ANNEX I. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT COMPONENTS

The project will achieve its immediate objectives (i.e. establishing the legitimacy of IAS guidelines, policies, plans and institutional arrangements, increasing the amount, availability and accessibility of IAS information, reducing the economic cost of IAS, improving biodiversity indices in pilot ecosystems and increasing IAS capacity in project countries) through the activities listed under the four project components that address four barriers to invasive plant management in Africa: an inadequate policy and institutional environment, a lack of information, inadequate implementation of IAS prevention and control programmes and a lack of capacity in IAS management. Ultimately each activity and component of which it is a part will contribute to the achievement of an integrated approach to IAS management so throughout the project linkages between activities and components will be emphasised. However, the separation of barriers to invasive plant management in Africa into distinct activities within clear components is useful conceptually and in terms of project execution, monitoring and evaluation.

Project activities and components have been agreed during extensive stakeholder consultation activities with the four project countries during the PDF process. Following stakeholder consultations and workshops conducted during the PDF-A phase of the project the four project components were agreed upon and a preliminary list of project activities was produced.

Monitoring of the impact of project activities will be carried out under the relevant activities in each component and this has been budgeted for. The basis for a statistically robust monitoring scheme complemented by the use of qualitative information has been established during the PDF-B phase of the project. This will be refined into a fully fledged Project Benefit Monitoring and Evaluation (PBME) system in the first six months of the project under Activity 5.1. (project inception phase & preparation of work plans). The inception report including the PBME system will be reviewed at the First International Steering Committee meeting.

The baseline situation, including barriers, and potential project interventions to address these barriers for each component were compiled as national reports during the PDF-B phase in each project country. Task teams composed of national specialists produced their findings using a combination of reviews of written information, stakeholder interviews and field surveys. Reports were finalised following their presentation at national stakeholder workshops and project steering committee meetings. Each project country compiled lists of national activities to address the identified barriers at national stakeholder workshops and project steering committee meetings. Reviews of the baseline situation and proposed project activities for each country were presented at the 2nd International Steering Committee Workshop held in Nairobi in July 2004. National activities were harmonised to produce an overall list of project activities during this workshop. Technical support has been provided by CABI and IUCN throughout the PDF-A and PDF-B phases of the project.

Information on the baseline situation regarding the IAS enabling policy environment, IAS information amount availability, IAS biological and socio-economic impact and IAS capacity will be refined during the project inception phase. This information will provide quantitative indicators that can be used as a basis for the PBME. Details of monitoring systems to be used are provided in the sections on each project component.

The good working relationship between CABI and IUCN and the project country partners, established during the PDF process will be maintained and built upon in the full project. Technical support will be provided throughout the project under arrangements established during the PDF process but at a more intensive level due to the increased staffing levels possible under the full project.

Summaries of the barriers identified under each component during the PDF-B are presented in this annex. The activities designed to address the identified barriers are then outlined in terms of rationale and aims, the process by which the aims are to be achieved and the outputs to be produced.

COMPONENT 1: STRENGTHENING THE ENABLING POLICY ENVIRONMENT

Policies, plans and strategies of relevance to IAS management as well as the institutional framework for IAS management were analysed during the PDF-B in each project country. There was a clear consensus that the current policy and institutional environment is inadequate for sustainable IAS management. Common barriers in the policy and institutional environment are listed below[7]:

National policies barriers:
- No national policy on IAS.
- IAS not listed as a national issue.
- Fragmented legal framework.

Barriers in mainstream regulations of relevance to IAS - Investment Act, Water Policy, etc:
- Legislation outdated.
- Lack of an environmental focus and provision on biodiversity conservation within mainstream legislation.
- Poor provision to mitigate and restore following development.

Barriers in policies which refer to IAS (as noxious weeds, pests, etc.) – Noxious Weeds Act, Plant Pests and Diseases Act, etc:
- IAS rarely explicitly mentioned or defined.
- Inconsistency in terminology.
- Poorly defined criteria for declaration of weeds.
- List of weeds is not comprehensive.
- No specific provision for EIAs for species introductions.
- Provisions for control often localised.
- Outdated legislation.
- No provision for IAS risk analysis.
- No provision for unintentional introductions.
- Weed control legislation is generally sectoral.
- Regulations on weed management which depend upon land tenure situation.
- Poorly defined criteria stated for exemption from weed control regulations.
- Few measures for mitigation of impacts of IAS.

Barriers in policies of relevance to biodiversity conservation:
- IAS not listed as threat to certain categories of protected area.
- Poor provisions for restoration of native vegetation.
- Often no distinction between alien and native species in forestry regulations.
- Inadequate provision for IAS issues in NBSAPs.

Barriers in policy implementation:
- Legislation subject to abuse.
- No clear criteria for exemptions to certain legislation.
- Poor funding for implementation and no specific funds for prevention, management and control of invasive alien species.
- No cost recovery schemes.
- Lack of equipment, infrastructure and logistical support.
- Inadequate monitoring systems.
- No incentive measures for landowners to comply with regulations.
- Difficulties in implementing policies on customary land, which is often prone to encroachment and disputes.
- Lack of involvement of stakeholders in resource management issues.

[7] Some of the barriers listed are addressed under other components. This illustrates the holistic nature of IAS issues. This schema of listing barriers even if they are addressed under different components is followed for all components.

Barriers in the institutional environment:

- Apex body for IAS coordination non-existent or insufficiently resourced to fulfil its mandate.
- Unclear, overlapping and conflicting mandates in management agencies.
- Lack of qualified and specialised staff.
- Inadequate staffing levels.
- Lack of stakeholder participation.

Activities to address barriers in the enabling policy and institutional environment are detailed below.

Output 1.1. Develop a national IAS strategy, action plan and policy guidelines, and modify NBSAPs to incorporate IAS issues.

A national invasive species strategy and action plan (ISSAP) is a prerequisite if the project countries are to move from the current situation where the norm for IAS management is a single species focus, *ad hoc* actions and a sectoral approach to a situation where IAS management norms are outcome-oriented, strategic and multi-sectoral. An ISSAP will articulate what the issues are, what measures need to be taken, who is responsible for implementation, how agencies should work together and what legal and regulatory measures are required.

National ISSAPs, along with IAS guidelines and institutional arrangements (see below) will be developed through task teams (based on those who have already addressed policy and institutional issues in the PDF-B) comprising of national experts in IAS and policy matters. National task teams will be under the management of the National Project Coordinators (NPCs). Individuals with detailed knowledge of projects identified as being highly relevant to the component or activity will be included in the respective task teams. Similar arrangements will be made for task team membership for all components and activities to help maximise between-project synergies.

Initial stakeholder consultations will establish the scope of the strategy. Draft ISSAPs will then be formulated using information obtained from these consultations, ISSAPs developed elsewhere, published guidelines and PDF-B outputs. Draft ISSAPs will be circulated to stakeholders and discussed at one or more participatory workshops. This consultation process will be followed by the production of a finished draft strategy which will be submitted to central government for endorsement. A wide range of stakeholders (as identified during the PDF-B) from government institutions, learning institutions, NGOs, CBOs and the private sector at national and sub-national levels will be targeted during stakeholder consultations to ensure that the outputs of the process are perceived to be of high legitimacy across all sectors of society.

The ISSAP will be supplemented by detailed guidelines for the incorporation of IAS considerations into plans, policies and strategies of direct IAS relevance (e.g. national agriculture plans, noxious weeds acts, etc.) as well as national and area-specific plans (e.g. land acts, shipping acts, poverty eradication plans, etc.). These guidelines which will be developed through the process outlined above for the ISSAP. Without such a 'mainstreaming' process it is unlikely that the value of IAS management will be appreciated by decision makers at the highest levels. PDF-B activities in Uganda in particular have highlighted the importance of mainstreaming IAS issues and under the PDF-B preliminary efforts have been made to estimate the economic costs of some key invasive species to Uganda. More detailed cost evaluations will be produced under Component 3 and training in biological and socio-economic impact assessment will be given under Component 4. The dissemination of information on cost evaluation will increase the perceived legitimacy of the ISSAPs and guidelines among key decision makers. High level support will be further facilitated by the participation of high ranking individuals on project steering committees and by briefing meetings with officials in addition to the consultative workshops. The awareness-raising and capacity building activities conducted under Components 2 and 4 respectively will also help to ensure a high level of support for the both ISSAP and guideline production process and their implementation.

Among the guidelines produced will be a document outlining measures whereby IAS issues can be addressed more comprehensively in NBSAPs. The consultative process outlined above will be of critical importance in ensuring that these guidelines are supported by the relevant authorities, are incorporated into modified NBSAPs and that the modifications are acted upon in the implementation of the NBSAPs. The

IAS management projects in areas of high biodiversity value, undertaken under Component 3, will be of play a pivotal role in demonstrating the possibilities for practical management of IAS-affected areas to those responsible for implementing NBSAPs.

Output 1.2. Develop mechanism for coordination and promotion of IAS management between stakeholders, including private sector and local communities.

The existence of ISSAPs alone does not guarantee their implementation. It is essential that robust institutional arrangements are developed not only to ensure that the strategy is implemented but that the strategy itself evolves in response to relevant developments including outputs and lessons learned from the proposed project. An apex body (e.g. in the form of a lead agency or national task force) is essential to drive the process. In the project countries this role will initially be played by the Project National Executing Agency (NEAs) working through the Project Coordination Units (PCUs). In the case of Uganda NEMA is already mandated to fulfil this role. In the long term NEAs in the other countries may also acquire this status or this function may be taken up elsewhere.

Institutional roles and responsibilities will be defined through the participatory process as outlined for the development of the ISSAPs and IAS guidelines. The apex body will coordinate IAS activity through meetings of the Project National Steering Committee (NSC) at which relevant institutions will be represented.

Institutional arrangements are unlikely to be fully effective if those designated to implement IAS-related activities are lacking awareness and capacity. The process of developing the ISSAPs, guidelines and institutional arrangements will address awareness and capacity issues to some extent. This sensitisation process will be supplemented by awareness-raising and capacity building activities undertaken under Components 2 and 3, specifically targeting those responsible for the implementation of the agreed IAS institutional arrangements.

The consultative process will ensure that those operating at the local level are involved in the decision making process. However, detailed institutional arrangements at the local level will not be implemented throughout the project countries during the project period. Such arrangements, however, will be implemented in areas where pilot IAS management activities are taking place. This approach will maximise synergy between project components, ensure that resources are not over-stretched, legitimise what could be construed as abstract notions of institutional arrangements with tangible actions on the ground and develop robust integrated IAS management arrangements that can be replicated elsewhere in the project countries and beyond.

All project countries will establish committees to coordinate project activities at the pilot site level. Local stakeholders at all levels will be represented on these committees. Communities in pilot sites, already involved in the PDF-B, will fully participate in the implementation of management activities undertaken under Component 3. This involvement will help to shape and ensure the legitimacy of institutional arrangements developed in the pilot site areas. In addition to project coordination structures at the national and pilot site levels project coordination structures will be established at the Regional State level in Ethiopia. In this large and diverse country with a Federal system of government, such arrangements will confer legitimacy, which would otherwise be lacking if all decisions were perceived to be coming from the Federal level.

Output 1.3. Develop and implement cost recovery mechanisms for IAS activities, from the public and private sector.

During the PDF-B one of the most frequently cited reasons for an inability to adequately manage IAS in project countries was the lack of funds when they were most needed. Substantial funding has been made available to tackle some high profile IAS, notably in the water sector, but such funding has invariably only been released once the target species have become very widespread. Sustained funding of the kind required for prevention, early detection, rapid response and maintenance of control operations has been lacking and consequently these (often highly cost-effective) operations have not been given due prominence. Mechanisms to help sustain recurrent IAS management costs will be pioneered under the project.

The Component 1 Task Team will be responsible for investigating possible cost-recovery systems (e.g. charges for phytosanitary services, levies on utilities affected by IAS, contributions from protected area entry fees, EIA fees, etc.) using PDF-B outputs, models developed elsewhere, published guidelines and stakeholder consultations. Cost recovery scenarios will be presented at stakeholder workshops and ranked using general criteria such as potential funding levels generated transparency, equitability, willingness to pay and efficiency of collection. The project-specific criterion of maximising synergy with other project activities will also be considered. The favoured option or options will be further developed. This development will include the formulation of financial plans as well as collection and mobilisation plans. Detailed plans will be developed by specialists in the Task Team in close collaboration with the levying institution(s). Contact with the Directors of the levying institution(s) will be maintained throughout this process to ensure the formulations are acceptable. For the same reasons contact will also be maintained with the relevant government agencies if different from the levying institution. A cost recovery mechanism(s) will be piloted in each country and its success evaluated (according to the type of criteria outlined above). Outcomes and lessons learned will be disseminated, used to modify the pilot mechanism(s) as appropriate and used to instigate other cost-recovery mechanisms as appropriate in project countries and elsewhere.

The initial meetings and workshops to be carried out under this component will refine the baseline situation regarding the enabling policy and institutional environment for cross-sectoral prevention and management of IAS. Surveys will provide qualitative and quantitative indicators on the degree to which the existence, potential and/or utility of IAS guidelines, plans, policies and institutional arrangements are recognised. Further surveys conducted during meetings and workshops carried out under this component will establish the degree to which the measures implemented under this component are recognised and are felt to be of value. These surveys will provide a before and after measure of the impact of the project activities relating to the enabling policy and institutional environment. In addition surveys undertaken during project execution will allow strategies to be adjusted if they do not appear to be achieving their planned impact.

COMPONENT 2: PROVISION, EXCHANGE AND UTILISATION OF INFORMATION AMONGST KEY STAKEHOLDERS IN IAS MANAGEMENT

Knowledge surveys were conducted during the PDF-B in order to develop national communication strategies. The aim of these strategies is to increase the awareness of IAS issues among target sectors in order for them to support and if possible meaningfully contribute to efforts to reduce the number and economic costs of alien invasive species. The communication strategies comprised of the following elements:

- Type of IAS-related information that needs to be communicated.
- Target groups and the type of information needed by target group.
- IAS knowledge barriers.
- Barriers in the overall communications environment affecting the acquisition of IAS-related information.
- Appropriate communications pathways.
- Appropriate communication products.

Information on IAS-related training needs, investigated in more detail under Component 4, was also summarised under this component.

Knowledge barriers and barriers in the overall communications environment are listed below:

Knowledge barriers:
- Inadequate understanding of the definition of IAS.
- Inadequate knowledge of the status and impacts of IAS.
- Inadequate knowledge of IAS Pathways.
- Inadequate knowledge of the IAS management hierarchy.
- Inadequate knowledge of IAS management options.
- Inadequate knowledge of the ecosystem approach to management.

Barriers in the overall communications environment:

- Lack of available information.
- Lack of capacity to access and utilise information.
- Multiple languages.
- Lack of communication between institutions.
- Conflicts of interest.
- Competing communications.

Although the project is being executed in four countries it is essential that the activities undertaken are seen as pilots for dissemination and replication to neighbouring countries, catalysing uptake of lessons learned and promoting regional cooperation. In the longer term, unless a regional approach to the management of IAS is adopted, even the best organised national programmes will ultimately not meet their objectives in terms of IAS management as IAS simply do not respect national boundaries in continental states. For this reason it is essential to establish mechanisms to exchange information in order to facilitate regional dissemination and replication. This will be done under this project component.

Activities to address barriers relating to national IAS information and to disseminate information beyond the pilot countries are detailed below.

Output 2.1. Review national communication strategy for ensuring effective transfer of information on IAS between stakeholders.

Each country's national communication strategy will form the basis for the awareness-raising activities undertaken during the full GEF project. Although produced from stakeholder interviews the completed strategies have not yet been reviewed by target stakeholder groups. It is therefore, vital that the strategies receive the support of identified stakeholders prior to their implementation. Task teams (based on those who addressed information issues in the PDF-B) comprising of national experts on IAS issues and information and communication will organise stakeholder consultations and workshops under the management of the NPCs. The communication strategies will be presented, discussed and revised as appropriate during this process.

Strategies for external communication and information exchange, first drafted in the PDF-B, will be finalised using the same process.

The implementation of the national communication strategy is detailed in 2.2 and strategies for external communication and information exchange are detailed in 2.3.

Output 2.2. Develop National IAS Databases/Websites and undertake comprehensive public awareness campaigns.

Many of the barriers affecting information availability identified in the PDF-B relate to issues of information availability and access. Although not comprehensive, valuable information on IAS in the project countries does exist. However, it is often in the form of grey literature or in publications that are not widely available. Data also exist but are scattered and rarely compiled systematically.

Although internet access is limited in the project countries as a whole, it is available to many of the managerial and technical staff of the key institutions involved in IAS management. A great deal of general information on IAS exists on the internet but it is scattered and not always easy to access for those without a great deal of prior knowledge. All NEAs have websites though none as yet contain IAS information.

National IAS databases and websites have the potential to act as "one stop shops", not only for accessing available national IAS information but for accessing relevant global web-based information.

The Component 2 Task Teams will define the scope of the database which will at the minimum contain a comprehensive bibliography of national IAS related work that has been undertaken to date, documents produced on IAS in electronic form where copyright considerations permit, individual species dossiers,

project documents including training modules, summaries of project data and contact details for institutions and individuals with relevant experience in IAS-related areas. The website will be linked with global IAS resources such as the ISSG and GISP websites and the GISP global interactive map. There will also be an overall project website with which reciprocal links will be established. The task team will also produce protocols for data management to ensure that information is standardised. The NPCs shall have overall responsibility for the management and maintenance of the database and website and will ensure that protocols are followed and that the site is regularly updated. Information will also be compiled on CDs so that it is accessible to those with computers but without reliable web access. The information on the CDs will be regularly updated.

The Task Team members who will establish the databases and websites will either be from within the NEAs or outside experts. For example ECZ in Zambia already has an information and communications unit that is equipped to undertake this work.

Training will be given in the use of the database, website and associated information CDs as part of the capacity building programme undertaken under Component 4.

A database and website alone will be insufficient to reach the majority of the people in the target sectors identified in the communication strategies. Thus information dissemination through databases and websites will form only one part of the overall communication strategy.

The following is an account of the broad thrust of the communication strategies as contained in reports produced during the PDF-B. However, as outlined in 2.1 the exact details of the national communication strategies will be finalised during the project.

Target sectors (a range of stakeholders grouped under the broad headings of decision makers, educators, technicians, local communities, the private sector and the media) will be targeted using the following communications pathways: modern media (radio, television and printed media, in addition to the internet detailed above), traditional media (music, dance and drama), authorities (executive, traditional, religious, NGOs/CBOs) and meetings (workshops, community meetings and field meetings). Educational pathways were also identified. Information channelled through this pathway falls under Component 4. Some of the awareness-raising activities at the community level will be conducted together with the pilot control programmes under Component 3.

The main messages to be communicated will concern IAS definition, IAS impacts, IAS pathways, the IAS management hierarchy (ranging from prevention to mitigation) and management options as part of an ecosystem approach. The exact emphasis will depend upon the target group being addressed.

The databases and websites will facilitate the production of synthesis materials that will form the basis for the production of awareness-raising materials such as articles, booklets, posters and fliers. A generic guide to invasive plants in the four project countries will be produced and customised for each country. This will be of value for awareness-raising, capacity building in deification skills and for those working on prevention and management options under Component 3. Task team members will be responsible for the production of awareness-raising materials where such activities fall within their competence. Other types of awareness-raising materials to be produced include radio and television documentaries, stories, songs, poems and pictures. In many cases these demand specialisations or equipment that may not be available to task team members. Therefore, the production of such materials is likely to be contracted out to specialists without a great deal of IAS knowledge. Close supervision by the task teams and the NPCs will ensure that the material produced conveys a message consistent with the overall aims of the communication strategy. Another key specialisation needed will be language translation as in many cases materials must be produced in several languages in order to most effectively reach particular target groups.

Barriers to effective information dissemination that concern the policies and institutional arrangements will be addressed under Component 1.

Output 2.3. Facilitate external communication, information exchange and data transfer with international and regional organisations, neighbouring and partner countries.

The importance of seeing national project activities as a precursor to a wider regional approach to IAS management was emphasised in the introduction to this component. This approach requires the national level operations to be successful and for this success to be demonstrated to neighbouring countries. Given limited resources it is essential that these two aspects are not in conflict.

Tangible gains from project activities will not be immediately apparent. This means that regional dissemination and replication activities will be small scale to begin with. In spite of this communications channels will be established early on in the project with international IAS-related organisations and regional economic blocs (IGAD, ECOWAS, EAC and SADC). National project personnel will be represented at meetings of these blocs and technical forums that impinge upon IAS issues. They will present project findings at these meetings and information packs and brochures explaining the project and its relevance in the regional context. As the project progresses exchange visits of regional counterparts to project countries will be promoted.

An important element of information dissemination will be the reciprocal links established between the national IAS websites and global IAS information sources.

Another aspect of external communication is information exchange between the four project countries. This will be facilitated through International Project Steering Committee meetings and an annual exchange visit to one of the project countries. These activities are both likely to heighten synergy between the project countries.

Initial surveys will build upon the results of PDF-B activities to quantify the baseline situation regarding IAS awareness. Periodic monitoring will be used to assess how effectively the communications initiatives are achieving their aims. Such monitoring will also allow strategies to be adjusted if targets are not being met. Stakeholder surveys will be conducted at project meetings and workshops. In addition national bibliographies of IAS information will be compiled and maintained. The rate of change in these bibliographies will give an indication of changing levels information availability during the project execution. The number of hits from project countries on relevant websites will be monitored throughout the project to give an indication of the changing degree of utilisation of information sources.

COMPONENT 3: IMPLEMENTATION OF IAS CONTROL AND PREVENTION PROGRAMMES

The baseline IAS prevention and control situation in each project country was assessed during the PDF-B. Common barriers to prevention and management are listed below:

Information barriers:
- Lack of information on IAS (identification, current status of IAS and impact in country, etc.).
- Lack of information from neighbouring countries.
- Lack of information on how to manage IAS.

Capacity barriers:
- Inadequate capacity for risk analysis especially as it applies to sectors outside agriculture.
- Inadequate taxonomic capacity.
- Inadequate monitoring capacity.
- Inadequate capacity in integrated approaches to IAS management.

Implementation barriers:
- Lack of procedures for risk analysis outside traditional sectors.
- Inadequate provision for cross-boundary IAS management.
- Inadequate provision for management of nascent IAS foci.
- Conflicts of interest and competing communications.
- Emphasis on single species management.
- Lack of emphasis on ecosystem approaches and ecological outcomes of IAS management.

- Lack of emphasis on ecological restoration.
- Insufficient involvement of affected communities in IAS management.

Institutional barriers:
- Unclear, overlapping and conflicting institutional mandates in management agencies.
- Insufficient communication between agricultural, environmental and other affected sectors in IAS management.
- Lack of qualified and specialised staff.
- Inadequate staffing levels.

Activities to address these barriers to prevention and management are detailed below.

Output 3.1. Establish appropriate IAS risk analysis procedures for quarantine authorities.

Prevention though widely accepted as the most cost-effective IAS management action is inadequately implemented in most countries. Barriers to IAS prevention in project countries are summarised above. Opportunities to improve IAS prevention also exist, notably through the fact that the countries have established plant quarantine organisations. Although facilities and staff are inadequate this does provide a base upon which to build IAS prevention capacity, which in many cases involves the adoption of procedures that are based upon those first developed for plant pest management.

Activities relating to IAS prevention will be coordinated by the NPC. However, they will require substantial input from the national quarantine authorities who will be represented in the task teams formed to execute this component. In the case of Ethiopia quarantine falls under MoARD the parent ministry of EARO. In the other project countries the agencies responsible for quarantine are under separate ministries from those of the NEAs. However, close contact has been established with the relevant authorities during the PDF process.

The concept of risk analysis for IAS will have been incorporated into the ISSAPs. Following this, detailed risk analysis procedures for IAS will be developed through Component 4 Task Teams comprising of national experts in IAS prevention and management. Draft procedures for IAS risk analysis will be formulated using information obtained from stakeholder consultations, risk analysis procedures developed elsewhere and published guidelines. The development of workable procedures will be a challenge given capacity and funding constraints. Therefore, any procedures developed will have to be less detailed than those pioneered in better resourced environments. Draft risk analysis procedures will be circulated to stakeholders and discussed at one or more participatory workshops. This consultation process will be followed by the production of finalised risk analysis procedures. The risk analysis procedures will be produced in tandem with any guidelines of relevance produced under Component 1.

It will almost certainly be beyond the scope of the national quarantine systems of the project countries to fully implement the agreed upon IAS risk analysis procedures during the project period. A planned phasing in of procedures may be a possibility. The exact nature of such a process would be determined through a consultative process. Capacity building will be critical if this process is to be successful. Capacity building in IAS risk analysis will be carried out under Component 4. A long term source of funding will be required if the IAS risk analysis system is to be fully established and sustainable. Some of the cost-recovery mechanisms piloted under Component 1 may fulfil this function. Awareness-raising activities will also contribute to IAS prevention. Activities to raise awareness about IAS will be targeted at the travelling public at selected entry points in the project countries under Component 2.

Output 3.2. Establish early detection and rapid response systems for IAS.

Even the best prevention procedures cannot be one hundred percent effective. Fortunately newly arriving species usually take some time to establish and spread in a new environment so there is likely to be a window of opportunity when a new invasion can be eradicated or contained at a low density.

A guide to early detection and rapid response will be produced in parallel with the production of IAS risk analysis procedures. Many of the stakeholders involved are likely to be the same so combining the process

makes logistical sense. However, the mode of implementation of early detection and rapid response procedures will be very different from that adopted for IAS risk analysis. Early detection and rapid response procedures will be established in pilot sites. These will be situated around key national entry points such as national airports and busy land border crossings. The exact location of the pilot sites will be established through stakeholder consultations during the project. In most cases pilot sites for the implementation of comprehensive early detection and rapid response procedures are unlikely coincide with pilot control sites. However, cases such as Livingstone in Zambia – a control pilot site which is also a major land border crossing, would seem *a priori* to be ideal pilot sites for early detection and rapid response benefiting as they would from the synergies created by them being pilot control sites. Although pilot control sites may not coincide with pilot sites for early detection and rapid response the control projects may involve some element of early detection and rapid response to reduce the spread of key IAS.

The implementation of more comprehensive early detection and rapid response systems will involve training of personnel, probably those of quarantine authorities, though local agricultural or environmental officers could also be targeted. This training will be undertaken under Component 4. A key resource for the early detection work is likely to be the IAS guide produced under Component 2. Changes may be required in local regulations and institutional arrangements, factors which will be addressed under Component 1. Funding for the implementation of early detection and rapid response procedures in pilot areas will be made available through the project but in the long run sustainable funding sources must be found. Some of the cost-recovery mechanisms piloted under Component 1 may fulfil this function.

Output 3.3. Conduct surveys at national level to document presence and impact of IAS.

Lack of information on the species of IAS present in a country, and their current extent and impact has been perceived as a major barrier to the implementation of comprehensive national IAS management programmes. As highlighted earlier the lack of information on the economic impacts of IAS has been singled out as one of the main reasons for the failure of IAS issues to feature prominently in the mainstream agendas of the project countries.

Some very detailed national assessments of IAS have been produced in some countries, for example for South Africa. Such an undertaking is highly resource intensive and time consuming and therefore is beyond the scope of this project. Less comprehensive but nonetheless useful analyses will be produced. Members of the Component 3 Task Team with expertise on IAS distribution, and biological and socio-economic impact will coordinate this activity under the management of the NPC. Protocols for establishing presence and impact will be formulated. These will be based upon initial assessments conducted at pilot sites during the PDF-B and refined through stakeholder consultations and literature surveys. Presence and approximate area of coverage of known invasive species (based on those highlighted as being problematic during the PDF process) in different parts of the project countries will be assessed by staff of NEAs and other organisations involved in project execution. These staff will be trained in identification of the focal species under Component 4. Surveyors will also collect specimens of unknown plant species for later identification by trained botanists. In this way national lists of alien species will be compiled. The identified species will be classified according to their known invasiveness elsewhere. A sub-sample of areas surveyed will be ground-truthed by trained botanists to establish the reliability of the surveys. Such a survey will not comprehensively cover the country but will provide a first measure of the spread of some known invasive species. The information obtained in this process will be very valuable for management planning. For some species it may be possible to complement data gathered using the above process with information gathered by remote sensing. This possibility will be investigated during the course of the project.

Survey information will be stored in the national database developed under Component 2 and summary information will be posted on the national IAS and project websites.

Economic impacts of selected species will be assessed through interviews with those impacted by the respective species. These data will be combined with those on species distribution to produce information on aggregate economic costs for the selected species. Where information is sufficient modelling software based on (crisp or more likely fuzzy) climate envelope models will be used to predict future spread. This

information will be a basis for the construction of simple cost benefit scenarios based on varying rates of spread and differing management options. These admittedly simple and relatively imprecise methods can nonetheless produce information that is of considerable value for advocacy, awareness-raising and planning purposes. The monitoring systems developed here will be the basis for assessing the impact of the project interventions on the economic costs of IAS in the project countries.

More detailed biological and socio-economic impact assessments will be undertaken at pilot control project sites.

Output 3.4. – 3.11. Implement, evaluate and document control projects identified by the PDF-B for priority IAS threatening globally important biodiversity.

In each project country the dominant concerns expressed about invasive species are focused on individual species that are currently present in high densities and are deflecting valued ecosystems away from a desired state. The primary objectives of the project concern the establishment of systems to deal with the generic issue of invasive plant species in Africa and not the control of individual species. However, a failure to address some of the impacts of the species currently perceived of as major threats in the project countries would jeopardise the support needed for at all levels in the project countries for the successful execution of the project's broader objectives.
The priority control projects identified in the PDF-B provide high profile foci through which to implement integrated control programmes within a holistic framework for IAS management. The control projects, therefore, are valuable, not only because of their potential for positive conservation and economic outcomes but also because of their high demonstration value.

The control sites were chosen during extensive stakeholder consultations using many criteria including the following – at least one terrestrial and one aquatic site per country, the perceived seriousness of the invasion for biodiversity and for livelihoods, the need to represent a diversity of focal species over the four project countries – some well known invaders and some not reported as major problems in many countries, some with well established control methods and some with for which systematic control methods are not documented, and logistical considerations. Biological and socio-economic surveys conducted during the PDF-B on the species short listed pilot sites and stakeholder consultations on survey findings served to finalise the selected sites and focal species to feature in control projects under the full project. Details of the control sites and focal species are given in Annex Giii.

Although the exact details will be site-specific the control projects will all be executed in the following broad manner: Pilot site management committees (SMCs) will be established through key stakeholders/stakeholder groups (Annex F). The project will foster stakeholder participation with a particular emphasis on the needs and views of local communities in the determination of management objectives, preparation and implementation of management plans for each project site. This will involve participatory assessment tools, such as participatory rural appraisal, and will identify barriers to community participation in the management of IAS. In addition, representatives of local communities will sit on the SMC. A pilot site coordinator will report to the SMC and will provide information on project activities at the site level.

Local communities do not necessarily have a single point of view on issues, and tend to be stratified by age, kinship and gender. In addition, they often reflect different interests based on wealth, involvement in the market, political affiliations etc. These differences can pose significant challenges for those working with such communities, as well as for those within the communities who are trying to reach agreement on contentious issues. Issues relating to conflicts of interest will be addressed by this consultative process which will build upon initial stakeholder consultations that have taken place during the PDF-B. Project management plans will be produced through this consultative process. The exact nature of the management plan will be site-specific but the following will be shared by each control project: an EIA will be carried out prior to project execution, management will be focused on ecosystem level outcomes, clear ecosystem and socio-economic goals will be established, management will involve local community participation as far as possible to maximise buy-in, the achievement of positive development outcomes, to maximise the use of local knowledge and to resolve conflicts of interest, management will be integrated using biological,

chemical, manual and mechanical control as deemed to be appropriate, active restoration using native species will be undertaken as appropriate, field trials will be conducted as necessary.

Systematic and intensive biological and socio-economic results and outcomes monitoring will be conducted in pilot site areas. Biological monitoring will use survey protocols based on those refined during the PDF-B. Long-term monitoring sites will be established using a stratified random design. Regular monitoring will establish changes in populations of invasive species and native biota. Other methods will be used to assess the extent of IAS infestations including aerial photography and satellite images as appropriate. Data collected during the project (such as rate of spread of target species, habitat suitability and point impacts on biodiversity) will be fed into models, which will be used to predict changing abundance and biodiversity consequences of the project interventions. The monitoring of socio-economic issues (including the availability and utilisation of indigenous knowledge) affecting the impact and management of IAS in pilot sites will be based on the studies pioneered in the PDF-B. Participatory approaches will be used to obtain quantitative and qualitative information. These will include interviews based on statistically designed informant selection and semi structured surveys based on participatory rural appraisal techniques such as village walks, group interviews and key informant interviews.

Intensive monitoring and data analysis will facilitate adaptive approaches. As part of this philosophy every effort will be made to maximise synergies with other relevant projects and programmes.

The monitoring side of the programmes has been emphasised in order to maximise dissemination and replication benefits. Community involvement is pivotal for awareness-raising, capacity building and ultimately programme sustainability. Many of the awareness-raising and capacity building activities under Components 2 and 4 respectively will be focused on communities in and around pilot sites to maximise synergies and to embed the control projects into a holistic IAS management framework. Pilot site activities will serve as physical demonstration sites for national, regional and international dissemination and replication.

COMPONENT 4: BUILDING CAPACITY FOR SUSTAINABLE IAS MANAGEMENT

Issues of capacity cut across all aspects of IAS management. No IAS management programme can be successful in the long term if in-country implementation capacity is lacking. The baseline situation in each project country regarding IAS issues was assessed during the PDF-B in the form of a capacity needs assessment. Major capacity barriers, some of which have already been summarised under other components, were listed in the following areas:

- Awareness of IAS issues.
- Basic taxonomy.
- Risk analysis especially as it applies to sectors outside agriculture.
- IAS control techniques.
- Integrated approaches to IAS management.
- Monitoring and surveillance.
- IAS socio-economic and biological impact assessment.
- Environmental law.
- Environmental economics.
- IAS policy issues.
- Communication about IAS issues.
- Teaching of IAS issues.
- Production of IAS awareness-raising materials.
- Data management.

The stakeholder groups to benefit from capacity building initiatives were outlined in the account of the activities to be conducted under Component 2. Capacity building activities will be customised for each target group.

A further constraint impacting on an institution's ability to deliver IAS management objectives is a lack of necessary equipment, consumables and infrastructure. Under the PDF-B stakeholder organisations

conducted a physical needs assessment to assess priority physical requirements for IAS management. The needs fell into the following broad categories:

- Infrastructure - buildings, laboratories, greenhouse facilities, etc.
- Laboratory facilities – rearing facilities, microscopes, cold storage, etc.
- Office facilities – computers, scanners, literature, software, etc.
- Field equipment – GPS units, digital cameras, surveying equipment, spraying units, etc.
- Laboratory, field and office consumables – reagents, chemicals, access to internet facilities, etc.

Activities to address the capacity and physical needs issues raised are detailed below.

Output 4.1. Conduct training programme for different stakeholders e.g. policy-makers, scientists, quarantine officers, extensionists and affected communities.

Practical training is the core of any capacity building initiative. Activity 4.1 concerns formal training activities. The basis of the project training activities was formulated during the capacity needs assessments process conducted under the PDF-B. The capacity building needs identified during these assessments will be addressed by training programmes undertaken during the full GEF project. Task teams (based on those who addressed capacity issues in the PDF-B) comprising of national experts on IAS issues and capacity building will organise stakeholder consultations and workshops under the management of the NPCs. This process will be used to produce a training strategy with clear capacity building targets. The strategy will articulate training aims and objectives, target beneficiaries, training approaches to be utilised and desired outcomes. The strategy will presented, discussed and revised as appropriate during the consultative process. The training strategy will complement ISSAPs.

Specialists will be assigned the task of developing and implementing customised training methods. Existing training courses will be customised for local needs. An example of this is the generic IAS awareness training course as developed by GISP, CABI and IUCN. Most training activities will be implemented by local experts. However, where no suitable candidates are available outside expertise will be brought in from international project partners or elsewhere. In the course of the project it will not be possible to offer training to all those who need it. Therefore, it is imperative that all training given is summarised in detailed training manuals. This will facilitate the delivery of similar courses beyond the duration of the project. The existence of written modules will also facilitate the incorporation of IAS issues into learning institution curricula (summarised in 4.3).

Training methods will be as participatory as possible, including practical sessions and field activities. Much of the training offered will be practical and field based. This will be the case, for example, for the training provided in IAS control techniques. Much of this training will be focused on pilot control sites under Component 3. Formal training will be supplemented, where possible, by continued on the job training and refresher courses.

In many cases training will be provided through stand alone short courses. However, in some instances it will be possible to incorporate IAS training into existing courses. This will be the case in Zambia for example where training relevant to IAS prevention, early detection and rapid response will be given as part of the annual training week hosted by the Plant Quarantine and Phytosanitary Service.

Those implementing the training strategy will liaise very closely with those implementing IAS awareness-raising activities. In some cases it is likely that the same individuals will be contributing to both activities.

Longer training will be provided in the form of access to post-graduate courses and research-based degrees in areas that have been highlighted as priorities by the project countries. Most courses will be given in-country but in cases where a particular course is not available in-country it may be necessary to participate in courses conducted abroad. In many cases post-graduate research projects at MSc and PhD level will be linked to the pilot control programmes. These arrangements offer capacity building benefits and will produce information of value to IAS management. Subjects for taught post-graduate courses that have been identified as being of key importance for IAS management in the project countries include environmental economics, environmental law and plant taxonomy.

Output 4.2. Provide equipment and material support to quarantine departments, border crossings, IAS control units, etc.

Lack of equipment has been identified as one of the barriers to effective implementation of IAS prevention and management programmes by the stakeholder institutions consulted during the PDF process. Clearly it will not been possible to meet all the needs identified. However, provision of some priority needs will be of tangible help to project implementation. The NPC will coordinate material procurement and disbursement through national procedures that are approved by the project implementing agency. Examples of the types of material needs provisioned under this activity are specimen preservation equipment for the Ethiopian phytosanitary services, a plant rearing unit for the Ghanaian Plant Protection and Regulatory Services Directorate (PPRSD), GPS units and digital cameras for the district level agricultural services in Uganda and plant identification guides for Zambia's Plant Quarantine and Phytosanitary Service.

Material provision will also be carried out under other project components and activities. For example much of the equipment to be used in IAS control work will be procured under Component 3 and the procurement of all project vehicles will fall under project management.

Output 4.3. Facilitate participation of national delegates in relevant international bodies e.g. the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, CBD, NEPAD, AMCEN, etc.

Much of the drive for improved IAS management globally is being instigated by international organisations. The representation of the project countries at international meeting where key decisions are being made will be valuable. Attendance of these meetings by project staff and others involved in IAS management at the national level will serve a capacity building function. In addition attendance at such meetings will provide opportunities for dissemination of project information as outlined in 2.3 above.

The NPC will compile details of forthcoming meetings, which will be circulated at Project Steering Committee Meetings. The selection of which meetings to attend will be based on criteria such as relevance to IAS issues, utility in addressing identified capacity needs and opportunities for dissemination of project findings. National participants will be selected based on criteria such as their abilities to contribute to the meeting and to communicate its findings upon their return.

All participants will submit back to office reports that will contain details of the relevance of the meeting for identified national IAS needs, the means by which the meeting's outputs can be incorporated into project activities, the means by which project outputs were disseminated during the meeting and suggested follow up activities.

Output 4.4. Formulate programmes for integrating IAS issues into learning institution curricula.

In the long run it is vital that IAS issues are understood by the public in general and the most effective way of initiating this understanding is by integrating IAS issues into learning institution curricula. Students at all levels were identified as a key target group under Component 2. IAS issues are generally not formally taught at any educational level in the project countries although they are touched upon in some university courses. Lack of awareness of IAS issues among educators is one of the primary reasons for this. This is one of the reasons why they were identified as one of the target groups for the IAS awareness-raising programmes to be conducted under Component 2. Educators including those responsible for curriculum development will be one of target groups for training in IAS awareness under 4.1 above. Even where sufficient awareness exists it is unlikely that IAS issues will be taught as long as they do not feature in formal curricula. The key to successful teaching of IAS issues once featured in the formal curricula is the availability of resources that can be utilised by teachers.

A specific process for incorporating IAS issues into learning institution curricula will be conducted in parallel with IAS training and awareness-raising activities. Guidelines for the incorporation of IAS issues in learning institution curricula will be developed through task teams comprising of national experts in IAS and education. National task teams will be under the management of the National Project Coordinators

(NPCs). Initial consultations with curriculum development authorities will establish the scope for incorporation of IAS issues into the identified curricula. Draft guidelines will then be formulated using information obtained from these consultations and curriculum guidelines developed elsewhere, Teachers packs on IAS will be produced in parallel with the curriculum guidelines. To maximise uptake the guidelines and teacher's packs will be produced to complement the teaching of existing subjects and not as stand alone modules. This will mean that net teacher workload remains unchanged. Following further consultation guidelines will be submitted to curriculum development authorities for inclusion in regular curriculum reviews. Teacher's packs will be piloted in selected schools and other educational institutions.

Other project activities such as those targeting IAS awareness and capacity are likely to have positive impacts on the teaching of IAS issues in the project countries.

Preliminary assessments of prevailing capacity levels related to IAS issues in the project countries were conducted during the PDF-B. These assessments will form the basis of quantitative and qualitative capacity assessments that will be conducted during the full project. Capacity assessments will be conducted as part of the activities relating to the review of training needs and the development of customised training methods. These assessments will provide the baseline relative to which the project impacts on capacity can be assessed. Regular monitoring will be conducted to assess how effectively the training strategy is achieving its aims. This will also allow strategies to be adjusted if targets are not being met.

ANNEX J: TERMS OF REFERENCE

A. INTERNATIONAL EXECUTING AGENCY (IEA)

CAB-International Africa Regional Centre (CABI-ARC) and The World Conservation Union Regional Office for Eastern Africa (IUCN EARO) are the joint International Executing Agencies for the project.

1. ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL EXECUTING AGENCIES

CABI-ARC will be the lead IEA for the project. IUCN EARO will be the second lead IEA for the project.

The international Executing Agencies (IEAs) through CABI-ARC will:

- Be accountable to the United Nations Environment Programme (GEF Implementing Agency), for the achievement of project objectives, results, and all fundamental aspects of project execution
- House and administer the PCU
- Provide project oversight through senior management
- Provide staff time and logistics for project execution
- Provide financial and management services to ensure efficient and timely execution of project activities
- Host the annual International Steering Committee (ISC) Meeting
- Establish a project International Advisory Group (IAG)
- Support the project through CABI Liaison Officers in project countries
- Support the project through IUCN staff in project countries
- Maintain links with other related initiatives
- Seek further funding to build upon project activities

Other roles of the IEAs will be executed through the International Project Coordinator (IPC) and Assistant IPC working within the Project Coordination Unit (PCU). These are roles are listed under the ToRs for the IPC and Assistant IPC.

B. INTERNATIONAL PROJECT COORDINATOR (IPC)

1. Background

CAB-International's Africa Regional Centre (CABI-ARC) will be the Lead Executing Agency and the World Conservation Union's Eastern African Regional Office (IUCN-EARO) will be the Assisting Executing Agency for a Global Environment Facility Project entitled: **Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa**. UNEP is the implementing agency for the project. The project falls under the Operational categories 1 - Arid and Semi-arid Ecosystems, 2 - Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems and 3 - Forest Ecosystems under the Biodiversity Focal Area of the GEF.

Invasive alien species (IAS) are second only to habitat destruction as a cause of global biodiversity loss. Prevention and mitigation of the effects of IAS is particularly challenging in Africa, impeding sustainable development as well as threatening biodiversity. This project aims to reduce and possibly remove barriers to the management of IAS through effective implementation of CBD Article 8(h) in 4 pilot countries (Ethiopia, Ghana, Uganda, Zambia), using a multisectoral ecosystem approach. In each country an enabling policy environment will be promoted through the establishment of appropriate institutional arrangements to ensure that IAS strategies are mainstreamed; stakeholder awareness of IAS issues will be raised and access to necessary information provided; prevention and control programmes will be established, including ecosystem management at pilot sites where IAS threaten biodiversity; capacity for sustainable IAS management will be built. Lessons learned will be disseminated for replication in other countries in Africa.

The incumbent will be based at the CABI-ARC Office in Nairobi, Kenya for a duration of 48 months.

2. Overall responsibility of the International Project Coordinator

Under the supervision of the Director of CABI-ARC, the Coordinator will manage the GEF Project's implementation. He/she will lead the Project Coordination Unit, supervise the work of the Assistant International Project Coordinator, maintain communication with the International Steering Committee and International Advisory Group, Supervise the work of the National Project Coordinators, provide technical guidance during project implementation and will ensure that budget and administrative procedures adopted are consistent with UNEP and CABI rules and regulations. The Coordinator will assume the following responsibilities:

3. Duties

- Co-ordinate the implementation of all technical and administrative aspects of the GEF Project components in close cooperation with the UNEP/GEF Coordination Office, insuring quality control, adequate use of resources, and timely delivery of project outputs in accordance with the project schedule
- Develop the terms of reference and expected outputs for the Project Coordination Unit and each project component for approval by the International Steering Committee at its first meeting
- Prepare for approval by the ISC the terms of reference for the International Assistant Project Coordinator, National Project Coordinators and assist in the identification of any required national and regional consultants and technical experts
- Prepare and submit annual workplan to the ISC and UNEP/GEF
- Prepare and submit annual budget and revisions to ISC and UNEP/GEF
- Assist in the convening ISC meetings, and prepare related documentation, including working and information documents
- Chair ISC meetings
- Ensure that members of the ISC are effectively involved in project implementation
- Liaise with the International Advisory Group of the Project, through exchange of information, and by integrating the IAG guidance into the implementation of the project's components
- Co-ordinate all activities of the PCU
- Provide supervision, technical and administrative support and back-up assistance to Assistant IPC in the design, planning and execution of their activities
- Co-ordinate recruitment of the NPCs
- Provide supervision, technical and administrative support and back-up assistance to NPCs in the design, planning and execution of their national activities through assistance in project design and implementation, review terms of reference prior to launching of subcontracts, and supervision of the quality of the work
- Ensure that project activities are effectively co-ordinated between NPCs
- Assist NPCs in the review of publications and grant proposals
- Assist NPCs in the facilitation of post-graduate training, workshops and courses
- Participate in, and facilitate regional workshops and meetings as appropriate, including arranging logistics, providing reports and facilitation
- Monitor and evaluate activities of the NPC and NCU
- Co-ordinate internal and external reviews of project as required
- Liaise with technical and financial partners, sub-regional intergovernmental organisations that have experience in and mandates relevant to invasive species issues, as well as National Governments, National Project Coordinators and National Committees; ensuring the establishment of operational mechanisms in order to link this project with other GEF and non-GEF regional activities through correspondence and ad hoc attendance at relevant regional meetings
- Oversee public relations for the project
- Resolve misunderstandings and conflicts between stakeholders/stakeholder groups
- Develop and maintain the project website
- Liaise with UNEP/GEF to ensure compliance with GEF procedures and guidelines and facilitate its monitoring and evaluation role
- Ensure that project results are published in a professional and timely manner
- Ensure that all UNEP/GEF standards for project monitoring and reporting including logframe and incremental cost analysis are met.
- Organise the annual project audit

- Submit regular reports to UNEP/GEF on progress of the individual components, and on progress of the project as a whole, as required.
- Organise the project mid-term review
- Organise the project terminal report

4. Deliverables

The International Project Coordinator will be responsible for delivering the following outputs:

- National Project Coordinators recruited
- National Project Coordinators supervised
- Assistant IPC recruited
- Assistant IPC supervised
- Efficient functioning of the PCU
- NPCs supervised
- Project activities implemented efficiently and on schedule
- National project activities implemented efficiently and on schedule
- One ISC meeting convened each year
- Annual work plan and budget approved by ISC
- Annual workplan and budget approved by UNEP/GEF
- All financial and technical reports submitted on schedule and approved
- Timely transfers of GEF funds
- Terms of reference produced for consultants and technical experts
- Inaugural, mid-term and project completion workshops convened
- Mid-term evaluation report and final evaluation report submitted to UNEP/GEF
- Project objectives met
- Effective public relations

5. Contract duration and nature

The contract covers a duration of one (1) year, renewable up to the end of the project which covers a period of four (4) years, with a probation period of 6 months, subject to good performance.

6. Qualifications and experience

- Postgraduate degree in a technical field related to agricultural, environmental issues or related field
- 10 years professional experience with at least 3 years spent in international multi- or bilateral cooperation
- 4 years of project leadership including budgetary management, work planning, and team leadership in an international setting
- Proven successful project implementation in Africa in agricultural, environmental issues or related field
- Excellent command of spoken and written English
- Excellent computer skills including high degree of familiarity with MS Office packages and statistical software
- Experience in GEF project implementation
- Knowledge of the operation of institutions in the project countries
- Demonstrated aptitude in leading multi-disciplinary teams
- Knowledge of the procedures relating to the management of projects of the GEF, UNEP, World Bank or any other major donor
- Solid management qualities and particularly aptitude in giving strategic directives and technical supervision
- Excellent communication and team leader qualities
- Capacity to mobilise resources
- Aptitude to work in multi-cultural environments
- Facility in interpersonal relationships
- Experience in participatory approach
- Experience in rural areas

- Professional mobility essential
- Everything else being equal in terms of competency, preference will be given to candidates from the region.

C. INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANT PROJECT COORDINATOR (ASSISTANT IPC)

1. Background

CAB-International's Africa Regional Centre (CABI-ARC) will be the Lead Executing Agency and the World Conservation Union's Eastern African Regional Office (IUCN-EARO) will be the Assisting Executing Agency for a Global Environment Facility Project entitled: **Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa**. UNEP is the implementing agency for the project. The project falls under the Operational categories 1 - Arid and Semi-arid Ecosystems, 2 - Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems and 3 - Forest Ecosystems under the Biodiversity Focal Area of the GEF.

Invasive alien species (IAS) are second only to habitat destruction as a cause of global biodiversity loss. Prevention and mitigation of the effects of IAS is particularly challenging in Africa, impeding sustainable development as well as threatening biodiversity. This project aims to reduce and possibly remove barriers to the management of IAS through effective implementation of CBD Article 8(h) in 4 pilot countries (Ethiopia, Ghana, Uganda, Zambia), using a multisectoral ecosystem approach. In each country an enabling policy environment will be promoted through the establishment of appropriate institutional arrangements to ensure that IAS strategies are mainstreamed; stakeholder awareness of IAS issues will be raised and access to necessary information provided; prevention and control programmes will be established, including ecosystem management at pilot sites where IAS threaten biodiversity; capacity for sustainable IAS management will be built. Lessons learned will be disseminated for replication in other countries in Africa.

The incumbent will be based at the CABI-ARC Office in Nairobi, Kenya for a duration of 48 months.

2. Overall responsibility of the Assistant International Project Coordinator

Under the supervision of the International Project Coordinator, the Assistant IPC will assist with the GEF Project's implementation. He/she will, together with the IPC form the Project Coordination Unit., The Assistant IPC will assist with the maintenance of communication with the International Steering Committee and International Advisory Group, the provision of technical guidance during project implementation and the implementation of budgetary and administrative procedures that are consistent with UNEP and CABI rules and regulations.

3. Duties

The Assistant IPC will assist in the following duties:

- Co-ordination of the implementation of all technical and administrative aspects of the GEF Project components, insuring quality control, adequate use of resources, and timely delivery of project outputs in accordance with the project schedule
- Development of the terms of reference and expected outputs for the Project Coordination Unit and each project component for approval by the International Steering Committee at its first meeting
- Preparation for approval by the ISC of the terms of reference for National Project Coordinators and assistance in the identification of any required national and regional consultants and technical experts
- Preparation and submission of annual workplan to the ISC and UNEP/GEF
- Preparation and submission of annual budget and revisions to ISC and UNEP/GEF
- The convening of ISC meetings, and preparation of related documentation, including working and information documents
- Ensuring that members of the ISC are effectively involved in project implementation
- Liaison with the International Advisory Group of the Project, through exchange of information, and by integrating the IAG guidance into the implementation of the project's components
- Co-ordination of all activities of the PCU
- Co-ordination of the recruitment of the NPCs

- Provision of technical and administrative support and back-up assistance to NPCs in the design, planning and execution of their national activities through assistance in project design and implementation, reviewing terms of reference prior to launching of subcontracts, and supervision of the quality of the work
- Ensuring that project activities are effectively co-ordinated between NPCs
- Reviews of publications and grant proposals by NPCs
- Facilitation of post-graduate training, workshops and courses by NPCs
- The facilitation of regional workshops and meetings as appropriate, including arranging logistics, providing reports and facilitation. The Assistant IPC should also participate in such meetings as appropriate
- The monitoring and evaluation activities of the NPC and NCU
- The co-ordination of internal and external project reviews as required
- Liaison with technical and financial partners, sub-regional intergovernmental organisations that have experience in and mandates relevant to invasive species issues, as well as National Governments, National Project Coordinators and National Committees; ensuring the establishment of operational mechanisms in order to link this project with other GEF and non-GEF regional activities through correspondence and ad hoc attendance at relevant regional meetings
- The public relations for the project
- The resolution of misunderstandings and conflicts between stakeholders/stakeholder groups
- The development and maintenance of the project website
- Liaison with UNEP/GEF to ensure compliance with GEF procedures and guidelines and facilitate its monitoring and evaluation role
- Ensuring that project results are published in a professional and timely manner
- Ensuring that all UNEP/GEF standards for project monitoring and reporting including logframe and incremental cost analysis are met.
- The organisation of the annual project audit
- The submission of regular reports to UNEP/GEF on progress of the individual components, and on progress of the project as a whole, as required.
- The organisation of the project mid-term review
- The organisation of the project terminal report

4. Deliverables

The Assistant IPC will be responsible for delivering outputs related to the above duties according to an annual workplan prepared by the IPC.

5. Contract duration and nature

The contract covers a duration of one (1) year, renewable up to the end of the project which covers a period of four (4) years, with a probation period of 6 months, subject to good performance.

6. Qualifications and experience

- Postgraduate degree in a technical field related to agricultural, environmental issues or related field
- 5 years professional experience with at least 3 in the field of environment or sustainable development
- Experience of budgetary management, work planning and working in an interdisciplinary team in an international setting
- Excellent command of spoken and written English
- Excellent computer skills including high degree of familiarity with MS Office packages and statistical software
- Demonstrated aptitude in working in multi-disciplinary teams
- Solid management qualities and aptitude in technical supervision
- Excellent interpersonal skills
- Aptitude for working in multi-cultural environments
- Facility in interpersonal relationships
- Experience in participatory approach

- Experience in rural areas
- Professional mobility essential
- Everything else being equal in terms of competency, preference will be given to candidates from the region.

D. PROJECT COORDINATION UNIT (PCU)

The Project Coordination Unit (PCU) will be housed within the CAB-International Africa Regional Centre (CABI-ARC) In Nairobi. The PCU will be staffed full time by the International Project Coordinator (IPC) and Assistant IPC. In addition CABI-ARC and IUCN EARO staff will contribute to the work of the PCU

The Project Coordination Unit will provide day to day coordination of technical, financial and administrative aspects of project execution. Details of these roles are listed under the ToRs for the IPC and Assistant IPC.

E. INTERNATIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE (ISC)

The international steering committee will consist of representatives of the following organisations:

- CAB International (International Project Coordinator)
- World Conservation Union, IUCN
- National Executing Agencies (Directors)
- United Nations Environment Programme/Global Environment Facility
- Global Invasive Species Programme

In addition two internationally recognised experts covering the range of IAS issues will be invited, making a total of 10 members.

The ISC will meet once each year, at the start of the project, and once at the end. The ISC will:

- Provide guidance on project coordination and execution
- Review and advise on project and national work plans
- Provide technical insight on project activities
- Review project reports
- Oversee the evaluation, monitoring and reporting aspects of the project
- Review and approve project outputs

The PCU is responsible for convening and organising the ISC meetings, including recording and distribution of minutes. The IPC will Chair the ISC meetings.

F. INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY GROUP

CABI-ARC will establish an International Advisory Group which will consist of experts in the field of invasive species prevention and management, sustainable development and the implementation of multi-country GEF and other major donor projects in Africa.

Members of the IAG will be in e-mail contact with each other and with the project executing agencies. Members of the IAG may be invited to attend project meetings on an ad hoc basis.

The IAG will:

- Provide advice on project coordination and execution
- Act as a consultative body on the technical aspects of the project
- Provide advice on project reports
- Help to establish links between the project and other relevant activities

- Help to provide information about project dissemination and replication pathways

G. NATIONAL COORDINATION UNIT (NCU)

Each project country will have a National Coordination Units (NCU) be hosted by the NEA. The NCUs will be staffed full time by the National Project Coordinator (NPC) and associated staff (see Annex F).

The Project Coordination Unit will provide day to day coordination of technical, financial and administrative aspects of project execution at the national. Details of these roles are listed under the ToR for the NPC.

H. NATIONAL PROJECT DIRECTOR

1. RELATIONSHIPS

The National Project Director will:

- Be accountable to CABI-ARC for the delivery of agreed national project outputs
- Supervise the work of the National Coordination Unit (NCU)

2. ROLE OF NATIONAL PROJECT DIRECTOR

The National Project Director will:

- Recruit and supervise staff of the National Project Coordination Unit
- Ensure the smooth running of the National Project Coordination Unit
- Ensure that financial and technical outputs are effectively delivered
- Liaise with counterparts in other sectors to ensure that cross-sectoral linkages are developed and maintained
- Maintain regular contact with CABI-ARC
- Be a member of the National Steering Committee
- Be a member of the International Steering Committee

I. NATIONAL PROJECT COORDINATOR (NPC)

1. Background

CAB-International's Africa Regional Centre (CABI-ARC) will be the Lead Executing Agency and the World Conservation Union's Eastern African Regional Office (IUCN-EARO) will be the Assisting Executing Agency for a Global Environment Facility Project entitled: **Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa**. UNEP is the implementing agency for the project. The project falls under the Operational categories 1 - Arid and Semi-arid Ecosystems, 2 - Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems and 3 - Forest Ecosystems under the Biodiversity Focal Area of the GEF.

Invasive alien species (IAS) are second only to habitat destruction as a cause of global biodiversity loss. Prevention and mitigation of the effects of IAS is particularly challenging in Africa, impeding sustainable development as well as threatening biodiversity. This project aims to reduce and possibly remove barriers to the management of IAS through effective implementation of CBD Article 8(h) in 4 pilot countries (Ethiopia, Ghana, Uganda, Zambia), using a multisectoral ecosystem approach. In each country an enabling policy environment will be promoted through the establishment of appropriate institutional arrangements to ensure that IAS strategies are mainstreamed; stakeholder awareness of IAS issues will be raised and access to necessary information provided; prevention and control programmes will be established, including ecosystem management at pilot sites where IAS threaten biodiversity; capacity for sustainable IAS management will be built. Lessons learned will be disseminated for replication in other countries in Africa.

The incumbent will be based at the National Project Office for a duration of 48 months.

2. Overall responsibility of the National Project Coordinator

Under the supervision of the International Project Coordinator, the National Coordinator will manage the GEF Project's implementation at National Level. He/she will lead the National Project Coordination Unit (NCU), supervise the work of the national project support staff, national consultants and task teams, maintain communication with the IPC and National Steering Committee members, provide technical guidance during project implementation and will ensure that budget and administrative procedures adopted are consistent with UNEP and CABI rules and regulations. The Coordinator will assume the following responsibilities:

3. Duties

- Co-ordinate the implementation of all technical and administrative aspects of the GEF Project components at the national level in close cooperation with the PCU, National Project Director and NSC insuring quality control, adequate use of resources, and timely delivery of project outputs in accordance with the project schedule
- Assist with the development of the terms of reference and expected outputs for the NCU and each project component for approval by the NSC
- Prepare for approval by the NSC the terms of reference for the national project support staff and assist in the identification of any required national consultants and technical experts
- Co-ordinate recruitment of the national project support staff
- Prepare and submit annual workplan to the NSC and PCU
- Prepare and submit annual budget and revisions to the NSC and PCU
- Assist in the convening NSC meetings, and prepare related documentation, including working and information documents
- Chair NSC meetings
- Ensure that members of the NSC are effectively involved in project implementation
- Assist in the recruitment of project support staff, project task team members, national consultants and technical experts
- Co-ordinate all activities of the NCU
- Provide supervision, technical and administrative support and back-up assistance to national project support staff, task teams and project consultants and technical experts in the design, planning and execution of their activities, review terms of reference prior to launching of subcontracts, and supervision of the quality of the work
- Monitor and evaluate project activities
- Produce and review publications and grant proposals
- Facilitate post-graduate training, workshops and courses
- Participate in, and facilitate regional workshops and meetings as appropriate, including arranging logistics, providing reports and facilitation
- Co-ordinate internal and external reviews of project as required
- Liaise with technical and financial partners, sub-regional intergovernmental organisations that have experience in and mandates relevant to invasive species issues, as well as National Governments, National Project Coordinators and National Committees; ensuring the establishment of operational mechanisms in order to link this project with other GEF and non-GEF regional activities through correspondence and ad hoc attendance at relevant regional meetings
- Oversee national public relations for the project
- Resolve misunderstandings and conflicts between stakeholders/stakeholder groups
- Develop and maintain the national project website
- Assist with liaison with UNEP/GEF to ensure compliance with GEF procedures and guidelines and facilitate its monitoring and evaluation role
- Ensure that project results are published in a professional and timely manner
- Ensure that all UNEP/GEF standards for project monitoring and reporting including logframe and incremental cost analysis are met.
- Organise the annual project audit at national level
- Submit regular reports to the PCU on progress of the individual components, and on progress of the project as a whole, as required.

- Organise national inputs into the project mid-term review
- Organise national inputs into the project terminal report

4. Deliverables

The National Project Coordinator will be responsible for delivering the following outputs:

- National project staff recruited
- National project staff supervised
- Efficient functioning of the NSC
- National project activities implemented efficiently and on schedule
- Annual work plan and budget approved by NSC
- Annual workplan and budget approved by UNEP/GEF
- All financial and technical reports submitted on schedule and approved
- Timely transfers of GEF funds
- Inception, mid-term and project completion workshops convened
- Terms of reference produced for task teams, consultants and technical experts
- Mid-term evaluation report and final evaluation report submitted to UNEP/GEF
- Project objectives met
- Effective public relations

5. Contract duration and nature

The contract covers a duration of one (1) year, renewable up to the end of the project which covers a period of four (4) years, with a probation period of 6 months, subject to good performance.

6. Qualifications and experience

- Postgraduate degree in a technical field related to agricultural, environmental issues or related field
- 10 years professional experience at the national level
- 4 years of project leadership including budgetary management, work planning, and team leadership
- Proven successful project implementation in agricultural, environmental issues or related field
- Excellent command of spoken and written English
- Sound computer skills including high degree of familiarity with MS Office packages and statistical software
- Experience in GEF project implementation
- Knowledge of the operation of institutions in the project country
- Demonstrated aptitude in leading multi-disciplinary teams
- Knowledge of the procedures relating to the management of projects of the GEF, UNEP, World Bank or any other major donor
- Solid management qualities and particularly aptitude in giving strategic directives and technical supervision
- Excellent communication and team leader qualities
- Capacity to mobilise resources
- Aptitude to work in multi-cultural environments
- Facility in interpersonal relationships
- Experience in participatory approach
- Experience in rural areas
- Professional mobility essential
- Everything else being equal in terms of competency, preference will be given to candidates from the region.

J. NATIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE (NSC)

Each country will convene a national steering committee consisting of the following members.

- Project Director (Chairman)
- National Coordinator (Secretary)
- CBD National Focal Point

- CHM National Focal Point (if different from CBD focal point)
- Representatives from stakeholder groups of key importance to the sound project execution, catalysing of sustainability of project beyond the life of project, and mainstreaming in non-green agencies (to be agreed by above and with guidance from NSC)

The national steering committee will meet regularly (at least quarterly) and will:

- Approve work plans for national coordinator, task leaders
- Approve terms of reference for consultants
- Oversee appointment of consultants
- Monitor progress against work plans
- Review reports and other project outputs
- Approve and monitor budgets
- Address national political and administrative issues

ANNEX K: BREAKDOWN OF CO-FINANCING COMMITMENT

Component	Funding Agency	Total Money Value ($)				Cash ($)				In kind ($)				Status & confirmed for period
		FY 05-06	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 05-06	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	FY 05-06	FY 06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09	
1	Gov. of Ethiopia	9,329	18,003	20,014	972	5,854	10,833	10,577	486	3,475	7,170	9,438	486	Confirmed
2	Gov. of Ethiopia	41,589	31,300	33,395	20,065	9,248	5,545	6,159	4,241	32,341	25,755	27,237	15,824	Confirmed
3	Gov. of Ethiopia	115,767	75,923	69,000	79,831	69,363	37,712	33,881	41,548	46,404	38,211	35,119	38,283	Confirmed
4	Gov. of Ethiopia	136,006	42,233	39,545	3,204	49,805	6,162	2,961	1,752	86,201	36,072	36,583	1,452	Confirmed
5	Gov. of Ethiopia	117,305	49,220	52,578	54,943	99,127	32,469	35,383	36,895	18,178	16,751	17,195	18,048	Confirmed
Total		419,996	216,679	214,532	159,015	233,397	92,720	88,961	84,922	186,599	123,958	125,572	74,093	
1	Gov. of Ghana	16,557	12,447	6,220	9,563	10,914	6,519	0	3,031	5,643	5,928	6,220	6,532	Confirmed
2	Gov. of Ghana	13,913	22,810	15,427	15,674	5,668	10,652	2,661	2,271	8,245	12,158	12,766	13,403	Confirmed
3	Gov. of Ghana	58,119	62,517	76,358	74,209	23,995	26,694	38,738	34,710	34,124	35,823	37,620	39,499	Confirmed
4	Gov. of Ghana	73,421	72,907	63,745	63,992	42,477	35,420	24,383	22,658	30,944	37,487	39,362	41,334	Confirmed
5	Gov. of Ghana	110,993	109,532	126,227	132,689	41,947	45,715	59,218	62,331	69,046	63,817	67,009	70,358	Confirmed
Total		273,002	280,213	287,977	296,126	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	148,002	155,213	162,977	171,126	
1	Gov. of Uganda	32,212	15,985	17,308	6,890	20,179	7,671	8,578	4,063	12,033	8,314	8,730	2,827	Confirmed
2	Gov. of Uganda	18,736	36,565	46,333	44,514	6,943	12,196	27,996	22,713	11,794	24,370	18,338	21,801	Confirmed
3	Gov. of Uganda	62,094	158,999	121,927	151,323	28,865	64,067	33,814	51,695	33,229	94,933	88,113	99,628	Confirmed
4	Gov. of Uganda	32,151	29,989	16,047	0	11,844	17,762	14,974	0	20,307	12,227	1,073	0	Confirmed
5	Gov. of Uganda	96,380	54,743	72,647	81,189	57,169	23,306	39,638	46,530	39,211	31,437	33,009	34,659	Confirmed
Total		241,573	296,281	274,262	283,915	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	116,573	171,281	149,262	158,915	
1	Gov. of Zambia	47,187	6,142	13,486	33,496	10,462	2,021	5,243	9,869	36,725	4,121	8,243	23,627	Confirmed
2	Gov. of Zambia	5,475	47,789	22,783	32,008	1,947	22,465	7,990	16,807	3,527	25,324	14,793	15,200	Confirmed
3	Gov. of Zambia	7,394	65,097	71,518	68,015	6,884	38,723	51,861	41,839	510	26,374	19,657	26,176	Confirmed
4	Gov. of Zambia	15,357	97,510	94,667	25,851	3,615	22,076	7,885	3,173	11,742	75,434	86,782	22,678	Confirmed
5	Gov. of Zambia	164,841	97,156	112,661	120,975	102,092	39,716	52,021	53,311	62,749	57,440	60,640	67,663	Confirmed
Total		240,254	313,694	315,115	280,344	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	115,254	188,694	190,115	155,344	
5	CABI	187,500	187,500	187,500	187,500	93,750	93,750	93,750	93,750	93,750	93,750	93,750	93,750	Confirmed
5	IUCN	62,500	62,500	62,500	62,500	31,250	31,250	31,250	31,250	31,250	31,250	31,250	31,250	Confirmed

ANNEX L: LETTERS OF COMMITMENT TO PROVIDE CO-FINANCING

የኢትዮጵያ ግብርና ምርምር ድርጅት

Ethiopian Agricultural Research Organization

Mr Ahmed Djoghlaf,
Director, UNEP Division of GEF Co-ordination,
Nairobi,
Kenya.

13 AUG 2004

Fax. +254-20-624041
Phone. +254-20-624166
Email. Ahmed.Djoghlaf@unep.org

Dear Sir

Full UNEP/GEF-Funded Proposal on Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa-Re: Co-Financing in-Cash and Co-Financing in-Kind by the Ethiopian Agricultural Research Organization

It is to be recalled that we have successfully completed the PDF-A phase of the UNEP/GEF funded project entitled "Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa". We have now nearly finished the PDF-B phase, which has been very successful and which will be completed on time. The full project is due to begin in January 2005.

The Ethiopian Agricultural Research Organization (EARO) is pledging the following funds, stated below in-kind and in-cash to support the implementation of the full project in the country.

FINANCING	YEAR1 (US$)	YEAR 2 (US$)	YEAR 3 (US$)	YEAR 4 (US$)	TOTAL (US$)
Government of Ethiopia Co-financing in-Cash	233,397	92,720	88,961	84,922	500,000
Government of Ethiopia Co-financing in-Kind	186,599	123,958	125,572	74,093	510,222
Grand Total	419,996	216,679	214,532	159,015	1,010,222

TSEDEKE ABATE (Dr)
DIRECTOR GENERAL

Tel. (251-1) 462633, 454443, 462270
460380, 460379

Fax (251-1) 461294
http://www.earo.org.et

P.O.Box2003
Addis Abeba Ethiopia

The co-financing in-kind categories include:

1. Personnel (i.e., all personnel contributing to the project but not paid by the project: their personal emoluments, health, pension schemes, etc.),
2. Office accommodation,
3. Laboratory facilities,
4. Vehicles,
5. Communications,
6. Utilities,
7. Meeting and Conference Rooms,
8. Documentation,
9. Equipment.

EARO is fully committed to implement the project "Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa". We will ensure full collaboration by the relevant Agricultural Research Centers, Public and Private Agencies in the vicinity of the selected pilot sites of the Project in order to make it a success.

Yours sincerely

TSEDEKE ABATE (Dr)
DIRECTOR GENERAL

c.c. Dr. Tewolde Berhan Gebre Egziabiher, General Manager
Environmental Protection Authority, Addis Ababa,
Ethiopia
Mr. Dennis Rangi, Director, CAB International – Africa Regional Centre, Nairobi,
Kenya.

In case of reply the Number and date of this letter should be quoted

MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND SCIENCE
P. O BOX MB 232
ACCRA

Tel: 666049/662264
Fax: 666828

REPUBLIC OF GHANA

Our Ref: MES/IA/037/V.4

4th August 2004.

Your Ref:

Mr Ahmed Djoghlaf,
Director, UNEP Division of GEF Co-ordination,
Nairobi,
Kenya.

Fax. +254-20-624041
Phone. +254-20-624166
Email. Ahmed.Djoghlaf@unep.org

Dear Sir

FULL UNEP/GEF-FUNDED PROPOSAL ON REMOVING BARRIERS TO INVASIVE PLANT MANAGEMENT IN AFRICA-RE: CO-FINANCING IN-CASH AND CO-FINANCING IN-KIND BY REPUBLIC OF GHANA.

Following the successful completion of the UNEP/GEF funded PDF-A and PDF-B phases of the Project entitled "Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa", the GEF Focal Point of CBD/Ghana gratefully acknowledges the receipt of a proposal of the full UNEP/GEF funded project due to begin in January 2005.

The Government of Ghana is pledging the following funds, stated below in-kind and in-cash to support the implementation of the full project in the country:

FINANCING	YEAR1 (US$)	YEAR 2 (US$)	YEAR 3 (US$)	YEAR 4 (US$)	TOTAL (US$)
Government of Ghana Co-financing in-Cash	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	500,000
Government of Ghana Co-financing in-Kind	148,002	155,213	162,977	171,126	637,318
Grand Total	**273,002**	**280,213**	**287,977**	**296,126**	**1,137,318**

The co-financing in-kind categories include:

1. Personnel (i.e, all personnel in the Project but not paid by the Project: their personal emoluments, Health, Pension Schemes),
2. Office accommodation,
3. Laboratory facilities,
4. Vehicles,
5. Communications,
6. Utilities,
7. Meeting and Conference Rooms,
8. Documentation,
9. Equipment,

The Ministry as the GEF Focal Point for Ghana fully endorses the project " Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa" and will ensure full collaboration by the relevant government departments and agencies in order to make this a successful project.

E. O. NSENKYIRE
CHIEF DIRECTOR
For: MINISTER

cc: ***Dr. Sarah Simons***
Deputy Director
CABI-Africa Regional Centre
P.O. Box 633-00621
Nairobi – Kenya

Prof. E. Owusu - Bennoah
Ag. Director General
CSIR
P. O. Box M32
Accra

Telephones: Kampala 234700/9 (10 lines)

Fax: Kampala 230163
Telex: 61170
Telegrams: "FINSEC"

In any correspondence on
this subject please quote No. ALD 58/141/01

THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA

Ministry of Finance, Planning
and Economic Development
P.O. Box 8147,
Kampala.
Uganda.
Plot 2-12 Apollo Kaggwa Rd
Finance HQs Building

30th November 2004

Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaf
Executive Director
UNEP Division of GEF Coordination
P.O. Box 30552
NAIROBI

COMMITMENT FOR CO-FINANCING THE REMOVING BARRIERS TO INVASIVE PLANT MANAGEMENT IN AFRICA PROJECT

As you are aware we have successfully implemented the PDF-A and PDF-B phases of the above mentioned project and are now finalising the project document for the full scale project due to start in 2005.

This is to confirm that the Government of Uganda considers the interventions of the project to be a priority and has budgeted the resources to co-finance it as follows:

Financing	Year 1 (US$)	Year 2 (US$)	Year 3 (US$)	Year 4 (US$)	Total (US$)
Cash	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	500,000
In kind	116,573	171,281	149,262	158,915	596,031
Grand total	241,573	296,281	274,262	283,915	1,096,031

M. C. Mududuli (Mrs.)
For: PERMANENT SECRETARY/SECRETARY TO TREASURY

cc. Mr. Dennis Rangi
Director, CABI-Africa Regional Centre
NAIROBI

The Director General
National Agricultural Research Organisation
ENTEBBE

Telex: ZA 45510
Telefax: 223930
Email: mtenrpe@coppernet.zm

In reply please quote:
No. .....

Telephone: 227645/7
Email: mtenrps@coppernet.zm

REPUBLIC OF ZAMBIA

MINISTRY OF TOURISM, ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

OFFICE OF THE PERMANENT SECRETARY

KWACHA HOUSE
CAIRO ROAD
P. O. BOX 30575
10101 LUSAKA

MTENR/6/7/7

4th August 2004

Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaf,
Director,
UNEP Division of GEF Co-ordination,
Nairobi,
Kenya.
Fax : +254-20-624041
Phone : +254-20-624166
Email : Ahmed.Djoghlaf@unep.org

RE: FULL UNEP/GEF-FUNDED PROPOSAL ON REMOVING BARRIERS TO INVASIVE PLANT MANAGEMENT IN AFRICA: CO-FINANCING IN-CASH AND CO-FINANCING IN-KIND BY THE REPUBLIC OF ZAMBIA.

Following the successful completion of the UNEP/GEF funded PDF-A and PDF-B phases of the Project entitled *"Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa"* the GEF Focal Point of Zambia gratefully acknowledges the receipt of a proposal of the full UNEP/GEF funded project due to begin in January 2005.

The Government of the Republic of Zambia has prioritized Invasive Alien Species (IAS) in its National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), together with the Zambia Wetlands Strategy and Action Plan (ZWSAP). Our Government is particularly concerned about the potential threat of IAS to the indigenous biodiversity in Protected Areas (PAs) as well as their detrimental effects on the economy.

In view of the above, the Government of Zambia is pledging the following funds, stated below in-kind and in-cash to support the implementation of the full project in the country:

FINANCING	YEAR1 (US$)	YEAR 2 (US$)	YEAR 3 (US$)	YEAR 4 (US$)	TOTAL (US$)
Government of Zambia Co-financing in-Cash	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	500,000
Government of Zambia Co-financing in-Kind	115,254	188,694	190,115	155,344	649,407
Grand Total	**240,254**	**313,694**	**315,115**	**280,344**	**1,149,407**

The co-financing in-kind categories include:

1. Personnel (i.e. all personnel contributing to the Project but not paid by the Project: their personal emoluments, health, pension schemes);
2. Office accommodation;
3. Laboratory facilities;
4. Vehicles;
5. Communications;
6. Utilities;
7. Meeting and Conference Rooms;
8. Documentation; and
9. Equipment.

The Ministry as the GEF Focal Point for Zambia fully endorses the project *"Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa"*. We will ensure full collaboration by the relevant government departments and agencies throughout the project in order to make it a success.

K. Nkowani (Dr)
Director
Environment and Natural Resources Management Department
For/Permanent Secretary
MINISTRY OF TOURISM, ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Cc: Mr. Edward Zulu,
Director,
Environmental Council of Zambia,
Zambia.

Mr. Dennis Rangi,
Director,
CAB International – Africa Regional Centre,
Nairobi,
Kenya.

CAB International

Africa Regional Centre

Applied life sciences for global development

Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaf
Director
UNEP/Division GEF Co-ordination
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi
Kenya.

3rd December 2004

Dear Sir,

COMMITMENT TO CO-FINANCE A PROJECT ENTITLED, 'REMOVING BARRIERS TO INVASIVE PLANT MANAGEMENT IN AFRICA'

As you are aware CABI, IUCN and their national partners in the four project countries have successfully implemented the PDF-A and PDF-B phases of the above mentioned project and are finalising the proposal for the full scale project due to start in 2005.

This is to confirm that CABI has the resources to co-finance the project as detailed in the table below.

Financing	Year 1 (US$)	Year 2 (US$)	Year 3 (US$)	Year 4 (US$)	Total (US$)
CABI Co-financing in cash	93,750	93,750	93,750	93,750	375,000
CABI Co-financing in kind	93,750	93,750	93,750	93,750	375,000
Grand total	187,500	187,500	187,500	187,500	750,000

Yours sincerely

Dennis Rangi
Director for International Development,
CAB International

Africa Asia Caribbean Europe Latin America North America

ICRAF Complex • PO Box 633 - 00621 • Nairobi • Kenya
Tel: +254 2 524450/62 • Fax: +254 2 522150/524001 • Email: cabi-arc@cabi.org • Internet: http://www.cabi-bioscience.org/

Eastern Africa
Regional Office

Wildlife Conservation Centre
Wildlife Road (off Magadi Rd.)

P. O. Box 68200 - 00200 City Square

Nairobi

Kenya

Tel: ++ 254 2 890605-12

Fax: ++ 254 2 890615, 890807

E-mail: mail@iucnearo.org

IUCN
The World Conservation Union

Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaf
Director
UNEP/GEF Co-ordination
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi
Kenya

7th December, 2004

Dear Dr Djoghlaf,

COMMITMENT TO CO-FINANCE THE PROPOSED PROJECT ENTITLED 'REMOVING BARRIERS TO INVASIVE PLANT MANAGEMENT IN AFRICA'

As you are aware, IUCN, CABI and their national partners in the four project countries have successfully implemented the PDF-A and PDF-B phases of the above mentioned project and are finalising the proposal for the full scale project due to start in 2005.

This is to confirm that IUCN has the resources to co-finance the project as detailed in the table below:

Financing	Year 1 (US$)	Year 2 (US$)	Year 3 (US$)	Year 4 (US$)	Total (US$)
IUCN Co-financing in cash	31,250	31,250	31,250	31,250	125,000
IUCN Co-financing in kind	31,250	31,250	31,250	31,250	125,000
Grand total	62,500	62,500	62,500	62,500	**250,000**

The contributions in cash will come from existing and proposed projects in the same area and on the same topics; in-kind contributions will come from IUCN's resources.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Eldad Tukahirwa,
Regional Director for IUCN in Eastern Africa

c.c. Dr G.W.Howard, IUCN
Drs D. Rangi and S. Simons, CABI
Dr Max Zieren, UNEP GEF

World Headquarters IUCN, Rue Mauverney 28, CH-1196 Gland, Switzerland
Tel. ++ 41 22 9990001; Fax: ++ 41 22 9990002; Telex: 419824 iucn ch

ANNEX M: MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN

The monitoring and evaluation plan is designed to ensure the project is executed efficiently, the outputs are delivered on time, within budget and to the required standard, and the impact of the project is evaluated and documented. Monitoring is the continuous or periodic review and surveillance by management of the implementation of an activity, and helps to ensure that all required actions are proceeding according to plan. Evaluation is a process for determining systematically and objectively the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and impact of the activities in light of their objectives. Ongoing evaluation is the analysis, during the implementation phase, of continuing relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness and the present and likely future outputs, effects, and impacts.

The general and specific objectives of the project, and the list of its planned outcomes, have provided the basis for this M&E plan. M&E will be undertaken at three levels: project implementation and performance; delivery of project outputs; project outcomes and impact. The indicators for these three levels are given in the following sections.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PERFORMANCE

Implementation performance monitoring will assess whether the management of project activities is effective. It will seek to identify any constraints or problems early, and rectify them before project implementation and delivery of outputs is impaired. It will be a continuous process, collecting information on the planned execution of activities in task team and annual workplans, advising on improvements to methods and performance, and comparing accomplishments with programmed tasks. Monitoring project implementation performance will be the responsibility of the Project Coordination Unit (PCU), under the guidance of the International Steering Committee (ISC). Indicators will be tracked by the UNEP Task Manager in collaboration with the PCU.

Table 1: Indicators for monitoring project implementation performance.

Indicator	Means of Verification
Semi-annual progress reports prepared on time and satisfactorily.	Receipt and acceptance of reports by UNEP.
Quarterly financial reports are prepared on time and satisfactorily.	Receipt and acceptance of reports by UNEP.
Tasks accomplished and milestones and outputs achieved as specified in annual work plans.	Semi annual progress reports
Deviations from the annual work plans are corrected promptly and appropriately. Requests for deviations from approved budgets are submitted in a timely fashion.	Work plans, minutes of SC meetings, receipt and approval of revisions by UNEP.
Disbursements are made on a timely basis, and procurement is achieved according to the procurement plan.	IMIS system at UNEP and Bank Account statements of executing agencies.
Report on the procurement of non-expendable equipment against the project budget filed in a timely manner.	Inventory of Non-Expendable Equipment
Audit reports and other reviews show sound financial practices.	Audit statements
International Steering Committee (ISC) is tracking implementation progress and project impact, providing guidance on annual work plans and fulfilling TOR.	Minutes of ISC meetings
ISC is providing policy guidance, especially on achievement of project impact.	Minutes of ISC meetings

National Coordination Units (NCUs) under the guidance of national steering committees (NSCs) will be responsible for monitoring task teams, site management committees and other activities in-country. The PCU will oversee this monitoring and consolidate reports to produce the indicators as shown in Table 1.

DELIVERY OF OUTPUTS

Monitoring of project outputs will be based on the logical framework and activity plan in annexes B and B1 respectively. Monitoring will ensure the outputs are accomplished on time, in the agreed quantity (where appropriate), and meet quality requirements. Internal monitoring will be undertaken by the PCU, while UNEP will commission external mid-term and final evaluations. Table 2 lists the outputs for each of the project components.

Table 2: Description and timing of expected outputs by project component

.

Project Components	Output (O)
1. Policy and institutional environment	**?** National IAS strategies and action plans developed and promoted by. Q4, Yr 3. **O** Guidelines for incorporating IAS considerations into national and provincial sector policies/plans developed and promoted. Q4, Yr 3. **O** NBSAP modified to include IAS. Q4, Yr 2. **O** National coordination mechanism/unit/apex body established by Q2, Yr 2. **O** Cost recovery mechanisms for IAS management (e.g. import risk analysis/phytosanitary certificates and EIA). Q4, Yr 4.
2. Information and awareness	**O** National IAS information systems (websites and databases) established. Q2 Yr 3. **O** Access to global invasive species websites and databases. Q2, Yr 2. **O** National IAS data transferred to Global databases. Q4, Yr 2. **O** Public Communications campaign: 20 posters, leaflets, newspaper, radio feature, seminars per country. Q4, Yr 4. **O** Baseline awareness levels assessed in each country for 100 selected target audience groups. Q4, Yr 1. **O** Awareness levels re-assessed and showing significant increase of at least 50% at average. Q2, Yr 4
3. Prevention and management	**O** Procedures for IAS risk analysis developed and endorsed by quarantine authorities of each country. Q4, Yr 3. **O** National intersectoral monitoring and rapid response mechanism established and communicated officially & effectively. Q4, Yr 3. **O** At least 80% of new species (plants/propagules) imported subject to environmental risk analysis. Q4, Yr 4. **O** National invasive plants lists produced, including the biological and socioeconomic status of priority invasive plants. Q4, Yr 2. **O** Ecosystem IAS Management Plans endorsed by Stakeholder Agreements at pilot sites. Q4, Yr 2. **O** Integrated management programs applied and/or integrated control agents for weed management released where recommended. Q4, Yr 3. **O** Baseline established Yr 1and biodiversity indices in pilot sites maintained/improved. Q3, Yr 4. **O** Economic impact of priority invasives maintained/reduced in pilot sites. Q4, Yr 4.
4. Capacity development	**O** Training strategy agreed. Q4, Yr 1. **O** At least 400 stakeholders trained in IAS awareness; at least 100 stakeholders trained in risk analysis; and at least 400 stakeholders trained in IAS management. Q4, Yr 3.

	O Training impact study showing positive trend in knowledge, awareness and changed behaviour levels with at least 60% of training participants. Q4, Yr 4. 12 Msc/PhD studies relevant to IAS completed. Q4, Yr 4. **O** National IAS policies and programmes represented at annual ICPM meeting in Rome, IAPSC general assembly, Ramsar COP 9 (Uganda), AMCEN, CBD COP 8 & SBSTTA. Q4, Yr 4. **O** Guidelines for integration of IAS issues into school curricula adopted by national curricula development bodies. Q4, Yr 3. **O** IAS information packs for schools developed. Q4, Yr 3. School information packs distributed to 100 pilot schools. Q1, Yr 4. **O** IAS modules added to a university course in each country. Q4, Yr 4.
5. Project management and coordination	**O** International project co-ordinator appointed by 1st Q Yr 1 **O** National project co-ordinators appointed by 2nd Q Yr 1 **O** National Co-ordination Units established by 2nd Q Yr 1 **O** Accounting and activity reporting system established by 2nd Q Yr 1 **O** Inception phase completed by 2nd Q Yr 1 **O** Annual workplans completed by 1st Q each year **O** Annual training workshops for project personnel completed in Yrs 1,2 & 3 **O** National Steering Committee Meetings convened at least once per quarter **O** Annual International Steering Committee Meeting Convened **O** M& E plan completed by Q4 Yr 1. **O** Mid-term evaluation completed by 4th Q Yr 2 **O** Terminal evaluation completed by 4th Q Yr 4

PROJECT IMPACT

Evaluation of the project's success in achieving its outcomes will be monitored continuously throughout the project through semi-annual progress reports, and mid-term and final evaluations, all of which will use the project logframe as a monitoring, evaluation, and reporting tool (See Project Logframe, Annex B). Table 3 presents the key performance indicators. Methods of data collection must strive to ensure that reliable baseline data are collected early in the project and that data are collected regularly throughout project implementation, following the monitoring protocols developed during the first year of the project. The project will develop the Logframe Tracking Form, based on the logical framework, early in the project to semi-annually report on progress in achieving the indicators, as well as interim targets to be met. The UNEP Task Manager will work closely together with the International Project Coordinator to complete this task.

Table 3. List of Key Performance Indicators

	Key performance indicator	Baseline (if baseline is not known, please identify how and when baseline will be established)	Method of data collection/Data collection strategy (including frequency)
Development objective:	1.1 Biodiversity indices maintained for protected areas.	1.1 Preliminary information on biodiversity has been collected during the PDF-B from the pilot sites and this will be extended as described below. Baseline information from other protected areas in the four countries has not been collected. Baseline for the pilot sites will be established during year 1.	1.1 Data for the pilot sites will be collected regularly throughout the project (see below). Data for other protected areas will be collated from other ongoing activities in the countries. Collection of field data on biodiversity indices in other protected areas is beyond the scope of this project.
	1.2 Status of threatened species improved.	1.2 Red list data exist for all four countries, though most data are for animals. The number of red list animal and plant species respectively (all categories except least concern) for the four countries in 2004 are: Ethiopia (119,0), Ghana (103,8), Uganda (126,5) and Zambia (73,0).	1.2 Red list data are updated annually. There are gaps in the list particularly for the non-animal kingdoms, which this project cannot rectify. Data from the pilot sites will be contributed annually to the red list updating process.
Project purpose (immediate objective):	***By end of project in each country***: 1.1 ISSAP and institutional arrangements, and the associated plans and procedures, recognized by majority of institutional stakeholders.	1.1 No country has an ISSAP as prescribed by COP decisions. IAS are mentioned in NBSAPs, and occasionally in other strategies and plans. All countries have recognized plant protection legislation for protecting agriculture from IAS.	1.1 Data will be collected annually on the status of the ISSAP and the NBSAP. The review of IAS in national plans etc conducted in the PDF-B will be updated annually.
	1.2 Amount, availability and accessibility of IAS information increased at least ten times above baseline.	1.2 Stakeholder awareness is currently poor, and access to information by all stakeholder groups is limited. Plant protection departments are the main information users and providers.	1.2 The IAS information centre established by the coordinating unit will be responsible for data collection as part of its ongoing activities. Quarterly summaries of data will be made. Results of informant surveys, literature searches, analysis of library catalogues; number of hits relevant websites
	1.3 Pilot sites implementing a management plan with multistakeholder support, with reduction of the	1.3 Preliminary management plans for the pilot sites have been developed during the	1.3 Detailed data collection will be made at pilot sites. Site management committees

	Key performance indicator	Baseline (if baseline is not known, please identify how and when baseline will be established)	Method of data collection/Data collection strategy (including frequency)
	socioeconomic and biological impact of IAS.	PDF-B, and methodology developed for monitoring socioeconomic and biological impact. Initial application of the methods has provided some baseline data which needs supplementing.	will oversee data collection and make quarterly reports.
	1.4 Institutional and individual capacity in IAS issues in ministries of environment, agriculture, education at least doubled against baseline.	1.4 There is scattered capacity in IAS issues, with numbers of postgraduates with relevant expertise in key institutions scored during the PDF-B. The baseline in terms of number of personnel with specific IAS skills required by their job in the main government institutions will be established at the start of the full project.	1.4 Data on capacity development will be collected mid-term and in year 4.
	1.5 Biodiversity indices in pilot ecosystems improved by at least 20% from baseline data and projections	1.5 Baseline not complete and to be established through statistically well designed sampling programs and monitoring during Yr 1	1.5 Results of biological monitoring programs and impact assessments (surveys and modelling)
	1.6 Economic cost of IAS reduced by at least 20% below projections based on baseline	1.6 No baseline yet. To be determined during Yr 1	1.6 Results of national IAS economic impact assessments (surveys and modelling)
Outcome 1 **Enabling policy and institutional environment for cross-sectoral prevention and management of IAS strengthened.**	1.1 National IAS strategies and action plans developed and promoted.	1.1 There is no baseline, as none of the countries currently has an invasive species strategy and action plan (ISSAP).	1.1 Draft ISSAPs will be produced during the first two years of the project. Reports of workshops to draft and revise the ISSAP will document progress to production of ISSAP.
	1.2 Guidelines for incorporating IAS considerations into national and provincial sector policies/plans developed and promoted.	1.2 Existing policies, strategies and legislation relating to IAS were compiled and renewed during the PDF-B. Gaps, overlaps and inconsistencies were identified.	1.2 Guidelines on incorporation of IAS issues will be published in each country. Progress towards the guidelines will be in the Stakeholders consultation and workshop reports through which the guidelines will be developed.
		1.3 All four countries have a national biodiversity strategy and action plan, either	1.3 The NBSAPs will be edited to mainstream IAS issues by the end of the 2nd year.

	Key performance indicator	Baseline (if baseline is not known, please identify how and when baseline will be established)	Method of data collection/Data collection strategy (including frequency)
	1.3 NBSAP modified to include IAS.	completed or in draft. They mention IAS as threats in specific ecosystems?, but do not recognize multi sectoral nature of the threat or identify the need for a coherent framework for addressing the problem.	Stakeholder approval will have been received, though cabinet approval cannot be guaranteed as some current NBSAPs are still awaiting approval.
	1.4 National coordination mechanism/unit/apex body established.	1.4 Uganda has vested the National Environmental Management Authority with the responsibility for coordinating IAS issues, but it has this far not been able to act on its mandate. None of the other countries has a mandated coordinating body.	1.4 The coordinating/apex bodies will be identified, and their responsibilities and mandate established by year 2. These will be documented in the relevant government department.
	1.5 Cost recovery mechanisms for IAS management (e.g. import risk analysis/phytosanitary certificates and EIA).	1.5 At the time of the PDF-B cost recovery mechanisms were not in operation.	1.5 At the start of the full project this will be updated by visits to the regulatory authorities. Once established, monthly data on cost recoveries will be obtained from the regulatory authorities making the charges.
Outcome 2 **Appropriate information on risks, impacts and management of IAS utilised by key stakeholder groups and awareness levels raised**	2.1 National IAS information systems	2.1 No country currently has a national information system. Some data exists on specific IAS on which work has been undertaken, such as water hyacinth in Uganda.	2.1 Once information systems have been established (databases and websites, year 3), data will be collected on acquisitions of new information/data, and of website list or information requests on a quarterly basis.
	2.2 Access to global invasive species websites and databases.	2.2 Access to globally available IAS databases is limited, with small numbers of individuals and institutes vary them occasionally.	2.2 The IAS coordination unit (or body charged with information management) will keep quarterly records of global databases assessed and for what reason, once it has been established.

	Key performance indicator	Baseline (if baseline is not known, please identify how and when baseline will be established)	Method of data collection/Data collection strategy (including frequency)
	2.3 National IAS data transferred to Global databases.	2.3 There is no systematic submission of data to global databases. National plant protection systems occasionally notify IAPSC and IPPC secretariat when an agricultural invasive is reported.	2.3 Once established the coordination unit/information centre will keep quarterly records of data and other information submitted to regionally or internationally maintained databases.
	2.4 Posters, leaflets, newspaper, radio feature, seminars in each.	2.4 Some publicity and awareness material is available for specific IAS in some countries. Plant quarantine departments have notices at some border points. Occasional articles in the mass media appear, when new invasion occurs.	2.4 Numbers of all printed materials produced will be recorded, and their distribution recorded as far as possible. Articles in the mass media will be listed as they appear, and estimates made (based on readership, listenership or viewer data) of the audience size.
	2.5 Baseline awareness levels assessed in each country	2.5 Awareness on IAS is generally poor, but no baseline studies have been conducted. Surveys will be conducted in the first year of the project to quantify awareness levels.	2.5 Surveys will be conducted early in the project to document IAS awareness amongst key stakeholder groups, including government departments, private sector and the general public. Repeat surveys will be conducted in year 4 to document the changes in awareness.
Outcome 3 **Strategies for the prevention and management of IAS implemented**	3.1 Procedures for IAS risk analysis developed and endorsed by quarantine authorities of each country.	3.1 Quarantine authorities are aware of the risk analysis guidelines (ISPM 11. Rev 1) but apply them sporadically for imports.	3.1 Quarantine authorities keep records of all import permits issued and conditions imposed. The risk analysis procedure, once agreed, will be implemented and applied thereafter. Risk analysis according to international standards includes documentation, so each analysis will be recorded. Annual summaries will be made.
	3.2 National intersectoral monitoring and rapid response mechanism established	3.2 No country has a monitoring and rapid response mechanism.	3.2 Following establishment of the monitoring and rapid response mechanism, their activities will be reported regularly to the IAS coordination unit. Reports will be on a quarterly basis for routine activities, but for emergency actions a report will be given following completion of the response.
	3.3 At least 80% of new species (plants/propagules)	3.3 Environmental weed risk assessments are	3.3 All risk analyses will be documented, once

	Key performance indicator	Baseline (if baseline is not known, please identify how and when baseline will be established)	Method of data collection/Data collection strategy (including frequency)
	imported subject to environmental risk analysis.	not made systematically, and do not follow the international standards.	the system is established, according to the international standards. Annual summaries of plant import applications will be made and the resulting decisions based on risk analysis.
	3.4 National invasive plants lists, including the biological and socioeconomic status of priority invasive plants.	3.4 Current lists of invasive plants are incomplete in their species cover, and contain little or no information on distribution or biological and socioeconomic status. Some data exists for individual species such as water hyacinth.	3.4 Information and data on invasive plants will be part of the national information system, from which reports will be able to be produced as necessary. An annual summary of the status of invasive plants will be prepared.
	3.5 Ecosystem IAS Management Plans at pilot sites.	3.5 Preliminary plans for managing the pilot sites have been prepared during the PDF-B, but need wider stakeholder consultation which will be undertaken in the first year following formation of the site management committees.	3.5 The plan will be finalized in the first year of the project. Progress towards development of the plan will be in pilot site management committee reports. The final plan will have endorsement from the stakeholder groups. Implementation of the plan will be reviewed regularly and included in quarterly progress reports to the national coordination unit.
	3.6 Biodiversity indices in pilot sites	3.6 During the PDF-B methodologies were developed and preliminary biological surveys were made. These will be supplemented with surveys at each pilot site during year 1 to establish the appropriate indices.	3.6 Based on the work in the PDF-B, methodologies will be finalized and surveys completed in the first year. Some data will be collected on a shorter timetable (monthly) while other information less frequently. Changes in biodiversity indices will be examined on an annual basis to account for within-year seasonal changes.
	3.7 Economic impact of priority invasives in pilot sites.	3.7 Preliminary socioeconomic impact was assessed at the pilot sites during the PDF-B. On establishment of the site management committees this information will be reviewed and if necessary additional surveys undertaken in year 1.	3.7 Individual questionnaires and focus group discussions will be undertaken in year 1. Thereafter surveys will be undertaken annually to document changes in socioeconomic impacts of the invasives.

	Key performance indicator	Baseline (if baseline is not known, please identify how and when baseline will be established)	Method of data collection/Data collection strategy (including frequency)
Outcome 4 **Capacity for multisectoral prevention and management of IAS strengthened.**	4.1 Stakeholders trained in specific areas	4.1 A review of training needs was made in each country during the PDF-B, to identify institutions and individuals needing training, and the topics for training. This will be reviewed and finalized in year 1.	4.1 Data on training will be updated after each training course. Annual summaries of training will be prepared of training activities.
	4.2 Trend in knowledge, awareness and changed behaviour levels	4.2 As part of the awareness survey above, key professionals in the main stakeholder groups from which trainees will be drawn, will be interviewed to establish baseline levels of knowledge.	4.2 In year 1 a survey will be conducted, to be repeated in year 4 using individual questionnaires and focus groups. At the start of each training course all participants will complete a questionnaire and following the end of the course a repeat questionnaire will be administered.
	4.3 Post graduate studies	4.3 The number of postgraduate personnel with relevant IAS expertise in the main stakeholder groups will be updated in year 1.	4.3 Post graduate training will be recorded as it occurs. Examination results provide data for taught course assessment, while post graduate research is evaluated by supervisors and examiners. Papers published as a result of the research provide additional data.
	4.4 Representation at international fora.	4.4 Current attendance at international fora is sporadic. Information on attendance in recent years is available as baseline.	4.4 Participation data at international fora will be compiled annually from country information and official participant lists.
	4.5 Guidelines for integration of IAS issues into school curricula adopted by national curricula development bodies	4.5 Environmental issues are dealt with in school curricula, but do not highlight IAS as a major threat. The existing curricula provide the baseline.	4.5 Revised curricula will be used in pilot schools. Data from these schools will be collected annually on the number of male and female students taking the revised curricula.
	4.6 IAS modules added to a university course in each country.	4.6 IAS topics are covered in university curricula generally within pest management modules as part of agriculture. Existing curricula for relevant environmental and agricultural degrees for the universities in each country provide the baseline.	4.6 The university curricula incorporating IAS will be taught and data on the number of male and female students taking the courses collected annually.

Table 4: Monitoring, Reporting, and Evaluation Responsibilities (see Annex F for further details of implementation arrangements)

UNEP	Project coordination unit (PCU)	National coordination units (NCU)	National Steering Committee (NSC)	International Steering Committee (ISC)	Site management committees (SMC)	Task teams (TT)
Monitor the agreed M&E plan in accordance with the terms of agreement with GEFSEC. Receive semi-annual progress and quarterly financial reports and copies of (substantive) technical reports from PCU. Task manager to attend and participate fully in meetings of ISC. Task manager to conduct annual supervision missions (or on as need basis) with member(s) of the PCU to selected project sites, identify implementation problems, and suggest remedies to annual meeting of the ISC. Engage and prepare terms of reference for independent M&E consultants to conduct the mid-term and final evaluations. Facilitate the selective review of the project by STAP (as appropriate). Carry out other monitoring as is determined in collaboration with the project ISC and PCU.	Establish reporting guidelines and formats for all partners in the project, ensure that they meet reporting dates, and provide reports of suitable quality. Prepare semi-annual progress reports for UNEP, and forward quarterly financial reports, with supporting documentation as appropriate, in a timely manner to UNEP. Carry out a program of regular visits to national coordination units (NCU) and pilot sites to supervise activities, and pay special attention to those with implementation problems. Organise the project impact monitoring design, implementation and reporting.	Prepare semi-annual progress reports for the PCU, and forward quarterly financial reports with supporting documentation, as appropriate. Provide copies of technical reports to the PCU, selected copies to UNEP GEF Carry out a program of regular visits to task teams and pilot sites to supervise activities.	Receive semi-annual progress reports and all substantive reports and outcomes and use them to annually review the project progress at national level . Advise NCU on implementation problems that emerge, and on desirable modifications to the work plan for the succeeding year. Monitor progress in the capacity-building aspects of the national project component, and advise the NCU on steps to enhance this aspect of the project.	Receive semi-annual progress and quarterly financial reports, and all technical reports, and provide policy guidance to the project on any matters arising from a reading of these reports. Assist the PCU in developing linkages with other projects and neighbouring countries, thus ensuring the wider impact of project work in the sub-regions. Provide overall guidance for the project implementation.	Provide the framework within which different stakeholder groups cooperate at the local level. Monitor site management activities and stakeholder participation and advise NCU of any difficulties. Provide semi-annual progress reports to NCU. Facilitate surveys, and monitoring and evaluation activities by NCU and PCU.	Monitor TT activities and advise NCU on any difficulties encountered. Prepare semi-annual progress reports for NCU. Facilitate monitoring and evaluation activities by NCU and PCU.

Table 5: Monitoring and progress reports

This table describes the key content required in the progress and financial reports.

Report	Format and Content	Timing	Responsibility
Progress Reports			
Document the completion of planned activities, and describe progress in relation to the annual operating work plan. Review any implementation problems that impact on performance. Summarize problems and proposed solutions. Provide adequate substantive data outcomes for inclusion in consolidated semi-annual progress reports. Highlight achievements.	Reports will use standard UNEP Progress Report format. The project Logframe Tracking Form will be attached to each report and progress reported against outcomes and output indicators.	Half-yearly, within 30 days of end of each reporting period.	Project Coordination Unit.
Project Implementation Review (PIR) reports	Per GEFSEC format.	Yearly (after project has been under implementation for one year)	UNEP Task manager.
Co-Finance reports			
Report on co-financing that has been provided to project as originally estimated in project proposal approved by GEF.	The required format will be provided by UNEP	Semi-annual	Project coordination unit.
Financial reports			
Details project expenses and disbursements.	Standardized UNEP format as found in project document. Disbursements and expenses in categories and format as set out in standard UNEP format, together with supporting documents as necessary.	Quarterly	Project coordination unit.
Financial audits			
Annual audit	Audit of accounts for project management and expenditures	Annual	Project coordination unit.

ANNEX N: TRACKING TOOL FOR BIODIVERSITY PROJECTS IN THE PROD. ENV.

ETHIOPIA

I. Project General Information

1. Project name: **Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa**

2. Country (ies): **Ethiopia** (also separate sheets for Ghana, Uganda and Zambia)

National Project:__**X**___ Regional Project:___**X**___ Global Project:_____

3. Name of reviewers completing tracking tool and completion dates:

	Name	**Title**	**Agency**
Work Program Inclusion	**Sarah Simons**	**Project Manager**	**CABI, Nairobi**
Project Mid-term			
Final Evaluation/project completion			

4. Project duration: ***Planned***___4____ years ***Actual*** _____ years

5. a. GEF Agency: UNDP **X** UNEP World Bank ADB AfDB
IADB EBRD FAO IFAD UNIDO

5. b. Lead Project Executing Agency (ies):

CAB International (CABI) - Lead Agency
World Conservation Union (IUCN) – Assisting Agency
Ethiopian Agricultural Research Organisation, Ethiopia
Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, Ghana
National Agricultural Research Organisation, Uganda
Environmental Council of Zambia, Zambia

6. GEF Operational Program:
X drylands (OP 1)
X coastal, marine, freshwater (OP 2)
X forests (OP 3)
mountains (OP 4)
agro-biodiversity (OP 13)
integrated ecosystem management (OP 12)
sustainable land management (OP 15)

Other Operational Program not listed above:_none_____

7. Project Summary (one paragraph):

Invasive alien species (IAS) are second only to habitat destruction as a cause of global biodiversity loss. Prevention and mitigation of the effects of IAS is particularly challenging in

Africa, impeding sustainable development as well as threatening biodiversity. This project aims to remove barriers to the management of IAS through effective implementation of CBD Article 8(h) in 4 pilot countries (Ethiopia, Ghana, Uganda, Zambia), using a multisectoral ecosystem approach. In each country an enabling policy environment will be promoted through institutional arrangements and mainstreaming of IAS strategies; stakeholder awareness of IAS issues will be raised and access to necessary information provided; prevention and control programmes will be established, including ecosystem management at pilot sites where IAS threaten biodiversity; capacity for sustainable IAS management will be built. Lessons learned will be disseminated for replication in other countries in Africa.

8. Project Development Objective:

The development objective of the intervention is to conserve ecosystem, species and genetic diversity in Africa by protecting it from the threat of invasive alien species.

9. Project Purpose/Immediate Objective:

The immediate objective of the project is to remove barriers to the management of IAS through effective implementation of CBD Article 8(h) in four representative African countries.

10. Expected Outcomes (GEF-related):

1. Enabling policy and institutional environment for cross-sectoral prevention and management of IAS strengthened.
2. Appropriate information on risks, impacts and management of IAS utilised by key stakeholder groups and awareness levels raised.
3. Strategies for the prevention and management of priority IAS implemented
4. Capacity built for multisectoral prevention and management of IAS

11. Production sectors and/or ecosystem services directly targeted by project:

11. a. Please identify the main production sectors involved in the project. Please put "**P**" for sectors that are primarily and directly targeted by the project, and "**S**" for those that are secondary or incidentally affected by the project.

Agriculture__P_____
Fisheries____P_____
Forestry____S_____
Tourism____S_____
Mining_____
Oil_____
Transportation____S_____

Other (please specify)___pastoralism; water management, trade/commerce:__S_____

11. b. For projects that are targeting the conservation or sustainable use of ecosystems goods and services, please specify the goods or services that are being targeted, for example, water, genetic resources, recreational, etc

1. __water_____
2. __genetic resources_____
3. __recreational_____
4. __NTFP

II. Project Landscape/Seascape Coverage

12. a. What is the extent (in hectares) of the landscape or seascape where the project will directly or indirectly contribute to biodiversity conservation or sustainable use of its components? An example is provided in the table below.

Targets and Timeframe Project Coverage	Foreseen at project start	Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project	Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project
Landscape/seascape[8] area directly[9] covered by the project (ha)	30,934		
Landscape/seascape area indirectly[10] covered by the project (ha)	432,532		

Explanation for indirect coverage numbers:

The figures given refer to areas benefiting from pilot site interventions under Output 3 and not to areas benefiting from all project interventions. The latter cannot be estimated with any degree of accuracy. More accurate estimates of areas covered by target species and areas of potential spread will be derived as part of the project. Therefore some of the above figures are likely to be revised during the project.

12. b. Are there Protected Areas within the landscape/seascape covered by the project? If so, names these PAs, their IUCN or national PA category, and their extent in hectares.

	Name of Protected Areas	IUCN and/or national category of PA	Extent in hectares of PA
1.	Awash National Park	Cat II	82,700 ha
2.			

III. Management Practices Applied

13.a. Within the scope and objectives of the project, please identify in the table below the management practices employed by project beneficiaries that integrate biodiversity considerations and the area of coverage of these management practices? Note: this could range from farmers applying organic agricultural practices, forest management agencies managing forests per Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) guidelines or other forest certification schemes, artisanal fisherfolk practicing sustainable fisheries management,

[8] For projects working in seascapes (large marine ecosystems, fisheries etc.) please provide coverage figures and include explanatory text as necessary if reporting in hectares is not applicable or feasible.

[9] Direct coverage refers to the area that is targeted by the project's site intervention. For example, a project may be mainstreaming biodiversity into floodplain management in a pilot area of 1,000 hectares that is part of a much larger floodplain of 10,000 hectares.

[10] Using the example in footnote 5 above, the same project may, for example, "indirectly" cover or influence the remaining 9,000 hectares of the floodplain through promoting learning exchanges and training at the project site as part of an awareness raising and capacity building strategy for the rest of the floodplain. Please explain the basis for extrapolation of indirect coverage when completing this part of the table.

or industries satisfying other similar agreed international standards, etc. An example is provided in the table below.

Targets and Timeframe **Specific management practices that integrate BD**	**Area of coverage foreseen at start of project**	**Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project**	**Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project**
	Ethiopia		
	Awash River catchment system		
Integrated management of areas infested by water hyacinth including physical, chemical, cultural and biological control and integrated catchment management	18,534 ha		
Area wide management of outlying individuals of water hyacinth	6,534 ha		
	Amibara District in Afar Region		
Integrated management of areas infested by *Prosopis* species including physical, manual, chemical and cultural control.	200 ha		
Area wide management of outlying individuals of *Prosopis* species	293,906 ha		
	Welenchiti area in the Oromiya Region		
Integrated management of areas infested by *Parthenium hysterophorus* species including physical, manual, chemical and cultural control.	10,000 ha		
Area wide management of outlying individuals of *Parthenium hysterophorus*	41,592 ha		

13. b. Is the project promoting the conservation and sustainable use of wild species or landraces?
____Yes **X** No

If yes, please list the wild species (WS) or landraces (L):

Species (*Genus sp*., and common name)	Wild Species (please check if this is a wild species)	Landrace (please check if this is a landrace)

1.		
2.		
3.		
4…		

13. c. For the species identified above, ***or other target species of the project not included in the list above (E.g., domesticated species)***, please list the species, check the boxes as appropriate regarding the application of a certification system, and identify the certification system being used in the project, if any. An example is provided in the table below.

Certification **Species**	A certification system is being used	A certification system will be used	Name of certification system if being used	A certification system will not be used
2…				

13. d. Is carbon sequestration an objective of the project?

Yes **X** No

If yes, the estimated amount of carbon sequestered is: _____

IV. Market Transformation and Mainstreaming Biodiversity

14. a. **For those projects that have identified market transformation as a project objective**, please describe the project's ability to integrate biodiversity considerations into the mainstream economy by measuring the market changes to which the project contributed. **Not applicable**

The sectors and subsectors and measures of impact in the table below **are illustrative examples, only**. Please complete per the objectives and specifics of the project.

Name of the market that the project seeks to affect (sector and sub-sector)	**Unit of measure of market impact**	**Market condition at the start of the project**	**Market condition at midterm evaluation of project**	**Market condition at final evaluation of the project**

14. b. Please also note which (if any) market changes were directly caused by the project.

Not applicable

V. Improved Livelihoods

15. For those projects that have identified improving the livelihoods of a beneficiary population based on sustainable use /harvesting as a project objective, please list the targets identified in the logframe and record progress at the mid-term and final evaluation. An example is provided in the table below. **Not applicable**

Improved Livelihood Measure	Number of targeted beneficiaries (if known)	Please identify local or indigenous communities project is working with	Improvement Foreseen at project start	Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project	Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project
1.					
2.					
3…					

VI. Project Replication Strategy

16. a . Does the project specify budget, activities, and outputs for implementing the replication strategy? Yes_**X**__ No___

16. b. Is the replication strategy promoting incentive measures & instruments (e.g. trust funds, payments for environmental services, certification) within and beyond project boundaries? Yes_**X**__ No___

If yes, please list the incentive measures or instruments being promoted:
Payment for quarantine services

16. c. For all projects, please complete box below. Two examples are provided.

Replication Quantification Measure (Examples: hectares of certified products, number of resource users participating in payment for environmental services programs, businesses established, etc.)	Replication Target Foreseen at project start	Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project	Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project
1. Legitimacy of IAS guidelines, policies, plans and institutional arrangements recognised by majority of institutional stakeholders by Yr 4.	>50%		
2. Amount, availability and accessibility of IAS information increased above baseline by Yr 4.	10 fold		
3. Awareness levels increased above baseline in 100 selected target audience groups.	50%		
4. % New species (plants/propagules) imported subject to environmental risk analysis by Yr 4.	80%		
5. Biodiversity indices in pilot ecosystems improved from baseline projections by Yr 4.	>20%		
6. Economic cost of IAS reduced below projections based on the baseline by Yr 4.	>20%		
7. Capacity for IAS management increased by Yr 4	2 fold		
8. Stakeholders trained in IAS awareness by 4th Q Yr. 3.	400		
9. Stakeholders trained in risk analysis by 4th Q Yr. 3	100		
10. Stakeholders trained in IAS management by 4th Q Yr. 3.	400		
11. Msc/PhD studies relevant to IAS completed by Yr 4.	12		

12. IAS information packs for schools developed by Yr 3 and distributed to pilot schools by 1st Q Yr 4.	100		
13. IAS modules added to a university course in each country by Yr 4.	4		

VII. Enabling Environment

For those projects that have identified addressing policy, legislation, regulations, and their implementation as project objectives, please complete the following series of questions*:* 17a, 17b, 17c.

An example for a project that focused on the agriculture sector is provided in 17 a, b, and c.

17. a. Please complete this table at **work program inclusion for each sector** that is a primary or a secondary focus of the project.
Please answer YES or NO to each statement under the sectors that are a focus of the project.

Sector **Statement: Please answer YES or NO for each sector that is a focus of the project.**	**Agriculture**	**Fisheries**	**Forestry**	**Tourism**	**Trade**	**Transport**
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy through specific legislation	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Regulations are in place to implement the legislation	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
The regulations are under implementation	No	No	No	No	No	No
The implementation of regulations is enforced	No	No	No	No	No	No
Enforcement of regulations is monitored	No	No	No	No	No	No

17. b . Please complete this table at **the project mid-term for each sector** that is a primary or a secondary focus of the project.
Please answer YES or NO to each statement under the sectors that are a focus of the project.

Sector **Statement: Please answer YES or NO for each sector that is a focus of the project.**	**Agriculture**	**Fisheries**	**Forestry**	**Tourism**	**Other (please specify)**	**Other (please specify)**
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy						
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy through specific legislation						

Regulations are in place to implement the legislation						
The regulations are under implementation						
The implementation of regulations is enforced						
Enforcement of regulations is monitored						

17. c. Please complete this table at **project closure for each sector** that is a primary or a secondary focus of the project.
Please answer YES or NO to each statement under the sectors that are a focus of the project.

Sector **Statement: Please answer YES or NO for each sector that is a focus of the project.**	**Agriculture**	**Fisheries**	**Forestry**	**Tourism**	**Other (please specify)**	**Other (please specify)**
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy						
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy through specific legislation						
Regulations are in place to implement the legislation						
The regulations are under implementation						
The implementation of regulations is enforced						
Enforcement of regulations is monitored						

All projects please complete this question at the project mid-term evaluation and at the final evaluation, if relevant:

17. d. Within the scope and objectives of the project, has the private sector undertaken voluntary **measures to incorporate biodiversity considerations in production? If yes, please provide brief explanation and specifically mention the sectors involved.**

An *example* of this could be a mining company minimizing the impacts on biodiversity by using low-impact exploration techniques and by developing plans for restoration of biodiversity after exploration as part of the site management plan.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

VIII. Mainstreaming biodiversity into the GEF Implementing Agencies' Programs

18. At each time juncture of the project (work program inclusion, mid-term evaluation, and final evaluation), please check the box that depicts the status of mainstreaming biodiversity through the implementation of this project with on-going GEF Implementing Agencies' development assistance, sector, lending, or other technical assistance programs.

Time Frame Status of Mainstreaming	Work Program Inclusion	Mid-Term Evaluation	Final Evaluation
The project is not linked to IA development assistance, sector, lending programs, or other technical assistance programs.			
The project is indirectly linked to IAs development assistance, sector, lending programs or other technical assistance programs.			
The project has direct links to IAs development assistance, sector, lending programs or other technical assistance programs.	**X**		
The project is demonstrating strong and sustained complementarity with on-going planned programs.			

IX. Other Impacts

19. Please briefly summarize other impacts that the project has had on mainstreaming biodiversity that has not been recorded above.

_____

_____

_____

_____

ANNEX N: TRACKING TOOL FOR BIODIVERSITY PROJECTS IN THE PROD. ENV.

GHANA

I. Project General Information

1. Project name: **Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa**

2. Country (ies): **Ghana** (also separate sheets for Ethiopia, Uganda and Zambia)

National Project:__**X**___ Regional Project:___**X**___ Global Project:_____

3. Name of reviewers completing tracking tool and completion dates:

	Name	**Title**	**Agency**
Work Program Inclusion	**Sarah Simons**	**Project Manager**	**CABI, Nairobi**
Project Mid-term			
Final Evaluation/project completion			

4. Project duration: ***Planned***___4____ years ***Actual*** _____ years

5. a. GEF Agency: UNDP **X** UNEP World Bank ADB AfDB IADB EBRD FAO IFAD UNIDO

5. b. Lead Project Executing Agency (ies):

CAB International (CABI) - Lead Agency
World Conservation Union (IUCN) – Assisting Agency
Ethiopian Agricultural Research Organisation, Ethiopia
Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, Ghana
National Agricultural Research Organisation, Uganda
Environmental Council of Zambia, Zambia

6. GEF Operational Program:
X drylands (OP 1)
X coastal, marine, freshwater (OP 2)
X forests (OP 3)
mountains (OP 4)
agro-biodiversity (OP 13)
integrated ecosystem management (OP 12)
sustainable land management (OP 15)

Other Operational Program not listed above:_none_____

7. Project Summary (one paragraph):

Invasive alien species (IAS) are second only to habitat destruction as a cause of global biodiversity loss. Prevention and mitigation of the effects of IAS is particularly challenging in Africa, impeding sustainable development as well as threatening biodiversity. This project

aims to remove barriers to the management of IAS through effective implementation of CBD Article 8(h) in 4 pilot countries (Ethiopia, Ghana, Uganda, Zambia), using a multisectoral ecosystem approach. In each country an enabling policy environment will be promoted through institutional arrangements and mainstreaming of IAS strategies; stakeholder awareness of IAS issues will be raised and access to necessary information provided; prevention and control programmes will be established, including ecosystem management at pilot sites where IAS threaten biodiversity; capacity for sustainable IAS management will be built. Lessons learned will be disseminated for replication in other countries in Africa.

8. Project Development Objective:

The development objective of the intervention is to conserve ecosystem, species and genetic diversity in Africa by protecting it from the threat of invasive alien species.

9. Project Purpose/Immediate Objective:

The immediate objective of the project is to remove barriers to the management of IAS through effective implementation of CBD Article 8(h) in four representative African countries.

10. Expected Outcomes (GEF-related):

5. Enabling policy and institutional environment for cross-sectoral prevention and management of IAS strengthened.
6. Appropriate information on risks, impacts and management of IAS utilised by key stakeholder groups and awareness levels raised.
7. Strategies for the prevention and management of priority IAS implemented
8. Capacity built for multisectoral prevention and management of IAS

11. Production sectors and/or ecosystem services directly targeted by project:

11. a. Please identify the main production sectors involved in the project. Please put "**P**" for sectors that are primarily and directly targeted by the project, and "**S**" for those that are secondary or incidentally affected by the project.

Agriculture__P_____
Fisheries____P_____
Forestry____S_____
Tourism____S_____
Mining_____
Oil_____
Transportation____S_____

Other (please specify)___pastoralism; water management, trade/commerce:__S_____

11. b. For projects that are targeting the conservation or sustainable use of ecosystems goods and services, please specify the goods or services that are being targeted, for example, water, genetic resources, recreational, etc

1. __water_____
2. __genetic resources_____
3. __recreational_____
4. __NTFP

II. Project Landscape/Seascape Coverage

12. a. What is the extent (in hectares) of the landscape or seascape where the project will directly or indirectly contribute to biodiversity conservation or sustainable use of its components? An example is provided in the table below.

Targets and Timeframe Project Coverage	Foreseen at project start	Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project	Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project
Landscape/seascape [11] area directly[12] covered by the project (ha)	5,020		
Landscape/seascape area indirectly[13] covered by the project (ha)	870,304		

Explanation for indirect coverage numbers:

The figures given refer to areas benefiting from pilot site interventions under Output 3 and not to areas benefiting from all project interventions. The latter cannot be estimated in with any degree of accuracy. More accurate estimates of areas covered by target species and areas of potential spread will be derived as part of the project. Therefore some of the above figures are likely to be revised during the project.

12. b. Are there Protected Areas within the landscape/seascape covered by the project? If so, names these PAs, their IUCN or national PA category, and their extent in hectares.

	Name of Protected Areas	IUCN and/or national category of PA	Extent in hectares of PA
1.	Afram Headwaters Forest Reserve	Cat IV	20,124 ha

III. Management Practices Applied

13.a. Within the scope and objectives of the project, please identify in the table below the management practices employed by project beneficiaries that integrate biodiversity considerations and the area of coverage of these management practices? Note: this could range from farmers applying organic agricultural practices, forest management agencies managing forests per Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) guidelines or other forest certification schemes, artisanal fisherfolk practicing sustainable fisheries management,

[11] For projects working in seascapes (large marine ecosystems, fisheries etc.) please provide coverage figures and include explanatory text as necessary if reporting in hectares is not applicable or feasible.

[12] Direct coverage refers to the area that is targeted by the project's site intervention. For example, a project may be mainstreaming biodiversity into floodplain management in a pilot area of 1,000 hectares that is part of a much larger floodplain of 10,000 hectares.

[13] Using the example in footnote 5 above, the same project may, for example, "indirectly" cover or influence the remaining 9,000 hectares of the floodplain through promoting learning exchanges and training at the project site as part of an awareness raising and capacity building strategy for the rest of the floodplain. Please explain the basis for extrapolation of indirect coverage when completing this part of the table.

or industries satisfying other similar agreed international standards, etc. An example is provided in the table below.

Targets and Timeframe **Specific management practices that integrate BD**	**Area of coverage foreseen at start of project**	**Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project**	**Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project**
	Ghana		
	the Oti Arm of the Volta Lake		
Integrated management of areas infested by water hyacinth including physical, chemical, cultural and biological control and integrated catchment management	5,000 ha		
Area wide management of outlying individuals of water hyacinth	845,200 ha		
	Afram Headwaters Forest Reserve		
Integrated management of areas infested by *Broussonetia papyrifera* including physical, manual, chemical and cultural control.	20 ha		
Area wide management of outlying individuals of *Broussonetia papyrifera*	25,104 ha		

13. b. Is the project promoting the conservation and sustainable use of wild species or landraces?
____Yes **X** No

If yes, please list the wild species (WS) or landraces (L):

Species (*Genus sp*., and common name)	Wild Species (please check if this is a wild species)	Landrace (please check if this is a landrace)
1.		
2.		
3.		
4…		

13. c. For the species identified above, ***or other target species of the project not included in the list above (E.g., domesticated species)***, please list the species, check the boxes as appropriate regarding the application of a certification system, and identify the certification system being used in the project, if any. An example is provided in the table below.

Certification **Species**	A certification system is being used	A certification system will be used	Name of certification system if being used	A certification system will not be used
2…				

13. d. Is carbon sequestration an objective of the project?

Yes **X** No

If yes, the estimated amount of carbon sequestered is: _____

IV. Market Transformation and Mainstreaming Biodiversity

14. a. **For those projects that have identified market transformation as a project objective**, please describe the project's ability to integrate biodiversity considerations into the mainstream economy by measuring the market changes to which the project contributed. **Not applicable**

The sectors and subsectors and measures of impact in the table below **are illustrative examples, only**. Please complete per the objectives and specifics of the project.

Name of the market that the project seeks to affect (sector and sub-sector)	**Unit of measure of market impact**	**Market condition at the start of the project**	**Market condition at midterm evaluation of project**	**Market condition at final evaluation of the project**

14. b. Please also note which (if any) market changes were directly caused by the project.
Not applicable

V. Improved Livelihoods

15. For those projects that have identified improving the livelihoods of a beneficiary population based on sustainable use /harvesting as a project objective, please list the targets identified in the logframe and record progress at the mid-term and final evaluation. An example is provided in the table below. **Not Applicable**

Improved Livelihood Measure	**Number of targeted beneficiaries (if known)**	**Please identify local or indigenous communities project is working with**	**Improvement Foreseen at project start**	**Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project**	**Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project**
1.					

2.					
3…					

VI. Project Replication Strategy

16. a . Does the project specify budget, activities, and outputs for implementing the replication strategy? Yes_**X**__ No___

16. b. Is the replication strategy promoting incentive measures & instruments (e.g. trust funds, payments for environmental services, certification) within and beyond project boundaries? Yes_**X**__ No___

If yes, please list the incentive measures or instruments being promoted:
Payment for quarantine services

_____
_____

16. c. For all projects, please complete box below. Two examples are provided.

Replication Quantification Measure (Examples: hectares of certified products, number of resource users participating in payment for environmental services programs, businesses established, etc.)	**Replication Target Foreseen at project start**	**Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project**	**Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project**
1. Legitimacy of IAS guidelines, policies, plans and institutional arrangements recognised by majority of institutional stakeholders by Yr 4.	>50%		
2. Amount, availability and accessibility of IAS information increased above baseline by Yr 4.	10 fold		
3. Awareness levels increased above baseline in 100 selected target audience groups.	50%		
4. % New species (plants/propagules) imported subject to environmental risk analysis by Yr 4.	80%		
5. Biodiversity indices in pilot ecosystems improved from baseline projections by Yr 4.	>20%		
6. Economic cost of IAS reduced below projections based on the baseline by Yr 4.	>20%		
7. Capacity for IAS management increased by Yr 4	2 fold		
8. Stakeholders trained in IAS awareness by 4th Q Yr. 3.	400		
9. Stakeholders trained in risk analysis by 4th Q Yr. 3	100		
10. Stakeholders trained in IAS management by 4th Q Yr. 3.	400		
11. Msc/PhD studies relevant to IAS completed by Yr 4.	12		
12. IAS information packs for schools developed by Yr 3 and distributed to pilot schools by 1st Q Yr 4.	100		
13. IAS modules added to a university course in each country by Yr 4.	4		

VII. Enabling Environment

For those projects that have identified addressing policy, legislation, regulations, and their implementation as project objectives, please complete the following series of questions*:* 17a, 17b, 17c.

An example for a project that focused on the agriculture sector is provided in 17 a, b, and c.

17. a. Please complete this table at **work program inclusion for each sector** that is a primary or a secondary focus of the project.
Please answer YES or NO to each statement under the sectors that are a focus of the project.

Sector **Statement: Please answer YES or NO for each sector that is a focus of the project.**	**Agriculture**	**Fisheries**	**Forestry**	**Tourism**	**Trade**	**Transport**
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy through specific legislation	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Regulations are in place to implement the legislation	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
The regulations are under implementation	No	No	No	No	No	No
The implementation of regulations is enforced	No	No	No	No	No	No
Enforcement of regulations is monitored	No	No	No	No	No	No

17. b . Please complete this table at **the project mid-term for each sector** that is a primary or a secondary focus of the project.
Please answer YES or NO to each statement under the sectors that are a focus of the project.

Sector **Statement: Please answer YES or NO for each sector that is a focus of the project.**	**Agriculture**	**Fisheries**	**Forestry**	**Tourism**	**Other (please specify)**	**Other (please specify)**
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy						
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy through specific legislation						

Regulations are in place to implement the legislation						
The regulations are under implementation						
The implementation of regulations is enforced						
Enforcement of regulations is monitored						

17. c. Please complete this table at **project closure for each sector** that is a primary or a secondary focus of the project.
Please answer YES or NO to each statement under the sectors that are a focus of the project.

Sector **Statement: Please answer YES or NO for each sector that is a focus of the project.**	**Agriculture**	**Fisheries**	**Forestry**	**Tourism**	**Other (please specify)**	**Other (please specify)**
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy						
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy through specific legislation						
Regulations are in place to implement the legislation						
The regulations are under implementation						
The implementation of regulations is enforced						
Enforcement of regulations is monitored						

All projects please complete this question at the project mid-term evaluation and at the final evaluation, if relevant:

17. d. Within the scope and objectives of the project, has the private sector undertaken voluntary **measures to incorporate biodiversity considerations in production? If yes, please provide brief explanation and specifically mention the sectors involved.**

An *example* of this could be a mining company minimizing the impacts on biodiversity by using low-impact exploration techniques and by developing plans for restoration of biodiversity after exploration as part of the site management plan.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

VIII. Mainstreaming biodiversity into the GEF Implementing Agencies' Programs

18. At each time juncture of the project (work program inclusion, mid-term evaluation, and final evaluation), please check the box that depicts the status of mainstreaming biodiversity through the implementation of this project with on-going GEF Implementing Agencies' development assistance, sector, lending, or other technical assistance programs.

Time Frame Status of Mainstreaming	Work Program Inclusion	Mid-Term Evaluation	Final Evaluation
The project is not linked to IA development assistance, sector, lending programs, or other technical assistance programs.			
The project is indirectly linked to IAs development assistance, sector, lending programs or other technical assistance programs.			
The project has direct links to IAs development assistance, sector, lending programs or other technical assistance programs.	X		
The project is demonstrating strong and sustained complementarity with on-going planned programs.			

IX. Other Impacts

19. Please briefly summarize other impacts that the project has had on mainstreaming biodiversity that has not been recorded above.

_____

_____

_____

ANNEX N: TRACKING TOOL FOR BIODIVERSITY PROJECTS IN THE PROD. ENV.

UGANDA

I. Project General Information

1. Project name: **Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa**

2. Country (ies): **Uganda** (also separate sheets for Ethiopia, Ghana and Zambia)

National Project:__X___ Regional Project:___X___ Global Project:_____

3. Name of reviewers completing tracking tool and completion dates:

	Name	**Title**	**Agency**
Work Program Inclusion	**Sarah Simons**	**Project Manager**	**CABI, Nairobi**
Project Mid-term			
Final Evaluation/project completion			

4. Project duration: ***Planned***___4____ years ***Actual*** _____ years

5. a. GEF Agency: UNDP **X** UNEP World Bank ADB AfDB IADB EBRD FAO IFAD UNIDO

5. b. Lead Project Executing Agency (ies):

CAB International (CABI) - Lead Agency
World Conservation Union (IUCN) – Assisting Agency
Ethiopian Agricultural Research Organisation, Ethiopia
Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, Ghana
National Agricultural Research Organisation, Uganda
Environmental Council of Zambia, Zambia

6. GEF Operational Program:
X drylands (OP 1)
X coastal, marine, freshwater (OP 2)
X forests (OP 3)
mountains (OP 4)
agro-biodiversity (OP 13)
integrated ecosystem management (OP 12)
sustainable land management (OP 15)

Other Operational Program not listed above:_none_____

7. Project Summary (one paragraph):

Invasive alien species (IAS) are second only to habitat destruction as a cause of global biodiversity loss. Prevention and mitigation of the effects of IAS is particularly challenging in Africa, impeding sustainable development as well as threatening biodiversity. This project

aims to remove barriers to the management of IAS through effective implementation of CBD Article 8(h) in 4 pilot countries (Ethiopia, Ghana, Uganda, Zambia), using a multisectoral ecosystem approach. In each country an enabling policy environment will be promoted through institutional arrangements and mainstreaming of IAS strategies; stakeholder awareness of IAS issues will be raised and access to necessary information provided; prevention and control programmes will be established, including ecosystem management at pilot sites where IAS threaten biodiversity; capacity for sustainable IAS management will be built. Lessons learned will be disseminated for replication in other countries in Africa.

8. Project Development Objective:

The development objective of the intervention is to conserve ecosystem, species and genetic diversity in Africa by protecting it from the threat of invasive alien species.

9. Project Purpose/Immediate Objective:

The immediate objective of the project is to remove barriers to the management of IAS through effective implementation of CBD Article 8(h) in four representative African countries.

10. Expected Outcomes (GEF-related):

9. Enabling policy and institutional environment for cross-sectoral prevention and management of IAS strengthened.
10. Appropriate information on risks, impacts and management of IAS utilised by key stakeholder groups and awareness levels raised.
11. Strategies for the prevention and management of priority IAS implemented
12. Capacity built for multisectoral prevention and management of IAS

11. Production sectors and/or ecosystem services directly targeted by project:

11. a. Please identify the main production sectors involved in the project. Please put "**P**" for sectors that are primarily and directly targeted by the project, and "**S**" for those that are secondary or incidentally affected by the project.

Agriculture__P_____
Fisheries____P_____
Forestry____S_____
Tourism____S_____
Mining_____
Oil_____
Transportation____S_____

Other (please specify)___pastoralism; water management, trade/commerce:__S_____

11. b. For projects that are targeting the conservation or sustainable use of ecosystems goods and services, please specify the goods or services that are being targeted, for example, water, genetic resources, recreational, etc

1. __water_____
2. __genetic resources_____
3. __recreational_____
4. __NTFP

II. Project Landscape/Seascape Coverage

12. a. What is the extent (in hectares) of the landscape or seascape where the project will directly or indirectly contribute to biodiversity conservation or sustainable use of its components? An example is provided in the table below.

Targets and Timeframe Project Coverage	Foreseen at project start	Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project	Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project
Landscape/seascape[14] area directly[15] covered by the project (ha)	77		
Landscape/seascape area indirectly[16] Covered by the project (ha)	367,768		

Explanation for indirect coverage numbers:

The figures given refer to areas benefiting from pilot site interventions under Output 3 and not to areas benefiting from all project interventions. The latter cannot be estimated in with any degree of accuracy. More accurate estimates of areas covered by target species and areas of potential spread will be derived as part of the project. Therefore some of the above figures are likely to be revised during the project.

12. b. Are there Protected Areas within the landscape/seascape covered by the project? If so, names these PAs, their IUCN or national PA category, and their extent in hectares.

	Name of Protected Areas	IUCN and/or national category of PA	Extent in hectares of PA
1.	Budongo Forest Reserve	Cat VI	79,300 ha
2.	Lake Mburo National Park	Cat II	37,000 ha

III. Management Practices Applied

13.a. Within the scope and objectives of the project, please identify in the table below the management practices employed by project beneficiaries that integrate biodiversity considerations and the area of coverage of these management practices? Note: this could range from farmers applying organic agricultural practices, forest management agencies managing forests per Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) guidelines or other forest certification schemes, artisanal fisherfolk practicing sustainable fisheries management,

[14] For projects working in seascapes (large marine ecosystems, fisheries etc.) please provide coverage figures and include explanatory text as necessary if reporting in hectares is not applicable or feasible.

[15] Direct coverage refers to the area that is targeted by the project's site intervention. For example, a project may be mainstreaming biodiversity into floodplain management in a pilot area of 1,000 hectares that is part of a much larger floodplain of 10,000 hectares.

[16] Using the example in footnote 5 above, the same project may, for example, "indirectly" cover or influence the remaining 9,000 hectares of the floodplain through promoting learning exchanges and training at the project site as part of an awareness raising and capacity building strategy for the rest of the floodplain. Please explain the basis for extrapolation of indirect coverage when completing this part of the table.

or industries satisfying other similar agreed international standards, etc. An example is provided in the table below.

Targets and Timeframe **Specific management practices that integrate BD**	**Area of coverage foreseen at start of project**	**Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project**	**Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project**
	Uganda		
	Lake Mburo area		
Integrated management of areas infested by water hyacinth including physical, chemical, cultural and biological control and integrated catchment management	2 ha		
Area wide management of outlying individuals of water hyacinth	1000 ha		
Integrated management of areas infested by *Cymbopogon nardus* including physical, manual, chemical and cultural control.	70 ha		
Area wide management of outlying individuals of *Cymbopogon nardus*	287,455 ha		
	Budongo Forest Reserve		
Integrated management of areas infested by *Senna spectabilis* including physical, manual, chemical and cultural control.	5 ha		
Area wide management of outlying individuals of *Senna spectabilis*	79,295 ha		

13. b. Is the project promoting the conservation and sustainable use of wild species or landraces?
____Yes **X** No

If yes, please list the wild species (WS) or landraces (L):

Species (*Genus sp*., and common name)	Wild Species (please check if this is a wild species)	Landrace (please check if this is a landrace)
1.		

2.		
3.		
4…		

13. c. For the species identified above, ***or other target species of the project not included in the list above (E.g., domesticated species)***, please list the species, check the boxes as appropriate regarding the application of a certification system, and identify the certification system being used in the project, if any. An example is provided in the table below.

Certification **Species**	A certification system is being used	A certification system will be used	Name of certification system if being used	A certification system will not be used
2…				

13. d. Is carbon sequestration an objective of the project?

Yes **X** No

If yes, the estimated amount of carbon sequestered is: _____

IV. Market Transformation and Mainstreaming Biodiversity

14. a. **For those projects that have identified market transformation as a project objective**, please describe the project's ability to integrate biodiversity considerations into the mainstream economy by measuring the market changes to which the project contributed. **Not applicable**

The sectors and subsectors and measures of impact in the table below **are illustrative examples, only**. Please complete per the objectives and specifics of the project.

Name of the market that the project seeks to affect (sector and sub-sector)	**Unit of measure of market impact**	**Market condition at the start of the project**	**Market condition at midterm evaluation of project**	**Market condition at final evaluation of the project**

14. b. Please also note which (if any) market changes were directly caused by the project.
Not applicable

V. Improved Livelihoods

15. For those projects that have identified improving the livelihoods of a beneficiary population based on sustainable use /harvesting as a project objective, please list the targets identified in the logframe and record progress at the mid-term and final evaluation. An example is provided in the table below. **Not applicable**

Improved Livelihood Measure	Number of targeted beneficiaries (if known)	Please identify local or indigenous communities project is working with	Improvement Foreseen at project start	Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project	Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project
1.					
2.					
3…					

VI. Project Replication Strategy

16. a . Does the project specify budget, activities, and outputs for implementing the replication strategy? Yes_**X**__ No___

16. b. Is the replication strategy promoting incentive measures & instruments (e.g. trust funds, payments for environmental services, certification) within and beyond project boundaries? Yes_**X**__ No___

If yes, please list the incentive measures or instruments being promoted:
Payment for quarantine services

_____
_____

16. c. For all projects, please complete box below. Two examples are provided.

Replication Quantification Measure (Examples: hectares of certified products, number of resource users participating in payment for environmental services programs, businesses established, etc.)	Replication Target Foreseen at project start	Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project	Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project
1. Legitimacy of IAS guidelines, policies, plans and institutional arrangements recognised by majority of institutional stakeholders by Yr 4.	>50%		
2. Amount, availability and accessibility of IAS information increased above baseline by Yr 4.	10 fold		
3. Awareness levels increased above baseline in 100 selected target audience groups.	50%		
4. % New species (plants/propagules) imported subject to environmental risk analysis by Yr 4.	80%		
5. Biodiversity indices in pilot ecosystems improved from baseline projections by Yr 4.	>20%		
6. Economic cost of IAS reduced below projections based on the baseline by Yr 4.	>20%		
7. Capacity for IAS management increased by Yr 4	2 fold		
8. Stakeholders trained in IAS awareness by 4th Q Yr. 3.	400		
9. Stakeholders trained in risk analysis by 4th Q Yr. 3	100		
10. Stakeholders trained in IAS management by 4th Q Yr. 3.	400		

11. Msc/PhD studies relevant to IAS completed by Yr 4.	12		
12. IAS information packs for schools developed by Yr 3 and distributed to pilot schools by 1st Q Yr 4.	100		
13. IAS modules added to a university course in each country by Yr 4.	4		

VII. Enabling Environment

For those projects that have identified addressing policy, legislation, regulations, and their implementation as project objectives, please complete the following series of questions*:* 17a, 17b, 17c.

An example for a project that focused on the agriculture sector is provided in 17 a, b, and c.

17. a. Please complete this table at **work program inclusion for each sector** that is a primary or a secondary focus of the project.
Please answer YES or NO to each statement under the sectors that are a focus of the project.

Sector **Statement: Please answer YES or NO for each sector that is a focus of the project.**	**Agriculture**	**Fisheries**	**Forestry**	**Tourism**	**Trade**	**Transport**
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy through specific legislation	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Regulations are in place to implement the legislation	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
The regulations are under implementation	No	No	No	No	No	No
The implementation of regulations is enforced	No	No	No	No	No	No
Enforcement of regulations is monitored	No	No	No	No	No	No

17. b . Please complete this table at **the project mid-term for each sector** that is a primary or a secondary focus of the project.
Please answer YES or NO to each statement under the sectors that are a focus of the project.

Sector **Statement: Please answer YES or NO for each sector that is a focus of the project.**	**Agriculture**	**Fisheries**	**Forestry**	**Tourism**	**Other (please specify)**	**Other (please specify)**
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy						
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy through specific legislation						

Regulations are in place to implement the legislation						
The regulations are under implementation						
The implementation of regulations is enforced						
Enforcement of regulations is monitored						

17. c. Please complete this table at **project closure for each sector** that is a primary or a secondary focus of the project.
Please answer YES or NO to each statement under the sectors that are a focus of the project.

Sector **Statement: Please answer YES or NO for each sector that is a focus of the project.**	**Agriculture**	**Fisheries**	**Forestry**	**Tourism**	**Other (please specify)**	**Other (please specify)**
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy						
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy through specific legislation						
Regulations are in place to implement the legislation						
The regulations are under implementation						
The implementation of regulations is enforced						
Enforcement of regulations is monitored						

All projects please complete this question at the project mid-term evaluation and at the final evaluation, if relevant:

17. d. Within the scope and objectives of the project, has the private sector undertaken voluntary **measures to incorporate biodiversity considerations in production? If yes, please provide brief explanation and specifically mention the sectors involved.**

An *example* of this could be a mining company minimizing the impacts on biodiversity by using low-impact exploration techniques and by developing plans for restoration of biodiversity after exploration as part of the site management plan.

VIII. Mainstreaming biodiversity into the GEF Implementing Agencies' Programs

18. At each time juncture of the project (work program inclusion, mid-term evaluation, and final evaluation), please check the box that depicts the status of mainstreaming biodiversity through the implementation of this project with on-going GEF Implementing Agencies' development assistance, sector, lending, or other technical assistance programs.

Time Frame Status of Mainstreaming	Work Program Inclusion	Mid-Term Evaluation	Final Evaluation
The project is not linked to IA development assistance, sector, lending programs, or other technical assistance programs.			
The project is indirectly linked to IAs development assistance, sector, lending programs or other technical assistance programs.			
The project has direct links to IAs development assistance, sector, lending programs or other technical assistance programs.	X		
The project is demonstrating strong and sustained complementarity with on-going planned programs.			

IX. Other Impacts

19. Please briefly summarize other impacts that the project has had on mainstreaming biodiversity that has not been recorded above.

ANNEX N: TRACKING TOOL FOR BIODIVERSITY PROJECTS IN THE PROD. ENV.

ZAMBIA

I. Project General Information

1. Project name: **Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa**

2. Country (ies): **Zambia** (also separate sheets for Ethiopia, Ghana and Uganda)

National Project:__X___ Regional Project:___X___ Global Project:_____

3. Name of reviewers completing tracking tool and completion dates:

	Name	**Title**	**Agency**
Work Program Inclusion	**Sarah Simons**	**Project Manager**	**CABI, Nairobi**
Project Mid-term			
Final Evaluation/project completion			

4. Project duration: ***Planned***___4____ years ***Actual*** _____ years

5. a. GEF Agency: UNDP **X** UNEP World Bank ADB AfDB IADB EBRD FAO IFAD UNIDO

5. b. Lead Project Executing Agency (ies):

CAB International (CABI) - Lead Agency
World Conservation Union (IUCN) – Assisting Agency
Ethiopian Agricultural Research Organisation, Ethiopia
Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, Ghana
National Agricultural Research Organisation, Uganda
Environmental Council of Zambia, Zambia

6. GEF Operational Program:
X drylands (OP 1)
X coastal, marine, freshwater (OP 2)
X forests (OP 3)
mountains (OP 4)
agro-biodiversity (OP 13)
integrated ecosystem management (OP 12)
sustainable land management (OP 15)

Other Operational Program not listed above:_none_____

7. Project Summary (one paragraph):

Invasive alien species (IAS) are second only to habitat destruction as a cause of global biodiversity loss. Prevention and mitigation of the effects of IAS is particularly challenging in Africa, impeding sustainable development as well as threatening biodiversity. This project

aims to remove barriers to the management of IAS through effective implementation of CBD Article 8(h) in 4 pilot countries (Ethiopia, Ghana, Uganda, Zambia), using a multisectoral ecosystem approach. In each country an enabling policy environment will be promoted through institutional arrangements and mainstreaming of IAS strategies; stakeholder awareness of IAS issues will be raised and access to necessary information provided; prevention and control programmes will be established, including ecosystem management at pilot sites where IAS threaten biodiversity; capacity for sustainable IAS management will be built. Lessons learned will be disseminated for replication in other countries in Africa.

8. Project Development Objective:

The development objective of the intervention is to conserve ecosystem, species and genetic diversity in Africa by protecting it from the threat of invasive alien species.

9. Project Purpose/Immediate Objective:

The immediate objective of the project is to remove barriers to the management of IAS through effective implementation of CBD Article 8(h) in four representative African countries.

10. Expected Outcomes (GEF-related):

13. Enabling policy and institutional environment for cross-sectoral prevention and management of IAS strengthened.
14. Appropriate information on risks, impacts and management of IAS utilised by key stakeholder groups and awareness levels raised.
15. Strategies for the prevention and management of priority IAS implemented
16. Capacity built for multisectoral prevention and management of IAS

11. Production sectors and/or ecosystem services directly targeted by project:

11. a. Please identify the main production sectors involved in the project. Please put "**P**" for sectors that are primarily and directly targeted by the project, and "**S**" for those that are secondary or incidentally affected by the project.

Agriculture__P_____
Fisheries____P_____
Forestry____S_____
Tourism____S_____
Mining_____
Oil_____
Transportation____S_____

Other (please specify)___pastoralism; water management, trade/commerce:__S_____

11. b. For projects that are targeting the conservation or sustainable use of ecosystems goods and services, please specify the goods or services that are being targeted, for example, water, genetic resources, recreational, etc

1. __water_____
2. __genetic resources_____
3. __recreational_____
4. __NTFP

II. Project Landscape/Seascape Coverage

12. a. What is the extent (in hectares) of the landscape or seascape where the project will directly or indirectly contribute to biodiversity conservation or sustainable use of its components? An example is provided in the table below.

Targets and Timeframe Project Coverage	Foreseen at project start	Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project	Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project
Landscape/seascape[17] area directly[18] covered by the project (ha)	18		
Landscape/seascape area indirectly[19] covered by the project (ha)	656,684		

Explanation for indirect coverage numbers:

The figures given refer to areas benefiting from pilot site interventions under Output 3 and not to areas benefiting from all project interventions. The latter cannot be estimated in with any degree of accuracy. More accurate estimates of areas covered by target species and areas of potential spread will be derived as part of the project. Therefore some of the above figures are likely to be revised during the project.

12. b. Are there Protected Areas within the landscape/seascape covered by the project? If so, names these PAs, their IUCN or national PA category, and their extent in hectares.

	Name of Protected Areas	IUCN and/or national category of PA	Extent in hectares of PA
1.	Lochinvar National Park	Cat II	41,000 ha
2.	Mosi-oa-Tunya National Park	Cat II	6,600 ha

III. Management Practices Applied

13.a. Within the scope and objectives of the project, please identify in the table below the management practices employed by project beneficiaries that integrate biodiversity considerations and the area of coverage of these management practices? Note: this could range from farmers applying organic agricultural practices, forest management agencies managing forests per Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) guidelines or other forest certification schemes, artisanal fisherfolk practicing sustainable fisheries management,

[17] For projects working in seascapes (large marine ecosystems, fisheries etc.) please provide coverage figures and include explanatory text as necessary if reporting in hectares is not applicable or feasible.

[18] Direct coverage refers to the area that is targeted by the project's site intervention. For example, a project may be mainstreaming biodiversity into floodplain management in a pilot area of 1,000 hectares that is part of a much larger floodplain of 10,000 hectares.

[19] Using the example in footnote 5 above, the same project may, for example, "indirectly" cover or influence the remaining 9,000 hectares of the floodplain through promoting learning exchanges and training at the project site as part of an awareness raising and capacity building strategy for the rest of the floodplain. Please explain the basis for extrapolation of indirect coverage when completing this part of the table.

or industries satisfying other similar agreed international standards, etc. An example is provided in the table below.

Targets and Timeframe **Specific management practices that integrate BD**	**Area of coverage foreseen at start of project**	**Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project**	**Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project**
	Zambia		
	Zambezi feeder water systems around Livingstone		
Eradication of water hyacinth in infested feeder water systems by physical and chemical means	2 ha		
Area wide management of outlying individuals of water hyacinth	100 ha		
	Mosi-oa-Tunya National Park		
Integrated management of areas infested by *Lantana camara* including physical, manual, chemical and cultural control.	5 ha		
Area wide management of outlying individuals of *Lantana camara*	6,595 ha		
	Area in and around Chunga Lagoon, Lochinvar National Park		
Integrated management of areas infested by *Mimosa pigra* including physical, manual, chemical and cultural control.	11 ha		
Area wide management of outlying individuals of *Mimosa pigra*	649,989 ha		

13. b. Is the project promoting the conservation and sustainable use of wild species or landraces?
____Yes **X** No

If yes, please list the wild species (WS) or landraces (L):

Species (*Genus sp*., and common name)	Wild Species (please check if this is a wild species)	Landrace (please check if this is a landrace)
1.		
2.		
3.		
4…		

13. c. For the species identified above, ***or other target species of the project not included in the list above (E.g., domesticated species)***, please list the species, check the boxes as appropriate regarding the application of a certification system, and identify the certification system being used in the project, if any. An example is provided in the table below.

Certification **Species**	A certification system is being used	A certification system will be used	Name of certification system if being used	A certification system will not be used
2…				

13. d. Is carbon sequestration an objective of the project?

Yes **X** No

If yes, the estimated amount of carbon sequestered is: _____

IV. Market Transformation and Mainstreaming Biodiversity

14. a. **For those projects that have identified market transformation as a project objective**, please describe the project's ability to integrate biodiversity considerations into the mainstream economy by measuring the market changes to which the project contributed. **Not applicable**

The sectors and subsectors and measures of impact in the table below **are illustrative examples, only**. Please complete per the objectives and specifics of the project.

Name of the market that the project seeks to affect (sector and sub-sector)	**Unit of measure of market impact**	**Market condition at the start of the project**	**Market condition at midterm evaluation of project**	**Market condition at final evaluation of the project**

14. b. Please also note which (if any) market changes were directly caused by the project.
Not applicable

V. Improved Livelihoods

15. For those projects that have identified improving the livelihoods of a beneficiary population based on sustainable use /harvesting as a project objective, please list the targets identified in the logframe and record progress at the mid-term and final evaluation. An example is provided in the table below. **Not applicable**

Improved Livelihood Measure	Number of targeted beneficiaries (if known)	Please identify local or indigenous communities project is working with	Improvement Foreseen at project start	Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project	Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project
1.					
2.					
3…					

VI. Project Replication Strategy

16. a . Does the project specify budget, activities, and outputs for implementing the replication strategy? Yes_**X**__ No___

16. b. Is the replication strategy promoting incentive measures & instruments (e.g. trust funds, payments for environmental services, certification) within and beyond project boundaries? Yes_**X**__ No___

If yes, please list the incentive measures or instruments being promoted:
Payment for quarantine services

_____
_____

16. c. For all projects, please complete box below. Two examples are provided.

Replication Quantification Measure (Examples: hectares of certified products, number of resource users participating in payment for environmental services programs, businesses established, etc.)	Replication Target Foreseen at project start	Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project	Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project
1. Legitimacy of IAS guidelines, policies, plans and institutional arrangements recognised by majority of institutional stakeholders by Yr 4.	>50%		
2. Amount, availability and accessibility of IAS information increased above baseline by Yr 4.	10 fold		
3. Awareness levels increased above baseline in 100 selected target audience groups.	50%		
4. % New species (plants/propagules) imported subject to environmental risk analysis by Yr 4.	80%		
5. Biodiversity indices in pilot ecosystems improved from baseline projections by Yr 4.	>20%		
6. Economic cost of IAS reduced below projections based on the baseline by Yr 4.	>20%		
7. Capacity for IAS management increased by Yr 4	2 fold		
8. Stakeholders trained in IAS awareness by 4th Q Yr. 3.	400		
9. Stakeholders trained in risk analysis by 4th Q Yr. 3	100		
10. Stakeholders trained in IAS management by 4th Q Yr. 3.	400		

11. Msc/PhD studies relevant to IAS completed by Yr 4.	12		
12. IAS information packs for schools developed by Yr 3 and distributed to pilot schools by 1st Q Yr 4.	100		
13. IAS modules added to a university course in each country by Yr 4.	4		

VII. Enabling Environment

For those projects that have identified addressing policy, legislation, regulations, and their implementation as project objectives, please complete the following series of questions*:* 17a, 17b, 17c.

An example for a project that focused on the agriculture sector is provided in 17 a, b, and c.

17. a. Please complete this table at **work program inclusion for each sector** that is a primary or a secondary focus of the project.
Please answer YES or NO to each statement under the sectors that are a focus of the project.

Sector **Statement: Please answer YES or NO for each sector that is a focus of the project.**	**Agriculture**	**Fisheries**	**Forestry**	**Tourism**	**Trade**	**Transport**
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy through specific legislation	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Regulations are in place to implement the legislation	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
The regulations are under implementation	No	No	No	No	No	No
The implementation of regulations is enforced	No	No	No	No	No	No
Enforcement of regulations is monitored	No	No	No	No	No	No

17. b . Please complete this table at **the project mid-term for each sector** that is a primary or a secondary focus of the project.
Please answer YES or NO to each statement under the sectors that are a focus of the project.

Sector **Statement: Please answer YES or NO for each sector that is a focus of the project.**	**Agriculture**	**Fisheries**	**Forestry**	**Tourism**	**Other (please specify)**	**Other (please specify)**
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy	YES					
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy through specific legislation	YES					

Regulations are in place to implement the legislation	NO					
The regulations are under implementation	NO					
The implementation of regulations is enforced	NO					
Enforcement of regulations is monitored	NO					

17. c. Please complete this table at **project closure for each sector** that is a primary or a secondary focus of the project.
Please answer YES or NO to each statement under the sectors that are a focus of the project.

Sector **Statement: Please answer YES or NO for each sector that is a focus of the project.**	**Agriculture**	**Fisheries**	**Forestry**	**Tourism**	**Other (please specify)**	**Other (please specify)**
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy	YES					
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy through specific legislation	YES					
Regulations are in place to implement the legislation	YES					
The regulations are under implementation	YES					
The implementation of regulations is enforced	NO					
Enforcement of regulations is monitored	NO					

All projects please complete this question at the project mid-term evaluation and at the final evaluation, if relevant:

17. d. Within the scope and objectives of the project, has the private sector undertaken voluntary **measures to incorporate biodiversity considerations in production? If yes, please provide brief explanation and specifically mention the sectors involved.**

An *example* of this could be a mining company minimizing the impacts on biodiversity by using low-impact exploration techniques and by developing plans for restoration of biodiversity after exploration as part of the site management plan.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

VIII. Mainstreaming biodiversity into the GEF Implementing Agencies' Programs

18. At each time juncture of the project (work program inclusion, mid-term evaluation, and final evaluation), please check the box that depicts the status of mainstreaming biodiversity through the implementation of this project with on-going GEF Implementing Agencies' development assistance, sector, lending, or other technical assistance programs.

Time Frame Status of Mainstreaming	Work Program Inclusion	Mid-Term Evaluation	Final Evaluation
The project is not linked to IA development assistance, sector, lending programs, or other technical assistance programs.			
The project is indirectly linked to IAs development assistance, sector, lending programs or other technical assistance programs.			
The project has direct links to IAs development assistance, sector, lending programs or other technical assistance programs.	X		
The project is demonstrating strong and sustained complementarity with on-going planned programs.			

IX. Other Impacts

19. Please briefly summarize other impacts that the project has had on mainstreaming biodiversity that has not been recorded above.

_____

_____

_____

_____

ANNEX O: UNEP RESPONSE TO GESEC REVIEW OF PROJECT BRIEF (2/2/05)

We thank the reviewers of GEFSEC for their detailed and comprehensive review and would like to provide the following clarification on the issues raised.

2. PROGRAM AND POLICY CONFORMITY

Monitoring and Evaluation:

- p. 8. "GEF Tracking Tool for Strategic Priority is attached but only a fist incomplete draft. Please finilize and submit."

Response UNEP: The final version of the GEF Tracking Tool for Strategic Priority 2 has been submitted to GEFSEC through the project registry on 31 January 2005. Annex N of the Final Project Brief has been updated accordingly.

3. FINANCING

Financing Plan:

- p. 9. " "Please make sure that most of the co-financing will be in-cash contributions."

Response UNEP: During finalisation of the project design the total co-finance was raised from exactly US$ 5 million to approximately US$ 5.4 million. Countries did so by increasing their in-kind contributions. The core of their commitments – the cash inputs to the project, have however not been affected. The Executing Agencies have already requested additional cash contributions from national agencies and governments, and the prospects for this are favourable, particularly once the project will commence its country programs.

- p.9 " GEF contribution was foreseen in 4 mio, and project cost in 9 mio at pipeline inclusion. Please clarify and explain the reasons for this increase in the budget."

Response from UNEP: When the proposal for the PDF-B phase of the project was submitted to UNEP/GEF in January 2003, the total costs of the full GEF project were estimated to be $ 4,000,000 from GEF and $ 5,000,000 in co-financing. However, following an extensive stakeholder consultation process conducted during the PDF-B phase it became apparent that insufficient funds had been allocated in the proposal for the full GEF project in two critical areas i.e. the Replication Strategy and the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. The Replicability strategy has now been strengthened and the budget increased accordingly. The Monitoring and Evaluation Plan was not initially included in the proposed budget for the GEF project, but will now clearly form an important part of the continual monitoring process, and an appropriate budgetary provision has now been included. Finally, following the STAP Review, it became clear that insufficient funding had been allocated to Stakeholder Involvement/Community Participation particularly in relation to the issue of 'conflict resolution' regarding the pros and cons of specific invasive species within and between different communities at the pilot sites. To take account of this, an additional budgetary provision was made in consultation with the National Programme Partners.

It should be noted that the amount of co-financing has also increased from an estimated $5,000,000 to $5,392,980.

ANNEX P: GEF COUNCIL TECHNICAL COMMENTS WORK PROGRAM IS12 (4 APRIL 2005)

1. US Technical Comments

Regional (Ethiopia, Uganda, Zambia, Ghana): Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa (UNEP)

Summary: The goal of the project is to protect ecosystem, species and genetic diversity from invasive alien species (IAS), for global, national and community benefit. The project will contribute to this goal through its purpose of removing the barriers to effective prevention and management of IAS in four pilot countries: Ethiopia, Ghana, Uganda and Zambia. The focus will be on invasive plants, as this group poses the greatest current threat, and because a number of invasive plant species have been identified in the four countries requiring immediate attention. Invasive plants in both terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems will be addressed.

Assessment: Establishing systems to effectively manage invasive plant species is fundamental for conserving biodiversity and essential for enhancing trade and development. This proposal is worth supporting provided the log frame is strengthened:

- The log frame provides good process indicators. However, it should include quantifiable and measurable out come indicators as well. (See the DR Watershed Land Management proposal for example of measurable indicators)

- Similarly, the primary benefits of this activity will accrue at the country level. It is important to measure the global benefits as well. We request that the indicators for the global benefits be strengthened and made quantifiable.

2. Swiss Technical Comments

N° 01: Regional*: Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa (UNEP); GEF cost: 5.8 million USD; total project cost: 11.9 million USD

* Ethiopia, Ghana, Uganda and Zambia

General Commentaries

The project's development goal is the conservation of biodiversity in Africa by protecting it from the threat of invasive alien plant species (IAS). Its immediate goal is focused on removing barriers to the management of IAS in four sub-Saharan pilot-countries, i.e. Ethiopia, Ghana, Uganda and Zambia.

The project is organised according to the following four components (i) strengthening policy environment, (ii) information management, (iii) implementation of control and prevention programmes, and, (iv) capacity building.

The proposal appears consistent with the GEF focal area "Biodiversity", addressing Operational Programs 1, 2 & 3 and GEF Strategic Priorities BD-2 and BD-4.

The project has been carefully designed following sound technical principles. Full use is made of the guidance provided by the Convention on Biological Diversity to address alien species (COP decisions VI/23 and VII/13). The project could provide a meaningful contribution to the implementation of article 8(h) of the Convention.

We particularly appreciate the strong commitment by recipient countries as reflected in the provision of substantial co-financing, the strong institutional embedment of the project on national, regional and international level and the thoroughly consideration of existing guidance and empirical knowledge.

The project is very ambitious, especially with regard to the tight timeframe of only four years. It could be a challenge to streamline the interests of the stakeholders, which today are contradictory, to reach consensus. However, this challenge is recognised and well addressed in the project documents.

Main Concerns

We have no main concerns regarding this soundly designed project.

Conclusions and Recommendations

We support the project proposal, and recommend its approval by the GEF.

3. German Technical Comments

No. 1: Regional (Ethiopia, Uganda, Zambia, Ghana): Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa

1. Project rationale and objectives

The project's development objective is to conserve ecosystems, species and genetic diversity in Africa by protecting it from the threat of invasive alien species. It aims to reduce barriers to the management – i.e. prevention and control - of invasive alien *plant* species (IAS) in 4 African pilot countries: Ethiopia, Ghana, Uganda, Zambia. During project preparation (PDF A and B) four categories of barriers to effectively managing IAS in these countries were identified and four corresponding project components/outcomes identified:

(1.) Enabling policy and institutional environment for cross-sectoral prevention and management of IAS strengthened;
(2.) Appropriate information on risks, impacts and management of IAS utilized by key stakeholders and awareness levels raised;
(3.) Strategies for the prevention and management of priority IAS implemented (in 9 pilot sites)
(4.) Capacity built for multisectoral prevention & management of IAS
(5.) Project managed and coordination.

2. Existence of impact indicators and their relation to the GEF Business Plan (GEF/C.22/6)

Appropriate indicators for the development objective and immediate objective are still subject of ongoing debate. So far, these indicators are based largely on the provisional targets and indicators discussed at COP7 (document UNEP/CBD/COP/7/20/Add.3: "..Evaluation of progress towards the 2010 biodiversity target.."). The indicators in the Logframe Matrix are supposed to be finalised during the project inception phase and to feed into a Project Benefit Monitoring and Evaluation System.

The project will contribute to Strategy Priority 2 in Biodiversity for GEF Phase III (BD-2 Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes and Sectors) and to Priority 4 (BD-4 Generation and Dissemination of Best Practices for Addressing currently and Emerging Biodiversity Issues). With pilot sites in semi-arid, freshwater and forest ecosystems, it covers the Operational Programs 1, 2, and 3. At these pilot sites the project will contribute to biodiversity conservation in a production environment of 2,111,690 hectares, comprising 268,524 hectares of protected areas.

3. Application of the incremental cost principle and identification of the „global environmental benefit“

In Annex A the baseline of each project component is described and costs are estimated[20] (total baseline expenditures amount 11,990,1890 US$). The project will provide a "global environmental benefit" by (i.) protecting globally significant biodiversity in the pilot sites from the invasive plants; (ii.) through replication of innovative approaches to other sites and countries in Africa; (iii.) by linking project outputs/websites in the pilot countries with global and regional IAS websites and resources.

The incremental cost to achieve the project's global environmental objectives through the GEF alternative has been estimated 10,392,980 US$, of which 5,000,000 US$ are requested from GEF (48,1 % of the total cost alternative).

4. Amount and quality of cofunding

Governments of the four pilot countries provide 4,392,980 US$ of cofinancing (in cash and in-kind). Cofunding of US$ 1,000,000 (500,000 in cash) is provided by the two international executing agencies CABI (750,000 US$ in-kind and in cash) and IUCN (250,000 US$ in-kind and in cash). So far, there are no other sources of co-funding assured for the full size project.

[For the PDF-A and –B phases a total of 58,400 US$ of cofunding has been provided by the US Dept. of State and others that are not specified]

5. Relationship, complementarities and synergies with German activities

In the past there have been a couple of German projects (BMZ/GTZ) in Africa dealing specifically with the issue of invasive alien species: For instance, a project to combat Water Hyacinth in Sudan (PN 1976.2159.2), or projects focussing on the prevention of agricultural pests (e.g. "Post harvest protection in small farming systems in Africa", PN 1994.2153.8). But there are also links and complementarities to ongoing projects dealing with the sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity – even though these are not specifically concerned with IAS management:

- Within the context of International Agricultural Research (PN 2003.7860.4) BMZ supports IPGRI's "*Genetic Resources Policy Initiative*" (GRPI), which aims to support developing countries (including Ethiopia, Zambia, and Uganda) to design comprehensive policy frameworks for genetic resources (http://www.grpi.org) .
- In Ethiopia, GTZ is implementing the projects "Forest Genetic Resources Conservation" (PN 2001.2011.3) and "Sustainable utilisation of natural resources for improved food security" (PN 2004.2060.4).
- In Ghana's Volta region, GTZ is implementing the project "Forest Protection and Resource Use Management" (PN 1996.2041.0).
- The GEF project is complementary to the work of the BMZ/GTZ Sector Projects "People and Biodiversity" (PN 2003.2256.0) and "Implementing the Biodiversity Convention"(PN 2002.2174.7) which also works towards the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, the development of appropriate policy and law, and the development of public awareness material.

Other related initiatives

Another initiative not mentioned in the project brief that should be considered by the coordinators of the GEF project is the *Forest Invasive Species Network for Africa* (FISNA). Its new website on forest invasive species in Africa is hosted by FAO (see http://www.fao.org/forestry/site/26951/en)

6. Participation of local communities and contribution to sustainable development

Provision for stakeholder involvement at pilot site level is made for through stakeholder workshops, community based meetings, application of participatory assessment tools and establishment of site management committees to ensure ownership of site-specific management plans. It is recognized that many invasive plant species have been introduced because of anticipated benefits, and that this is likely to present conflicts when control is proposed. Therefore, resolving misunderstandings and conflicts between different stakeholders is supposed to be a key aspect of the project. During the

[20] For component 2 and 3 baseline costs have erroneously been specified in pounds (£) (pages A-14, A-15)

project inception phase guidelines for stakeholder participation will be developed, with indicators to monitor the quality of participation and to address issues relating to conflict resolution.

The project's objectives are focussed mainly on conservation of biodiversity and ecological sustainability (improvement of status of threatened species; maintenance of biodiversity indices for protected areas, reduced invasion of alien species etc.). Moreover, it is assumed that the project can lead to a reduction of socio-economic costs of existing invasions and that it will indirectly impact on a range of economic activities (e.g. more effective addressing of invasives of agricultural importance; improvements in production, ecosystem services or tourism). The project's contribution to all aspects of sustainable development (including socio-economic aspects) will basically depend on the quality of (local) stakeholder participation.

7. Final Assessment:

The proposal is well elaborated and in line with the principles and goals of Germany. Minor changes should be made during further planning steps and during project implementation. These include:

- More concrete elaboration of the project's strategy (1.) to address conflicts between different stakeholders around the management of IAS and (2.) to contribute to improved livelihoods of local communities. An increased emphasis on these aspects should also be reflected in the impact indicators, which still have to be refined.
- As mentioned in the STAP review, four years is too little time for the project to achieve its objectives. The project logframe - particularly its indicators - should be adjusted according the progress realistically achievable in this period.

The participation and commitment of different stakeholders – including the private sector – should also become manifest in the provision of additional co-funding.

Recommendation:

Taking into account the above comments, Germany supports the proposal. Changes should be made during further planning steps and project implementation.

Annex P1: UNEP RESPONSE TO GEF Council Technical Comments on Work Program IS12 (5th April 2005)

US COMMENT	UNEP RESPONSE
Assessment: Establishing systems to effectively manage invasive plant species is fundamental for conserving biodiversity and essential for enhancing trade and development. This proposal is worth supporting provided the log frame is strengthened: • The log frame provides good process indicators. However, it should include quantifiable and measurable out come indicators as well. (See the DR Watershed Land Management proposal for example of measurable indicators) • Similarly, the primary benefits of this activity will accrue at the country level. It is important to measure the global benefits as well. We request that the indicators for the global benefits be strengthened and made quantifiable.	Indicators relating to the global benefits to be achieved by the project, 'Removing barriers to invasive plant management in Africa' have been strengthened and made quantifiable (see revised Logframe in Annex B). Similarly, the Outcome Indicators have been revised to be more quantifiable and objectively verifiable (see revised Logframe in Annex B). Finally, the footnote of the project Logframe referring to the detailed M&E program, revised accordingly (see revised Logframe in Annex B).
SWISS COMMENT	UNEP RESPONSE
Recommendation: We support the project proposal, and recommend its approval by the GEF.	No response required.
GERMAN COMMENT	UNEP RESPONSE
Assessment: The proposal is well elaborated and in line with the principles and goals of Germany. Minor changes should be made during further planning steps and during project implementation. These include: • More concrete elaboration of the project's strategy (1.) to address conflicts between different stakeholders around the management of IAS and (2.) to contribute to improved livelihoods of local communities. An increased emphasis on these aspects should also be reflected in the impact indicators, which still have to be refined. • As mentioned in the STAP review, four years is too little time for the project to achieve its objectives. The project logframe - particularly its indicators - should be adjusted according the progress realistically achievable in this period.	UNEP has agreed to provide more concrete elaboration of the strategies to address conflicts between different stakeholders, and to contribute to improved livelihoods of local communities in the project on removing barriers to invasive plant management in Africa, during the appraisal and inception phases. Impact indicators have also been strengthened in this respect, and will be reassessed during the first months of the project by the assigned staff responsible for the M&E plan. UNEP also recognises that four years is too little time for the project to achieve all of its objectives, and agrees to adjust the relevant indicators in the project Logframe during the inception phase to ensure the progress is realistically achievable.

• The participation and commitment of different stakeholders – including the private sector – should also become manifest in the provision of additional co-funding. **Recommendation:** Taking into account the above comments, Germany supports the proposal. Changes should be made during further planning steps and project implementation.	Standard UNEP project monitoring procedures include reporting on amongst others, co-finance provision through in-kind and/or cash contributions from community groups, government staff support, and cooperation with the private sector. The establishment and testing of IAS prevention and management pilots will allow for increased co-finance contributions through these initiatives.

ANNEX Q: FORMAT FOR BIANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT TO UNEP
as at 30 June and 31 December
(Please attach a current inventory of outputs/Services when submitting this report)

1. Background Information

1.1 Project Number:

1.2 Project Title:

1.3 Division/Unit:

1.4 Coordinating Agency or Supporting Organization (if relevant):

1.5 Reporting period (the six months covered by this report):

1.6 Relevant UNEP Programme of Work (2002-2003) Subprogramme No:

1.7 Staffing Details of Cooperating Agency/ Supporting Organization (Applies to personnel / experts/ consultants paid by the project budget):

Functional Title	Nationality	Object of Expenditure (1101, 1102, 1201, 1301 etc..)

Sub-Contracts (if relevant):

Name and Address of the Sub-Contractee	Object of expenditure (2101, 2201, 2301 etc..)

2. Project Status

2.1 Information on the delivery of outputs/services

	Output/Service (as listed in the approved project document)	Status (Complete/ Ongoing)	Description of work undertaken during the reporting period	Description of problems encountered; Issues that need to be addressed; Decisions/Actions to be taken
1.				
2.				
3.				

2.2 If the project is not on track, provide reasons and details of remedial action to be taken:

3. Discussion acknowledgment (To be completed by UNEP)

Project Coordinator's General Comments/Observations	First Supervising Officer's General Comments
Name: _____ Date: _____ Signature: _____	Name: _____ Date: _____ Signature: _____

ANNEX Q ATTACHMENT TO HALF-YEARLY PROGRESS REPORT: FORMAT FOR INVENTORY OF OUTPUTS/SERVICES

a) Meetings

No	Meeting Type (note 4)	Title	Venue	Dates	Convened by	Organized by	# of Participants	List attached Yes/No	Report issued as doc no	Language	Dated
1.											
2.											
3.											

List of Meeting Participants

No.	Name of the Participant	Nationality

b) Printed Materials

No	Type (note 5)	Title	Author(s)/Editor(s)	Publisher	Symbol	Publication Date	Distribution List Attached Yes/No
1.							
2.							
3.							

c) Technical Information / Public Information

No	Description	Date
1.		
2.		
3.		

d) Technical Cooperation

No	Type (note 6)	Purpose	Venue	Duration	For Grants and Fellowships		
					Beneficiaries	Countries/Nationalities	Cost (in US$)
1.							
2.							

e) Other Outputs/Services (e.g. Networking, Query-response, Participation in meetings etc.)

No	Description	Date
1.		
2.		
3.		

Note 4
Meeting types (Inter-governmental Meeting, Expert Group Meeting, Training Workshop/Seminar, Other)
Note 5
Material types (Report to Inter-governmental Meeting, Technical Publication, Technical Report, Other)
Note 6
Technical Cooperation Type (Grants and Fellowships, Advisory Services, Staff Mission, Others

ANNEX R: CASH ADVANCE STATEMENT

Statement of cash advance as at .....
And cash requirements for the six-months of .....

Name of cooperating agency/ Supporting organization _____
Project No. _____
Project title _____

I. **Cash statement**

1. Opening cash balance as at ..... US$ _____
2. Add: cash advances received:

Date	**Amount**
.....	.....
.....	.....
.....	.....
.....	.....

3. Total cash advanced to date US$ _____
4. Less: total cumulative expenditures incurred US$ (_____)
5. Closing cash balance as at ..... US$ _____

II. **Cash requirements forecast**

6.Estimated disbursements for six-months ending[21] .....US$ _____
7. Less: closing cash balance (see item 5, above) US$ (_____)
8.Total cash requirements for the six-months .....US$ _____

Prepared by_____ Request approved by_____
Duly authorized official of cooperating agency/ supporting organization

[21] A cash request should be supported by a detailed itemized breakdown of estimated expenditures using the same budget lines as per the approved budget in UNEP format, Annex Y.

ANNEX S: FORMAT OF QUARTERLY PROJECT EXPENDITURE ACCOUNTS FOR SUPPORTING ORGANISATION

Quarterly project statement of allocation (budget), expenditure and balance (Expressed in US$) covering the period

..... to .....

Project No. ..... Supporting Organization .....

Project title: .....

Project commencing: ..... Project ending: .....

(date) (date)

Object of expenditure by UNEP budget code	Project budget allocation for year.....		Expenditure incurred for the quarter		Expenditure incurred Cumulative expenditures this year		Unspent balance of budget allocation for year	
	m/m (1)	Amount (2)	m/m (3)	Amount (4)	m/m (5)	Amount (6)	m/m (7)	Amount (2)-(6)
1100 Project personnel								
1200 Consultants								
1300 Administrative support								
1400 Volunteers								
1600 Travel								
2100 Sub-contracts								
2200 Sub-contracts								
2300 Sub-contracts								
3100 Fellowships								
3200 Group training								
3300 Fellowships								
4100 Expendable equipment								
4200 Non-expendable equipment								
4300 Premises								
5100 Operation								
5200 Reporting costs								
5300 Sundry								
5400 Hospitality								
99 GRAND TOTAL								

Signed: _____

Duly authorized official of supporting organization

NB: The expenditure should be reported in line with the specific object of expenditures as per project budget

ANNEX T: TERMINAL REPORT FORMAT

1. Background Information

1.1 Project Number

1.2 Project Title

1.3 UNEP Division/Unit

1.4 Implementing Organization

2. Project Implementation Details

2.2 Project Activities (*Describe the activities actually undertaken under the project, giving reasons why some activities were not undertaken, if any)*

2.3 Project Outputs (*Compare the outputs generated with the ones listed in the project document*)

2.4 Use of Outputs (*State the use made of the outputs)*

2.5 Degree of achievement of the objectives/results (*On the basis of facts obtained during the follow-up phase, describe how the project document outputs and their use were or were not instrumental in realizing the objectives / results of the project)*

2.6 Determine the degree to which project contributes to the advancement of women in Environmental Management and describe gender sensitive activities carried out by the project.

2.7 Describe how the project has assisted the partner in sustained activities after project completion.

3. Conclusions

3.1 Lessons Learned (*Enumerate the lessons learned during the project's execution. Concentrate on the management of the project, including the principal factors which determined success or failure in meeting the objectives set down in the project document*)

3.2 Recommendations (*Make recommendations to (a) Improve the effect and impact of similar projects in the future and (b) Indicate what further action might be needed to meet the project objectives / results*)

4. Attachments

4.1 Attach an inventory of all non-expendable equipment (value over US$ 1,500) purchased under this project indicating Date of Purchase, Description, Serial Number, Quantity, Cost, Location and Present Condition, together with your proposal for the disposal of the said equipment

4.2 Attach a final Inventory of all Outputs/Services produced through this project

ANNEX T ATTACHMENT TO TERMINAL REPORT: FORMAT FOR INVENTORY OF OUTPUTS/SERVICES

a) Meetings

No	Meeting Type (note 4)	Title	Venue	Dates	Convened by	Organized by	# of Participants	List attached Yes/No	Report issued as doc no	Language	Dated
1.											
2.											
3.											

List of Meeting Participants

No.	Name of the Participant	Nationality

b) Printed Materials

No	Type (note 5)	Title	Author(s)/Editor(s)	Publisher	Symbol	Publication Date	Distribution List Attached Yes/No

c) Technical Information / Public Information

No	Description	Date
1.		
2.		
3.		

d) Technical Cooperation

No	Type (note 6)	Purpose	Venue	Duration	For Grants and Fellowships		
					Beneficiaries	Countries/Nationalities	Cost (in US$)
1.							
2.							

e) Other Outputs/Services (e.g. Networking, Query-response, Participation in meetings etc.)

No	Description	Date
1.		
2.		
3.		

Note 4: Meeting types (Inter-governmental Meeting, Expert Group Meeting, Training Workshop/Seminar, Other)

Note 5: Material types (Report to Inter-governmental Meeting, Technical Publication, Technical Report, Other)

Note 6: Technical Cooperation Type (Grants and Fellowships, Advisory Services, Staff Mission, Others)

ANNEX U: INVENTORY OF NON-EXPENDABLE EQUIPMENT PURCHASED AGAINST UNEP PROJECTS[22]
UNIT VALUE US$1,500 AND ABOVE AND ITEMS OF ATTRACTION

As at _____
Project No._____
Project Title _____
Executing Agency: _____
Internal/SO/CA (UNEP use only)_____
FPMO (UNEP) use only)_____

Description	Serial No.	Date of Purchase	Original Price (US$)	Purchased / Imported from (Name of Country)	Present Condition	Location	Remarks/recommendationfor disposal

The physical verification of the items was done by:

Name:_____ Signature:_____

Title: _____ Date: _____

[22] The equipment purchased using UNEP/GEF PDF-B funds, already transferred to CABI for its use during full-size project implementation, should also be reported. Kindly differentiate by noting 'PDF-B funding' in the column 'Original Price' to avoid double accounting.

ANNEX V: LIST OF ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS

ACODE	Advocates Coalition for Development and Environment (Uganda)
AHFR	Afram Headwaters Forest Reserve
AMCEN	African Ministerial Conference on the Environment
APC	Assistant Project Coordinator
ARC	Agricultural Research Centre (Ethiopia)
ARDC	Agricultural Research and Development Centre (Uganda)
ASARECA	Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa
AWF	African Wildlife Foundation
CABI	CAB International - HQ, Wallingford, UK
CABI-ARC	CAB International – Africa Regional Centre, Nairobi, Kenya
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
COP	Conference of Parties
CORAF	Conseil Ouest et Centre Africain pour la Recherche et le Développement Agricole
CSIR	Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (Ghana)
DANIDA	Danish International Development Co-operation
DEC	District Environment Committee (Ghana)
DEC	District Environment Committee (Uganda)
DEWA	Division of Early Warning and Assessment (UNEP)
DWA	Department of Water Affairs (Zambia)
EAC	East African Community
EAP	Regional Office for Africa (NEPAD)
EARO	Ethiopian Agricultural Research Organisation
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
ECZ	Environmental Council of Zambia
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EPA	Environmental Protection Authority (Ethiopia)
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency (Ghana)
ESTC	Ethiopian Science and Technology Commission
EWCO	Ethiopia Wildlife Conservation Organisation
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organisation
FORIG	Forestry Research Institute of Ghana
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIDA	Ghana Irrigation Development Authority
GISIN	Global Invasive Species Information Network
GISP	Global Invasive Species Programme
GSBA	Globally Significant Biodiversity Area
GTZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (German Technical Cooperation)
IA	Implementing Agency
IAG	International Advisory Group
IAPSC	Inter-African Phytosanitary Council
IAS	Invasive Alien Species
IBA	Important Bird Area
IBC	Institute of Biodiversity Conservation
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organisation
ICIPE	International Centre for Insect Physiology and Ecology
ICLARM	World Fish Centre
ICRAF	World Agroforestry Centre
IEA	International Executing Agency
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
IMO	International Maritime Organisation

IPC	International Project Coordinator
IPPC	International Plant Protection Convention
ISC	International Steering Committee
ISPM	International Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measure
ISSAP	Invasive Species Strategy and Action Plan
ISSG	Invasive Species Specialist Group
IUCN	World Conservation Union
LI	Learning Institution
LVEMP	Lake Victoria Environmental Management Programme
MAAIF	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries and Fisheries (Uganda)
MoARD	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (Ethiopia)
MoE	Ministry of Education (Ethiopia)
MoFA	Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Ghana)
MoFA	Ministry of Federal Affairs (Ethiopia)
MoFED	Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (Ethiopia)
MoFPED	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (Uganda)
MoLF	Ministry of Lands and Forestry (Ghana)
MoTI	Ministry of Trade and Industry (Ethiopia)
MoWR	Ministry of Water Resources (Ethiopia)
MSE	Ministry of Science and Environment (Ghana)
MSP	Medium Size Project
MTENR	Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources (Zambia)
MWLE	Ministry of Water, Lands and Environment (Uganda)
NAADS	National Agriculture Advisory Services (Uganda)
NAC	National Advisory Committee
NARO	National Agriculture Research Organisation (Uganda)
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NCSA	National Capacity Self-Assessment for Global Environmental Management
NCU	National Coordination Unit
NEA	National Executing Agency
NEAP	National Environmental Strategy and Action Plan
NEMA	National Environmental Management Authority (Uganda)
NEPAD	New Partnership for African Development
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
NHCC	National Heritage Conservation Commission (Zambia)
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
NP	National Park
NPC	National Project Coordinator
NPD	National Project Director
NPCS	National Project Coordination Secretariat (Ethiopia)
NPCU	National Project Coordination Unit (Ethiopia, Ghana & Zambia)
NSC	National Steering Committee
OP	Operational Programme
PDF-A	Project Development Facility, Block A (GEF project development grant)
PBF-B	Project Development Facility, Block B (GEF project development grant)
PBME	Project Benefit Monitoring and Evaluation
PCU	Project Coordination Unit
PEAP	Poverty Eradication Action Plan (Uganda)
PI	Private Institution
PMA	Plan for Modernisation of Agriculture (Uganda)
PPRSD	Plant Protection and Regulatory Services Directorate (Ghana)
ROA	Regional Office for Africa (UNEP)
SABSP	Southern Africa Biodiversity Support Programme
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SBSTTA	Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice
SCBD	Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
SCOPE	Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment

SMC	Site Management Committee
SPS	Sanitary and Phytosanitary
STAP	Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel
TT	Task Team
TTL	Task Team Leader
UEB	Uganda Electricity Board
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
URC	Uganda Railway Corporation
USAID	US Agency for International Development
UWA	Uganda Wildlife Authority
WB	World Bank
WTO	World Trade Organisation
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature
ZAWA	Zambia Wildlife Authority
ZRA	Zambia Revenue Authority

ANNEX W: REFERENCES

CAB International 2004. Prevention and Management of Alien Invasive Species: Forging Cooperation throughout West Africa. Proceedings of a workshop held in Accra, Ghana, 9-11 March, 2004. CAB International, Nairobi, Kenya.

IUCN 2003. 2003 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. www.redlist.org (accessed 9/8/2004).

Lyons, E.E. and S.E. Miller, S.E. 1999. Invasive Species in East Africa: Proceedings of a Workshop held at ICIPE, July 5-6, 1999. ICIPE Science Press, Nairobi, Kenya.

FAO 1996. Code of conduct for the import and release of exotic biological control agents. ISPM Pub. No. 3, FAO, Rome.

FAO 1996. Guidelines for pest risk analysis. ISPM Pub. No. 2, FAO, Rome.

Macdonald, I.A.W., Reaser, J.K., Bright, C., Neville, L.E., Howard, G.W., Murphy S.J. and G. Preston (eds.). 2003. Invasive alien species in southern Africa: national reports & directory of resources. GISP, Cape Town, South Africa.

Matthews, S. and K. Brand 2004. Africa Invaded. The Growing Danger of Invasive Alien Species. GISP, Cape Town, South Africa.

McNeely, J.A. 2001. The Great Reshuffling: Human Dimensions of Invasive Alien Species. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.

McNeely, J.A., Mooney, H.A., Neville, L.E., Schei, P.J. and J.K. Waage 2001. A Global Strategy on Invasive Alien Species. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.

Mooney, H.A. and R.J. Hobbs (eds.). 2000. Invasive Species in a Changing World. Island Press,Washington, D.C.

NEPAD 2003. Development of an Action Plan for the Environment Initiative of NEPAD. Programme Area 3. Prevention, Control and Management of Invasive Alien Species. UNEP, Nairobi, Kenya.

Sandlund, O.T., Schei, P.J. and Å. Viken 1999. Invasive Species and Biodiversity Management. Based on a Selection of Papers Presented at the Norway/UN Conference on Alien Species, Trondheim, Norway. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity 2001. Assessment and Management of Alien Species that Threaten Ecosystems, Habitats and Species. Abstracts of Keynote Addresses and Posters Presented at the Sixth Meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, held in Montreal, Canada from 12 to 16 March 2001. SCBD, Montreal, Canada.

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (2001). Review of the Efficiency and Efficacy of Existing Legal Instruments Applicable to Invasive Alien Species. SCBD, Montreal Canada.

Shine, C., Williams, N. and L. Gundling 2000. A Guide to Designing Legal and Institutional Frameworks on Alien Invasive Species. IUCN Environmental Law Centre, Gland, Switzerland.

United Nations Environment Programme. 1992. Convention on Biological Diversity. United Nations Publications, New York.

Wittenberg, R. and M.J.W. Cock 2001. Invasive Alien Species: A Toolkit of Best Prevention and Management Practices. CAB International, Wallingford, Oxon, UK.

BirdLife International 2003. BirdLife's online World Bird Database: the Site for Bird Conservation. Version 2.0. BirdLife International, Cambridge, UK. Available: http://www.birdlife.org (accessed 9/8/2004).

IUCN 2001. IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria Version 3.1. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.

Regassa. S., Tesfaye, A., Tessema, T., Worku, A. Engida, G., Emana, G. and F. Reda 2004. Invasive Alien Plant Control and Prevention in Ethiopia - Pilot Surveys, Baseline Conditions and Proposed GEF Interventions. Report submitted to EARO Ethiopia and CABI under the PDF-B phase of the UNEP GEF Project Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa. EARO, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Myers, N., Mittermeier, R. A., Mittermeier, C. G., da Fonseca, G. A. B. and J. Kent 2000. Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. Nature 403, 853-858.

Slattersfield, A.J., Crosby, M.J., Long, A.J. and D.C. Wege 1998. Endemic Bird Areas of the World: Priorities for Conservation. BirdLife International, Cambridge, UK.

Davis, S.D., V.H. Heywood, and A.C. Hamilton 1994. Centres of Plant Diversity: A Guide and Strategy for their Conservation. Published by WWF and IUCN.

Tamado T & P. Milberg 2004. Control of parthenium (*Parthenium hysterophorus* L.) in grain sorghum in smallholder farming system in Eastern Ethiopia. - Weed Technology 18, in press.

Beier, P., van Dreilen, M., and B.O. Kankam 2002. Avifaunal collapse in West African forest fragments. Conservation Biology 16, 1097-1111.

Blay, E.T., Cudjoe, A.R., Wilson, D.D., Kankam, B.O., Braimah, H., Fiati, C. Dadey, M., de Graft-Johnson, K.A.A, Clottey, V.A. and F.O. Anno-Nyako 2004. Implementation of IAS Control and Prevention Programmes. Pilot Surveys of Priority Invasive Plant Species. Report submitted to CSIR Ghana and CABI under the PDF-B phase of the UNEP GEF Project Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa. EPA, Accra, Ghana.

Eggeling, W.J. 1947. Observations on the ecology of the Budongo Rain Forest, Uganda. Journal of Ecology 34, 20-87.

Plumptre, A. J. 1996. Changes following 60 years of selective timber harvesting in the Budongo Forest Reserve, Uganda. Forest Ecology and Management. 89, 101-113.

Ebong, C., Byenkya, S., Ogwang, J., Kiwuso, P., Molo, R. and G. Eilu 2004. Evaluation of Baseline Conditions and Control Options for Priority Invasive Species in Uganda. Report submitted to NARO Uganda and CABI under the PDF-B phase of the UNEP GEF Project Removing Barriers to Invasive Plant Management in Africa. NARO, Entebbe, Uganda.

ANNEX X: Format for Report on COFINANCING

Title of Project:							
Project Number:							
Name of Executing Agency:							
Project Duration:	**From:**		**To:**				
Reporting Period *(to be done annually)* **:**							
Source of Cofinance	**Cash Contributions**			**In-kind Contributions**			**Comments**
	Budget original (at time of approval by GEF)	Budget latest revision	Received to date	Budget original (at time of approval by GEF)	Budget latest revision	Received to date	
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Name: _____

Position: _____

Date: _____

All amounts in US dollars

ANNEX Y: Budget in UNEP Format

UNEP BUDGET LINE			Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Total
10	**PROJECT PERSONNEL COMPONENT**						
1100	Project Personnel						
	ETHIOPIA						
	1101	Full time national project coordinator (at senior researcher rate) @$1454 pm	17,058	17,324	17,575	17,846	69,803
	1102	Full time national project assistant (at junior researcher rate) @$385 pm	4,206	4,440	4,660	4,896	18,202
	GHANA						
	1103	Full time national project coordinator (at senior researcher rate) @$1745 pm	22,643	21,207	19,221	20,696	83,766
	1104	Full time national project assistant (at junior researcher rate) @$419 pm	5,434	5,090	4,613	4,967	20,104
	UGANDA						
	1105	Full time national project coordinator (at senior researcher rate) @$1738 pm	20,231	23,963	19,527	19,682	83,403
	ZAMBIA						
	1106	Full time national project coordinator (at senior researcher rate) @$1782 pm	18,315	22,839	21,301	23,100	85,555
	1107	Full time national project assistant (at junior researcher rate) @$1248 pm	12,821	15,987	14,911	16,170	59,889
	CABI / IUCN						
	1108	Full time regional project coordinator @$7917 pm	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	380,000
	1109	Full time regional project administrator @$3125 pm	37,500	37,500	37,500	37,500	150,000
	1199	**Sub-total**	**233,208**	**243,351**	**234,307**	**239,856**	**950,722**
1200	Consultants						
	ETHIOPIA						
	1201	Consultants for national IAS strategy, action plan & guidelines (0.8 pm @$100 p/d)	1,119	1,234	0	0	2,354
	1202	Consultants to develop and implement publicity and awareness campaigns on IAS (1.6 pm @$100 p/d)	3,634	0	1,283	0	4,917
	1203	Consultants to develop risk analysis procedures and guidelines for IAS (2.9 pm @$100 p/d)	4,268	4,482	0	0	8,750
	1204	Consultants to monitor and document effects biodiversity effects of IAS (5.3 pm @ $100 p/d)	5,900	3,175	3,333	3,491	15,899
	1205	Consultants to facilitate training programmes (2.6 pm @$100 p/d)	1,811	1,901	1,992	2,083	7,787
	1206	Consultants to establish and implement m & e plan (2.8 pm @$100 p/d)	1,913	2,021	2,121	2,225	8,279
	1207	Consultants to map invasive species infestation levels (3.3 pm @$100 p/d)	5,000	0	0	5,000	10,000
	1208	Consultants - Environmental Impact Assessment for pilot IAS control projects (5.4 pm @$100 p/d)	16,200	0	0	0	16,200
	GHANA						
	1209	Consultants for national IAS strategy, action plan & guidelines (3 pm @$100 p/d)	9,359	0	0	0	9,359
	1210	Consultants to develop financing mechanisms for IAS activities (1.6 pm @$100 p/d)	377	0	0	4,469	4,847
	1211	Consultants to develop and implement publicity and awareness campaigns on IAS (4.5 pm @$100 p/d)	8,302	707	3,692	690	13,391
	1212	Consultants to develop risk analysis procedures and guidelines for IAS (1.3 pm @$100 p/d)	3,774	0	0	0	3,774
	1213	Consultants to monitor and document effects biodiversity effects of IAS (9 pm @$100 p/d)	6,257	7,258	6,578	7,082	27,176
	1214	Consultants to facilitate training programmes (2.3 pm @$100 p/d)	1,887	1,767	1,602	1,725	6,980
	1215	Consultants to establish and implement m & e plan 2.3 pm @$100 p/d)	1,614	1,704	1,789	1,877	6,984
	1216	Consultants to map invasive species infestation levels (6.5 pm @$100 p/d)	5,283	4,948	4,485	4,829	19,545
	1217	Consultants - Environmental Impact Assessment for pilot IAS control projects (3.6 pm @$100 p/d)	10,906	0	0	0	10,906

		UGANDA					
	1218	Consultants for national IAS strategy, action plan & guidelines (7.5 pm @$100 p/d)	13,853	6,186	2,363	0	22,402
	1219	Consultants to develop financing mechanisms for IAS activities (2.8 pm @$100 p/d)	2,504	5,931	0	0	8,435
	1220	Consultants to develop and implement publicity and awareness campaigns on IAS (4 pm @$100 p/d)	3,237	2,636	3,124	3,149	12,146
	1221	Consultants to develop risk analysis procedures and guidelines for IAS (6.2 pm @$100 p/d)	18,697	0	0	0	18,697
	1222	Consultants to monitor and document effects biodiversity effects of IAS (19.5 pm @$100 p/d)	17,483	17,829	11,581	11,713	58,607
	1223	Consultants to facilitate training programmes (4.3 pm @$100 p/d)	12,948	0	0	0	12,948
	1224	Consultants to establish and implement m & e plan (2.4 pm @$100 p/d)	1,681	1,775	1,863	1,955	7,274
	1225	Consultants to map invasive species infestation levels (4 pm @$100 p/d)	2,951	9,226	0	0	12,177
	1226	Consultants - Environmental Impact Assessment for pilot IAS control projects (5.6 pm @$100 p/d)	15,000	1,917	0	0	16,917
		ZAMBIA					
	1227	Consultants to develop financing mechanisms for IAS activities (1.4 pm @$100 p/d)	916	1,142	1,065	1,155	4,278
	1228	Consultants to develop and implement publicity and awareness campaigns on IAS (3.8 pm @$100 p/d)	0	7,724	1,878	2,037	11,639
	1229	Consultants to develop risk analysis procedures and guidelines for IAS (6.2 pm @$100 p/d)	0	0	8,861	9,610	18,471
	1230	Consultants to monitor and document effects biodiversity effects of IAS (8.6 pm @$100 p/d)	0	10,181	8,361	7,320	25,861
	1231	Consultants to facilitate training programmes (1.4 pm @$100 p/d)	916	1,142	1,065	1,155	4,278
	1232	Consultants to establish and implement m & e plan (2.6 pm @$100 p/d)	1,769	1,869	1,961	2,058	7,656
	1233	Consultants to map invasive species infestation levels (6.8 pm @$100 p/d)	7,524	1,827	1,704	9,490	20,546
	1234	Consultants - Environmental Impact Assessment for pilot IAS control projects (3.6 pm @$100 p/d)	10,000	914	0	0	10,914
	1299	**Sub-total**	**197,084**	**99,495**	**70,701**	**83,113**	**450,393**
1600		Travel on Official Business					
		CABI / IUCN					
	1601	Local travel and subsistence	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	20,000
	1602	International travel	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	80,000
	1699	**Sub-total**	**25,000**	**25,000**	**25,000**	**25,000**	**100,000**
1999		**Component Total**	**455,292**	**367,846**	**330,008**	**347,969**	**1,501,115**
20		**SUB CONTRACT COMPONENT**					
2200		Subcontracts					
		CABI / IUCN					
	2201	IUCN - for project sub-coordinator @$4167 pm	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	200,000
	2202	Sub - Contract with Ethiopia	400,006	167,714	146,633	123,457	837,810
	2203	Sub - Contract with Ghana	311,717	211,792	134,475	135,184	793,169
	2204	Sub - Contract with Uganda	193,130	281,875	157,133	114,855	746,993
	2205	Sub - Contract with Zambia	160,435	252,059	164,003	174,417	750,914
	2299	**Sub-total**	**1,115,288**	**963,441**	**652,243**	**597,913**	**3,328,885**
2999		**Component Total**	**1,115,288**	**963,441**	**652,243**	**597,913**	**3,328,885**
30		**TRAINING COMPONENT**					
3300		Group Training					
		CABI / IUCN					
	3301	International project meetings(inc. MTR)	12,500	12,500	12,500	12,500	50,000

	3399	**Sub-total**	**12,500**	**12,500**	**12,500**	**12,500**	**50,000**
3999	**Component Total**		**12,500**	**12,500**	**12,500**	**12,500**	**50,000**
40	**EQUIPMENT AND PREMISES COMPONENT**						
4100	Expendable Equipment						
	CABI / IUCN						
	4101	Field, lab and office consumables for project management	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500	30,000
	4199	**Sub-total**	**7,500**	**7,500**	**7,500**	**7,500**	**30,000**
4200	Non-expendable Equipment						
	CABI / IUCN						
	4201	Non-expendable equipment for project management	20,000	0	0	0	20,000
	4299	**Sub-total**	**20,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**20,000**
4999	**Component Total**		**27,500**	**7,500**	**7,500**	**7,500**	**50,000**
50	**MISCELLANEOUS COMPONENT**						
	Reporting Costs						
5200							
	CABI / IUCN						
	5201	Reporting costs for project management	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	40,000
	5202	Project Auditing (4 persone months)	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	10,000
	5299	**Sub-total**	**12,500**	**12,500**	**12,500**	**12,500**	**50,000**
5300	Sundry						
	CABI / IUCN						
	5301	Communication for project management	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	20,000
	5399	**Sub-total**	**5,000**	**5,000**	**5,000**	**5,000**	**20,000**
5999	**Component Total**		**17,500**	**17,500**	**17,500**	**17,500**	**70,000**
99	**GRAND TOTAL**		**1,628,080**	**1,368,787**	**1,019,751**	**983,383**	**5,000,000**

SUMMARY						
ETHIOPIA	**461,115**	**202,291**	**177,596**	**158,998**	**1,000,000**
GHANA	**387,553**	**254,474**	**176,454**	**181,519**	**1,000,000**
UGANDA	**301,716**	**351,339**	**195,591**	**151,354**	**1,000,000**
ZAMBIA	**212,695**	**315,683**	**225,110**	**246,512**	**1,000,000**
CABI / IUCN	**265,000**	**245,000**	**245,000**	**245,000**	**1,000,000**
TOTAL	**1,628,080**	**1,368,787**	**1,019,751**	**983,383**	**5,000,000**

Annex Z: List of Equipment, Ethiopia

UNEP Code	Country	Objects of expenditure	Total (US$)
4201	Ethiopia	UPS	1,030
4201	Ethiopia	GPS x3	2,576
4201	Ethiopia	Laptop computer	2,061
4201	Ethiopia	Desktop computer	1,702
4201	Ethiopia	Electric Generators x3	7,612
4201	Ethiopia	Motorized Chainsaw	3,950
4201	Ethiopia	Hammer mill for production of briquets from Prosopis	39,040
	Ethiopia		**57,971**
4202	Ethiopia	Scanner	831
4202	Ethiopia	Microscope (binocular)	1,884
4202	Ethiopia	Spraying equipment	884
4202	Ethiopia	Sensitive balance	1,179
4202	Ethiopia	Insect rearing facilities	2,953
4202	Ethiopia	Specimen cabinet for MoRAD and for pilot sites	1,297
4202	Ethiopia	Refrigerator (7 for MoRAD and one each for pilot sites 1 and 2)	6,387
4202	Ethiopia	Printer	2,594
4202	Ethiopia	Photocopier for EPA	2,947
4202	Ethiopia	Microscope (compound)	8,253
4202	Ethiopia	Greenhouse facilities	11,790
4202	Ethiopia	Incubator/ Growth Chamber	11,790
	Ethiopia		**52,788**
4203	Ethiopia	Motor cycles (two each for pilot sites 1 & 2)	5,000
4203	Ethiopia	Vehicle (double cabin pickup) for pilot site I - terrestrial areas of Upper Awash and Rift Valley Lakes (Parthenium hysterophorus + Eichhornia crassipes)	16,505
4203	Ethiopia	Vehicle (double cabin pickup) for pilot site II - Amibara and Eastern Ethiopia (Prosopis juliflora + Parthenium hysterophorus)	16,505
	Ethiopia		**38,011**
4204	Ethiopia	Furniture	2,277
4204	Ethiopia	Digital still camera	589
4204	Ethiopia	Laptop computer	2,061
4204	Ethiopia	Desktop computer	1,702
4204	Ethiopia	Digital video camera	1,179
4204	Ethiopia	Multimedia Projector	1,768
4204	Ethiopia	Photocopier for Coordination Unit	2,947
	Ethiopia		**12,524**