



PROJECT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
REQUEST FOR COUNCIL WORK PROGRAM INCLUSION
UNDER THE GEF TRUST FUND

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 1620

IA/EXA'S PROJECT ID: 3820, Proposal ID: 00045017

COUNTRY: Republic of Seychelles

PROJECT TITLE: Seychelles IEM Programme: Mainstreaming Prevention and Control Measures for Invasive Alien Species into Trade, Transport and Travel across the Production Landscape

GEF IA/EXA: UNDP

OTHER EXECUTING AGENCY(IES): Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources

DURATION: 5 YEARS

GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity

GEF STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES: Primary SO: BD-2: Mainstream Biodiversity in Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors
 Secondary SO: BD-4: Generation, Dissemination, and Uptake of Good Practices for Addressing Current and Emerging Biodiversity Issues

GEF OPERATIONAL PROGRAM: OP 2 (Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems); OP 3 (Forest Ecosystems)

PIPELINE ENTRY DATE: 12-06-2003

EXPECTED STARTING DATE: September 2007

EXPECTED CEO ENDORSEMENT: August 2007

IA/EXA FEE: US\$ 180,000

FINANCING PLAN (\$)		
	PPG	Project*
GEF Total		2,000,000
Co-financing	(provide details in Section b: Co-financing)	
GEF IA/ExA		
Government		1,650,000
Others		2,955,000
Co-financing Total		4,605,000
Total		6,605,000
Financing for Associated Activities If Any:		

* for multi-focal projects, indicate agreed split between focal area allocations

FOR JOINT PARTNERSHIP**		
GEF PROJECT/COMPONENT (\$)		
(Agency Name)	(Share)	(Fee)
(Agency Name)	(Share)	(Fee)
(Agency Name)	(Share)	(Fee)

** Projects that are jointly implemented by more than one IA or ExA

CONTRIBUTION TO KEY INDICATORS IDENTIFIED IN THE FOCAL AREA STRATEGIES:

Increase in production area under effective conservation management: EOP Target: 1,374,000km² (Seychelles Exclusive Economic Zone).

Approved on behalf of the *United Nations Development Programme*. This proposal has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the standards of the GEF Project Review Criteria for work program inclusion.

Y. Glemarec

Yannick Glemarec
 UNDP Deputy Executive Coordinator

Date: April 18, 2007

Project Contact Person
 Nik Sekhran, Regional Coordinator UNDP/GEF
 Pretoria, South Africa Tel: (27) 12 354 8131
Nik.Sekhran@undp.org

1. PROJECT SUMMARY

PROJECT RATIONALE, OBJECTIVE, OUTCOMES, AND OUTPUTS/ACTIVITIES.

1. **Summary:** The Seychelles islands are a repository of globally significant biodiversity that has evolved in isolation to the biota of the Continental landmasses. The islands are part of a Global Conservation Hotspot: Madagascar and the Indian Ocean Islands. The ecological integrity of the islands is still generally better than those in many small island states. However, biodiversity is threatened by Invasive alien species (IAS) brought into the country through the trade, travel and transportation sectors. IAS comprise the single greatest singular threat to native species and habitats. Invasive plants out-compete and smother the native flora, while invasive animals similarly out-compete and prey on the fauna. The Seychelles currently has an inadequate internal framework for controlling the entry of IAS into, and their spread within, the archipelago. The country has taken impressive steps to eradicate invasive alien species from small islands and to restore small island ecosystems. It is taking a number of actions to eradicate invasive fauna and control weeds on larger islands, where technology permits. However, such investments make little sense as long as the door is left open to the arrival of new IAS and there is a risk of re-invasion.

2. The Government of Seychelles has established a comprehensive Environment Management Plan (EMPS) aimed at addressing a number of environmental challenges, including biodiversity conservation. With the assistance of UNDP-GEF it has initiated a Programme, known as the Integrated Ecosystem Management (IEM) Programme, to address threats to biodiversity stemming from production sector activities. The Biosecurity Project aims at addressing the threats posed to the Seychelles' biodiversity by the introduction of IAS through the movement of people and merchandise into and within the country. Working on the principle that 'prevention is better than the cure', the project will address three sets of barriers to addressing this threat, namely capacity deficits inherent in the policy and legislative framework, capacity weaknesses within institutions, and inadequate technical capabilities. Interventions are geared towards improving the effectiveness of institutions mandated with regulating trade, travel and transport, and changing attitudes amongst production enterprises and the citizenry at large regarding the risks posed by IAS to the natural environment and economy. Measures to halt the inter-island spread of IAS already established on some islands will be instituted together with a robust monitoring system to assess their efficacy and inform national management responses. Finally, the project will establish a knowledge management facility to ensure that control schemes for different IAS are being undertaken with full access to information regarding the relative efficacy and the costs of different treatment options.

3. The project complements a second initiative under the IEM Programme, the UNDP-GEF Mainstreaming Biodiversity Management into Production Sector Activities Project, which addresses the direct threats to biodiversity associated with the two main production sectors, namely tourism and artisanal fisheries. However, it differs from that initiative by focusing on the entire production landscape of the country, and sectors across the economic spectrum, rather than vertically within specific sectors.

4. **Environment Context:** The Seychelles comprises a total of 155 islands, located in the Western Indian Ocean between 3 and 10 degrees south of the equator and between longitude 46 and 57 degrees east. It has a landmass of 455 square kilometres, and an Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of 1.374 million km². A total of 42 islands are of granitic origin (known as the 'Inner' Islands) and the rest are coralline (the 'Outer' Islands). The main terrestrial habitats of the granitic islands are: a) beach and dune vegetation; b) lowland and coastal forests up to 200-300m; c) intermediate forests from 200 to 500m altitude; d) granite inselbergs or "glacis" outcroppings, and; e) mountain mist forests over 400-500m. The coralline islands are characterized by a mixed scrub vegetation and the Pemphis thicket type where sea water penetrates the limestone. The coastal and marine habitats include a variety of wetland types, rocky shores and sandy shores, and 1,690 km² of coral reefs, which include: a) fringing reefs; b) coral atolls and c) platform reefs.

5. **Global Significance of Biodiversity:** The unique biodiversity of Seychelles has developed largely because of its long history of geological isolation, allowing evolution to follow its own course in relative isolation from that on the continental land masses. The rate of terrestrial endemism is particularly high on the granitic islands. The granitic islands are a repository of over 80 endemic species of flowering plants, 10

endemic species of ferns and 62 endemic species of bryophytes. The coralline islands are small, flat and geologically much younger. While still diverse, they do not harbour the same degree of species endemism as the granitic islands. The marine ecosystems of Seychelles are much less well known and documented. However, recent surveys have documented an exceptional level of marine biodiversity. The position of Seychelles in the central southwest Indian Ocean ensures that these islands act as stepping-stones for marine dispersal between the eastern Indian Ocean/western Pacific and West Indian Ocean. Additional information on the biodiversity heritage is provided in Sections 1.A.1/2 of the Project Document.

6. **Threats to Biodiversity:** The biodiversity of Seychelles is not as severely threatened as that of most other small islands. However, threats associated with production sectors continue to grow and uncertainty exists as to their trajectory. Historical records indicate that the 'inner' islands were originally covered by dense forests, supporting large populations of birds and reptiles. Invasive alien species (IAS) brought into the country through trade, travel and transport currently comprise the single greatest threat to terrestrial biodiversity. Seychelles is typical of remote islands in the ecological susceptibility of its terrestrial biodiversity to IAS. IAS out-compete and replace indigenous fauna and flora through predation, elimination of natural regeneration, introduction of diseases and smothering by creepers. Animal IAS, like rats, feral cats and other predators, can be devastating to the avifauna and small fauna, reducing levels of recruitment. Marine IAS also pose a threat of unquantified magnitude to Seychelles' marine biodiversity.

7. The introduction of IAS into Seychelles has long been associated with trade, transport and the movement of people. Dramatic economic transformations have taken place within the past 35 years. Access to the Islands has improved dramatically in this period, following the construction of an airport on Mahé in 1971, able to handle long range aircraft and improvement of infrastructure at the main port in Victoria. The nature of the IAS threats has changed dramatically as a result of the improved accessibility of the country. Imports are handled through the seaport at Victoria on the island of Mahé as either bulk cargo or in refrigerated or non-refrigerated cargo containers, or through the international airport on Mahé in air containers. At the seaport, visual inspections of goods are currently undertaken in the open or within the warehouse, where local produce is also stored, without any safeguards against the escape of IAS. At the airport, the clearance is undertaken within the bond store, which lacks the facilities to examine produce for infestations. There are no treatment facilities other than an incinerator, which has been recently installed. Rising living standards have led the Seychellois to pay more attention to homestead beautification, resulting in increased planting of ornamental plants around homes. The risks posed by the introduction of ornamentals have not been properly assessed.

8. Marine IAS have not been identified as a major problem to this date, but there is reason for concern. A recent quick port survey in Victoria harbour found 3 non-indigenous introduced marine species in the port of Victoria¹. The main pathways for introduction of marine IAS are normally the exchange of ballast water and hull fouling from ships. The newly introduced species in Seychelles are likely introduced through hull fouling or in ships' seachests, as ballast water exchange is not a major issue in Seychelles since most ships arriving in port import goods to Seychelles, and hence take in rather than discharge ballast water. For most marine IAS, eradication by physical removal or chemical treatment has not been cost-effective. In the absence of quantitative information on the species' distribution and local impacts, management should be directed toward preventing the introduction and spread of marine IAS to locations where they do not presently occur. Such management will require better understanding of the frequency of movements by vessels to and from Port Victoria and improved procedures for hull maintenance and domestic ballast transfer by vessels.

9. Further information on the threats to biodiversity posed in IAS is provided in Section IB 1 of the Project Document and in Annex I. Annex V provides trade data related to possible IAS incursions; Table V.3 lists

¹ Three newly found marine spp. in survey: *Erichthonius braziliensis*, *Stenothoe valida*, *Mycale cf. Cecilia*. An earlier introduced freshwater spp. (for consumption) is *Oreochromis mossambicus* (Mozambican Tilapia), which is now regarded as invasive and can already be found in brackish waters around the port.

the potential pests that might be imported through currently traded fresh food and vegetables.

10. **Socio-Economic Profile:** Some 90% of the population of 81,200 (2002 census) live on the main island of Mahé. Most of the physical development is concentrated on the narrow coastal plains of the main granitic islands of Mahé, Praslin and La Digue. Since 1971, the economy has been transformed from a quasi mono-crop agricultural economy (based on cinnamon and coconut) to a dual economy heavily dependent on tourism and fishing, and highly vulnerable to external economic factors. The Seychelles faces the typical constraints of a SIDS, with its small land area and population, remoteness from major markets, limited natural resources and environmental vulnerability. Its most important assets are the truly rare beauty of the environment, and a significant fishery resource, which comprises pelagic and various coastal stocks. Biodiversity underpins most economic activities, especially the two main sectors of fisheries and tourism.

11. **Policy Context:** There is a strong policy framework for environmental management and for biodiversity conservation in the Seychelles. Environmental concerns are embedded in the Seychelles' constitution and guided by the second Environment Management Plan of Seychelles (EMPS) for the term 2000 – 2010. The EMPS 2000 – 2010 is the country's leading sustainable development strategy document and stresses the need to integrate environment management concerns into other development sectors. A specific Invasive Species Management Programme under the EMPS has as an output: "National control, mitigation and prevention established". Other pertinent policy documents addressing IAS are: National Biodiversity Strategy and Action plan (NBSAP, 1997), a newly developed National Biosafety Framework with an accompanying Action Plan (2005), the National Capacity Self-Assessment Action Plan (2005), and sector-specific policy such as the Seychelles Forest Management Plan (1993); National Strategy for Plant Conservation (2005); National Wetland Conservation and Management Policy (2006); and the National Agricultural Policy (2003-2013). See Section 1A.6 of the Project Document for further information.

12. **Legal Context:** The key pieces of national legislation which have a bearing on the control of IAS are as follows: the Plant Protection Act (1996); Animals (Disease and Imports) Act (1981); the Quarantine Act (1948); the Breadfruit and Other Trees (Protection) Act (1917); the Wild Animals and Birds Protection Act (1961) and regulations; the Fisheries Act (1986) and regulations; the Trades Tax Act 1992 (amended 1994) and the Trades Tax regulations 1997; and the Merchant Shipping Act (1975). A Biosafety Act is currently being drafted. Seychelles is a signatory to the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and abides by the International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM). Seychelles is about to sign the International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments under the International Maritime Organization (IMO), adopted to prevent the spread of harmful aquatic invasive alien organisms carried by ships' ballast water. Seychelles is not a signatory to the Office International des Epizooties (World Animal Health Organisation - OIE), but accepts OIE standards which regulate imports of animals and animal products. Seychelles ratified the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in 2004. Further information on the national legislation and international conventions relevant to IAS is provided in Section 1A.6 of the Project Document.

13. **Institutional Context:** The Department of Environment (DOE), under the Ministry of Environment & Natural Resources (MENR), has prime responsibility for environmental management; the Conservation Section houses an IAS management unit and the Director Conservation is chairperson of the multi-stakeholder IAS Committee. The Department of Natural Resources (DONR) under MENR is responsible for Agriculture and Fisheries, and houses the Plant Protection and Veterinary Sections that are responsible for agricultural quarantine. The Plant Protection Section acts as the National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) under the IPPC for the control over the entry, establishment, and spread of pests/IAS, and as such acts as an inspection agency at ports of entry and issues International Phytosanitary Certificates. The Maritime Safety Administration (MSA) under the Department of Transport is the designated authority for the Ballast Water Management Convention. A number of agencies are responsible for regulating the movement of goods and people into and within the country: Immigration, Customs (Trades Tax Department), Transport Security Division, Coast Guard, Police, Islands Development Company (IDC) and the Department of Health. Seychelles has a vibrant environmental NGO (ENGO) community that has developed a range of working partnerships with tourism operators for the control of IAS on small islands. The Seychelles Chamber of Commerce and Industries (SCCI) represents business interests. A multi-stakeholder Invasive Alien Species

Committee meets irregularly to discuss matters concerning the prevention and control of Invasive Alien Species. See Section 1A.7 of the Project Document for more information.

GEF Expected Achievements / Reasons for Involvement

14. The **Baseline** is the “business-as-usual” scenario that would take place during the next 5 years in the absence of the planned project. Baseline activities are described in the above sections on Policy, Legal and Institutional Context above, as well as in Section IB.2, and summarised in Table 8 of the Project Document. In a business-as-usual situation, a range of activities pertaining to the management of the threats posed by IAS would be undertaken, that would have positive impacts on native ecosystems. However, baseline activities would address threats to biodiversity from IAS in a fragmented fashion, leaving critical gaps. Seychelles has been a pioneer of IAS control efforts, particularly efforts to eradicate IAS on small islands and rehabilitate small island habitats, with ENGOs taking a strong lead in this endeavour. The feasibility and benefits of IAS eradication on small islands has been demonstrated, though the costs are high. These investments will make little sense as long as the door is left open to the new arrival of IAS. There are significant weaknesses in the sanitary and quarantine control framework for imported produce.

15. Although the Government has established policies, regulations and infrastructure to perform its duties under applicable international law and national legislation dealing with phytosanitary issues, there is a need to improve the effectiveness of management strategies and responses (i.e. through identifying risks and gearing interventions towards reducing the highest risks). This is expected to improve the efficacy and cost effectiveness of interventions. Furthermore, lessons and best practices on IAS eradication and habitat restoration efforts need to be established and disseminated. These measures need to be accompanied by awareness-raising to garner support from decision makers, the identified risk groups and the general public at large. Additional measures to improve the efficacy of current controls are particularly critical in light of the increasing probability of IAS invasions emanating from increased trade and the movement of goods and people.

Normative Solutions needed to Address Threats and Barriers to its Realisation

16. Under the Baseline scenario, new IAS would continue to enter the country and spread between islands with potentially catastrophic consequences for native flora and fauna. Under the Normative Solution, the Seychelles will be applying the principle that ‘prevention is better than cure’. The country will have developed strong institutional capacities to prevent the entry of new IAS into the country that pose a risk to biodiversity, and thus will have improved the level of security for native species threatened by potential new IAS. In particular, capacities will be in place for a) assessing the relative risks posed by the different pathways for entry; and b) instituting effective control programmes to minimise entry of IAS by the identified pathways. Production activities in the trade, transport and travel sectors will have been adapted, to improve controls. This will be driven both by regulatory enforcement and voluntary action by businesses. There will have been an attitudinal shift amongst the citizenry concerning the importance of IAS controls, which are presently sometimes seen as needlessly punitive. Measures to halt the inter-island spread of IAS already established on some islands will be formalized and put in place. Monitoring systems will be assessing the efficacy of the control measures, and informing management actions. Finally, control and eradication schemes for IAS will be undertaken with full access to knowledge on the efficacy and costs of different treatment options, and with access to a community of practice constituted by local experts—but with ready access to international expertise through established networks.

17. There are a number of barriers impeding the control of IAS in the production landscape, and realisation of the afore-mentioned normative solution. These barriers are briefly summarised below, and are further elaborated in Section 1b3 of the Project Document and in Annex I: Threats and Root Causes Matrix.

18. **Capacity deficits at the systemic level:** Although the policy framework for biodiversity conservation is generally sound, there are a number of gaps with respect to the decision support process. The absence of a comprehensive information system on IAS, coupled with economic data on the relative costs and benefits of IAS control, is a constraint to effective mainstreaming of control efforts in the production landscape. The

legal framework governing IAS prevention activities is currently largely outdated, and not wholly compliant with international standards and guidelines. There are also inconsistencies between the different pieces of legislation governing IAS, trade and immigration matters. The mechanisms for integrating environmental management into long-term, cross sectoral development planning processes currently have significant weaknesses. The respective roles and responsibilities of the Government, private sector and NGOs need to be defined in order to ensure efficient use of the limited expertise available within the country. Ad hoc awareness campaigns on the identification and threat of IAS are being undertaken; however, no comprehensive awareness or communications plan on IAS exists.

19. Limited capacities at the institutional level: Institutional weaknesses serve as a barrier to the institution of effective quarantine systems guarding against the entry of IAS. Capacity will need to be strengthened within institutions responsible for these functions. A complicating factor in strengthening institutional effectiveness is that regulatory authority is split between agencies and is generally poorly coordinated. Seychelles has very little functional capacity to prevent the entry (or re-entry) of IAS into the country or between islands. At present, there is de facto open access entry into the country of fresh fruits and vegetables, grain (with associated weed seeds), timber products and ornamental plants. The facilities and equipment at both the airport and seaport are inadequate for the safe clearance of goods and passengers, and there are limited effective treatment facilities if alien pest infestations are detected. The practical management of marine IAS presents particular problems for Seychelles, which has limited resources and facilities. There is a need to strengthen the capacity of the Maritime Safety Administration to prevent the introduction and spread of marine IAS through shipping (mainly ships' ballast water and hull fouling), and to ensure that activities are properly coordinated with those of other agencies concerned with IAS management.

20. Technical capability and knowledge systems: The capacity to identify pathways, commodities and organisms that present an IAS risk, to evaluate the effectiveness of management systems and to effectively capture and adapt practices to ensure effective control and eradication measures, is weak. Within the country there is no common agreed list of priority alien species that should be monitored, or controlled as invasives. No complete island-by-island inventory exists of IAS and species considered to be at risk. Despite considerable practical experience in eradicating IAS from, and restoring habitats on small islands, there are no agreed models. This is compounded by a failure to document "lessons learned" or "best practices" for control of IAS. There is no coordinated information management system for IAS.

21. The role of the GEF will be to lift these barriers, and thus ensure the attainment of the normative solution. The GEF investment will build on the existing policy and institutional framework, and quarantine/phytosanitary control systems, covering the incremental costs of ensuring that biodiversity management objectives pertaining to IAS are mainstreamed into the production practices of the travel, transport and trade sectors. This will involve expanding the management paradigm, to improve risk management (risk identification and action prioritisation), interception systems, and private sector involvement. This will ensure that Seychelles' biodiversity is effectively safeguarded against the threats posed by IAS, and hence improve the conservation status of globally important ecosystems and endangered species. Improved control over the introduction and spread of IAS within Seychelles will also impede further regional and global spread of these IAS.

Main Incremental Actions / Innovations

PROJECT STRATEGY AND APPROACH

22. The Biosecurity Project is one of two initiatives being pursued under the Seychelles Integrated Ecosystem Management Programme, designed to assist in implementation of core elements of the EMPS pertaining to biodiversity management. The Programme is geared to mainstreaming biodiversity management into the production activities of the main production sectors, and addressing threats to biodiversity across the production landscape. The Overall Goal of the Programme is: **The functional integrity of the terrestrial and coastal ecosystems is secured now and into the future, thus providing a base for sustainable development.** The Programme has been segmented into two projects because the strategies and interventions needed to mainstream biodiversity management into specific production sectors on the one hand, and across

the production landscape as a whole, are necessarily different.

23. The associated project in the IEM Programme is the Mainstreaming Biodiversity Management into Production Sector Activities Project. That project aims at mainstreaming biodiversity management objectives into the activities of the two principle production sectors in the Seychelles, namely tourism and artisanal fisheries. The project is designed to address threats deriving from, and conservation opportunities embedded in, these sectors, working vertically along the supply chain to improve production and marketing practices. The Project was approved by the GEF in June 2006 for a sum of US\$4 million, including US\$0.3 million in preparatory assistance funds and co-finance totalling US\$7.59 million. The two projects are designed to allow each strategy to be given better definition and focus with a view to optimizing impacts. However, the projects will be implemented in close association under the same steering mechanisms, thus ensuring strong synergies in effort and making best use of capacities.

24. The Mainstreaming Biosecurity project –for which funding is requested herein– will address the broader threat associated with the introduction and spread of alien invasive species into the archipelago. This threat derives from trade and commerce, transport and the movement of people, and has its roots in cross sectoral economic activities including services, tourism, fisheries and agriculture. Interventions will focus on fortifying import controls to reduce this risk, installing control measures to prevent the spread within the country, and engendering voluntary measures by enterprises and the citizenry to reduce the level of threat. The Project also aims at distilling and disseminating the best practices for IAS eradication and control.

25. A number of key lessons were distilled from an internal review of previous biodiversity management projects in Seychelles and following a worldwide review of lessons for controlling the introduction of IAS. This included a review of lessons from GEF projects in the Pacific and Galapagos Islands. These are further detailed in Table 15 in the Project Document.

26. The project takes an innovative approach, in so far as managing the Invasive Alien Species from a production sector and landscape approach, as well as emphasizing the control and prevention aspects, summarized in the term “biosecurity”. The approach builds on strategies traditionally undertaken in the agricultural sector (quarantine and phytosanitary measures). Most IAS projects, including those funded by GEF, have in the past mainly concentrated on eradication efforts, which in many cases has not proven to be cost effective. It is expected that this approach will also generate knowledge and best practices that can be replicated in other countries, especially Small Island Developing States (SIDS), undergoing similar threats.

Biosecurity Project: Project Objectives, Outcomes, and Outputs/Activities

OBJECTIVE: Increased capacities to prevent and control the introduction and spread of Invasive Alien Species through Trade, Travel and Transport across the Production landscape.

OUTCOME 1: Enabling conditions for effective control of the introduction and spread of IAS in place.

1.1. An overarching and comprehensive IAS policy developed. A comprehensive IAS policy will be developed to guide the effective prevention and control of the introduction and spread of IAS. The policy will make provision for the creation of a Biosecurity Service, charged with coordinating and undertaking all the necessary functions to manage the introduction of IAS. The IAS Policy will be harmonized with other relevant plans, programmes and initiatives, including the EMPS, Biosafety and GloBallast Frameworks. The policy will be developed in a participatory manner with ample input from stakeholders spanning the production sectors and civil society groups. Economic valuation of the influence of IAS on the national economy, including on ecosystem services, etc. will be undertaken.

1.2.: National legislative framework dealing with IAS amended and brought in line with international standards. A Biosecurity Act will be drafted in tandem with the developing legal framework for Biosafety out of the draft Plant Protection Bill. The Act will ensure that the functions of the Biosecurity Service are legally binding and meet international norms/ standards. Key components will be:

- Legal framework for setting up of the Biosecurity Service charged with coordinating and undertaking all the necessary functions to manage the introduction of IAS.
- Identification of a Biosecurity Consultative Committee to advise the Minister on the general direction of policy and technical decision making. This will involve strengthening and reformulation of the IAS Committee.
- Powers to require permits for declarations, search for goods, detain, treat and destroy without compensation.

- Capacity to determine import conditions based on risk assessment of pathways and commodities.
- Capacity to charge and retain fees, and to levy fines.
- Requirement for agencies other than Biosecurity Service to provide facilities to permit it to undertake measures.
- Powers to eradicate IAS and to take appropriate actions to restrict spread.
- Inter-island controls against the spread of IAS, notably the formalization of protocols for access of smaller islands.

1.3. Cost Recovery System for Bio-security Service is in place. A system for part-financing of the Biosecurity Service, through the institution of fees for inspection services will be established, to recover the costs of operation. This will require the inclusion in the legislation to establish the authority the right to charge fees for the services provided under a set of schedules. Activities that would generate fees would include the following: approval of an import request and issuance of import permits (permits would only be valid for a single importation); assessment of the risks associated with a request for import of a new commodity or from a new source; treatment of a commodity to remove an IAS risk after detection; inspections of commodities at points of entry; maintaining plants or animals in post entry quarantine prior to release; issuance of certificates for export; and fines for non-compliance.

1.4. National Communication Plan / Public Awareness Strategy on IAS management developed and Implemented. A comprehensive public awareness strategy to raise stakeholder awareness of the need for the prevention of the introduction of IAS into the country and control of establishment and spread within the country will be developed. Targeted awareness programmes on IAS will be implemented, with a view to engendering attitudinal change. This will include the design, production and broadcasting of information through a range of media, targeting specific stakeholders. NGOs that have an already acquired expertise in this regard will take the lead in these programmes. All targeted awareness programmes will be monitored and evaluated in a participatory manner, involving all major stakeholders, in order to adapt the campaign to address emerging needs and circumstances

OUTCOME 2: Strengthened Institutional capacity to prevent and control the introduction and spread of IAS.

2.1. “Biosecurity Service” created. An institutional review of the quarantine and control functions, both at national borders and between islands will be completed. This will include an evaluation of the identifiable threats of specific IAS in all production sectors. A Biosecurity Service will be created by consolidating the IAS control and quarantine functions that are currently shared between the Plant Protection and Veterinary Sections of DONR, and the Nature Conservation Division of DOE. The Service would report to the Minister for Environment and Natural Resources. At the operational level, the Biosecurity Service will enter into Memoranda of Understanding with the Trades Tax Department (Customs), Immigration, Environmental Health, Transport Security (Police), Island Development Company (IDC) and Maritime Safety Administration (MSA) with a view to coordinate inspection activities at the airports and wharves, both for international and domestic (inter-island) transport. A new position of Chief Biosecurity Officer within the DONR will be created, who will have the mandate to ensure that all biosecurity activities are properly coordinated and adhered to.

2.2. Biosecurity Service equipped and staffed with capacitated human resources. Capacities to conduct inspections, carry out effective control measures, and enforce compliance with the revised Biosecurity regulations will be enhanced, both within and outside (immigration, customs, MSA) of the Biosecurity Service. The project will enhance the capacity of the Biosecurity Service to function in accordance with international guidelines (IPPC, IMO-Globallast, OIE and others) and to conduct risk assessments, inspections and to undertake treatments through the provision of equipment and training. This will entail the establishment of secure commodity, conveyance and passenger inspection facilities at the international and domestic seaports, airports and at the premises of importers. Furthermore, the project will provide funds to develop a comprehensive Biosecurity Operational Manual for inspection and quarantine, for use by inspectors. The capacity of inspectors to identify IAS and undertake diagnostic tests will be strengthened.

OUTCOME 3: Improved knowledge and learning capacities to control the introduction, establishment and spread of IAS

3.1. IAS baseline established. A comprehensive baseline of nationally significant native and invasive plants and animals will be established by compiling all previous information on IAS and by conducting participatory surveys where necessary. This should provide the necessary information on the different species, abundance and distribution of IAS in the country, and thereby their potential threat to sensitive and priority habitats. The survey will involve ENGOs, Wildlife Clubs, private hotels and entrepreneurs and other stakeholders, partly as a means of awareness raising and also to encourage these stakeholders to participate in a voluntary network for the monitoring of the spread of IAS. This will also entail enhancement of the current survey activities of various government agencies and ENGOs, in order to develop and adopt a standardized methodology for survey techniques and data management. This will lead to the development of a national database, linked with international networks, that needs continual updating. A National Network for the monitoring of the establishment and spread of IAS will be established, comprising of all relevant stakeholders (Government, NGO, private).

3.2. Lessons learned and best practices on IAS eradication & control, and habitat restoration established and disseminated. A review of past and current IAS eradication practices and an evaluation of their effectiveness and efficiency

will be undertaken with a view to documenting lessons and establishing protocols to improve the efficacy and cost effectiveness of IAS control activities. This will cover important IAS and different habitat needs. IAS eradication and restoration protocols/manuals will be developed. There will be on-going evaluation and revision of the eradication protocols/ manuals. The Biosecurity Service will be responsible for helping to prioritise and coordinate IAS control activities based on the protocols / manuals, undertaken by (partnerships of) NGOs, Government or Private Sector. Provision is made for site based demonstrations in the partner project “Mainstreaming Biodiversity Management into Production Sector Activities”. Information generated through the knowledge facility will be shared regionally and internationally, e.g. through the Global Invasive Species (GISP) and other IAS networks. A national Knowledge & Learning Network will be created, modeled after the recently established Pacific Invasives Learning Network (PILN), to engender learning within the participant network and which will be expanded to a regional internet based Indian Ocean Network. This will be complemented by dissemination through scientific, popular or advocacy articles, and participation in external meetings or conferences. The lessons learned and best practices will also feed into awareness and educational activities.

KEY INDICATORS, ASSUMPTIONS, AND RISKS

27. A number of performance indicators have been identified. The Log Frame (Annex B) provides the full list of indicators, baselines and targets.

A sample of the indicators selected:

- ❑ *Well functioning national IAS inspection and quarantine system in place that functions across all production sectors of the country;*
- ❑ *No up-grading or addition of threatened or vulnerable species from Seychelles on IUCN red list of threatened species due to effects of IAS;*
- ❑ *New legislation which conforms with international standards is enacted for IAS prevention, control and management*
- ❑ *% of commodities, conveyances, goods and passengers that are inspected or undergo targeted or random baggage searches for IAS*
- ❑ *Cost effective control and mitigation programmes on IAS in place*

28. The table below presents the risks and the risk mitigation measures identified.

Risk Analysis and Mitigation Measures

Risk	Risk Rating	Risk Mitigation Measures
Cross-cutting enabling conditions		
Conflict between stakeholder groups emerges.	M	Formal MOUs will be used to define roles and responsibilities. Project activities are designed in a way that will require cooperation in order to benefit from project support. Data dissemination and sharing procedures will be established that are mutually beneficial for all concerned.
IAS prevention		
IAS prevention measures lack broad based public support leading to poor compliance.	M	The project will develop an awareness raising output that will specifically target the development of public support for effective IAS prevention and control measures. The status of the Biosecurity Service within Government agencies will be raised.
Increased Trade related risk		
Trade will increase under a liberalized trade regime that is to conform to the rules and agreements under the World Trade Organization (WTO). Liberalised and uncontrolled trade will increase the risk of IAS introductions.	M	Institutional framework to deal with Biosecurity will be strengthened, so that it can deal effectively with increased imports. Economic Partnership Agreements (EPA) with EU are underway; the link between trade and environment, specifically introduction of IAS, will be re-emphasized in the on-going discussions. Assistance to cope with increased and liberalized trade will be sought from EU (under the EPA) and from WTO (under SPS agreement - Seychelles is currently seeking membership of WTO).
Climate Change		

Risk	Risk Rating	Risk Mitigation Measures
Seychelles is likely to witness sea level rise and extended dry spells, which may make conditions more suitable for colonization of certain IAS, e.g: Sea level rise may create “gaps” in lowlying coastal and wetland vegetation, which can be occupied by IAS; Increased forest fires may leave “gaps” in native vegetation; Sea water temperature rise may cause coral die off and gaps in marine ecosystems; Import of more drought tolerant plants for the garden which may “escape”; Changed tolerance levels for new pathogens.	S	Increased prevention and control mechanisms to prevent incursion of IAS. Risk assessments will take into account changing climate conditions. General Climate change adaptation measures will be developed and undertaken, some with international support (e.g. GEF).

*Risk rating – H (High Risk), S (Substantial Risk), M (Modest Risk), and L (Low Risk). Risks refer to the possibility that assumptions, defined in the logical framework in Annex B, may not hold.

2. COUNTRY OWNERSHIP

COUNTRY ELIGIBILITY

29. The Government of Seychelles is a recipient of UNDP assistance and meets the eligibility criteria for GEF Funding. The Country has prioritised the project for funding under the country’s allocation from the GEF Resource Allocation Framework. Seychelles ratified the CBD in 1992. The proposed project will fulfill a number of provisions of the CBD, including Article 6: General Measures for Conservation and Sustainable Use, Article 7: Identification and Monitoring, Article 8: In Situ conservation, Article 10: Sustainable Use Management and Article 12: Capacity Building. The project will play a critical role in achieving the 2010 Biodiversity Target, especially regarding the following goals: a) reducing the loss of biodiversity; b) addressing major threats; and c) maintaining ecosystem integrity. The project will address a number of elements in the thematic work programme on ‘Island Biodiversity’, especially the following targets: “By 2010, 10% of island species are maintained, restored, or their population decline reduced”; and “By 2010, scientific capability, institutional support, legal frameworks, and infrastructure are in place to prevent the introduction, establishment, spread, and negative impacts of high-risk, high-impact alien species to islands....”. The project will also consider the 15 guiding principles for the prevention, introduction and mitigation of impacts of invasive alien species (decision VI/23).

COUNTRY DRIVENNESS

30. There is a strong policy framework for environmental management and for biodiversity conservation in the Seychelles. Environmental concerns are embedded in the Seychelles’ Constitution. Seychelles was the second country to approve the CBD. An energized NGO community has developed that is very active in biodiversity conservation, with particular strengths on IAS eradication and habitat restoration. The country has taken a number of key steps for environmental management that resonate positively for biodiversity conservation, and particularly regarding IAS. These include:

- The Government of Seychelles is a contracting party to the International Plant Protection Convention and, in conformity with the provisions of the Convention, has established the Plant Protection Section within the MENR as the National Plant Protection Organisation (NPPO).
- The country has established a Maritime Safety Administration that administers the International Ballast Water Convention
- There are successful small island IAS eradication and habitat restoration programmes, mainly driven by NGOs in partnership with Government and private tourism operators.

- Total Government co-financing for this project is estimated to be at US\$ 1.65 million, which is a further sign of its commitment.

3. PROGRAM AND POLICY CONFORMITY

FIT TO GEF FOCAL AREA STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND OPERATIONAL PROGRAM

31. The project satisfies the revised **GEF Strategic Priority 2, BD-2**: “Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors”. The project is in line with the stated Objective of: “Internalize the goals of biodiversity conservation and its sustainable use into production systems, supply chains, markets, sectors, development models, policies and programmes”, and therefore contributes to the Outcome: “Biodiversity conserved and sustainably used in production landscapes and seascapes”. A mainstreaming approach is warranted in order to target the root causes of the threat: namely production interests responsible for bringing IAs into the country and facilitating their spread within it. Successful and sustainable threat remediation will require an attitudinal change in these sectors, and remoulding of production practices.

32. The interventions proposed under the project address the eligibility criteria established for BD-2, by: (i) Strengthening the policy foundations to accommodate biodiversity management needs in production activities across an entire production landscape; (ii) Strengthening institutional capacities across production sectors to manage the risks of new alien species’ invasions; (iii) Cultivating broad-based support from production sector interests to control IAS and to sustain control measures once initiated; (iv) Strengthening capacity to undertake strategic environment assessments to gauge the risks from IAS, and guide management responses; (v) Establishing comprehensive knowledge management systems and a community of practice to abet learning vis-à-vis IAS control efforts; and (vi) Providing resources to engender attitudinal change amongst businesses and the citizenry.

33. The Project contributes to the following Indicators of BD-2:

Relevant BD-2 Strategy Indicator	Project’s contribution
At least 10 projects in each production sector (forestry, fisheries, agriculture, and tourism, etc) targeted to mainstreaming biodiversity into the sector.	Project is cross-cutting across the production landscape, but has particular reference to the national agriculture, trade and transport sectors.
At least 75 million hectares in production landscapes and seascapes that contribute to biodiversity conservation or the sustainable use of its components.	Project will ensure improved protection from entry and spread of Invasive Alien Species for the whole of the Seychelles Exclusive Economic Zone, i.e. 1.374 million km ²
70 % of projects in each sector have supported the incorporation of biodiversity aspects into a) sector policies and plans at national and sub-national levels; b) legislation; c) implementation of regulations and its enforcement, and d) monitoring of enforcement.	Project will establish Biosecurity Policy and Act, in coordination with the other national policies and Acts on biodiversity, trade, etc.. It will strengthen and monitor regulations for control of IAS pathways, as well as its enforcement
50% of projects mainstream biodiversity into Implementing Agency/Executing Agency development assistance, sector, lending programs or other technical assistance programs.	Project will mainstream biodiversity concerns into the cross-sectoral investment programmes.
Measurement of cumulative market changes to which GEF projects have contributed.	Project will install “part-payment for services” for the Biosecurity Service, e.g. the risk assessments and certifications for traders / importers.

34. A number of planned activities also contribute to GEF BD 4: **Generation, Dissemination, and Uptake of Good Practices for Addressing Current and Emerging Biodiversity Issues**. This will be addressed under Outcome 3, through the establishment of an active knowledge management network that will distil and codify knowledge and ensure that it is disseminated within the country and to other SIDS to inform the

design of management controls on IAS. Equally, some planned activities contribute to GEF BD-3: **Capacity Building for the Implementation of the UN Convention on Biological Diversity Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety**. This pertains in particular to the institutional and capacity building under Outcome 2. To ensure synergies, it is proposed that the newly set up Biosecurity Service will include the National Biosafety Administration within its structure and be responsible for following and implementing the National Biosafety Framework and Action Plan. In particular the capacity building activity on Risk Assessment and Management planned under the project will assist in managing risks through the intended importation of LMOs.

35. The project is consistent with the **GEF Operational Strategy and Operational Programmes (OP) 2 and 3** for the ‘Biodiversity’ Focal Area: “Coastal and Marine Environment”, and “Forest Ecosystems”, respectively. The project focuses on the abatement of the major threat to biodiversity in an area of high global conservation significance. It will cover the incremental costs of strengthening the long-standing commitment of Seychelles to biodiversity conservation, designing and implementing a comprehensive strategy for addressing the threats posed by invasive species at a time when biodiversity loss is still low and habitat degradation is reversible. It is consistent with national conservation priorities, will achieve the participation of a range of stakeholders and provide valuable lessons that can be replicated in other parts of the world. In particular, it satisfies eligibility criteria specified under the Operational programmes by: i] invoking a highly participatory management strategy; ii] being country-driven, initiated by the Government in accordance with the policy commitments articulated in the Environmental Management Plan for Seychelles; iii] securing co-financing to share the costs of executing conservation measures; and iv] providing for long-term financial and institutional sustainability. The GEF would finance the agreed incremental costs of attaining biodiversity conservation objectives.

36. **Global Benefits:** The principle global environmental benefits of the project are derived from the added security provided for ecosystems and constituent flora and fauna through improved prevention of entry and spread of IAS. The planned strategies are expected to improve the cost effectiveness and sustainability of biodiversity conservation. If IAS are allowed to enter and multiply unchecked, the Seychelles may serve as a stepping stone for the spread of IAS in the Indian Ocean Region and even further. This seems already to be the case for one of the recently discovered non-indigenous introduced marine species that seems to have spread from the Seychelles further into the Western Indian Ocean Region.

SUSTAINABILITY (INCLUDING FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY)

37. Sustainability has been a major consideration throughout the development of this project. There are two key interlinked challenges to assuring sustainability of the Biosecurity Services to be established under the project – (i) financing, and (ii) public awareness and support. The Biosecurity Services will be constituted not by creating an entirely new institution, but rather through the consolidation of existing but scattered functions “under one roof”. There will be a re-gearing of existing budgetary appropriations and human resources, with the intention that they be used more effectively. The balance of additional costs will be made up with the institution of a fees-for-service. It is estimated that fees for service will sustain approximately 30% of the recurrent operating costs of the Biosecurity Service. The GOS will cover the balance out of its general revenues – largely through a reshuffling of existing agency budget appropriations. (Table 13 in main document gives projected budgets of both GOS and the new Biosecurity Service).

38. Awareness raising undertaken by this project will be a key factor in developing support to improve IAS controls from policy makers and decision-makers, the private sector and from the general public. Economic analyses of the costs and risks posed by IAS will be a key tool used in raising awareness on the need to control the entry of produce to the Seychelles. The project will identify the clear threats that IAS pose to the livelihoods of the general public. Similarly, the benefits and gains of eradicating IAS and restoring habitats need to be clearly demonstrated to garner support from the citizenry and private sector. Support to ensure sustainability will depend on the engagement of stakeholders and the generation of ownership of IAS activities and their beneficial outcomes. Such involvement will require increased transparency in the regulatory functions. This will require the construction of information platforms.

39. Global warming is likely to affect the distribution of both endemic and invasive species. The project has internalized this factor into design. The changes and impact of environmental factors will be monitored by surveys of habitats and the collection of species distribution data. Such changes in species distribution, however small or significant, will be taken into account in modifying the inputs and outputs of risk assessments that are the basis for determining IAS management options. As an example, lower rainfall levels would require that assessments for weediness in plants would be skewed towards consideration of drought tolerance as an invasive trait, and the assessment of the likelihood of the entry and establishment of other terrestrial IAS in a pathway would require an evaluation of resistance to periods of low humidity at the different life stages; assessment of marine organisms would consider higher sea temperatures and UV tolerance. As a consequence of any changed environmental conditions in Seychelles, the criteria for determining the risk organisms and their impact will also change, and the management of IAS will be modified accordingly to ensure the sustainability of interventions.

REPLICABILITY

40. The Project incorporates good biodiversity management practices that have been demonstrated elsewhere. During project preparation, technical expertise was sought and provided from competent authorities in the South Pacific and Galapagos islands on IAS management. Relevant good practices have been integrated within project design. The Seychelles is already a leader in the biodiversity conservation field, in particular the eradication of IAS and restoration on small islands. The merger of the “Seychelles” experience with good practices distilled from other SIDS is expected to yield a number of powerful new models with potential for replication. Replication will be promoted at two levels. At a national level, the project will seek to roll out promising management approaches and good practices. At the global level, information will be made available through knowledge management systems, particularly through Web links such as the one set up during project development, or through the Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP) or the Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG) of IUCN. A replication plan is supplied in Section 2.10 of the main document.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

41. Activities will be implemented through partnerships between government agencies and parastatals, industry associations, NGOs, fishers, tourism operators and community groups. A complete list of stakeholders and an accompanying participation plan is provided in Annex III (Project Document). The project development team undertook extensive consultations with interested parties through a series of presentations, interviews, and workshops during the preparatory phase. These wide-ranging consultations were undertaken to ensure that: Stakeholders at all levels are aware of the project and its objectives; stakeholders assist in the identification of threats to biodiversity conservation and determination of their root causes; stakeholders participate in the identification of the GEF alternative; and, differential stakeholder capacity needs were taken into account.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

42. Project monitoring and evaluation will be conducted in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures, and will be provided by the Programme Coordination Unit (PCU) and the UNDP Country Office for Seychelles (UNDP-CO). The logical framework matrix in Part VI of the Project Document provides impact indicators for project implementation, along with their corresponding means of verification. These will form the basis for monitoring the outcomes of the project. A number of subsidiary output indicators have been defined, to track project processes (Annex II of the Project Document). Following UNDP procedures, quarterly progress and financial reports will be prepared by the PCU and presented to the Project Steering Committee at its meetings. A joint Annual Project Review will be undertaken, and will provide the basis for the annual GEF Project Implementation Review. In addition, independent mid-term and end-of-project evaluations will be made to identify project strengths, correct weaknesses and mine lessons.

4. FINANCING

43. Total project financing amounts to US\$ 6,605,000, excluding preparatory costs. Of this, the GEF will finance US\$ 2,000,000. Total co-financing amounts to US\$4,605,000, broken down as follows:

a) PROJECT COST

Project Outcomes	Co-financing (\$)	GEF (\$)	Total (\$)
1. Policy and regulatory framework	1,200,000	400,000	1,600,000
2 Institutional framework	2,169,000	984,500	3,153,500
3 Knowledge and learning	1,145,000	400,000	1,545,000
4. Project management budget/cost	91,000	215,500	306,500
TOTAL	4,605,000	2,000,000	6,605,000

b) PROJECT OWN OPERATIONAL MANAGEMENT BUDGET/COST

Component	Estimated consultant weeks	GEF (\$)	Other Sources (\$)	Project Total (\$)
Locally recruited consultants*	380	160,500	57,000	217,500
Internationally recruited Consultants**	0	0	0	0
Office facilities, equipment, vehicles and communications		50,000	12,000	62,000
Travel		0	10,000	10,000
Miscellaneous		5,000	12,000	17,000
Total Project Management Cost		215,500	91,000	306,500

*Locally recruited consultants: GEF budget: 1 Project Manager for Integrated Ecosystem Programme (combined Biodiversity Mainstreaming and Biosecurity) with 25% internal operational management duties for this project; Part-time accountant/administrative support. All standard UNDP oversight costs are covered through the IA Fee and are not charged to the project budget.

Other Sources: in kind and cash contributions of project counterparts for project management, e.g. Project director, auditors, clerical and support staff, etc. In accordance with both UNDP and GEF policies no GEF project resources will be used to pay any government, agency, NGO staff or personnel.

** No internationally recruited consultants for direct internal Project Management

c) CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS

Component	Estimated consultant weeks	GEF (\$)	Other Sources (\$)	Project Total (\$)
Personnel				
Local Consultants*	200	105,000	40,000	145,000
International Consultants	122	450,000	100,000	550,000
Total	322	555,000	140,000	695,000

*In accordance with both UNDP and GEF policies no GEF project resources will be used to pay any government, agency, or NGO staff or personnel.

d) CO-FINANCING SOURCES

Co-financing Sources				
Name of Co-financier (source)	Classification	Type	Amount (US\$)	
			Confirmed (\$)	Unconfirmed (\$)
GOS	Government	In cash + in Kind	1,650,000	
EU	Bilateral Agency	In Cash	1,480,000	300,000
FFEM	Bilateral Agency	In Cash	300,000	
NGOs	NGO	In Kind		440,000
Private Sector	Private Sector	In Cash + In Kind		435,000
Sub-Total Co-Financing			3,430,000	1,175,000

COST EFFECTIVENESS

44. The natural ecosystems of the Seychelles are still relatively intact when compared to other small islands. The costs of preventing the entry and spread of IAS are considerably less than the cost of control and eradication, assuming that eradication and restoration is technically feasible. The cost of IAS eradication and ecosystem restoration on one small island alone, North Island, is estimated to run in excess of US\$600,000 or US\$ 3000 / hectare (excluding recurrent costs). Trials performed in Morne Seychellois National Park have shown that the costs of IAS eradication and restoration back to native forest can be as high as US\$50,000/ha (Kueffer et al, 2004). The cost of preventing the entry of new IAS into Seychelles is much lower. While the improvement of quarantine and border controls will require high up-front investments in infrastructure and capacity building, these combined costs are lower (< US\$ 80 per hectare) than the eradication costs. Moreover, the Seychelles has already made substantial investments in eradicating IAS from and restoring small islands, such as Cousin. IAS prevention interventions will help to protect these investments that have already been made, or are planned, that may not be sustained in the absence of an effective IAS prevention/quarantine system for the entire country.

5. INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT

CORE COMMITMENTS AND LINKAGES

45. The project will contribute to meeting the objectives as set out in the UNDP Country Programme 2003-2006 for Seychelles (CPD 2003-2006), and will be implemented within that programme. It particularly contributes to the objective of Programme (III) on “Biodiversity conservation, including community participation”. Furthermore, the project is in line with the major development challenges identified in the new Common Country Assessment (CCA) which is being finalized. The CCA identified sound environmental management as one of several key development challenges for the sustainable development of the Seychelles.

46. The mainstreaming strategies to be adopted under the project are consistent with UNDP’s mandates in the development arena, and will complement UNDP’s work on strengthening governance, in particular improving institutional effectiveness in public institutions. As the project is focused on building the capacity of public and private sector institutions to control IAS, and will, inter alia, undertake necessary institutional reforms to improve the efficacy of institutions responsible for regulating trade and the movement of merchandise and people, there is strong resonance with UNDP’s mandate. UNDP is providing support for the development of a National Plan of Action on Social Development which aims at ensuring that larger social concerns, including environment management are accommodated in economic planning. Institutional mechanisms to monitor implementation are being developed. These should abet measures to ensure IAS controls are effectively mainstreamed in production practices.

47. Substantively, the project will benefit from UNDP-GEF’s past work on controlling invasive species in small island ecosystems. This work includes interventions in Mauritius, the Galapagos, and Western Pacific SIDS. The lessons and good management practices distilled from these interventions will be incorporated into project design, particularly with regard to the control of entry and spread of IAS. The Project in Galapagos, in particular has a component focused on improving controls on trade, transport and travel. Close

linkages will be maintained between these respective initiatives during the implementation stage. Finally, the project is pertinent to UNDP's advisory services and capacity development on trade-helping to ensure that national and global trade operates on the basis of human development concerns. This aims, inter alia at ensuring that trade reforms contribute to the Millennium Development Goals.

CONSULTATION, COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION BETWEEN IAS, AND IAS AND EXAS

48. The project is highly complementary with a number of national GEF projects. The Project development team has worked in close collaboration with other project teams to avoid any duplication and overlap between the initiatives, and to optimise programmatic synergies. The project will liaise and take into account the lessons learned from the GEF-World Bank Medium Sized project (MSP) "Improving Management of NGO & Privately Owned Nature Reserves & High Biodiversity Islands", which will end in 2007. Seychelles recently developed an MSP on: "Capacity Development and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in Seychelles (SLM)". This project will address land degradation in the forestry and agricultural sectors. The Biosecurity project will concentrate on the cross-cutting prevention and control of introduction and spread of all IAS in the landscape. These projects are therefore wholly complementary and will actively coordinate their activities. The Seychelles was one of the first SIDS and African countries to complete its NCSA. The country has now developed a follow-on project to strengthen its capacities to plan and oversee implementation of actions to address the provisions of three global environmental conventions. The main focus will be on strengthening the role of the EMPS, to serve as a coordinating body for cross-sectoral environmental management, and will thereby facilitate implementation of the Biosecurity Project.

49. A Regional UNEP/GISP Project on "Building Capacity and Raising Awareness in IAS Prevention and Management" is being developed. The purpose/immediate objective of the project is to improve the ability of developing countries and regions to prevent, the incursion of invasive alien species; and to manage existing and new introductions. The two initiatives will share lessons learned during implementation. Seychelles is not directly included in pilot countries, but the eastern and southern African region may be. A Global project on "Building Regional Partnerships to Assist Developing Countries to Reduce the Transfer of Harmful Aquatic Organisms in Ships' Ballast Water (GloBallast Partnerships)" is being developed by UNDP and IMO. The project is assisting developing countries understand the problem of ballast water transfers of aquatic IAS, and monitor the transfer of ballast water. A Strategic Action Programme to address the issue in East Africa has been agreed. Seychelles may be a beneficiary from regional activities, which may include coordinating information management and training. Close linkages with the Biosecurity Project, through the Seychelles Maritime Safety Administration will be established. Seychelles may also participate to a limited extent in the "Developing a Multi-Country Approach in Support of Country Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for the Transboundary Transfer, Use, and Handling of Biotechnology Products within the SADC Sub-region of Africa" initiative, especially benefiting from capacity building initiatives under this regional project which will have direct links to the Biosecurity Project (e.g. on risk assessment & management, safe handling, etc.)

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

50. The project will be implemented over a period of five years beginning in June 2007, in partnership with the associated project under the Integrated Ecosystem Management (IEM) Programme: "Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Production Sector Activities". Both these projects will be implemented under a UNDP-GEF Programme Coordination Unit (PCU), that will oversee, support and coordinate the different UNDP-GEF projects in Seychelles, lead by an overall "Programme Coordinator". An important role for the PCU is the management of tenders for outsourcing of activities, following UNDP-GEF rules and regulations. Daily project management is provided through a National Project Manager. A National Project Director needs to be appointed by Government to ensure the liaison between the PCU and government. Short-term national as well as international technical assistance (TA) will be provided by the Programme, in order to overcome barriers and achieve the project outputs/outcomes. For effective direction and steering of the project, a committed and balanced Project Steering Committee (PSC) that represents stakeholders' interests will be established. The Project Managers will prepare the necessary project reports, with the Programme Coordinator consolidating and submitting the reports to the PSC and UNDP following standard UNDP

reporting procedures. The responsibility for Project delivery/impacts ultimately rests with UNDP, acting as the GEF implementing agency. UNDP will monitor all project activities and outputs, with a view to assuring outcomes.

ANNEX A: Incremental Cost Analysis

National Development Objectives

1. The Government of Seychelles is presently drafting a new National Development Plan (NDP 2005 – 2015), entitled ‘restoring growth and stability’. The overriding development objective is to improve economic performance, and foster economic growth rates well above the trend in recent years. This is required to sustain the socio-economic progress that the country has achieved in the last 25 years. Factors that might impact negatively on growth prospects include risks related to exogenous volatility (natural disasters), uncertainties in the oil markets, erosion of preferential market access to the EU market for fisheries products, regional conflicts and security issues that affect tourism, and a slowdown in global economic recovery. The intrinsic relationships that exist between the natural environment and the socio-economy are particularly evident in Seychelles. The limited natural resource endowment greatly restricts the economic options of the country, which is marked by the essentially heavy reliance on the tourism and fishery industries. The growth of the economy is linked therefore to the sustainable use of the country’s natural resources, and dependent on the effective protection and management of its environment.

Global Environmental Objectives

2. The Seychelles is a repository of globally significant marine and terrestrial diversity. The importance of the terrestrial component of biodiversity is amplified by the fact that the rate of endemism is high. Some taxa are threatened or endangered, in particular the higher plants, birds, turtles, amphibians and invertebrates. The marine biodiversity is still largely unknown. The goal of the project is to secure the functional integrity of terrestrial and coastal ecosystems of the Seychelles. Much of the sensitive biodiversity in the Seychelles is already under some form of protection or maintenance but the main threats to biodiversity emanate from the production sectors and trade. The project is mainly designed to counter the threats to biodiversity from colonization by invasive alien species across the landscape. It attempts to address this threat through prevention and control of introduction and spread of IAS, which is linked with increasing trade, and the movement of persons and goods through the travel and tourism industries.

Baseline Scenario

Under the baseline scenario, defined as business as usual, a total investment of some US\$ 15,475,000 equivalent will be invested by different national stakeholders (Government, International donors, NGO community and private sector) to address the threat of IAS over the next five years. While insufficient to ensure complete prevention and control of IAS in the country, these activities provide an important foundation in which this project is nested. A sketch of the main baseline activities follows:

3. Enabling environment The total baseline investment dealing with the enabling environment for measures concerning biodiversity and the threat of IAS is estimated at US\$3,880,000. This includes spending by MENR of some US\$1,640,000 million for policy development addressing biodiversity (EMPS and NBSAP review; forestry, agriculture and fisheries policies, etc.). Several Government ministries (MENR, MLUH, etc.) and the office of the Attorney General will allocate some US\$2,040,000 to revise existing legislation and put in place new legislation and policies for biodiversity with relevance to IAS (i.e. Biodiversity Act, Biosafety Act, revise Environmental Protection Act, Environmental Impact Regulations, etc.). NGOs and Private Sector are estimated to contribute some US\$ 100,000 each, mainly in kind, for participating in policy, legal and regulatory development.

4. The baseline investment in awareness raising to garner support for biodiversity and IAS management is estimated at US\$ 800,000. Government is estimated to spend US\$ 600,000 on on-going education and awareness relating to biodiversity and IAS. The Education Information and Communication Section under MENR will continue to undertake ad hoc awareness activities. Periodic clean up campaigns sponsored and organized by the MENR will continue, some with support of the private sector (e.g. SeyBrew, Barclays Bank). The Environment Education Section in the Ministry of Education and Youth will devote further resources to biodiversity conservation. The Nation newspaper in its weekly environment page will continue reporting on biodiversity related issues. The Biodiversity Centre will be completed and will become a central point for education and awareness programmes on native flora and fauna. The yearly Agriculture and Horticulture Show organized by DONR usually pays attention to agricultural and general biodiversity. NGOs will continue with ad hoc awareness campaigns on biodiversity related issues at an estimated cost of US\$ 150,000. The Wildlife Clubs will undertake biodiversity awareness and education programmes, with the youth in schools. Some private islands have awareness programmes for tourists, e.g. trails with specific information on biodiversity and invasive species, estimated at US\$ 50,000.

5. Institutions. The total baseline investment under this component is estimated at US\$7,860,000. Several Government agencies including the Customs, Port and Airport authorities, Coast Guard, Maritime Safety Administration, MPA, Plant Protection & Veterinary Services, Environmental Health, etc. will spend over US\$ 5,700,000 to run existing regulatory services for inspections and quarantine, as part of their current mandate. MENR will allocate some US\$ 600,000 for continuing IAS programmes from the National Parks & Forest and Conservation Sections (mainly trials with invasive woody and herbaceous species in forest, and eradication of animal species like alien birds, lizards, terrapins, etc.). The Agricultural Extension and Plant Protection Services will continue to provide extension services to farmers and other clients on measures against invasive weeds and pathogens, at a cost of US\$ 800,000. This component also includes a baseline investment of US\$ 200,000 by NGOs and a contribution of US\$ 500,000 over the next 5 years by private land owners, including private island resort owners, for ongoing IAS eradication and control/restoration programmes.

6. Knowledge and learning. Total baseline investment under this component is estimated at US\$ 2,935,000. GOS will continue to outlay US\$ 2,100,000 for knowledge and learning activities pertaining to biodiversity. This will mainly involve on-going ad hoc trials and monitoring activities from DOE, DONR, SFA and SCMRT. The Forestry Information Unit within DOE will continue to manage biodiversity related data, as will the GIS units within MENR and MLUH. SBS will continue to process biodiversity research applications and compile research data and publications, and EMPS and stakeholders will discuss individual research applications. A new GIS unit has been established in the Agricultural Planning section, assisted by an FAO project for US\$ 235,000, which will manage land information pertaining to agricultural production. ENGOS will undertake research, and data collection and management on biodiversity conservation at an estimated cost of US\$ 300,000. This includes on-going conservation activities from: Nature Seychelles on Inner islands, especially Cousin; ICS on Aride, and some outer islands; NPTS on Silhouette; MCSS in the marine environment; and PCA is working on restoration efforts with Geobotanical Institute at the University of Zurich, and the Botanical Gardens and Forestry Sections of MENR, as well as compiling a data list on endemic plant species. Nature Seychelles, with assistance from a GEF-WB Island Biodiversity project, will also open a biodiversity research and resources centre on Praslin. A turtle monitoring research network is managed by MCSS with the cooperation of private sector and other ENGOS. Private Hotels will continue to undertake ad hoc conservation efforts and compile some data in collaboration with ENGOS at a cost of US\$ 300,000.

Alternative Strategy

7. The Seychelles Government has limited financial and human resources, as well as the knowledge base to move beyond simple nature conservation paradigms and to ensure that biodiversity is valued, and used sustainably. This holds also true for IAS management, where the Government and other stakeholders

attempt to prevent and control the introduction and spread of IAS but are limited in their capacity to do so, especially in view of the increasing probability of IAS invasions emanating from increased trade and movement of goods and persons, and global climate change. The total cost of the baseline described above is US\$15,475,000. This is not sufficient to ensure adequate prevention and control of IAS in the Seychelles' production landscape. In addition, serious inadequacies in the controls over IAS entry and inter-island transfer threaten to compromise the efficacy of baseline programmes. The GEF Alternative aims at addressing these unmet needs, with a focus on the pathways for IAS invasions created through trade and the movement of people into and within the country, and knowledge management for IAS eradication efforts. The aim is to improve the enabling environment, enhance the existing institutional capacity, and foster the existing knowledge and learning capacities. This will safeguard biodiversity of global importance within Seychelles, as well as reduce the risk of further regional and global spread of IAS. The total cost of the Alternative is US\$22,080,000 with an incremental cost of US\$ 6,605,000 (30% of the Alternative) for which GEF funding of US\$ 2,000,000 is sought (30% of the increment).

8. Outcome 1: Enabling conditions for effective control of the introduction and spread of IAS in place.

The incremental cost for policy and legislative reform under this component is US\$ 810,000 with requested GEF funding amounting to US\$ 200,000 or 24% of the increment. GOS will develop an encompassing Biosecurity Framework, and ensure harmonization with all related policies (e.g. the new Biosafety Framework and Forestry Policy, as well as existing policies that need to be revised, e.g. EMPS, NBSAP, Agriculture and Fisheries policies). Similarly, in terms of legislation, GOS will develop a new encompassing *Biosecurity Act* and ensure harmonization with all *Acts* that will be reviewed (e.g. *Environmental Protection Act*) and newly developed *Acts* (e.g. *Biosafety, Access and Benefit Sharing*). The GOS will also fund Seychelles' participation in international forums on IAS. Total funding from the GOS, including the work needed to ratify the legislation, amounts to US\$ 420,000.

9. The EU will commit a total of US\$ 130,000 under their different projects for developing an Integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan (addressing coastal degradation which may provide fertile environments for the spread of invasive species) and developing the draft *Plant Protection Act* which will be integrated in the *Biosecurity Act*. The Marine Invasive Species Project undertaken by MPA-SCMRT, is developing a Marine Invasive Species Management Plan, with funding from Total Oil Company to the tune of US\$ 50,000, which will be integrated into the overall Biosecurity policy framework. NGOs and private sector are estimated to spend US\$40,000 and US\$20,000 respectively in participating in the revision and development of pertinent IAS policies and legislation. The GEF will fund the recruitment of technical expertise and capacity building for policy and legal revision to ensure that IAS controls are addressed in a holistic manner, and that these instruments are compliant with established international standards. The GEF will also support the establishment of a cost recovery system for the new Biosecurity Service.

10. The total incremental cost of awareness raising activities under this Outcome is US\$790,000 with requested GEF funding of US\$ 200,000 or 25% of the increment. Different government entities (MENR, MEY, SFA, MPA) will provide some US\$ 200,000 for enhanced and targeted awareness programmes on IAS prevention, control and eradication through the different media (newspaper, SBC, campaigns and shows, curricula, etc.). The EU will mount specific and targeted awareness and education campaigns on IAS at a total estimated cost of US\$ 200,000 through their different projects (Melon Fruit Fly eradication, Regional Plant Protection and Regional Coastal Zone projects). NGO's and private sector will provide specific and targeted awareness programmes on IAS control for US\$ 100,000 and 50,000 respectively. The Marine Invasives Project is currently undertaking an awareness programme, funded by Total Oil Company for US\$ 40,000. GEF will provide 200,000 for expertise in developing an encompassing Communications Plan on IAS / Biosecurity, as well as for developing specific and targeted awareness programmes for the general public, travelers and private entities that create support for prevention and control measures on the risk pathways for entry and spread of IAS.

11. Outcome 2: Strengthened Institutional capacity to prevent and control the introduction and spread of

IAS. The total incremental cost for this component is US\$3,460,000 with requested GEF funding of US\$ 1,200,000 or 34% of the increment. Government will provide co-finance to review and strengthen existing quarantine functions and expand their mandate, and set up the new Biosecurity Service (with a total outlay of US\$800,000). NGOs and the private sector will provide some US\$100,000 each for strengthened IAS control activities, mainly on smaller islands. The EU will provide funding of US\$ 800,000 as part of the EU Melon Fruit Fly Eradication Project for the installation of 2 incinerators at ports of entry and other fruit fly control activities. The COI Regional Coastal Zone Project will allocate some US\$ 100,000 for activities to control invasive alien species in coastal areas. The EU Regional Plant Protection Programme will commit US\$ 200,000 for training on plant quarantine matters. GEF will provide US\$ 800,000 to assist in setting up the Biosecurity Service, by providing necessary equipment, training and technical expertise.

12. **Outcome 3: Improved knowledge and learning capacities to control the introduction, establishment and spread of IAS.** The total incremental cost for this component is US\$1,545,000, with requested GEF funding of US\$ 400,000 or 26% of the increment. GOS will provide US\$200,000 through different entities (DOE, DONR, SCMRT, SFA, SBS) for specific research programmes on IAS, including data collection and management, which will assist in establishing the necessary baseline. EU is expected to provide US\$ 350,000 towards biodiversity baseline assessments, knowledge management systems and strengthening of knowledge and learning capacities from their different projects, especially the “Regional Programme for the Sustainable Management of the Coastal Zones of the Countries of the Indian Ocean”. FFEM will finance biodiversity and IAS assessments, as well as IAS eradication and restoration programmes on different islands to the tune of 200,000 US\$ from its Island Rehabilitation Project. NGOs, private sector and individual researchers will provide some US\$ 325,000 to undertake biodiversity assessments with specific relevance to IAS, strengthen information management systems, and undertake IAS eradication and restoration activities. The MPA-SCMRT Marine Invasive Species project, through funding from Total Oil Company, has undertaken a baseline port marine survey which cost US\$50,000, and will continue periodic monitoring. GEF will contribute US\$ 400,000 towards the review of existing data, establishment of lessons learned and best practices, as well as installing improved knowledge management and learning systems to facilitate and demonstrate good IAS control practices.

Incremental Cost and Benefits

13. The incremental cost matrix provides a summary of the domestic and global benefits arising from the project. The baseline cost, incurred irrespective of the GEF support and which is undertaken primarily to produce domestic benefits amounts to US\$ 15,475,000. The cost of the additional activities required to achieve the project outcomes is estimated at US\$ 6,605,000, of which the GEF would finance US\$2,000,000 and co-financiers (local and international) US\$4,605,000. The total cost of the Alternative Strategy, comprising of the total project costs and the business-as-usual baseline, is US\$ 22,080,000. The GEF funds under the Alternative Strategy are geared towards safeguarding the biodiversity of global importance within Seychelles from the threat of the introduction and spread of IAS. Improved general quarantine measures that will generate National Benefits (improved protection for the small agricultural sector and to safeguard human health) are funded from other sources (e.g. incinerators at sea- and air-port provided by EU National Melonfly Eradication Project and Government funds). See Table 1 for details and Table 2 for a summary.

Table 1: Incremental Cost Matrix

Outcome	Cost	Cost ('000 US\$)		National Benefits	Global Benefits
Outcome 1: Enabling Conditions for effective control of the	Baseline	National Assembly	80	-Improved policy and legal foundations, especially concerning IAS introduction and spread and its threat to Biodiversity.	-Control of IAS safeguards biodiversity of global importance
		GOS	4200		
		Env. NGOs	250		
		Private Sector	150		

introduction and spread of IAS in place.		Total	4680	-Increased protection of prioritized larger habitats and ecosystems through improved knowledge.	
	Increment	GEF	400		
		Others:			
		GOS	600		
		National Assembly	20		
		EU Plant Protection	130		
		EU Coastal Zone	100		
		EU Melonfly eradication	100		
		Env. NGOs	140		
		Private Sector	70		
		Total Oil	40		
		Total	1600		
	Alternative	Total	6280	-New encompassing policy on IAS/Biosecurity, in tandem with local policies and in line with international requirements, is more effective to face increasing threats. -Sustainable development is better ensured with enhanced protection towards introduction and spread of IAS. - Public sensitized on general IAS issues through ad hoc awareness programmes.	-Biodiversity hot spots secured for the long term through mitigation of IAS threats. -Improved conservation of Ecologically sensitive areas of global importance. -Globally endangered species secured by reducing extinction threat levels. -Public support and active participation in mitigating and controlling the threat of IAS in biodiversity important and sensitive areas.
Outcome 2: Strengthened Institutional capacity to prevent and control the introduction and spread of IAS	Baseline	National Assembly	60	- Basic protection of agricultural crops, livestock and native fauna and flora from the entry of new pests and diseases	- Status of some ecological sensitive areas with globally important biodiversity maintained through continued prevention and control programmes.
		GOS	7100		
		Env NGOs	200		
		Private land owners	500		
		Total	7,860		
	Increment	GEF	1200		
		Others			
		GOS	800		
		National Assembly	10		
		EU Melonfly eradication	800		
		EU Plant Protection	200		
		EU Coastal Zone	100		
		FFEM	100		
		Env NGOs	100		
TOTAL Oil		50			
Private Sector		100			
	Total	3,460			

	Alternative	Total	11,320	- Greatly improved protection of agricultural crops, livestock, forest production areas and natural ecosystems in general from the entry of new IAS	- Risk of loss of globally important biodiversity/ ecosystems from new IAS greatly reduced - Improved control of regional and global spread of IAS	
Outcome 3: Improved knowledge and learning capacities to control the introduction, establishment and spread of IAS	Baseline	GOS	2100	- Collection of some general biodiversity baseline data; - Further ad hoc restoration and eradication programmes by GO, NGOs and private entities,	- IAS in small areas, e.g. on private islands, further eradicated and habitats for some globally important biodiversity improved.	
		Env NGOs	300			
		Private land owners	300			
		FAO (GIS)	235			
		Total	2,935			
	Increment	GEF	400			
		Others				
		GOS	200			
		National Assembly	20			
		FFEM	200			
		EU Plant Protection	100			
		EU Melonfly eradication	150			
		EU Coastal Zone	100			
		Env NGOs	200			
TOTAL Oil		50				
Private Sector	125					
	Total	1,545				
Alternative	Total	4,480		- Improved baselines and knowledge management systems that facilitate increased protection of prioritized larger habitats and ecosystems. - Implementation of uniform, effective and sustainable control, eradication and restoration programmes.	- Global body of knowledge on IAS, in particular on small islands, greatly improved; - Threat of main IAS in priority habitats and ecosystems effectively minimized and habitats including globally important BD restored	

Table 2. Summary of Incremental Cost Analysis

Grand Totals	Baseline	All Stakeholders	15,475,000
	Increment	GEF	2,000,000
		Non GEF	4,605,000
		Total increment	6,605,000
	Total	Alternative	22,080,000

Annex B: Logical Framework Analysis

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators					
	Indicator	Baseline	Mid-term Target	End of Project Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Goal: The functional integrity of terrestrial and coastal ecosystems of the Seychelles is secured and provides a base for sustainable development.						
<p>Project Objective: Increased capacities to prevent and control the introduction and spread of Invasive Alien Species through Trade, Travel and Transport across the Production landscape.</p>	<p>Well functioning national IAS inspection and quarantine system in place that functions across all production sectors of the country.</p> <p>No up-grading or addition of threatened or vulnerable species from Seychelles on IUCN red list of threatened species due to effects of IAS</p>	<p>Uneven IAS control and quarantine system in place</p> <p>IUCN Red list for threatened animals in Seychelles exists and continually updated; Red list for threatened Seychelles plants being updated</p>	<p>Comprehensive Biosecurity Service in place operating at all points of entry clearing main commodities and baggage.</p> <p>No upgrading or addition of any species on red list of threatened animals due to effect of IAS; New red list for threatened plants in Seychelles established</p>	<p>Biosecurity Service inspection activities at all points of entry capable of identifying risk profiles and inspecting all risk goods, passengers, conveyance, doing treatments and collecting fees for service Responding to IAS incursions</p> <p>No up-grading of any species from Seychelles on IUCN red lists of threatened species from effects of IAS.</p>	<p>Reports of Biosecurity Service with information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of import permits issued and the outcomes; • Data on passenger numbers, commodity quantities and numbers of interceptions and treatments; • Value of fees collected. <p>Project Progress and Technical Reports</p> <p>Project Annual reports/PIR</p> <p>Surveys and reports of new IAS introduced and reaction to such incidents.</p> <p>IAS Eradication Protocols / Manuals</p> <p>Demonstration sites</p> <p>GIS</p> <p>IUCN red data lists</p> <p>Seychelles threatened and vulnerable species lists</p>	<p>Continued interest in IAS from Government.</p> <p>Cooperation of other government regulatory authorities continues.</p> <p>Collected fees from Biosecurity Service are used for own recurrent costs.</p> <p>Red lists of threatened species continued to be updated</p>

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators					
	Indicator	Baseline	Mid-term Target	End of Project Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Outcome 1: Enabling conditions for effective control of the introduction and spread of IAS in place.	New overarching and comprehensive Policy on IAS implemented	No IAS Policy	IAS Policy developed	Policy implemented	Policy document disseminated	Government, civil society and private sector continue to work together in a participatory, constructive fashion. Key stakeholders reach agreement of policy and legal reforms needed. Laws and policies will be enacted promptly without delays that would constrain the timely implementation of the project. Theme is acceptable to all sectors of the public and interpreted in a positive manner. Trade, Tourist and travel sector continues to cooperate with programmes.
	New legislation which conforms with international standards is enacted for IAS prevention, control and management	Present legislation is outdated, not conforming to international standards and ineffective	New comprehensive legislation conforming to international standards prepared	Laws enacted and implemented; All IAS inspection, treatment and destruction activities are legally supported	New legislation published in GoS official gazette. Project Progress and Technical Reports; Government budget Biosecurity Service reports & audits IAS / Biosecurity Communications Plan Survey of travelers, importers and tourism operators Number of positive interceptions, number of erroneous declarations of regulated goods (seeds, plants and foodstuffs) on travelers and importers.	
	Amount spent from non-government sector on IAS control and management	90% IAS control and management efforts financed by Government	75% of IAS control and eradication financed by government (10% fees-for-services of recurrent costs of Biosecurity Service and increased NGO and Private Sector spending on IAS eradication)	50% of IAS control and management financed by non-government (30% fees-for-service for recurrent costs of Biosecurity Service + increased NGO and Private Sector funding for IAS eradication and habitat restoration).	Import declarations Audit reports	
Traveling public, tourism operators, importers and shipping agents aware of risks of IAS and need for biosecurity.	Few posters available and some reports in newspapers and magazines. No specific information targeting tourism	40 % of traveling public and 66% of risk commodity importers, agents and tourism operators aware of risks of IAS	75% of traveling public and 100% of risk commodity importers, agents and tourism operators aware of risks of IAS and need for Biosecurity			

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators					
	Indicator	Baseline	Mid-term Target	End of Project Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
		operators, importers and shipping agents. In general little awareness of IAS and no knowledge of biosecurity	and need for Biosecurity			
Outcome 2: Strengthened Institutional capacity to prevent and control the introduction and spread of IAS.	Fully functioning Biosecurity Service. % of commodities, conveyances, goods and passengers that are inspected or undergo targeted or random baggage searches for IAS	Institutional responsibilities are fragmented and most pathways have no routinely inspections Less than 5%	Biosecurity Service created and staffed 60%	Biosecurity Service fully functional conducting routine inspections, identifications and effective treatments over all pathways. 100%	GOS official gazette MTR Project Final evaluation Annual reports of Biosecurity Services MTR and EOP evaluation	Biosecurity Service is able to develop and retain the capacity to undertake the technical risk analysis to an international standard. Political/economic opposition will not prevent the levy and retention by BS of fees for service that are needed to cover most of the recurrent costs of BS Opposition by the general public and other regulatory services to the luggage and container searches
Outcome 3: Improved knowledge and learning capacities to control the introduction, establishment and spread of	Economically important IAS established in Seychelles are identified.	No established list of priority IAS in country. Non-uniform information on different species exists with different entities	IAS Baseline established, including white and black lists of priority IAS.	Baselines updated; IAS eradication protocols /	Reports IAS Baseline (Database, online?) Demonstrations Networks established (website)	Stakeholders willing to share information; Specific expertise available. Agreement on Demonstration projects reached.

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators					
	Indicator	Baseline	Mid-term Target	End of Project Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
IAS.	Cost effective control and mitigation programmes of IAS in place. Knowledge & Learning Network in place and used	Some past and on-going efforts described; eradication programmes, not following uniform and agreed eradication methodologies No national or regional IAS network	Best practices compiled and reviewed; Cost effective IAS eradication models developed and Demonstrations in place National IAS Knowledge and Learning Network in place	Manuals for IAS mitigation and control in place and demonstrated in priority sites Indian Ocean IAS Knowledge and Learning Network in place and used	Hits on website Feedback on network website Interactive network participants and customer surveys	Facilities and equipment and trained staff are operating efficiently. National and regional interest in IAS continues

ANNEX C:**STAP Technical Review of Project Proposal,**

Project: Integrated Ecosystem Management Programme: Mainstreaming Prevention and Control Measures for Invasive Alien Species into Trade, Transport and Travel across the Production Landscape, PIMS 3820 [Seychelles]

Introduction

This project, often termed the Biosecurity Project, originally formed part of a broader UNDP GEF project addressing the mainstreaming of biodiversity concerns and control of invasive species into the main productive sectors of the Seychelles economy, in particular fisheries and tourism. This larger project was later split into one dealing directly with the productive sectors (now called "Mainstreaming Biodiversity Management into Production Sector Activities", PIMS 2053) and a separate UNDP GEF project addressing the development of national prevention and control mechanisms for alien invasive species that are negatively impacting upon native biodiversity in Seychelles ("Mainstreaming Prevention and Control Measures for Invasive Alien Species into Trade, Transport and Travel across the Production Landscape", PIMS 3820). The present STAP review covers just this second project.

However, the present STAP reviewer also earlier reviewed the sister project (Mainstreaming Biodiversity Management) and a number of relevant points raised in that review have been clearly addressed in the development of the present Biosecurity project. They are not repeated here.

Overall Impression

The project is well justified and has been carefully thought through. It tackles a real problem in a constructive and realistic way, and would appear to have a good chance of achieving its stated objectives and targets. The profile of Invasive Alien Species (IAS) within the Seychelles should be enhanced, not just in Government circles but also in a number of the productive sectors and among the general public. Not only will this result in a lower risk of alien species establishing on the islands and greater possibilities of control at source, but there should also be a better and more integrated knowledge of the status of IAS across the Seychelles, an institutionalised ability to continually evaluate this and feed new findings into decision-making forums, and a coordinated involvement of environmental NGOs and others in eradication and awareness-raising programmes. Hopefully this will be something of a model and a set of experiences that could be used more widely across Indian Ocean states.

There are a few aspects at present that appear somewhat or may need particular attention. These are summarised below and elaborated upon later.

1. There needs to be clearer targeting of private sector importers and tourism operators in the awareness activities (Output 1.4). At present the stated activities seem directed more at government and the general public, rather than specifically at the main potential channels of IAS importation. Awareness should be not just on control measures, but also cover why IAS control is necessary and the negative impacts of IAS on native biodiversity.
2. The project is effectively taking over some of the responsibility for the alien invasive control programme in the Seychelles, although it is specifically not involved in actual eradication measures. However, eradication is presumably a major part of the mandate of the new Biosecurity Service to be established under the project, and project management should consider this when making demands on resources. It should not be a case of control of new species at port of entry dominating unduly over eradication/ control aspects of species already present.

3. There is a need to institutionalise the monitoring activities of the new Biosecurity Service so that the status and situation with IAS is regularly updated, analyzed and fed into decision-making long after the project has finished. Species sometimes become problematic only a number of years after introduction and initial establishment.
4. Given that, once introduced, IAS often spread owing to poor land use or fisheries practices, the project should retain strong links and synergy and sense of purpose with initiatives working on these issues within Seychelles, including other GEF projects in these fields.
5. The project should work specifically with the private sector and NGOs in awareness-raising and self-regulation, as well as with government.
6. One of the benefits of this project will be experience with more integration of IAS control, greater public awareness, and greater knowledge of IAS status and control measures. This will include lessons learned, perhaps both negative as well as positive, as well as best practices. These experiences and lessons should be widely disseminated regionally in appropriate forums and through appropriate means (scientific, popular or formal) as part of project activities.
7. The results from knowledge-generation activities (Output 3.1) should underlie and inform subsequent project decisions. Therefore this should be a priority activity and preliminary results obtained as soon as possible and used.

Project Targets

The project explicitly states that it is not directly addressing invasive alien species (IAS) eradication for a number of reasons: (a) such activities are already being carried out in a number of places by other initiatives/projects, (b) they have high costs and sustainability concerns, and (c) the risk of introduction of other IAS, or reintroduction of existing ones, is still high as the national controls and coordination are not fully functional. Instead it addresses the weaknesses in control at ports of entry and the fractured legislation and institutional responsibilities. This stance is fully justified.

Part of this control process is in raising public awareness, not only on the present impacts of IAS on Seychelles biodiversity, but also on the necessity to have restrictive controls at ports of entry to reduce future impacts – often adding to expense, time and inconvenience. The particular sectors that need targeting in this regard, as the justification makes clear, are private sector importers (including shipping agents) and the tourism industry. This part of the process is addressed under Outcome 1 (Output 1.4, National communication plan and public awareness strategy, with listed activities), but at present the approach is rather vague and high-level, and not very clearly targeted. In addition, engagement appears to be more with government and similar institutions, and much less with the private sector and NGOs. The chances for long-term achievement of the Project Objective will be enhanced by greater public awareness and understanding, particularly in the importing and tourism sectors that are the main sources of IAS imports. The project should ensure these aspects are adequately resourced and executed.

Scientific and Technical Soundness

The analysis of the impacts and importance of IAS in Seychelles is comprehensive and good. What comes out is that there are a number of widespread and globally common species that are known to be a problem for island biodiversity; a set of species linked to inshore coastal ecosystems spread especially by shipping; a smaller set of species which impact upon particular endemic or special biodiversity (for example, in the important and biodiverse forests on the high granite islands); and finally a number of pathogens often linked

to agricultural imports. The project is attempting to cover all these groups, not through their eradication but in attempting to better control their accidental importation and spread – prevention rather than cure.

Presumably the project will also cover or incorporate biological control agents, although these have not been specifically mentioned in the ProDoc. Will the new Biosecurity Service be central in evaluating the potential use of these, as well as in controlling their introduction?

Part of the control process outlined in the project is the establishment of enabling legislation and capacity-building of an institution to implement it (Outcomes 1 and 2), and part involves consolidation and analysis of existing information, its documentation and dissemination (Outcome 3). It is hoped that the essential part of Outcome 3 (Output 3.1) is initiated early on in the project so that legislation and institutional capacitation is based on, and informed by, the best existing knowledge. This should be a priority Output.

The case is made that technical decisions at this stage do not primarily require new knowledge (i.e. research), but consolidation and application of existing knowledge; the project addresses this.

One central point is that the new Biosecurity Service must be able to undertake and analyze (or access results from) regular monitoring of the spread and status of IAS across the Seychelles, particularly those species that may be most seriously affecting island ecology and native biodiversity. This might not be a specific activity under this project, but it should try to assist in its establishment. Species sometimes become problematic only a number of years after introduction and initial establishment; the system is dynamic, depending not just on species' biology but also on changes in land use practices or ecological decisions. The Biosecurity Service would need to keep continual track of the IAS situation, not just new introductions.

Although the project is not intending to address on-ground control or eradication of IAS, an outcome of its activities should clearly be much better targeted eradication programmes, whether by the new Biosecurity Service or by NGOs. Although not stated as a specific Outcome in the ProDoc, it is hoped there is an envisaged activity that would address this issue. The project is, de facto, taking on some responsibility for the establishment of a new consolidated service. And much of that new service's responsibility will be on the control of existing IAS as well as on the prevention of new introductions. Hopefully it will not be a case of control of new species at port of entry dominating unduly over eradication/ control aspects of species already present.

Global Environmental Benefits & Fit with GEF Goals

The negative impact of IAS on native biodiversity, particularly on islands, is well documented; the project is thus addressing an important and real issue relevant to many countries. Findings on, for example, approaches to the integration of the IAS control system may well have significant value to other Indian Ocean island states and beyond – the project is not just addressing a unique Seychelles problem. However, although it is recognised that the socio-political and legislative environment may well differ significantly between countries, and indeed between islands within the Seychelles. By focussing on enhancing and harmonising import control mechanisms on a broad front, and not just on the strict legislative aspects, the project's achievements will have relevance elsewhere and may well have value as a model.

In order to maximise this extra-national value, the project should ensure its findings are actively disseminated regionally – this will also assist in satisfying the GEF's requirement to fund primarily incremental costs rather than solely national responsibilities.

Regional Context, Linkages & Replicability

The project would appear to fit well in the regional context. The proposal specifies a number of other international, regional and national initiatives in various aspects of IAS control including, importantly, land management programmes, and is complementary to them. It is most important that the strongest linkage is with the UNDP/GEF project on Mainstreaming Biodiversity Management into Production Sector Activities

(although surprisingly this is not mentioned in Table 12, Ongoing GEF projects). The two project management units should liaise continually in both in terms of practices and activities as well as in approach and results. It is laudable that the PMUs will be in the same building (para. 122). The two projects should perhaps be evaluated or reviewed together, or at least in a fully integrated manner.

The project should ensure full liaison with any agricultural land use initiatives (in particular the GEF/UNDP MSP Land Degradation project), even if such activities are not necessarily part of the formal Outputs. One would hope that it would also develop strong linkages and synergy with the GEF/IBRD project on Improving Management of Privately Owned Nature Reserves. It is not clear how this synergy might be realised during project implementation, but perhaps some of these islands can act as specific sites or case studies. The current project would benefit from having some conservation action and results feedback to help keep it focussed on potential conservation impacts. At present most activities emphasise process rather than the ultimate target of measurable biodiversity conservation impact.

Owing to differences in circumstances between island states, it is unlikely that many specific activities will be directly replicable in other places. What is useful, however, especially given that Seychelles is a regional leader in IAS control, is the sharing of experiences, both positive and negative. I think it important that any lessons as well as experiences and technical findings are comprehensively documented and disseminated to appropriate audiences.

Risks and Sustainability

The risks appear to be minimal, unless the establishment of a new service and changes in legislation fails and leads to an effective breakdown in existing control mechanisms and increased fragmentation of control. This must be considered highly unlikely.

Sustainability issues have been well thought through. Most project activities are to do with structural changes and organisational approaches rather than continued interventions (except Output 3.1). Where continued interventions are envisaged, sustainability appears good, e.g. fees for IAS inspections. Many other activities are part of government's stated and funded mandate and should be readily funded under the general budget and not be more financially onerous than the status quo.

It should, however, be realised that the project is effectively taking on some of the responsibility for the Seychelles alien invasive species programme. So although the project is not actually tackling control or eradication of species once established on the islands, it should clearly bear in mind the eradication responsibilities of the new Biosecurity Service when making resource-allocation decisions or demands upon it.

One sustainability issue concerns monitoring, which by its very nature tends to be long-term and goes beyond project or often professional lifetimes. There is need to ensure that regular and timely monitoring is institutionalized in the new Biosecurity Service, and that these findings are fed into decision-making, both in terms of IAS control programmes and at higher government level. The project can carry out IAS survey (part of Output 3.1), but this needs to be updated and continue long after external funds finish. It should try to get this established on a basis where external funding or initiative is not required.

Stakeholder Involvement

Table III.3 shows a wide range of stakeholders are to be involved in project activities, and the ProDoc also shows that many were involved in its formulation and that of its sister UNDP/GEF project. It is clear that activities under Outcomes 3 (plus Output 1.4) are envisaged to be mostly driven by NGOs and the PMU, while Outcomes 1 and 2 primarily involve government agencies. Hopefully this breadth of involvement will lead to synergy with Government realising the strengths of the NGO sector in terms of awareness-raising and

in mobilising resources for specific activities, such as IAS control on a particular island or surveys. There seems to be very little involvement of the private sector except as a recipient of awareness activities and in consultations on new legislation. Would it be possible to get the tourism sector more involved in awareness or eradication programmes, or in industry self-regulation?

Logframe (part VI of ProDoc, para 148, Annex II, Table II.3, and paras 92-99 with Project Outputs)

Project Objective; Targets: There is an implication here that IUCN Red Data lists are current and frequently updated. However, they can lag by 5-10 years in the case of less-charismatic groups, and there can be quite a procedure to get assessments changed. Perhaps what is needed is a nationally-agreed Seychelles systems of impact levels, including input from conservation NGOs, to measure the on-ground situation, a system that is readily updated and appropriate to the Seychelles situation.

Project Objective; End of Project target: States "no upgrading of any species ...owing to IAS", but goal could also be "no additional IAS coming into islands". Sometimes an IAS appears benign for many years, well beyond project life spans, then starts impacting negatively upon biodiversity later.

Project Objective; Verification: It is not clear what sort of monitoring will be put in place; at present it seems what is referred to here is a one-off survey, whereas an institutionalised monitoring system is what is required.

Outcome 1: EoP target states 50% of IAS control financed by non-GoS sources. But surely quarantine fees are a government source.

Outcome 1, Output 1.4: Indicator states just the travelling public. This should be extended to the import and tourism business communities as they would seem to be the major avenues for IAS importation.

Outcome 3: Top row of targets seems incomplete. The baselines need to be regularly updated or monitored.

Outcome 3, Output 3.2: There is very little here on regional collaboration; the dissemination activity appears somewhat passive. Given that Seychelles is a leader in IAS control, this project should be able to help develop this regional strength, which is then actively disseminated across other Indian Ocean states.

Outcome 3, Output 3.2: Dissemination of lessons learned could usefully be at various levels – govt/institutional, private sector (importers/tourist industry), national awareness, and regional fora (southern Africa, small island states). At present the emphasis seems to be at government level.

The Logframe is somewhat weak on the collation, analysis and dissemination of overall project achievements and lessons (both positive and negative) to other island states. This would include scientific, popular or advocacy articles, and participation in external meetings or conferences. Even if not a specific Output, it does need to be factored into the activities and be a measurable means of impact and achievement.

Jonathan Timberlake
Eastbourne, UK, 11 September 2006

Response to STAP Comments

COMMENT STAP REVIEWER	HOW ADDRESSED	PRO DOC Response
1. There needs to be clearer targeting of private sector importers and tourism	There was always an intention to target specific sectors and enterprises, but this was unfortunately not reflected in the	Part II: Project Strategy. Output

operators in the awareness activities (Output 1.4).	Output statement. The output description has been changed: Private sector (importers, tourism developers and operators, travel industry, shipping agents, etc.) are now specifically mentioned in Output 1.4. Also, the earlier implied understanding of why IAS control is necessary and the negative impacts on native biodiversity is highlighted.	1.4. Para. 103.
2. Eradication is presumably a major part of the mandate of the new Biosecurity Service to be established under the project, and project management should consider this when making demands on resources. It should not be a case of control of new species at port of entry dominating unduly over eradication/ control aspects of species already present.	<p>Eradication efforts have been and are currently being undertaken by different actors. The Project, through the new to be established Biosecurity Service (which is the re-gearing of different control functions “under one roof”) will concentrate mainly on prevention and control of (re-) introduction and spread of IAS, as this is where the main weaknesses lie. A problem is that there is still no agreed priority list of what IAS are controllable in Seychelles and there are conflicting costings data on eradication / restoration efforts. The project will make available resources and expertise to actively extract lessons learned and to distill and disseminate best (and most cost effective) practices on IAS control (Output 3.2). The Biosecurity Service will facilitate the adoption of these best practices through the development of manuals and protocols that will be continually reviewed.</p> <p>The Project Document has been amended to clarify the Biosecurity Service will be responsible for helping to prioritise and coordinate control activities, undertaken by NGOs, Government or Private Sector. Provision is made for such site based demonstrations in the partner project under the IEM Programme: Mainstreaming Biodiversity Management into Production Sector Activities.</p>	<p>Part II: Project Strategy. Output 3.2. Para. 107.</p> <p>ANNEX II: Output LFA: Output 3.2.</p>
3. There is a need to institutionalise the monitoring activities of the new Biosecurity Service so that the status and situation with IAS is regularly updated, analyzed and fed into decision-making long after the project has finished.	<p>There is an intention to institutionalize the monitoring functions of the Biosecurity Service. A monitoring network will be created. Output 3.1 has been revised to better clarify this. The following sentence has been added: <i>“The baseline needs continual updating, in order to monitor the establishment, (changes in) invasiveness and spread of IAS. A National Network for the monitoring of the establishment and spread of IAS established, comprising of all relevant stakeholders (Government, NGO, private) will be set up.”</i></p> <p>The indicator of Output 3.1. (ANNEX II) also specifies: <i>“National Network for the monitoring of the establishment and spread of IAS established”</i>.</p>	<p>Part II: Project Strategy. Output 3.1. Para. 106.</p> <p>ANNEX II: Output LFA: Output 3.1.</p>
4. Given that, once introduced, IAS often spread owing to poor land use or fisheries practices, the project should retain strong links and synergy and sense of purpose with initiatives working on these issues within Seychelles, including other GEF projects in these fields.	<p>The Project has been designed specifically to optimize links and synergies with on-going and planned projects, especially concerning land and marine use. Table 12 in the Pro DOC has been strengthened to clarify the links with the proposed Sustainable Land Management Project (through Memoranda of Understanding and National UNDP coordination). The land use planning, fisheries and tourism activities under the associated UNDP-GEF “Mainstreaming Biodiversity management into production sector activities” will be implemented jointly with this Biosecurity project (see also point 9. in this table). Other projects with which links have been operationalised include the “<i>Island rehabilitation project</i>” (funded by the Fond Francais de l’Environnement Mondial – FFEM) and the EU funded “<i>Regional Programme for the Sustainable Management of the Coastal Zones of the Countries of the Indian Ocean</i>”.</p>	<p>Section 2.8: Linkages with GEF Projects, para 130, Table 12;</p> <p>PART III: IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS.</p> <p>Incremental Cost Analysis, para 163.</p>
5. The project should work specifically	This is intended. The narrative statement for Output 1.4 has	Part II: Project

with the private sector and NGOs in awareness-raising and self-regulation, as well as with government.	been amended to confirm this (as regards awareness raising, see also point 1 in this table, above), as has Output 3.1 (as regards to monitoring, see point 3. above). NGOs that have experience in awareness raising and advocacy and will take the lead in this.	Strategy. Output 1.4. Para. 103. Part II: Project Strategy. Output 3.1. Para. 106.
6. Lessons learned and best practices should be widely disseminated regionally in appropriate forums and through appropriate means (scientific, popular or formal) as part of project activities.	Wider dissemination of lessons learned will be actively pursued, though existing regional (COI, NEPAD, Inter African Phytosanitary Council) and global (GISP, ISSG) networks, as well as through new to be established networks (following the Pacific Invasives Learning Network-PILN model).	Part II: Project Strategy. Output 3.2. Para. 107. ANNEX III: Table III.3: Roles, responsibilities and reporting
7. The results from knowledge-generation activities (Output 3.1) should underlie and inform subsequent project decisions. Therefore this should be a priority activity and preliminary results obtained as soon as possible and used.	No specific Workplan has been developed (as this is normally developed at the Inception Stage in the Inception Plan), but the following sentence has been inserted under description of Output 3.1: <i>“This is a priority activity and should be started as early as possible so that the results can be used in determining further actions”</i> .	Part II: Project Strategy. Output 3.1. Para. 106.
8. Will the new Biosecurity Service be central in evaluating the potential use of biological control agents, as well as in controlling their introduction?	The Biosecurity Service will be active in biocontrol as it will be guided by the International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM), and be implementing ISPM No 3, which is the relevant code of conduct that includes biological control. However, at the moment the Government is reluctant to introduce biocontrol (e.g. for whitefly) because previous mistakes were made (introduction of cats and owls to control rats, etc.). Accordingly Biocontrol will only be pursued following careful feasibility assessment and with appropriate safeguards.	
9. It is most important that the strongest linkage is with the UNDP/GEF project on Mainstreaming Biodiversity Management into Production Sector Activities. The two project management units should liaise continually in both in terms of practices and activities as well as in approach and results. The two projects should perhaps be evaluated or reviewed together, or at least in a fully integrated manner.	Both Projects are part of the Same Programme: Integrated Ecosystem Management programme and will have common implementation procedures designed to optimize synergies. This is elaborated in para 108. (<i>link with UNDP-GEF Biodiversity Mainstreaming Project</i>), Table 9., and Implementation and Monitoring & Evaluation sections.	Para 108; Table 9; PART III: IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS PART IV: MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN.
LFA: OBJECTIVE AND OUTCOMES		
10. Project Objective; Targets: There is an implication that IUCN Red Data lists are current and frequently updated. Perhaps what is needed is a nationally-agreed Seychelles systems of impact levels.	The Government has decided to use international, independent and authoritative IUCN lists, to avoid possible contention. These lists will be updated using nationally collected information that will be centrally submitted to IUCN.	No change
11. Project Objective; End of Project target: States "no upgrading of any species ...owing to IAS", but goal could	Proposed Goal of “No additional IAS coming into islands” is unrealistic. The goal is to contain introduction and spread and minimize negative impacts.	No change

also be "no additional IAS coming into islands".		
12. Project Objective; Verification: It is not clear what sort of monitoring will be put in place; at present it seems what is referred to here is a one-off survey, whereas an institutionalised monitoring system is what is required.	<p>Project Monitoring detailed in PART IV.</p> <p>A National Monitoring Network comprising of active stakeholders will be created to monitor the establishment and spread of IAS. (see point 3. above) on a continuing basis.</p> <p>The Biosecurity Service will have its own regular monitoring and audit procedures.</p>	<p>PART IV: MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN.</p> <p>Part II: Project Strategy. Output 3.1. Para. 106.</p> <p>ANNEX II: Output LFA: Output 3.1.</p>
13. Outcome 1: EoP target states 50% of IAS control financed by non-GoS sources. But surely quarantine fees are a government source.	<p>Quarantine fees are a government source. However, the fees would be additional to regular budgetary subventions. Target is that 30% of the re-current costs of the Biosecurity Service (control functions) be financed through fees-for-service. Table 13 has been added under <i>Financial Sustainability</i> to highlight the Government and fees-for-services portions in the budget of the Biosecurity Service. In addition it is expected that an increasing amount of IAS eradication and habitat restoration activities will be financed by NGO and private sector sources as opposed to mainly government.</p> <p>The Indicator under Outcome 1 has been fine-tuned.</p>	<p>2.9. <i>Sustainability</i>, para 132 and Table 13.</p> <p>PART VI: LFA, Indicator Outcome 1</p>
14. Outcome 1, Output 1.4: Indicator states just the travelling public. This should be extended to the import and tourism business communities as they would seem to be the major avenues for IAS importation.	<p>Indicator has been changed to take import and tourism businesses into account: <i>“Traveling public, tourism operators, importers and shipping agents aware of risks of IAS and need for biosecurity”</i></p>	<p>Part II: Project Strategy. Output 1.4. Para. 103.</p> <p>PART VI: LFA</p> <p>ANNEX II: Indicator 1.4</p>
15. Outcome 3: Top row of targets seems incomplete. The baselines need to be regularly updated or monitored.	<p>Top rows of targets have been verified.</p> <p>Updating of baselines included and specifically mentioned in Output 3.1 and LFA Output table (ANNEX II)</p>	<p>Part II: Project Strategy. Output 3.1. Para. 106.</p> <p>ANNEX II</p>
16. Outcome 3, Output 3.2: There is very little here on regional collaboration; the dissemination activity appears somewhat passive. Dissemination of lessons learned could usefully be at various levels – govt/institutional, private sector (importers/tourist industry), national awareness, and regional fora (southern Africa, small island states).	<p>See also point 6.</p> <p>Output 3.2 has been further elaborated, to better elaborate the dissemination processes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • though existing regional (COI, NEPAD, IAPC) and global (GISP, ISSG, FAO) networks, • through new to be established national and regional learning and knowledge networks (including websites). • through scientific, popular or advocacy articles, and participation in external meetings or conferences. • through awareness and educational activities 	<p>Part II: Project Strategy. Output 3.2. Para. 107.</p> <p>ANNEX II: LFA Output 3.2.</p>
17. The Logframe is somewhat weak on the collation, analysis and dissemination of overall project achievements and lessons (both positive and negative) to other island states. This would include scientific, popular or advocacy articles,	<p>See above Point 16.</p>	<p>Part II: Project Strategy. Output 3.2. Para. 107.</p> <p>ANNEX II: LFA Output 3.2.</p>

and participation in external meetings or conferences.		
--	--	--

ANNEX D:

RESPONSE TO GEF SECRETARIAT PROJECT REVIEW

COMMENT GEF SECRETARIAT PROJECT REVIEW	HOW ADDRESSED	PRO DOC / EXECUTIVE SUMMARY RESPONSE
Analyze any relationships with SP3 on Biosafety and include links if warranted	<p>Paragraph explaining the relationships with SP-3 included under 2.6. “Fit with Focal Area Strategy” in ProDOC and Executive Summary.</p> <p><i>National Biosafety Framework</i> and <i>Seychelles Biosafety Action Plan</i> further described under 1.A.6 “Policy Context” in the ProDOC.</p> <p>Reference added in the ProDOC under “Legislation” to the <i>Biosafety Act</i>, currently being drafted, plus reference in the ExSUMM</p> <p>Paragraph added in the ProDOC and reference in ExSUMM on the <i>Cartagena protocol on biosafety</i> in Seychelles’ context.</p> <p>Reference made under 2.8. “GEF Project Linkages” in the Project Document to “Developing a Multi-Country Approach in Support of Country Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework for the Transboundary Transfer, Use, and Handling of Biotechnology Products within the SADC Sub-region of Africa” in which Seychelles may participate. Reference is also included in ExSUMM para. 49.</p>	<p>ProDOC: para 119; ExSUMM: para 34</p> <p>ProDOC: para 31, footnote 9, 10.</p> <p>ProDOC para 32. ExSUMM para. 12</p> <p>ProDOC para. 36. ExSUMM para.12</p> <p>ProDOC Table 12; ExSUMM para. 49.</p>
Specify under the incremental cost analysis in the alternative scenario that only the global aspects are to be funded by GEF versus the unmet needs which need to be qualified in reference to GEF global aspects	<p>Section 2.5 in the Project Document describes the <i>Expected Global and National Benefits</i>. A pertinent portion of that section has now been included in the Executive Summary.</p> <p>Statement emphasizing the global environmental benefits from lifting barriers using GEF funding is included under IB.3.”<i>Barriers to the Conservation of Biodiversity</i>” in ProDOC and ExSUMM (para 21).</p> <p>Statement specifying the global environmental benefits from the Alternative Scenario funded by GEF vs the National Benefits accruing from improved quarantine control funded from other sources, is included in the Incremental Cost Analysis in ProDOC and ExSUMM.</p>	<p>ExSUMM para. 36</p> <p>ProDOC: para 92; ExSUMM para 21</p> <p>ProDOC: para 158 and 165; ExSUMM para 7 and 13 of ICA</p>
GEF funds can not be used for government, agency & NGOs staff/personnel.	<p>Because of an earlier omission, the footnotes under Table b) under 4. FINANCING in ExSUMM were not included. These are now re-inserted, and explain the GEF Management budget, which is used for directly hired national consultants, with part internal management duties for this project, not for government or NGO staff/personnel. Similarly the line “<i>Locally recruited personnel</i>” and column “<i>Estimated Staff weeks</i>” have been changed to “<i>Locally recruited consultants</i>” and “<i>Estimated Consultant weeks</i>”, respectively to avoid misunderstanding.</p>	<p>ExSUMM, para 43, Table b)</p>