



PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG)
PROJECT TYPE: FSP
TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

Submission Date: November 30, 2011

GEF PROJECT ID: TBD

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID: 4714

COUNTRIES: Mexico

PROJECT TITLE: Enhancing National Capacities to manage Invasive Alien Species (IAS) by implementing the National Strategy on IAS

GEF AGENCY(IES): UNDP

GEF FOCAL AREA(S): BIODIVERSITY

A. PROJECT PREPARATION TIMEFRAME

Start Date of PPG	February 2012
Completion Date of PPG	June 2013

B. PROPOSED PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES (\$)

Describe the PPG activities and justification: The PPG process will engage stakeholders and will support specific studies and analyses to enable detailed design of the project "Enhancing National Capacities to Manage Invasive Alien Species (IAS) by Implementing the National Strategy on IAS". The final result of these analyses and consultations will be the Full Project Document and CEO Endorsement Request for the above mentioned project that will be submitted to GEFSec within the agreed upon timeframe and with all support documentation required, including co-financing confirmation letters.

The overall project strategy and main components of the project were identified during the preparation of the PIF. However, to enable more detailed assessments and the definition of priority actions, PPG resources are being requested. These resources will be used to support more detailed analysis of baseline conditions and opportunities, to carry out necessary consultations, and to define the roles and responsibilities of different institutions for project implementation. PPG resources will be supplemented with resources mobilized for co-funding a number of analyses, particularly those related to more in-depth assessment of the feasibility of IAS management demonstrations in targeted islands and protected areas, and for consultations with local stakeholders on these demonstration activities.

The PPG process will support: a) baseline and technical analyses of national level capacities related to IAS management ("management" includes identification, prevention, detection/response, control, eradication, and restoration), to further identify and cost the actions to be included in the FSP for improving IAS management at the systemic level; b) the definition of demonstration activities to be implemented in the FSP to test IAS management approaches for a variety of IAS under varying circumstances; and c) final preparation of all details of the FSP, including preparation of required documentation; a completed logical framework; monitoring and risk plans; feasibility analyses; budget and financing plans; and implementation arrangements.

1. Baseline and Technical Analysis of National Capacities and Needs for Integrated IAS Management

PPG resources will be used to collect information and analyze the institutional capacities of national institutions and authorities involved in the control of IAS, in order to identify gaps and constraints in the overall IAS governance framework. Particular focus will be placed on assessing the effectiveness and efficiencies of public

services with responsibilities in IAS management in terms of coordination mechanisms; legal and regulatory mandates; protocols, tools and mechanisms for IAS risk analysis, early warning, monitoring, and coordinated inter-institutional response; financial mechanisms to support IAS management; and budget allocation. The following activities will be undertaken and will provide critical data for Components 1 and 2 of the FSP:

1.1 Assessment of existing systems for collecting, assessing and sharing information on IAS in Mexico, and of the critical gaps in existing systems. Based on this, define actions to be undertaken in the FSP to establish widely accessible IAS information management systems and networks. (Note: CONABIO is already in the process of assessing IAS information systems, and will continue to this work during the PPG phase)

1.2 Full assessment of legal instruments related to IAS management at national, regional and local levels; identification of gaps; and definition of actions to be undertaken in the FSP to improve the framework for more effective protection of key biodiversity from the IAS threat.

1.3 Detailed capacity needs assessment for IAS management. This would include the analysis of staffing capacities and procedures, equipment; and budgets of different public institutions (in particular, CONANP, PROFEPA, SEMARNAT, and SENASICA) as well as know-how and expertise in a broader range of entities such as Universities; NGOs; and the private sector. Based on this, develop a proposal for professional skills development and the strategic elements for a capacity building plan that would be implemented in the FSP to improve skills of national and regional stakeholders.

1.4 Costing of government baseline expenditure (by each public agency) for IAS management and identification of potential additional sources of funds for financing IAS management over the long-term. This may include national development funds as well as international sources such as instruments on IAS (international treaties or conventions) signed by Mexico.

1.5 Analyses of current IAS management practices to limit the spread of IAS (flora and fauna) into and within Mexico, and identification of improvements needed to strengthen IAS management. These assessments, based on existing information sources, will analyze the main pathways (airports; ports; land transport) and processes (packing and transportation) responsible for IAS spread in the country, with a particular emphasis on pathways related to targeted production sectors (aquaculture; aquarium fish; wildlife and forest products). The assessments will evaluate the effectiveness of existing measures for IAS Prevention (Restriction; Inspection; Quarantine); Early Detection and Rapid Response (Treatment; Monitoring); and Control (containment), including the establishment of cost-effective and participatory systems of surveillance of these sectors, and of the key stakeholders that can and should take part in these procedures. Based on this, a final selection of IAS management activities (to be carried out during the FSP) will be made for each of the selected production sector, including the timing and costing of activities.

2. Demonstration Sites in FSP: Baseline Assessment and Technical Studies to further define the Scope of Demonstration Activities

The final goal of the demonstration activities in the FSP is to develop an effective approach for integrated IAS management at selected sites that can be replicated at other sites and at the national level. The aim of the demonstration work is thus not only to deliver direct global benefits by containing IAS at globally outstanding sites, but also to provide inputs to the development of the IAS management framework at the system level. Demonstration activities will show cost effective ways of preventing and/or controlling the spread of IAS internally in Mexico, and also will develop integrated approaches to reducing the impacts of IAS through programs of containment, eradication and/or mitigation.

In-depth studies, based on existing information, will be required during the PPG phase to define the full extent of the demonstration activities, and to ensure that the FSP proposal builds on sound information and clear feasibility

analyses. PPG resources therefore will be used to assess baseline activities for IAS management at the site level and provide a better understanding of the constraints that impede more effective management of IAS in islands and protected areas. Care will be taken to review past experiences and draw on lessons learned from previous and on-going IAS management actions (which are extensive in the case of islands, and less at protected areas), as well as a review of international programs including those funded through GEF. These reviews will be used to select and develop the most feasible and cost-effective demonstration activities, thereby providing critical inputs for components 2 and 3 of the FSP.

2.1 Define IAS management strategies to be implemented (during the FSP) at selected Mexican islands (most of them NPAs): Work together with national, regional and municipal stakeholders, private sector actors, and local communities to define the scope of the IAS threat to targeted island ecosystems; assess existing IAS management strategies and capacities; and develop detailed range of costed activities for IAS management of targeted islands during the full project. Based on previous analyses and experience with IAS management at the island level, a total of 13 islands in 6 island groups have already been selected.

2.1.1 Analyses of previous and ongoing IAS management practices on Mexican islands, and identification of improvements needed to strengthen IAS management (to be tested through demonstration activities during the project itself). These assessments, based on existing information sources, will analyze the main sectors (e.g. fishing; tourism) responsible for IAS spread to islands; the mechanisms for IAS spread within islands; and the relative importance for biodiversity conservation of different strategies (i.e. preventing / controlling new IAS introductions vs. containing / eradicating existing IAS vs. restoration of ecosystems and native species). The assessments also will evaluate the cost-effectiveness at these sites of the entire spectrum of IAS management, including: Prevention (Restriction; Inspection; Quarantine); Early Detection and Rapid Response (Treatment; Monitoring); Control (Containment; Suppression/Mitigation; Eradication) and Rehabilitation/Restoration, and will identify key stakeholders that can and should take part in these procedures. Based on this, a preliminary identification will be undertaken of the mechanisms, procedures and infrastructure needed to change these practices and effectively manage IAS.

2.1.2 Consultations with local government and civil society to broaden awareness on the importance of the whole spectrum of IAS management options to preserve the biodiversity values of the demonstration sites, as well as socio-economic benefits associated with biodiversity

2.1.3 Consultations and workshops on the advances of project design, including discussion of the proposed demonstration activities and their potential impact on local communities; participation of local stakeholders in the project; and identification of visitation regulations that could be developed during the FSP for control of the IAS threat (e.g. guided visits; IAS information brochures, etc.)

2.1.4 Final selection of IAS management activities (to be carried out during the FSP) for each of the selected islands, including the timing and costing of activities, and with details on targeted sites and species/populations on the islands. Detailed justification will be provided for the selection of specific sites/species and specific IAS management interventions, based on their importance for biodiversity conservation, potential socio-economic benefits, feasibility, cost effectiveness and potential for replication. Potential strategies may include: i) targeting high impact invasive species for which eradication, control or mitigation methods exist but require testing under more varied conditions (i.e. in different ecosystem types); ii) eradication or control of small populations in specific places to test the effectiveness of measures for replication in larger areas; and iii) testing cost-effective methods of containment or suppression for invasive species populations for which eradication is not considered to be feasible.

2.2 Define IAS management strategies to be implemented (during the FSP) at selected Protected Areas: Work together with national, regional and municipal stakeholders, private sector actors, and local communities to define the scope of the IAS threat to targeted protected area ecosystems; assess existing capacities and potential IAS management strategies; and develop detailed range of costed activities for IAS management of targeted protected

areas during the full project. Analysis will be carried out based on the existing initial diagnosis on IAS in the NPA System prepared by CONANP, with the expectation that 4-9 protected areas will be selected for implementation of IAS management interventions during the full project.

2.2.1 Assessments will be made of the main sectors (e.g. agriculture, forestry) and mechanisms (deforestation leading to ecosystem vulnerability; use of IAS in agriculture) responsible for IAS spread to protected areas; and the relative importance for biodiversity conservation of different strategies (i.e. preventing / controlling new IAS introductions vs. containing / eradicating existing IAS vs. restoration of ecosystems and native species). The assessments also will evaluate the cost-effectiveness at these sites of the entire spectrum of IAS management, including: Prevention (Restriction; Inspection; Quarantine); Early Detection and Rapid Response (Treatment; Monitoring); Control (Containment; Suppression/Mitigation; Eradication) and Rehabilitation/Restoration, and will identify key stakeholders that can and should take part in these procedures. Based on this, a preliminary identification will be undertaken of the mechanisms, procedures and infrastructure needed to effectively manage IAS.

2.2.2 Consultations with local government and civil society to broaden awareness on the importance of the whole spectrum of IAS management options to preserve the biodiversity values of the demonstration sites, as well as socio-economic benefits associated with biodiversity.

2.2.3 Consultations and workshops on the advances of project design, including discussion of the proposed demonstration activities and their potential impact on local communities, and the participation of local stakeholders in the project.

2.2.4 Final selection of 4-9 PAs to carry out IAS management activities (to be carried out during the FSP) based on the diagnosis about the IAS in PA prepared by CONANP, including the timing and costing of activities, and with details on targeted sites and species/populations within the protected areas and the productive landscape surrounding them. Detailed justification will be provided for the selection of specific sites/species and specific IAS management interventions, based on their importance for biodiversity conservation, potential socio-economic benefits, feasibility, cost effectiveness and potential for replication. Potential strategies may include: i) targeting high impact invasive species for which eradication, control or mitigation methods exist but require testing under more varied conditions (i.e. in different ecosystem types); ii) eradication or control of small populations in specific places to test the effectiveness of measures for replication in larger areas; and iii) testing cost-effective methods of containment or suppression for invasive species populations for which eradication is not considered to be feasible (based on prior experiences).

3. Definition of implementation arrangements and final preparation of project proposal including feasibility analysis and budget

Consultation will be undertaken at both the national and site levels to reach consensus on the final project details (drawing on inputs from activities 1 and 2), including the definition of implementation arrangements with clear roles and responsibilities for different components; financing levels, sources and modes; and target values for indicators against which the project success will be evaluated. These activities will pave the way for effective and efficient implementation and also promote sustainability of the project's goals. Activities will include:

3.1 Consultations with national and local government authorities, private sector actors, and civil society on the general understanding of the impact of IAS on biodiversity and national development and of their potential roles in IAS management. The consultations will provide input to design appropriate communications strategies for targeted audience in the FSP and to confirm potential partners and financers for the FSP.

3.2 Assessment of the alternatives to the project strategy and establishing the cost-effectiveness analysis of the preferred strategy and suite of activities.

3.3 Selection of key project indicators and monitoring strategy for the project including biodiversity benefits, environmental, economic, organizational, and efficiency indicators. This will include an evaluation of current monitoring and evaluation systems used by the different stakeholders in Mexico to measure impacts of IAS on native BD and BD of global importance. It will also include consultations with experts on indicators and the identification of baseline values for these.

3.4 Assessment of social and economic and financial sustainability of proposed project activities including gender aspects. The gender assessment will be aligned with the UNDP's Gender Equality Strategy (2008-2013). In this regard, UNDP is committed to ensure that gender equality is fully integrated into its entire program from the design to implementation and reports annually on its performance across the portfolio.

3.5 National level validation of the final details of project outcomes, outputs and activities based on a logical framework analysis, and the results of the studies undertaken in activities 1 and 2. This will include further definition of project risk mitigation measures, final validation of indicators and quantified targets, and formulation of the project M&E plan to track project progress and effectiveness.

3.6 Definition of the implementation arrangements for the FSP, including institutional arrangements to support project implementation; costs of the project management unit; and inputs required for implementation (consultants and their terms of reference; equipment, travel, etc).

3.7 Costing of the Project Outcomes and Outputs, and proposal for allocation of GEF and co-financing funds to cover those costs; identification of co-financing sources and secured letters of co-financing commitment.

List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities	Output of the PPG Activities	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (a)	Co-financing (b)	Total c = a+b
1. Baseline and Technical Analysis of National Capacities and Needs for Integrated IAS Management	1.1 Assessment of existing IAS information systems; define FSP actions to establish IAS information management systems and networks 1.2 Assessment of legal instruments related to IAS management; define FSP actions to improve framework for more effective protection of key biodiversity from IAS 1.3 Detailed capacity needs assessment for the identification, prevention, management and control of IAS; proposal for professional skills development and the strategic elements for a capacity building plan for FSP 1.4 Costing of government baseline expenditure for IAS management; identification of potential additional sources of funds for financing IAS management activities in the long-term. 1.5 Analyses of current IAS threats and IAS management practices at the national level and for selected production sectors; final selection of IAS management activities (to be carried out during the FSP) for each production sector, including the timing and costing of activities.	GEF TF	40,600 ¹	50,000 ²	90,600

¹ Payment of Intl. IAS Expert (incl. travel costs) and Legal Expert

² Payment for Policy/Institutional Coordination

<p>2. Demonstration Sites in FSP: Baseline Assessment and Technical Studies to further define the Scope of Demonstration Actions</p>	<p>2.1.1 Analyses of previous and ongoing IAS management practices on Mexican islands; preliminary identification of the mechanisms, procedures and infrastructure needed to change these practices and effectively manage IAS. 2.1.2 Consultations with local government and civil society at island sites to broaden awareness on IAS management options and socio-economic benefits associated with biodiversity. 2.1.3 Consultations on proposed demonstration activities, potential impact on local communities, and participation of local stakeholders at island sites 2.1.4 Final selection of IAS management activities (to be carried out during the FSP) for each of the 13 island sites, including the timing and costing of activities, and with details on targeted sites and species/populations on the islands. 2.2.1 Assessments of factors responsible for IAS spread to protected areas; analysis of previous and ongoing IAS management practices in and around PAs; preliminary identification of the mechanisms, procedures and infrastructure needed to effectively manage IAS. 2.2.2 Consultations with local government and civil society in and around protected areas to broaden awareness on IAS management options and socio-economic benefits associated with biodiversity. 2.2.3 Consultations on proposed demonstration activities, potential impact on local communities, and participation of local stakeholders at protected area sites 2.2.4 List of proposed IAS management activities (to be carried out during the FSP) for each of the protected areas (and the productive landscape surrounding them) selected during PPG phase, based mainly on the number of IAS present and their level of disturbance, with details on targeted sites and species/population and including the timing and costing of activities</p>	<p>GEF TF</p>	<p>17,000³</p>	<p>64,000⁴</p>	<p>81,000</p>
<p>3. Definition of implementation arrangements and final preparation of project proposal including feasibility</p>	<p>3.1 Communication strategies for targeted audiences; identification of potential partners and financiers for the FSP 3.2 Assessment of alternatives to project strategy; cost-effectiveness analysis of project strategy and suite of activities 3.3 Selection of key project indicators and monitoring strategy for project, including BD benefits, environmental, economic, organizational, and efficiency indicators 3.4 Assessment of social and economic and financial sustainability of proposed project activities including gender aspects</p>	<p>GEF TF</p>	<p>42,400⁵</p>	<p>10,000⁶</p>	<p>52,400</p>

³ Payment of the Participation & Communication Expert

⁴ Payment of the IAS Expert for Protected Areas; contract to GECEI; travel to demonstration sites

⁵ Payment of the Intl. Project Planning & Monitoring Expert, incl. travel costs, and for contractual services

⁶ Payment for office space/equipment; and workshops/consultations

analysis and budget	3.5 Finalized project outcomes, outputs and activities based on a logical framework analysis, and the results of the studies undertaken in activities 1 and 2 3.6 Implementation arrangements for the FSP, including institutional arrangements, inputs required for implementation, and Terms of Reference for main consultants and contracts 3.7 Costing of Project Outcomes and Outputs; secured letters of co-financing commitment				
Total Project Preparation Financing			100,000	124,000	224,000

C. FINANCING PLAN SUMMARY FOR PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT: (\$)

	Project Preparation	Agency Fee
Grant Amount	100,000	10,000
Co-Financing	124,000	
Total	224,000	10,000

D. PPG AMOUNT REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), FOCAL AREA(S) AND COUNTRY(IES)

Trust Fund	GEF Agency	Focal Area	Country Name/Global	(in \$)		
				PPG (a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total c = a+ b
GEF TF	UNDP	Biodiversity	Mexico	100,000	10,000	110,000
Total PPG Amount				100,000	10,000	110,000

E. PPG BUDGET

Cost Items*	Total Estimated Person Weeks for Grant (PW)	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Total (\$)
Local consultants*	49	22,600 ⁷	28,000 ⁸	50,600
International consultants	20	65,000 ⁹	0	65,000
Travel**		8,000	16,000	24,000
Contractual Services***		4,400	70,000	74,400
Office Space and Equipment		0	5,000	5,000
Workshops & consultation		0	5,000	5,000
Total PPG Budget		100,000	124,000	224,000

* Figures for consultants are the sum of all of the local and international consultants presented in Annex A

** Travel costs: CONABIO will cover travel costs for visits of the project preparation team to the island demonstration sites and to the protected area demonstration sites. GEF resources are being requested to cover travel to Mexico and per diems for

⁷ GEF funds for local consultants will cover the costs of the Participation & Communication Expert and the Legal Expert


⁸ Co-financing funds for local consultants will cover the costs of the IAS Expert for Protected Area Demonstration Sites

⁹ GEF funds for international consultants will cover the costs of the Expert on IAS Management and the Project Planning & Monitoring Expert

the international experts on IAS Management and on Project Planning and Monitoring (2 trips of 1 week each for each consultant: total of 20 days X \$250/day, plus 4 plane tickets at \$750 per ticket)

*** GEF resources will be used for contractual services for reporting and translation of documentation. Co-financing resources from CONABIO will cover the costs of a designated CONABIO staff person to manage the Policy & Institutional Coordination, as well as to contract GECI to prepare project activities at the island demonstration sites

F. GEF AGENCY CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF LDCF/SCCF Trust Fund criteria for project identification and preparation.					
Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Yannick Glemarec, UNDP/GEF Executive Coordinator		November 30, 2011	Lyes Ferroukhi, EBD	+507 302- 4576	Lyes.ferroukhi@undp.org

Annex A: Consultants Financed by the Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

Type of Consultant	Position / Titles	\$ / Person Week	Estimated PWs	Tasks to be Performed
National	Legal Expert	1,400	4	<p><u>Tasks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with legal experts in the relevant government institutions (SEMARNAT; PROFEPA, CONANP, SAGARPA, CONAFOR, INE, etc.) to undertake a full assessment of legal instruments related to IAS management at national, regional and local levels; identify gaps in this framework; and define actions to be undertaken in the FSP to improve this framework and provide more effective protection of key biodiversity from the IAS threat. <p><u>Outputs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document with the assessment of gaps in legal framework for IAS management and threat; a detailed plan of activities (with costs, timing and responsibilities) for addressing legal framework during FSP
Inter-national	Expert on IAS Management	3,500	10	<p>An international expert will be hired to provide technical analysis and expertise on IAS management issues, especially on Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR), in the development of the proposal. Ideally, the expert will have knowledge and experience across the range of IAS management strategies, including: Prevention (restriction; inspection; quarantine); Control and Management (containment; suppression/mitigation; eradication) and particularly Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR). This expert will be expected to provide guidance and strategy on IAS management and EDRR to key partners working to enhance systemic processes and capacities at the national level (CONABIO), to key partners developing strategies tailored to targeted production sectors (PROFEPA, etc.); and to key partners at the protected area demonstration sites (CONANP). The Expert on IAS Management will work under the general guidance of the Policy and Institutional Expert with regard to standard formats and approaches to data collection and consultation, and will report to the PPG National Director.</p> <p><u>Tasks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give guidance on how to develop an EDRR concept at the national level; propose activities to be implemented during the FSP to strengthen national processes and capacities; • Analyze main IAS pathways in the productive sectors targeted by the project and the gaps and barriers that need to be addressed to reduce IAS and suggest prevention and EDRR practices in response; • Provide inputs to the work of the Policy and Institutional Expert on the institutional context and the programmatic baseline for IAS management in Mexico; • Provide guidance to the IAS Expert for Protected Area Demonstration Sites on site-level regulations and controls that could be implemented during the FSP to minimize the threat of IAS introductions; provide guidance to develop a concept for Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR) within the selected PAs, and produce a general strategy document on EDRR for CONANP; • Participate in technical meetings and workshops to reach agreement on project outcomes and activities and provide relevant expertise on IAS management to these discussions, and to the definition of project indicators to monitor IAS pressures and to track project progress and effectiveness; <p><u>Outputs</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposal for an EDRR concept at the national level; a report on proposed interventions (during the FSP) to strengthen national coordination, processes and

				<p>capacities for IAS prevention and response, with details on appropriate indicators, analysis of risks and risk responses, and guidance on costs, timing and responsibilities;</p> <p>2. Report on the main IAS threats and pathways related to the targeted production sectors; the effectiveness of existing IAS management activities; and proposed interventions (during the FSP) to strengthen coordination, processes and capacities for IAS prevention and response at the targeted production sectors, with details on appropriate indicators, analysis of risks and risk responses, and guidance on costs, timing and responsibilities;</p> <p>3. Proposal for an EDDR concept for selected PAs, including costs and timing</p>
National	IAS Expert for Protected Area Demonstration Sites	1,000	28	<p>The full project will implement demonstrations of IAS management strategies in 4-9 high risk/high diversity National Protected Areas (NPAs). An expert will be hired to review and update the existing initial diagnosis on IAS in the NPA System prepared by CONANP in order to select the 4-9 NPAs where activities will take place during the full project. Island NPAs will not be considered. Ideally, the IAS Expert for Protected Area Demonstration Sites will have knowledge and experience across the range of IAS management strategies, with particular emphasis on identification of IAS and their impacts on natural ecosystems, and of relevant IAS management responses at the site level. The expert will be expected to provide guidance to CONANP so that it may select the most suitable NPAs. The Expert on IAS Management will provide consultation and review, while the Policy and Institutional Expert will provide general guidance on standard formats and approaches to data collection and consultation. The selected expert will report to the PPG National Director.</p> <p><u>Tasks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify current and potential IAS of greatest impact within NPA System, based on existing diagnoses • Carry out an analysis of the globally significant biodiversity, and existing and potential IAS threats and their impacts, at each of the 9 selected NPAs. This work will be done by reviewing the existing initial diagnosis, pertinent literature and databases, and by collecting information through personal communication with NPA staff, academic institutions, and environmental management units. The expert will take into account existing experiences and lessons learned from previous and ongoing activities outside and inside NPAs in Mexico as well as abroad; • Examine the contribution of productive sector activities to IAS threats within and surrounding NPAs, identifying key IAS pathways and determining (broadly) their impacts on native wildlife and ecosystems. This analysis will include identification of official programs that may be encouraging the use of IAS in these areas; • Work with staff, local authorities and communities at demonstration NPAs to assess the potential and impacts of regulations and controls that may be implemented during the FSP to minimize the threat of IAS introductions (e.g. establish cost-effective surveillance of pathways; implement regulations on productive sector activities, etc.); • Analysis of previous and ongoing IAS management practices at NPAs and surrounding landscapes; preliminary identification of the mechanisms, procedures and infrastructure needed to effectively manage IAS. • Based on these results, consult with national stakeholders to confirm the priority list of 4-9 NPA demonstration sites for the Full Project, and the activities to be carried out at each site during the Full Project. Final selection should be based on the presence of sustainable populations of globally significant biodiversity; the vulnerability of those populations to existing or potential IAS threats; the interest and capacities of local authorities and communities in

				<p>implementing IAS management; and the classification of specific areas and their related land and resource use restriction options.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participate in technical meetings and workshops to reach agreements regarding project outcomes and activities and provide relevant expertise on IAS management to these discussions, and to the definition of project indicators to monitor IAS pressures and to track project progress and effectiveness • Develop criteria and identify possible sites in Mexico for replication of project demonstrations (post-project); collect initial data on potential sites (e.g. globally significant biodiversity; IAS impacts; location and size; management status); propose actions (during project) that will facilitate replication (with costs, timing and responsibilities). • Work on the GEF IAS Tracking Tool in collaboration with at least 10 national counterparts (from various institutions) <p><u>Outputs</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update the initial diagnosis about efforts at NPAs in Mexico for IAS control, prevention, eradication or rehabilitation, including analysis of effectiveness and barriers; 2. Report on the 9 NPAs diagnosed, including globally significant biodiversity, existing IAS and their impacts, the level of disturbance of the different ecosystems; productive activities involving IAS (including information on any federal, state or local government institutions/programs that are promoting the use of IAS at the sites); 3. Confirmed list of 4-9 NPAs for project demonstration sites, with details on globally significant biodiversity; existing and potential IAS threats; local interest and capacities in implementing IAS management; information on land uses and classifications; and summary of reasons for selection; 4. With the inputs of national experts and local stakeholders, create a detailed proposal for IAS management activities to be implemented during the FSP at the selected project demonstration sites, taking account of the specific conditions at each site, with details on activities (including further diagnoses, if required), appropriate indicators, analysis of risks and risk responses, and details on costs, timing and responsibilities. IAS management at the selected sites will focus as much on the surrounding productive landscape (from which many IAS threats originate) as within the PAs themselves. For each site, the proposal should include justification for the selection of specific IAS management choices, taking into account the need to select approaches that are cost effective, that address any interactions among different IAS species, and that provide maximum benefits to endangered biodiversity of global significance. Primary emphasis is expected to be on prevention and EDRR approaches, which should include details on productive sector controls and surveillance, inspection and quarantine infrastructure and resources, and an early warning system for rapid detection and response to new IAS introductions; 5. Proposal for activities during the FSP to promote replication (post-project) of project demonstrations, including a table showing: i) critical needs/opportunities for replication; ii) project activities to enable / support replication; iii) location and timing for replication; and iv) institutional responsibilities for replication activities. 6. Completed IAS Tracking Tool, with scores from each participant at two levels: i) national capacities for IAS management; and ii) demonstration site capacities for IAS management
National	Participation & Communication Expert	1,000	17	Effective frameworks for IAS management, with potential for replication throughout Mexico, will be developed based on the demonstration projects undertaken at selected project demonstration sites. It is therefore essential that the management frameworks for IAS at the site level are compatible with those developed with stakeholders at the systemic level. It is furthermore important that

				<p>the strategies for IAS management at the site level are developed with the participation and support of local authorities, communities, and resource users. For this reason, an expert in participatory processes and communications will undertake the following tasks, in close collaboration with national and local authorities, and with the Policy and Institutional Expert:</p> <p><u>Tasks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide inputs for communication activities/strategies as part of the institutional capacity needs assessment and related capacity building proposal developed by the Policy and Institutions Expert; • Identification of existing regional and local organizations dealing with IAS-related subjects (e.g. CAMAFU - Comunidad de Aprendizaje de Manejo de Fuego /Learning Community on Fire Management). Based on this, develop a proposal for activities during the FSP to establish institutional coordination mechanisms for IAS management; • Describe the key stakeholders (site level) for the project; hold consultations with identified stakeholders to measure their understanding of the mechanisms and impacts of IAS threats to biodiversity and national development, as well as to discuss their potential future roles in IAS management. Based on this, develop a stakeholder involvement plan (site level) for participation in the FSP; communications and outreach strategies for targeted audiences during the FSP; and proposed project indicators to ensure participation can be effectively measured during project implementation; • Assess the socio-economic conditions at the selected demonstration sites, including the conditions and practices of the production sectors targeted by the project; • Work with local stakeholders at the demonstration sites to ensure that the selection of IAS management strategies and sites takes account of local priorities and interests, and that the potential impacts of prevention, response, control and management activities on local stakeholders are fully understood and accounted for; • Facilitate consultation and validation meetings at the site level to generate inputs and agreement on project outcomes, outputs and activities; act as a focal point for information to local stakeholders as needed • Assess the social and economic sustainability of proposed project activities at the demonstration site level, including gender aspects; <p><u>Outputs</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposal for communication activities at the national level, with details on specific activities, costs, timing, and responsibilities; 2. Proposal for activities during the FSP to establish institutional coordination mechanisms for IAS management (at the site level), with details on specific activities, costs, timing, and responsibilities; 3. A stakeholder involvement plan (site level) for participation in the FSP; 4. Targeted communications and outreach strategies designed for FSP, with details on specific activities, costs, timing, and responsibilities; 5. Description of the socio-economic conditions at each of the proposed demonstration sites, including the conditions and practices of the production sectors targeted by the project; 6. Description of the social and economic sustainability of proposed project activities at the demonstration site level, including gender aspects.
Inter-national	Project Planning & Monitoring Expert	3,000	10	Through at least two missions to Mexico and support from home base, the International Project Planning and Monitoring Expert will closely coordinate with the PPG Policy and Institutional Expert and the PPG National Director to perform the following tasks:

				<p><u>Tasks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide overall orientation to PPG team in relation to GEF requirements for project planning and monitoring; and specific guidance on methodologies for data collection for project planning and monitoring, with particular attention to the approach for describing and quantifying the baseline expenditure; • In conjunction with the PPG experts and national staff; and based on outputs of PPG studies, validate the results of the studies undertaken during the PPG phase and the final details of project outcomes, outputs and activities based on a logical framework analysis; • Assess existing monitoring and evaluation systems of relevant institutions for IAS and biodiversity in Mexico, and provide guidance and orientation on indicators and quantified targets to track project progress and effectiveness; <p><u>Products</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Guidance documents for the national team regarding: i) methodologies for collecting data for planning and project monitoring; and ii) the requirements of the GEF in terms of planning and project monitoring; 2. Together with Policy and Institutional Expert, finalize all details in the project logical framework, including validation of the final details of the results, products and activities of the project, a precise definition of mitigation measures for project risks, and final validation indicators and quantified targets; 3. A monitoring and evaluation plan and a plan for the project that: a) allows the adoption of adaptive management strategies for project implementation; b) facilitates the evaluation of the project to its completion; c) provides input as to provide risk mitigation measures; and d) provides the basis for a future integrated monitoring and evaluation for integrated management of IAS in Mexico; 4. Together with Policy and Institutional Expert, submit required documentation (UNDP Prodoc and GEF Endorsement Request) and lead process to revise and finalize documents in response to comments from UNDP and GEF
--	--	--	--	---

In addition to the work of consultants hired during the PPG process (as detailed in the table above), significant contributions to the development of the Full Sized Project will be made by partner institutions through the use of co-financing funds, as follows:

1. Policy & Institutional Coordination: CONABIO will designate a staff person to coordinate the work of all partner institutions as well as the PPG consultants, and to lead the development of the policy and institutional work necessary during the PPG phase. As noted earlier, the FSP will improve legal, institutional and policy frameworks for the management of Invasive Alien Species, and will undertake specific interventions to improve IAS management in targeted production sectors, to strengthen ongoing IAS management actions on selected islands, and to implement demonstration projects in mainland protected areas to manage IAS in high biodiversity ecosystems. This will require consolidating policies, laws and regulations, capacities, and institutional responsibilities and coordination across different national governmental authorities and sectors. In order to plan effectively for these actions in the FSP, the project preparation phase will require data collection and consultation with a wide range of stakeholders and experts on a number of issues. An expert at CONABIO will have overall responsibility for the coordination of national counterparts, as well as PPG experts hired for specific tasks, and will be responsible for guiding the process of data collection, systematization and validation of findings. The expert will also be charged with coordinating closely with the international expert on project planning and monitoring and with the PPG national director to ensure the timely completion of project development steps and the final project documentation. In addition she will undertake specific analyses in her area of expertise.

Tasks

- Convene, direct and report on meetings of the PPG oversight / technical committee(s)
- Provide methodological orientation to experts hired through co-funding and PPG resources and to PPG Government focal points in the relevant institutions to ensure a harmonised approach to data collection and consultation across stakeholders. This will include review of methodologies proposed by different experts for data collection and support to meetings, consultations and negotiation of project components with different stakeholders;
- Work with national institutional counterparts to undertake a detailed capacity needs assessment of key institutions for integrated IAS management, including an analysis of existing staffing and procedures; equipment and resources; and budgets. Based on this, develop a capacity building plan for the FSP to improve skills of national and regional stakeholders;
- Analyze and describe the socio-economic context of production sectors targeted by the project
- Analyze and describe the policy, institutional and financial barriers to effective IAS management in Mexico
- Working with national counterparts, analyze and describe the programmatic baseline of the project (a summary of existing and planned programs and projects for IAS management in Mexico, including budgets / expenditures of government agencies and projects);
- Analyze and describe the programmatic strategy of the project vis-à-vis national priorities for IAS; regional priorities and programs for IAS; and linkages with other IAS projects in Mexico;
- Undertake a review of the cost-effectiveness and sustainability of proposed project activities; summarize for discussion with national counterparts; and finalize for project documentation;
- Convene and chair consultations and technical meetings with all national counterparts and experts to validate the baseline and technical studies commissioned through the PPG, and to finalize the project outcomes, outputs and activities based on a logical framework analysis;
- Together with the PPG National Director, hold consultations and meetings with relevant institutions to agree on project financing and to secure co-financing letters; develop project budgets
- Collaborate closely with national and international experts on project planning and monitoring, to develop M&E plan to track project progress and effectiveness;
- Hold meetings and consultations with relevant institutions to define the implementation strategy for the FSP, including institutional arrangements for project implementation; detailed costs of the project management unit; and other key inputs required for implementation;
- Oversee the final preparation and review of project documentation by all relevant experts and the consultations for internal and external approval

Outputs

The designated expert at CONABIO will deliver the following specific outputs:

1. Guidance documents for work planning, consultations and data collection for use by national staff/experts and experts hired through the PPG (including input from the international project planning and monitoring expert);
2. Capacity needs assessment for public institutions for IAS management; a detailed plan of activities (with costs, timing and responsibilities) for addressing institutional and individual capacities during FSP;
3. Assessment of the socio-economic context of production sectors targeted by the project;
4. Assessment of the critical policy, institutional and financial barriers to effective IAS management in Mexico;
5. Assessment of baseline expenditures for IAS management (by each government agency and/or project); estimate of future IAS management budgets during the 4 years of FSP implementation; estimate of funds required to cover the recurrent costs of improved IAS management;

6. Assessment of the programmatic strategy of the project: i) how the project fits into national priorities, as expressed in official documents and programs; ii) how the project fits into regional priorities and programs relevant to Mexico; and iii) linkages between the project and other GEF projects in Mexico and/or the projects of other institutions regarding IAS in Mexico
7. Analysis of the cost-effectiveness and sustainability (institutional, environmental, social and financial) of proposed project activities, including gender aspects;
8. Based on participatory logical framework development process, finalize detailed descriptions of project outcomes, outputs and activities (with associated costs, timing, and responsibilities), and finalize project results framework with indicators (incl. baseline and target values), sources of verification, and risks / assumptions (incl. annex describing project risk mitigation measures)
9. Develop all required project budgets and budget notes (in both the UNDP Prodoc and GEF Endorsement Request) showing uses of GEF and co-financing funds; secure signed letters of co-financing commitment;
10. Provide inputs to work of international expert on project planning and monitoring on detailed project M&E plan (including budget)
11. Implementation arrangements defined for the FSP, including institutional roles and responsibilities (and any required institutional agreements); costing of the project management unit; inputs required for implementation (terms of reference for project committees and key project staff and consultants; contracts; etc.);
12. Work together with international expert to review and revise final Project documentation, including required responses to comments from UNDP and GEF
13. Final report on activities carried out during the project preparation (PPG) phase.

2. Project Demonstration Sites – Islands: As noted in the table on PPG consultants, the IAS Expert for Protected Area Demonstration Sites will take the lead role (in close collaboration with CONANP) in assessing IAS issues in protected areas and developing a suite of activities for managing IAS in those areas during the Full Project. For the Mexican islands that also will be Protected Area Demonstration sites, significant baseline information and IAS management experience is already available, and therefore no outside expert will be hired during the project preparation phase. Rather, the Mexican NGO GECEI, which has extensive previous and ongoing experience with IAS management activities on Mexico's islands, will be contracted by CONABIO to carry out similar activities of assessment and project activity design for these sites. Many of the outputs of this work by GECEI are expected to be similar to those of the IAS Expert for Protected Area Demonstration Sites, although the former will have more emphasis on IAS control, prevention, eradication and rehabilitation, while the latter will have more emphasis on IAS prevention, detection and response. The outputs of the GECEI work are expected to include:

1. Confirmed list of specific project demonstration sites, with details on globally significant biodiversity; existing and potential IAS threats; local interest and capacities in implementing IAS management; and information on the land use classifications;
2. Detailed report on previous efforts at project demonstration sites for IAS control, prevention, eradication or rehabilitation, including analysis of effectiveness and barriers;
3. Summary report on the selection of management choices related to control, management and eradication at the project demonstration site level, with information on selection process, justification, and biodiversity benefits;
4. Detailed proposal for control, management and eradication activities to be implemented at the project demonstration sites during the FSP, possibly including: (i) aggressive invasives for which control, management or eradication methods exist but require testing under specific site conditions; (ii) eradication or control of small populations in specific places to test the effectiveness of measures for replication in larger areas; and (iii) cost-effective methods of control for invasive species populations for which eradication is not feasible; with details on

activities, appropriate indicators, analysis of risks and risk responses, and guidance on costs, timing and responsibilities;

5. Proposal for activities during the FSP to promote replication (post-project) of project demonstration demonstrations, including a table showing: i) critical needs/opportunities for replication; ii) project activities to enable / support replication; iii) location and timing for replication; and iv) institutional responsibilities for replication activities