted amounts should be returned to the GEF Trust Fund. This is not a physical transfer of money, but achieved through reporting and netting out from disbursement request to Trustee. Please indicate expected date of refund transaction to Trustee.

**ANNEX E: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS**

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

Not applicable to this project.