



# PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF)

**PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project**  
**THE GEF TRUST FUND**

**Submission Date:** 07 April 2009

**Resubmission:** 22 May 2009, 09 Sept 2009, 15 January 2010

## PART I: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

**GEF PROJECT ID:** 3957 **PROJECT DURATION:** 48 months

**GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:**

**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):** Indonesia: Forest and Nature Conservation Research & Development Center (Bogor) - Ministry of Forestry, with Ministry of Environment; Cambodia – Ministry of Environment with Forest Administration; Vietnam – Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment – Vietnam Environmental Protection Agency; Philippines – Department of Environment and Natural Resources. ASEAN Center for Biodiversity (Manila) and FAO Regional Office Asia Pacific (Bangkok).

**GEF FOCAL AREA (S):** Biodiversity

**GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S):** BD SP 7 Invasive Species

**NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT (if applicable):** related to but not part of GEF SFM

INDICATIVE CALENDAR*	
Milestones	Expected Dates
Work Program (for FSP)	March 2010
CEO Endorsement/Approval	March 2011
Agency Approval Date	May 2011
Implementation Start	July 2011
Mid-term Evaluation	June 2013
Project Closing Date	July 2015

## **A. PROJECT FRAMEWORK**

**Project Objective:** 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	Indicative GEF Financing <sup>a</sup>		Indicative Co-Financing <sup>a</sup>		Total (\$) c = a + b
				(\$ a)	%	(\$ b)	%	
1. Establishing National Policy and Institutional Frameworks	STA	(i) Policy and institutional environment enabled in at least two of four countries for cross-sectoral prevention and management of IAS (all invasive species, not just forest)  (ii) Cost-recovery recognized by national agencies as key to long term IAS programming.  (iii) Strengthened national regulatory and legal frameworks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ National Invasive Species Strategy and Action Plans agreed – based on science, data analysis. &amp; consultations</li> <li>▪ National invasive species multi-stakeholder mechanisms (e.g. Apex body) established.</li> <li>▪ Identification of cost recovery mechanism &amp; action plan.</li> <li>▪ Guidelines towards national regulations on prevention, control and management of IAS established with related authorities, including customs and quarantine agencies"</li> </ul>	420,000	49	443,150	51	863,150
2. Regional Cooperation – the Regional Forest Invasive Species Strategy (RFISS) for Southeast Asia	STA	(i) Enhanced transboundary coordination, programming and resource mobilization of priority forest IAS and pathways.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Development &amp; Agreement on an regional Action Plan under the available draft RFISS</li> <li>▪ Strengthened regional network (Asia Pacific Forest Invasive Species Network; Int SC established).</li> <li>▪ Information exchange mechanisms, joint</li> </ul>	152,500	39	235,000	61	387,500

			programming, and resource mobilization towards targeting priority IAS and pathways.					
3. National Capacity Building and Institutional Support	STA &TA	(i) Enhanced collaboration and capacity built for multisectoral prevention and management of IAS  (ii) Trained staff on IAS in all relevant departments playing role in prevention, control and management of IAS.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ National training programs on IAS awareness, prevention, risk analysis, control methods, identification skills, legislation (e.g. agriculture, forestry, transport, tourism, etc).</li> <li>▪ Strengthened national prevention and control programs through institutional support, equipment and training.</li> <li>▪ Support to expanding national research capacity and organizing IAS inventory programs. (available scientific data feed into NISSAPs as well as collaborative regional action)</li> </ul>	565,000	47	635,000	53	1,200,000
4. National Pilots on the Prevention, Control and Management of Priority Forest IAS	TA/S TA	(i) Improved national field management experience with implementing IAS prevention, control and monitoring measures  (ii) Enhanced protection of forest biodiversity hotspots and its associated local community livelihood  (iii) Enhanced understanding and experience with habitat and vegetation rehabilitation after IAS control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Design and feasibility assessment conducted towards national and regional biosecurity systems, including export-import precautions for forest related invasives, expansion of existing quarantine systems, etc.</li> <li>▪ "HCVF Pilot Sites established through effective local partnerships (1-2 per country)</li> <li>▪ Biodiversity &amp; socio-economic (baseline) data for pilot sites and buffer zones collected and applied to local IAS monitoring systems</li> <li>▪ Local site management plans drafted and agreed, including on cost effective control measures, vegetation restoration, economic impacts, EIA procedures.</li> <li>▪ Eradication and control measures taken and EIA conducted incl. bio- and chemical control for priority IAS.</li> <li>▪ Site monitoring plans (priority IAS) established.</li> </ul>	624,000	46	725,000	54	1,349,000

5. National Information, Monitoring, and Awareness Program	TA& STA	(i) Enhanced capture, access and use of information by IAS managers nationally and in the region  (ii) Enhanced willingness of stakeholder groups to be involved in IAS management and resource mobilization.  (iv) Strengthened national public agenda on IAS.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Development of the Asia Pacific forest IAS network database, development and linking with national and global IAS information systems.</li> <li>▪ National awareness &amp; media campaigns, workshops, meetings and training activities especially targeting local communities affected, as well as related government institutions.</li> <li>▪ Program for national IAS surveys established, with emphasize on HCVF, as part of IAS early detection and monitoring systems.</li> <li>▪ National and regional reporting procedures established with multi-stakeholder forum / Apex bodies.</li> </ul> <p>Best practices and lessons compiled &amp; disseminated based on country pilots</p>	882,350	45	1,088,500	55	1,970,850
6. M&E Plan		(i) Ability to track and monitor project progress and impact performance against prior agreed indicators & benchmarks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Project M&amp;E Plan up and running including MTR and TE</li> </ul>	129,090	49	135,000	51	264,090
7. Project management				308,105	44	385,000	56	693,105
<b>Total project costs</b>				<b>3,081,045</b>		<b>3,646,650</b>		<b>6,727,695</b>

**B. INDICATIVE CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE and by NAME** (in parenthesis) if available, (\$)

Sources of Co-financing	Type of Co-financing	Project
Project Government Contribution 4 countries	Both cash and in-kind	2,800,000 <sup>1</sup> t.b. confirmed
GEF Agency(ies) : UNEP	In-kind	100,000 t.b. confirmed
Bilateral Aid Agency(ies)		
Multilateral Agency(ies): FAO	Both cash and in-kind	350,000
Private Sector		
NGO		
Others	t.b confirmed	396,650
<b>Total Co-financing</b>		<b>3,646,650</b>

<sup>1</sup> Given the large financial and state budgeting problems in the countries, no confirmation can be given on amount of any cash co-finance available in particularly Indonesia and Cambodia

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

	Previous Project Preparation Amount (a) <sup>2</sup>	Project (b)	Total c = a + b	Agency Fee
GEF financing	0	3,081,045	3,081,045	308,105
Co-financing	0	3,646,650	3,646,650	
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6,727,695</b>	<b>6,727,695</b>	<b>308,105</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	Indonesia	1,300,000	130,000	1,430,000
„	„	Cambodia	404,545	40,455	445,000
„	„	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>

**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 recognised 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 additionally negative impacts to ecosystem services including a.o. a stable hydrology for water supply and containment of floods; soil productivity, pollination functions, or 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 experience high forest maintenance costs (e.g. invasive plant clearing, replanting). Logged-over forests in particular have problems with natural regeneration due to invasive alien species 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, waterways, logged-over sites, as well as buffer-zones surrounding protected areas and forest.

Partially as a result of large scale deforestation and forest degradation, 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, 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 entire Asia 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 country in the region has developed costs-recovery mechanisms to deal with the growing cost of invasives species prevention and control. Reportedly this is also an issue in a developed countries like Australia where years of invasive species control are paid by public funding instead of mechanisms such as the consumer or polluter pays principles.

<sup>2</sup> Include project preparation funds that were previously approved but exclude PPGs that are awaiting for approval.

The Global Invasive Species Program (GISP) supported countries in South and SE Asia in 2002 to summarize species, threats and impacts of IAS in the project region, including recommended action (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 poverty, 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 programs, and which will act as pilots to test new mechanisms to assess key national & regional pathways to forest infestations, developing technical as well as institutional prevention and control mechanisms, remove capacity and knowledge barriers, and work towards replication and expansion to neighboring countries through capturing and dissemination of best practices supported by the Asia-Pacific Forest Invasive Species Network (APFISN), the ASEAN ACB, as well as provision of training and regional workshops. Priority given to IAS control and management in national policies needs to be increased, as should allocated funding through design of specific cost recovery mechanisms.

lack of awareness in negative effects of IAS and insufficient coordination between related departments, sectors and stakeholders under an efficient Regional Forest Invasive Species Strategy (RFISS) are additional issues to be solved. This project aims at assisting the countries in terms of capacity building, awareness raising, development of efficient national policies, IAS control & management field testing, and sharing knowledge and experiences through working in a collaborative way in the region. Expected global benefits include contributions to reducing the loss of forest biodiversity, as well as damage to natural forest ecosystems, and reducing the negative impacts of IAS on national economies and local livelihoods.

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

All countries covered by this proposal have identified the threat of invasive species to their ecosystems, biodiversity, community health and economies as of major concern. The four countries' mention in their National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAP) the issue of invasive species although not always at an extend as needed, and have submitted 3rd National Reports highlighting remaining challenges for effective IAS management. Some countries have already initiated steps including legislative measures towards National Invasive Species Strategic Action Plans. The APFISN, coordinated by FAO, has already written a draft Regional Invasive Species Strategy as well as 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:

**Indonesia:** although IAS are an integral part of the NBSAP very little work has been conducted nationally in prevention and control of invasive species, as such the level of expertise in the country is rather low. Exceptions are found in the 40+ years long battle against *Acacia nilotica*, a species introduced in the 1960s to act as a (bush)fire break in Baluran National Park, some basic research on the invasiveness of agricultural pests by BIOTROP, and the start of inventory work on forest IAS by the Forest Research and Development Agency (MoF). It is well known that Indonesian lakes, many with unique endemic fish fauna have been impacted seriously by aquatic invasive species such as Water Hyacinth, Salvinia or Grass Carp and the Silver Carp, (disturbed) humid dipterocarp forests have been invaded by *Lantana camara*, *Piper aduncum* and many others exotic plant species, Alligator Weed (*Alternanthera philoxeroides*) is difficult to control in rice paddies, *Mimosa pigra* and Golden Apple Snail are found in high densities in (protected) wetlands, and Siam Weed (*Chromolaena odorata*) invades semi-arid vegetation zones such as in Eastern Indonesia. All of these example invasions have generated serious impacts to agricultural production, water resources quantity and quality, (protected) biodiversity, as well as human livelihoods. The main recommendations made by Indonesian government and research officials indicate the need to (GISP, 2003):

- Conduct applied research to find alternative control methods;
- Develop strategies and guidelines to control and eradicate invasive alien species;
- 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 challenge for Indonesia during the PPG would be to design a project enabling a national IAS policy and programming framework covering multiple sectors and ecological regions, whilst at the same time gaining broad field experience with various control measures of priority invasive species in the forestry sector, within the restricted budget available for this huge and highly diverse country.

**Vietnam:** IAS have been present in Vietnam for a long time, and are known to cause harmful effects. Some IAS have a very high invasive potential, and are listed on quarantine pest lists mainly in the agriculture sector. The species that have caused the greatest damage in Vietnam are the golden apple snail (*Pomacea* sp.) to rice production and the giant

mimosa (*Mimosa pigra*) to biodiversity conservation in (forested) national parks, and as a result Vietnam has practiced integrated management of these IAS all over the country to reduce crop losses and to maintain the ecological balance. Vietnamese agencies have conducted national inventories on IAS (mostly conducted for pest control in rice paddies and afforestation programs), and gained experience with chemical- as well as biocontrol of Mimosa and Apple Snail in wetlands habitats and (rice) production systems (GISP, 2003). Forest plantations (over 1.5M hectares) are gradually replacing forest products harvested from natural forests, but an estimated 20,000 ha are affected annually by serious pests and invasive species. Systematic research is needed to identify specific forest invasive species, their impact and best control measures in both plantations as well as natural forests (FAO, 2005). Prevention of new IAS infestations was reportedly highly needed to reduce future impacts. Presently, chemical control measures are most commonly applied with only modest success in containing invasives, and further work on safe mechanical and/or biological control measures are highly needed. Capacity building on IAS through on the job training, including on proven and safe control measures, as well as IAS research and inventory are mentioned as additional program needs.

During a ACB workshop in Hanoi (December 2008), discussing the GEF project, national partners indicated the following priorities for Vietnam, as well as endorsed the draft PIF project framework as submitted to GEFSEC:

- 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 (but also including those for GMOs);
- Strengthening measures for controlling the import and release of biological agents.

Given the very restricted BD RAF resource made available in Vietnam, the PPG will set FSP program priorities and decide on what specific outputs to fund for Vietnam based on local stakeholder consultations, baseline assessments, as well as cost estimates.

**Cambodia:** Few systematic data are available on IAS in Cambodia except those coming from wetland conservation programs such as at Tonle Sap Great Lake system or the Mekong river system (e.g. UNDP/GEF Tonle Sap Conservation project). Most reports deal with infestations and impacts of *Mimosa pigra* (FAO, 2005), and Water Hyacinth (*Eichornia crassipes*). Although just 18 out of a known list of 50+ invasive species occurring in the Mekong basin have established themselves in the Tonle Sap area, more could potentially occur now or in the future as the two systems are connected ecologically but also economically -e.g. through local trade (WCS, 2006). Similarly neighboring Thailand and PDR Laos could easily be a source as well as pathway of new IAS infestations into Cambodia through their connected ecosystems, cross border trade and human migration, given the already known hundreds of IAS recorded in Thailand and to a lesser extend in Lao PDR (GISP, 2003). The message should be that not having adequate data available on Cambodian IAS does not mean that these are not a growing threat to biodiversity conservation, forest production systems and human health alike, which is already the proven case for most SE Asian countries (GISP, 2003). The Forest and Wildlife Science Research Institute, Forest Administration, has started work on compiling secondary data on forest invasive species (non published) and calls for increased field inventories, data and information systems, and capacity building in the field of IAS control measures, and is one of the two NEAs for the proposed GEF project. As a result the prevention and management of IAS in Cambodia is still in its infancy, due to many constraints, including the low level of awareness on the negative impacts of IAS within society, lack of national policies and legislation, as well as prior field experience with prevention and effective control measures. The December workshop in Hanoi attended by Cambodia did approve the proposed PIF project concept, based on the condition that the detailed country programme design will take place during the PPG.

**Philippines:** Although reports show that over the past hundreds of years more than 475 plant species, mainly from the Malayan and American regions, have been introduced in the Philippines for economic reasons, there is a lack of specific data on those being IAS, as there have been only a few research studies conducted on impacts and management of IAS. The situation has now arisen as a bio-safety issue due to the growing environmental and economic impacts of alien species which were not considered prior to introduction of new species into the country. The list of known IAS at present includes terrestrial and aquatic weeds, trees, insects, fish, and amphibians, but as mentined above needs further fine-tuning and completion. The Philippines has commenced work to address IAS at a national level, including its implementation of quarantine regulations; implementation of the Philippine Policy on Biodiversity; implementation of the Guidelines on Planned Release to the Environment of GMOs and Potentially Harmful Exotic Species; as well as a few IAS programmes such as on the biological control of *Chromolaena odorata* by gall fly.

The Philippines country report recommends the following priorities for future work and strategies for IAS management (GISP, 2003):

- Preparation of inventory/status reports of each alien species (invasive and non-invasive)
- Preparation of database of all alien species, including management strategies
- Networking between those involved in IAS issues, including:
  - Establishment of a country hub specific for monitoring and management of alien species;
  - Establishment of a regional hub as IAS regional data repository and knowledge management from and for member countries, and fund sourcing for all IAS activities including research and development.
- Enforcement of quarantine regulations
- Enhancement of policies and other regulations related to IAS
- Monitoring of IAS
- Research and development
- Enhancement of public awareness
- Encouragement of advocacy campaigns on taking action against IAS.

All of these are found in the proposed GEF project framework, but it will be clear that for the Philippines just a few can be supported through the available and seriously restricted BD RAF allocation made available for the country, and the PPG will work with NEA to set priorities on these. One additional focus during the PPG would be to find possible sources of extra co-finance to make up for the lack of GEF funds.

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

IAS can affect all ecosystems, but the project pilot sites will be specific to forest ecosystems and protection and production forests in particular, the proposed intervention fits therefor with the GEF Sustainable Forest Management Framework Strategy (SFM), and particularly with the BD strategic program 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 contribute directly to achieving the SFM Strategic Objective: SO-2: sustainable management and use of forest resources by developing institutional and organisational capacity to build cross-sectoral partnerships. The GEF Focal Area Strategies highlighted the findings of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, which identified the spread of invasive species as one of the five major direct drivers of change in biodiversity and ecosystems. The proponents of this project are four countries in Southeast Asia with important and vulnerable high biodiversity ecosystems.

### **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 projects and activities that can attain tangible biodiversity benefits in the forestry production as well as conservation sectors. The non-refundable GEF financial support is therefore destined to strengthening human and institutional capacities, together with testing small-scale prevention, control and monitoring measures in a well planned and strategized fashion.

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

This project will work through existing programs such as the APFISN, the GISP and the ASEAN Center for Biodiversity.

FAO through the 19<sup>th</sup> session of the Asia-Pacific Forestry Commission in August 2002 organized the AP Forest Invasive Species Conference, which subsequently established the AP Forest Invasive Species Network - APFISN (2003). The network is active in the field of inter-country cooperation, running national workshops, information supply, as well as strengthening capacities of the 30 member countries in matters of forest IAS. It also publishes regular issues of their newsletter “Invasives”. Recent activities include the development of a regional strategy for implementing the activities of the network and a series of visits to help countries in the Asia-Pacific region prepare national reports on status of forest invasive species. Some of the latest activities were the November 2007 workshops in Vietnam and Cambodia, as well as the December 2008 workshop in Kuala Lumpur on “Forest Health in a Changing World” organized with IUFRO. This project will strengthen the coordination and capacity of countries through APFISN with use of project generated tools, outputs and methodologies, as well as will benefit from FAO's Asian-Pacific Forestry Commission network and knowledge in the region to achieve globally significant outcomes of the proposed IAS project.

The Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP) has been a long time player on IAS and initiated a number of regional technical workshops, country IAS inventories, as well as discussions on regional and country responses to the threat of IAS in the AP region (*see e.g. “Barnard, P. and J.K. Waage, 2004, Tackling species invasions around the world: regional responses to the invasive alien species threat, GISP, South Africa” or “Pallewatta, N., J.K. Reaser,*

and A.T. Gutierrez. (eds.). 2003. *Invasive Alien Species in South-Southeast Asia: National Reports & Directory of Resources. Global Invasive Species Programme, Cape Town, South Africa*” or from same authors: 2003, “*Prevention and Management of Invasive Alien Species: Proceedings of a Workshop on Forging Cooperation throughout South and Southeast Asia*”). GISP and its partners, are active in the region with related initiatives such as the SPREP program in the Pacific, where a similar regional GEF initiative is being developed (part of GEFPAS). For the proposed project GISP would bring in technical expertise and information rather than acting as a EA. GEF funding would enable benefitting from GISPs considerable knowledge and expert network.

The ASEAN Center for Biodiversity (ACB) has similarly been active in the area of capacity building as well as regional invasive species management, being one of the organizers of a regional workshop in 2008 on invasive species in the Southeast Asia. ACB has offered to assist with capacity building for the GEF project and well as information services to attract more attention to the threat of IAS. GEF funding, through ACB, would enable to significantly enhance the IAS activities and outreach to additional AP countries beyond the four project pilots. It is targeted to make ACB a more prominent player in the field of IAS in the region.

Additionally, there are several regional/global GEF projects, in various stages of development and implementation, with which linkages and knowledge exchange will be sought. The most relevant of these are the regional UNEP-GEF project: "Mitigating the Threats of Invasive Alien Species in the Insular Caribbean", UNEP-GEF "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 Program"; UNEP-GEF "Regional: Prevention, Control and Management of Invasive Alien Species in the Pacific Islands"; and the ongoing UNEP-GEF "Regional: Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa". In particular the latter project has generated various good practices and lessons which have benefitted the current proposed project, and will continue to do so, particularly in relation to raising awareness, institutional capacity and government commitment as well as regional approaches, while the demonstration projects planned under this proposal (and their lessons learnt) will serve to better understand invasion dynamics and how to choose cost-effective management options, and could therefore provide inputs for other UNEP projects entering design or implementation phases.

#### **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. International collaboration such as through the projects regional component activities, as well as involvement of regional & international bodies like ACB and GISP plays 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 spread and establishment of potential invasive species. This project will complement and enhance existing invasive species activities in Southeast Asia by assisting the process of drawing them into a comprehensive regional framework, linking production- and conservation-based initiatives, providing regionally-facilitated efficient and effective support-raising, information-sharing, research and management mechanisms, while building national capacity and helping establish financial sustainability for invasive species management across the region. The benefits and support to be drawn from combining national and regional-level interventions would not arise in the absence of GEF and UNEP support. Likewise, the project’s emphasis on multi-sectoral action, information sharing and extracting lessons learnt from pilot experiences would likely be lost if countries were to act individually. Assisting in making more efficient national policies on IAS is also among the aims of the project. Strengthened national action plans and regional information sharing systems will play a strong role to achieve global environmental benefits. Without GEF support, all four countries are 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, improvement in the activities on the negative impacts of IAS will certainly help to reduce poverty. The aim of this project is to address the IAS issue through mainstreaming the prevention of invasive species issues into national and regional policy-making, build adequate capacity, provide tools, engender inter-sectoral and cross-boundary cooperation particularly in management of existing IAS, as well as prevention of new invasive species infestations. Overall the AP countries’ actual baseline situation is one of very restricted investments and program attention to the risks and management of IAS, whilst through GEF financial support the project could create the 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 allowing for higher and more sustained



levels of national funding and programming on IAS. Working with ASEAN ACB, FAOs coordinated APFIN, as well as UNEPs regional & country programs on Ecosystem Management (including the outputs related to IAS) would further stimulate the 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:**

Possible risks for the project and measures that will be taken are: 1) Lack of interest and support from key stakeholder groups and organisations: Effective communication and coordination will be built and the interest of stakeholders will be increased through training and awareness raising activities; 2) Inadequate financial support at the national level: Co-finance confirmation letters will be obtained through an extensive process of consultations and collaborative project design in order to secure stakeholders' groups who appreciate its benefits and can make the necessary financial commitment; 3) Poor implementation of regulations on IAS: Information and knowledge generation, management and dissemination, as well as institutional support, equipment and staff training, are key components of this project. Monitoring and controlling regulatory compliance are also essential and will be built into the strengthening of regulatory frameworks; 4) Conflicts of interest where certain forest IAS provide benefits to particular individuals or groups (e.g. for firewood): Participatory and consultative approaches will be used to get a consensus among the stakeholders and to raise awareness of alternative natural resources other than IAS; 5) Inability to demonstrate impact of project interventions due to complex natural interactions and a long time span until impacts are noticed: Related stakeholders will be informed through awareness raising programs, training/exchange programs, and participatory monitoring on the immediate and long-term developments and impacts of IAS. Additionally national NISSAPs will cater for a long-term vision and programming, including monitoring of IAS management effectiveness at pilots and elsewhere; 6) Environmental risks: It is recognised that the environmental impact of the project's activities will be almost entirely positive. However, it should be recognised that IAS management activities, such as the use of agrochemicals and large scale clearance in control /eradication activities, can sometimes result in negative environmental impacts. The project will use risk analysis (EIA) to examine possible negative consequences of any proposed intervention and propose measures to reduce any negative impact, such as through the integrated habitat management plans for field pilots e.g. on vegetation rehabilitation needs. The impacts of climate change are unpredictable and good science-based knowledge is required to predict changes in resilience or vulnerability to invasive species. The project will facilitate more effective participation of the countries in global information systems such as the Global Invasive Species Database, and strengthen institutional environment and research capacity to permit better detection and understanding of trends that might be driven by climate change.

**H. DESCRIBE, IF POSSIBLE, THE EXPECTED COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROJECT:**

The project will establish and strengthen regional support mechanisms that will reduce duplication losses, high transaction costs, and limited economies of scale in dealing with management of invasive species in Southeast Asia. It will strengthen the coordination of different IAS programmes in the region and promote cooperation between regional organizations and amongst countries, and as such, offer a more cost-efficient alternative to continue running these programs 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 spread of invasives, including new introductions, and limited effectiveness in developing and implementing management. On the other hand, in economic terms, only the direct economic costs of IAS are significant and run into billions of dollars annually world-wide. The improvements that will be achieved by this project will help to reduce the economic loss in the region. The proposed project is also the first time that participating countries embark on a cooperative and comprehensive GEF-assisted forest IAS initiative, with project components covering all the strategic areas that require strengthening, and Component 4 investing in prevention which is the most cost-effective strategy for tackling IAS and minimizing biodiversity impacts.

**I. JUSTIFY THE COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE OF GEF AGENCY:**

The problem of invasive alien species is trans-boundary by nature and 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 the comparative advantages in these areas. UNEP has been at the forefront of establishing IAS programs under GEF, and has successfully completed a number of IAS projects such as the Best Practices for Dealing with Invasive Alien Species, which is a compelling example on how a relatively modest GEF grant and institutional support through UNEP can make a difference globally. The project put invasives on the agenda of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), established increased awareness on invasive species globally, particularly in the developing world; enacted the institutionalisation of the Global Invasive

Species Program as global leader in raising information and awareness, 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 program under the global Ecosystem Management Program strategy; some of the GEF-funded regional projects are mentioned under Section C. UNEP's strength in working with both scientific partners such CABI, as well as NGOs like IUCN, and TNC on invasives will also be a significant asset to the project.

The partnership with FAO is to build upon their experience in forest IAS through the APFISN launched in 2004, benefitting from their institutional network in SE Asia.


**PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)**

**A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT (S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):**  
(Please attach the [country endorsement letter\(s\)](#) or [regional endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this template).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE
Dr Lonh Heal	Technical Director General,	MoE, Cambodia	14/7/2008
Dr Atty. Analiza R. The	Assistant Secretary	DENR, Foreign Assisted and Special Projects Office, Philippines	6/10/2008
Dr. Nguyen Van Tai	Director General	ISPONRE - MONRE, Vietnam	30/10/2008
Dr Agus Purnomo	Special Assistant to the Ministry of Environment, Indonesia	Ministry of Environment, Indonesia	13/04/2009

**B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for project identification and preparation.

Agency Coordinator, Agency name	Signature	Date	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Maryam Niamir-Fuller Director, UNEP Division of GEF Coordination		07 April 2009	Max Zieren UNEP DGEF - Regional Programme Coordinator - Asia Pacific	Tel.: +66-2- 288-2101	zieren@un.org