



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

GEF ID:	9539		
Country/Region:	Malawi		
Project Title:	Enhancing sustainability of Protected Area systems and Stabilizing Agro-production in Adjoining Areas through Improved IAS Management		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 1; BD-2 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$1,502,511
Co-financing:	\$4,950,000	Total Project Cost:	\$6,452,511
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Max Zieren

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	8-1-16 Yes. Cleared	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	8-1-16 Yes. Pages 19-20 of PIF Cleared	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,	8-1-16 Yes Cleared	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>8-1-16 Yes. Incremental reasoning can be improved once the "Baseline Project" is clarified. See below.</p> <p>9-15-16 Cleared</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>8-1-16</p> <p>The MSP has a good balance between working at the policy and institutional capacity on one hand, and on interventions in target PAS on the other. There is also a component on KM. There are nevertheless, some issues that need to be reconsidered by the proponents in order to sharpen the project.</p> <p>1. The budget for components 1 and 3 appear to be high (\$300K+ each) compared to the budget for component 2 for the work on the ground (\$600K+). Please consider rebalancing. Also change TA for INV for Component 2. Not possible to achieve the objective with TA only.</p> <p>2. The number of target Protected Areas (N=5) may be too high with a total area is \$380,000+ ha (+ adjacent ecosystems). Can this MSP take care</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>of the removal of the target IAS within time and budget, in addition to the proposed work under Component 1 and 3? On Table 1, please add the species threaten by the IAS in each of the protected areas, as appropriate.</p> <p>3. The number of target IAS (10+) is very high (Table 1). The GEF suggest narrowing down the number of Target Protected Areas and/or IAS. Suggest selecting a mix of species; some that the project is sure can remove, and others that will require experimentation. When selecting species, please be cognitive of the difficulties of eradicating some species like Pteridium aquilinum, because of the work involved in removing the rhizomes and the lightness of the spores that will almost guarantee its return to the park. Similar issues with Pistia and Azolla as they are transported by water and would be free to come in with the river flows and flooding. Are these realistic species to work with? The project needs to pay a really closed looked at the list of IAS it is proposing to remove. As is the project is overpromising and likely to under delivering.</p> <p>4. Considering the challenges of</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>permanently removing the target IAS, the GEF suggest preparing a table with the list of IAS that the project decides to concentrate on and provide information on a series of parameters like the degree of difficulties of removing the species, know methods of removal, extent in the different protected Areas (ball-park figure will suffice), etc. This table should allow narrowing down the list of species and have a "balance" portfolio with species the project can handle and species that will be challenging.</p> <p>4. On bio-control. Please indicate the IAS and the proposed biological control. Experience has showed how damaging bio-controls can be. Some times more damaging that the IAS themselves.</p> <p>5. Under 1.1 "The global environmental problems....", IAS Threats and Impacts in Malawi, there is no reference to the IAS affecting the Protected Areas or adjacent agricultural lands. Is it because these species are dealt with in Table 1? Again, reduced to the number of target species considering actual impact and feasibility of removal.</p> <p>6. Please elaborate on how the project</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>will ensure that the IAS removed from the PAs will be permanently removed. The project need to make a very good case for the removal of species as the GEF is currently concentrating resources in the management frameworks to prevent, control and manage IAS.</p> <p>7. Baseline. There is a comprehensive summary of IAS related issues on pages 9-10. Nevertheless, the reading suggest that there is no real "baseline project", that is, a set of initiatives and investments on the part of the Government to address the issue of IAS in protected areas and adjacent agro-ecosystems ("...no specific IAS prevention and control programs are being funded through government right now (p.9). The baseline project should be able to effectively implemented, whether or not the GEF project gets approved. What are the initiatives on which the GEF project is standing to provide incremental reasoning to deliver tangible and measurable results on the ground?</p> <p>8. There is an impressive list of co-financiers. Are they all aware they have been included in this PIF with the corresponding \$ figures? Please only include those that have been</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>contacted and agreed to participate. Having a long list of co-financiers is good, assuming their contributions in-kind are totally aligned with the proposed activities under the GEF grant. Otherwise, they will not contribute to the objective and may even interfere with the proposed work.</p> <p>9. Text on page 8 (starting on "Finally, there is little capacity to develop and implement..." appears to belong to the text Barrier 2.</p> <p>10. For Coordination, please indicate the projects and initiatives this proposed GEF project on IAS project has actually contacted to understand and work together. As is, it is no more than a list of similar projects whether or not there is real potential to coordinate.</p> <p>9-23-16 All issues addressed in the revised version. Please also look at email exchange with Agency on IAS. Cleared</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>8-1-6 Cleared</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>8-01-16 No. Please address outstanding issues under items 4 & 5. Thanks.</p> <p>9-23-16 Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review	August 01, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 15, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		

Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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