

Capacity strengthening for management of invasive alien species in South Africa to enhance sustainable biodiversity conservation and livelihoods improvement

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10524

Countries

South Africa

Project Name

Capacity strengthening for management of invasive alien species in South Africa to enhance sustainable biodiversity conservation and livelihoods improvement

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

3/20/2020

Review completed by PM

4/13/2020

Program Manager

Jaime Cavelier

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-6-20

The project is in alignment with BD-2-6: *Address direct drivers to protect habitats and species through the Prevention, Control and Management of Invasive Alien Species.*

As stated in the BD strategy, “*While GEF will maintain a focus on island ecosystems and strongly engage with island states to advance this agenda, projects submitted by continental countries that address IAS management through the comprehensive pathways approach outlined above will also be supported*”.

Cleared

Agency Response

Cleared

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

According to the GEF-7 Strategy *GEF will support the implementation of comprehensive prevention, early detection, control and management frameworks that emphasize a risk management approach by focusing on the highest risk invasion pathways.*

COMPONENT

The terms "prevention" and "early detection" are used in the definition of the Outcome of the Component, without further elaboration except when mentioned in Output 1. (An inter-agency 'Biosecurity Risk Assessment/ Targeting Centre (BRA/TC) is established and operational). Since the prevention and early detection of IAS encompasses numerous depending on the organism, please provide the names of the institutions with the mandate and the appropriate frameworks to take action. and/or bibliographic references will suffice. The objective of this question is to understand what tools the BRA/TC will have at its disposal to carry its proposed functions.

Suggest reducing the number of indicators (i.e. one of the first two or a combination).

Under Outcome 1, remove the top lines which are the same as the title of the Component.

According to the PIF, *there are 72 official ports of entry.....Eight of these are maritime ports, ten are airports and 54 are land border posts. Unfortunately, control measures are still not in place for many of these pathways. Only one of the ports of entry – OR Tambo International Airport – has adequate biosecurity measures in place, while the remaining ports of entry have limited, or sporadic deployment, of biosecurity capacity.* There are also “*11 pathways involved in the accidental introduction of alien species as stowaways on transport vectors*”.

Is this component being designed to cover all these ports of entry? If there are 8 maritime ports, and output 1.2 is for one “*sea container and break-bulk cargo biosecurity risk management system*” (Durbin?) what are the expectation for the other 7? What does “*biosecurity risk management system*” entail? If there is only 1 *small team of biosecurity detection dogs and their handlers*”, where is it going to be deployed? (the PIF refers to key ports –[plural] of entry). Can these dogs detect all types of IAS?

What is the expected ratio of TA/INV for the different outputs? (It is difficult to determine if the GEF funding and co-financing will be enough to deliver these outputs and the Component’s Outcome.

COMPONENT 2

Reduce the number of indicators to 1-2.

Output 2.1. aims at engaging a) the private sector; (b) disadvantaged local communities; and (c) environmental community groups. This reads as a daunting task because of the sheer number of people to be targeted. The output assumes that the GEF needs to hear about; *facilitating the active involvement (through the adopt-a-river approach administered by the DHSWS) of poor local communities in controlling the spread of invasive plants species along rivers and river courses with high biodiversity and ecosystem service value.* Do local communities have the incentives, mechanism and means to control the spread of IAS along rivers and river courses? It is difficult to visualize how this can be deliver and work on the ground. Same for *environmental groups to become more involved in biosecurity monitoring, through surveillance, detection and reporting activities.* The GEF suggest resizing the target audiences for this output.

Output 2.1 What group of species will the *Centralized National Biosecurity Information and Risk Analysis System (BIRAS)* handle? According to the PIF, there are *2033 alien species recorded (or assumed to be present) outside of cultivation or captivity in the country, 775 are known to be invasive, 388 are known to be naturalized but not invasive, and 355 are present, but not naturalized.* There is also reference to the *NEM:BA Alien and Invasive Species Regulations (A&IS, 2014 as amended¹[6]) list a total of 559 alien species as invasive.*

Do the “*awareness and involvement campaign*” and BIRAS require \$6.4 million (GEF \$0.8M and Co-financing \$5.6 million? This reads as a super expensive proposition.

COMPONENT 3

The indicators don't correspond to the proposed outputs and unlikely to be achieved. How is the project going to measure the reduction of *the number of invasive species in South Africa*; or the reduction of the *extent of land area in South Africa that suffers major impacts from invasions*; or even *the increase in the proportion of species of species under an effective control regime increases*?

It is not possible to see how the proposed outcome will result from the two outputs. If the *eradication of the house mouse on Marion Island* is the real target of the component, this needs to be fully justified and flush out. As stated in the GEF-7 BD Strategy *Targeted eradication will be supported in specific circumstances where proven, low-cost, and effective eradication would result in the extermination of the IAS and the survival of globally significant species and/or ecosystems*.

4-13-20

Cleared

Agency Response

Response on 9 April 2020

GEF Secretariat Comments	Response /Answer
2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?	

According to the GEF-7 Strategy *GEF will support the implementation of comprehensive prevention, early detection, control and management frameworks that emphasize a risk management approach by focusing on the highest risk invasion pathways.*

COMPONENT

The terms "prevention" and "early detection" are used in the definition of the Outcome of the Component, without further elaboration except when mentioned in Output 1. (An inter-agency 'Biosecurity Risk Assessment/ Targeting Centre (BRA/TC) is established and operational). Since the prevention and early detection of IAS encompasses numerous depending on the organism, please provide the names of the institutions with the mandate and the appropriate frameworks to take action and/or bibliographic references will suffice. The objective of this question is to understand what tools the BRA/TC will have at its disposal to carry its proposed functions.

The project's objective is to improve efficiency and effective management of high-risk invasive alien species (IAS) in South Africa. This project is important since it will directly mitigate the resultant negative impacts of IAS on South Africa's biodiversity assets, and indirectly contributes to the improvement of rural food security and livelihoods.

South Africa has extensive transport networks that facilitate the movement of goods and people around the country and also connecting the Southern African Development Community region with world through road and air transportation). In line with the international trade patterns, the volume of goods and the number of people moving around the country is expected to increase. For instance, the number of domestic airline passengers has increased over time such that in the 2015/2016 financial year, there were over 13 million trips made by over 140 000 flights thus making South Africa more prone to alien invasion. As in the PIF, over 2000 alien species have established populations outside of captivity or cultivation in South Africa to date. About one third of these have become invasive. Experts are of the opinion that more than 100 invasive species already cause major impacts. Both number of species causing major impacts, and the magnitude of the impacts themselves, are set to grow as further species become invasive, and as others enter a phase of exponential spread.

The enabling frameworks, and the respective mandates of the different state institutions (directly and indirectly) responsible for the prevention and early detection of IAS, are more comprehensively described in Chapter 7 of the report 'The status of biological invasions and their management in South Africa (2017).

The enabling frameworks, and the respective mandates of the different state institutions (directly and indirectly) responsible for the prevention and early detection of IAS, are more comprehensively described in Chapter 7 of the report '*The status of biological invasions and their management in South Africa* (2017) and are summarised below:

Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment: They are the National Focal Point of the Convention on Biological Diversity and responsible for administering the National Environment Biodiversity Act and the Alien and Invasive Species Regulations. The implementation of the Act is mainly supported by number of environmental programmes that are presented in detail on the PIF such include the Natural Resource management (Working for Water).

Suggest reducing the number of indicators (i.e. one of the first two or a combination).	Only the first 2 indicators have been left in the PIF – see table B of the PIF
Under Outcome 1, remove the top lines which are the same as the title of the Component.	The top lines have been removed

According to the PIF, there are 72 official ports of entry.....Eight of these are maritime ports, ten are airports and 54 are land border posts. Unfortunately, control measures are still not in place for many of these pathways. Only one of the ports of entry – OR Tambo International Airport – has adequate biosecurity measures in place, while the remaining ports of entry have limited, or sporadic deployment, of biosecurity capacity. There are also “11 pathways involved in the accidental introduction of alien species as stowaways on transport vectors”.

Is this component being designed to cover all these ports of entry? If there are 8 maritime ports, and output 1.2 is for one “sea container and break-bulk cargo biosecurity risk management system” (Durbin?) what are the expectation for the other 7? What does “biosecurity risk management system” entail? If there is only 1 small team of biosecurity detection dogs and their handlers”, where is it going to be deployed? (the PIF refers to key ports –[plural] of entry). Can these dogs detect all types of IAS?

In South Africa there is currently no intervention to prevent introduction through hull fouling. Over 60 alien taxa are believed to have been introduced in South Africa through hulls of visiting ships. The rate of introductions that have occurred so far has increased over time. To address the increasing demand, all of South Africa’s major ports, except the Mossel Bay, will be upgraded and expanded in the future. This action could lead to an increase in the number of visiting ships, and unless additional biosecurity measures are put in place, the increased shipping intensity could result in an increase in the introduction of marine organisms through hull fouling.

Currently the Durban harbour is more threatened by this pathway due to the number of visiting ships, and trade routes from Asia in particular.

The Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment is more visible at the OR Tambo international airport. The latter is the busiest airport that connects the rest of the cities across the country. The Beitbridge border post which connects South Africa to the rest of continent is one of the priority border posts for this project. However, occasional joint operations are carried out at other entry points in conjunction with other departments in particular Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development (DALRRD) which is visible at most of the ports (air, harbor and land boarders).

Currently, the DALRRD have 11 detection dogs that are trained to detect plants and plant products. The detector dogs are a fast, versatile and mobile detection technology that can screen across a range of environments. Therefore, the project will also look into upscaling capacity for interception and prevention of import of potentially damaging invasive species. This will be done through the deployment of detection dogs that might offset the cost of vigilance, and an increase in this capacity to deliver positive returns on investment. The dogs will be trained to detect broad spectrum of alien species and animal products to strengthen our biosecurity system

It is initially envisaged that Output 1.1 be piloted at 2 primary ports of entry - OR Tambo International Airport and Durban maritime port. During the PPG, the feasibility of including a key land border post (such as Beit Bridge) as an additional pilot will be assessed.

In Output 1.2, GEF resources will only be used to support the roll out of a sea

<p>What is the expected ratio of TA/INV for the different outputs? (It is difficult to determine if the GEF funding and co-financing will be enough to deliver these outputs and the Component's Outcome.</p>	<p>A detailed output-based assessment has not yet been prepared for the project, so this is difficult to estimate with any degree of confidence.</p> <p>At the component level, we estimate the following TA/INV ratios:</p> <p>Component 1 = 60:40</p> <p>Component 2 = 30:70</p> <p>Component 3 = 90:10</p> <p>Please note that the portal does not allow us to select both TA and INV but we are attaching a version of the PIF in the portal with the ratios stated.</p>
<p>COMPONENT 2 Reduce the number of indicators to 1-2.</p>	<p>We have reduced the number of indicators to two, as requested.</p>

Output 2.1. aims at engaging a) the private sector; (b) disadvantaged local communities; and (c) environmental community groups. This reads as a daunting task because of the sheer number of people to be targeted. The GEF suggest resizing the target audiences for this output.

The target area of the project will be on the catchments that are tributaries to the Crocodile River which is one of the most pressured river systems in South Africa and invasive plant species have negatively affected the integrity of the system. The following catchment that are situated in the Eastern Cape province will be targeted the Buffalo, Mzimvubu, Mbhashe, Nahoon and Pienaars/Crocodile.

There are already volunteer groups in these areas and the target will be women and youth that are classified as disadvantaged due to lack of modern amenities. The Expanded Public Works initiative is a well establish programme that has set the benchmark for incentive schemes targeting the folks mention above. The standard rate is approximately US\$6.18 (ZAR105.00) per person per day. The current project would follow suit since the approach is similar and at an affordable rate than utilizing formal employees while being able to cover larger areas. The approach would entail training and environmental awareness. Experience has demonstrated that this approach results in a sense of ownership by communities, and this contributes to biodiversity management. In addition to assisting in either mechanical/physical removal or biocontrol of AIS, communities are trained in and monitoring and reporting the occurrence of IAS.

Taken together, these activities result in a range of benefits that include skills in biodiversity management, benefits and opportunities in harvesting and control of IAS, data capturing, and water resource monitoring. These skills enhance prospects for a range of opportunities that include learning to start own businesses in making compost, furniture, etc, from the control of IAS. Point (iii) below speaks to the technology that the communities can utilize and the monitoring of the occurrence and spread of IAS.

GEF resources will be used to develop a national biosecurity awareness campaign, but funding for implementation of the campaign will be contained to the following:

- (i) Four to five large national corporate businesses with a national high-profile footprint
- (ii) Poor communities living in four to five water sub-catchment areas in the Eastern Cape
- (iii) Four to five environmental groups/NGOs with a national footprint

The output assumes that the GEF needs to hear about; *facilitating the active involvement (through the adopt-a-river approach administered by the DHSWS) of poor local communities in controlling the spread of invasive plants species along rivers and river courses with high biodiversity and ecosystem service value*. Do local communities have the incentives, mechanism and means to control the spread of IAS along rivers and river courses? It is difficult to visualize how this can be deliver and work on the ground. Same for *environmental groups to become more involved in biosecurity monitoring, through surveillance, detection and reporting activities*.

The adopt-a-river programme has already been running, under the then leadership of the Department of Water Affairs, since 2010. The cooperative governance arrangements, implementation modalities, community empowerment mechanisms, partnership arrangements, alignment to local and regional IAS management strategies and plans and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, are well established.

The same is true to the approach to ‘citizen science’, where there is a strong involvement of volunteers in the collection, monitoring and conservation of biodiversity. Well established examples include the Protea Atlas Project, South African Bird Atlas Project, Southern African Butterfly Conservation Assessment Project and the Custodians of Rare and Endangered Wildflowers.

Output 2.1 What group of species will the *Centralized National Biosecurity Information and Risk Analysis System (BIRAS)* handle? According to the PIF, there are 2033 alien species recorded (or assumed to be present) outside of cultivation or captivity in the country, 775 are known to be invasive, 388 are known to be naturalized but not invasive, and 355 are present, but not naturalized. There is also reference to the *NEM:BA Alien and Invasive Species Regulations (A&IS, 2014 as amended[6])* list a total of 559 alien species as invasive.

The rate at which alien species are being introduced in South Africa has been increasing steadily, from around 35 species per decade in the 1950s to 70 species per decade between 2000 and 2010. Historically, most species have entered South Africa from overseas. However, the growth in trade across Africa over the past decade is anticipated to result in an increase in the number of alien species likely to be introduced to other countries in Africa. These are eventually expected to make their way to South Africa.

Terrestrial plants, numerous animals have also invaded the country's landscapes. South Africa's freshwater ecosystems have been invaded by both alien as well as extralimital introductions (indigenous species outside their historical extent of occurrence). The status of invasion in the marine environment remains poorly studied.

The current project will target the economically important species as listed in terms of NEMBA IAS regulation. The regulation further categorise the listed alien invasive species into four categories 1a; 1b; 2 and 3. Category 1a: are those alien invasive species which must be controlled and where possible removed and destroyed. Any form of trade or planting is strictly prohibited and approximately 69 species across all taxa are listed under this category.

In Output 2.2, the focus is less on data and more about facilitating data flow and data sharing between institutions and improving biosecurity analytic capabilities. The species data on BIRAS will be information already being collected by the plethora of different mandated institutions (in accordance with their legislative mandates). We have used experiences in Australia and the EU in the development of similar systems to guide the costing of this output but accept that this remains a rough estimate for now. During the PPG we will liaise with counterparts from these regions to get a better indication of the input costs for this output.

<p>Do the “<i>awareness and involvement campaign</i>” and BIRAS require \$6.4 million (GEF \$0.8M and Co-financing \$5.6 million? This reads as a super expensive proposition.</p>	<p>The bulk of the co-financing of this component (>90%) will be for the implementation of Output 2.1. As mentioned in the comment above, the costs of implementation of the biosecurity awareness campaign will be significant.</p> <p>Besides the institutional investments in ongoing data collection, storage and management there are no in-country resources to support the development of the BIRAS.</p>
<p>COMPONENT 3</p> <p>The indicators don’t correspond to the proposed outputs and unlikely to be achieved. How is the project going to measure the reduction of <i>the number of invasive species in South Africa</i>; or the reduction of <i>the extent of land area in South Africa that suffers major impacts from invasions</i>; or even <i>the increase in the proportion of species of species under an effective control regime increases</i>?</p> <p>It is not possible to see how the proposed outcome will result from the two outputs. If the <i>eradication of the house mouse on Marion Island</i> is the real target of the component, this needs to be fully justified and flush out. As stated in the GEF-7 BD</p> <p><i>Strategy Targeted eradication will be supported in specific circumstances where proven, low-cost, and effective eradication would result in the extermination of the IAS and the survival of globally significant species and/or ecosystems.</i></p>	<p>Agreed. These indicators and the outcome statement have been revised to more realistically reflect the activities across the two outputs.</p> <p>The Marion island and Prince Edward Islands are already recognised as a Special Nature Reserve, which affords the highest degree of protection under South African environmental legislation, they are also a Ramsar site.</p> <p>The Marion Island’s terrestrial ecosystem has been radically transformed by introduced mice, which are now threatening the island’s globally important seabird. The project eradication efforts will start during early winter, when mouse numbers are falling due to lack of food and cold conditions, increasing the likelihood of all animals consuming bait. These Mice also cease breeding on Marion from late May to August, reducing the chances of semi-independent young in the den failing to encounter bait. Winter also coincides with the period of lowest numbers of brown skuas and giant petrels (<i>Macronectes spp.</i>) present on the island, which might be killed accidentally by either primary or secondary poisoning. This is a cost-effective method to eradicate mice in the island which will be done by helicopter bait spraying costs to achieve wide application of bait. The method has also been tested and proven effective in the eradication of house mice from South Georgia. The method has also been tested and proven effective in the eradication of house mice from South Georgia. A preliminary expert assessment (Birdlife South Africa) has confirmed that eradication of mice from Marion Island is entirely feasible, with minimal and manageable risks to non-target species.</p>

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-6-20

Co-Financing (all coming from different Government Departments), is in the amount of \$22.6 million (Recurrent Expenditures = \$16.1 million and Investment Mobilized = \$6.5 Million).

Cleared

Agency Response

Cleared

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-6-20

Table D has the same amount as in ~~LoE~~ and Agency Fee is 9.5%

Cleared.

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
UNEP	GET	South Africa	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	3,411,644	324,106	3,735,750
Total GEF Resources(\$)					3,411,644	324,106	3,735,750

Agency Response

Cleared

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

N/A

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

N/A

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

N/A

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

N/A

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

N/A

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-6-20

The PPG is the same as in the LoE and in agreement with the GEF policies.

Cleared

PPG Amount (\$)	PPG Agency Fee (\$)
150,000	14,250

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
UNEP	GET	South Africa	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	150,000	14,250	164,250

Agency Response

Cleared

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)


Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-6-20

Core Indicators

Is the project going to create the Prince Edward Special Island Reserve (Under Indicator 1.1)?

Indicator 1.1 Terrestrial Protected Areas Newly created ⓘ

Ha (Expected at PIF)		Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)		Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)		Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	
33,400.00		0.00		0.00		0.00	
Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	
Prince Edward Island Special Nature Reserve	555563456	Strict Nature Reserve	33,400.00				

4-13-20

Cleared

Agency Response

Response on 9 April 2020

Prince Edward Island is already declared a special nature reserve. The core indicator has been removed

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-6-20

Yes

Cleared

Agency Response

Cleared

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-2-20

Project justification

Cleared

Agency Response

Cleared

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-6-20

There is a very detail account of the Background as well as of the Baseline Projects

Cleared

Agency Response

Cleared

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-6-20

Alternative scenario. This was reviewed under item 2

Cleared

Agency Response

Cleared

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-6-20

Yes. This was discussed in Window No. 1

Cleared

Agency Response

Cleared

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-6-20

Cleared

Agency Response

Cleared

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-6-20

Cleared

Agency Response

Cleared

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-6-20

Please elaborate on the innovations for South Africa

4-13-20

Cleared

Agency Response

Response on 9 April 2020

The response has been changed to specific address the South African situation. See section 1.7 of the PIF but summarized here below:

Innovation: The current operations are disintegrated and very inefficient making it difficult to effectively manage AIS in South Africa. The current project is aimed at addressing these major issues by introducing a number of innovative measures including:

- (i) Establishing and operationalising an inter-agency operations centre to improve coordination and cooperation in the surveillance of IAS at key national ports of entry (Output 1.1). It has not been attempted in South Africa and is a cost-effective way of preventing entry of IAS into South Africa.
- (ii) Developing a biosecurity risk management capacity at South Africa's main harbours, and implementing a self-financing cleaning and fumigation system for sea containers and break-bulk cargo at Durban harbour (Output 1.2). Such a cleaning and fumigation system is new to South Africa.
- (iii) Establishing a centralised national biosecurity information system, with dedicated biosecurity risk-analytic capabilities (Output 2.2); and
- (iv) Introducing a smartphone application, linked to the national biosecurity information system and to national IAS databases, to enable the IAS fraternity and civil society to identify IAS for a wide range of purposes and to report sightings of them being introduced via entry ports and in the wild (Output 2.1). Using this new technology for conservation purposes will result in better reporting and results.

These activities are innovative because they aim to change business-as-usual management of IAS styles by creating efficiency and effectiveness.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Response on 9 April 2020

Yes, the map was attached /uploaded

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-6-20

There is a detailed table in the PIF that includes Roles & Responsibilities in IAS management, at PIF development and implementation.

Cleared

Agency Response

Cleared

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6-4-20

Cleared

Agency Response

Cleared

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

2-6-20

Private Sector. To be engaged in Output 2.1

Cleared

Agency Response

Cleared

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-6-20

As per the Guidelines on the GEF Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards, the Secretariat, in its review, is assessing the availability and completeness of the information on environmental and social risks and potential impacts associated with the project and response measures to address identified risks and impacts. Please review the Risk Component of the PIF to ensure that the following information is available and complete i) The overall project/program risk classification; ii) Relevant types and levels of risks and potential impacts. And if appropriate: preliminary measures to address identified risks and potential impacts. Any supporting documents like screening reports or preliminary Environmental and Social Risk and Impact Assessment reports, as appropriate. Please check

GUIDELINES ON
GEF'S POLICY ON ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

GEF/C.57/Inf.05
December 12, 2019 |

4-13-20

Cleared

Agency Response

Response on 9 April 2020

The risks have been written and classified and rated as per the table in section 5 of the PIF on risks

The social and environmental risk assessment report has been attached

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-6-20

There is a detail account on the Coordination with clear roles and responsibilities for the GEF Agency and the Executing Agency.

Cleared

Agency Response

Cleared

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-6-20

National Priorities listed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Cleared

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-6-20

Yes. The KM is embedded inside each of the components and relevant outputs rather than in a separate Component. This is probably best as KM does not come separate from the rest of the project.

Cleared

Agency Response

Cleared

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-6-20

LoE is signed by the current OFP

Cleared

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area	Amount (in US\$)			
			Project Preparation	Project	Fee	Total
GEF TF	UNEP	Biodiversity	150,000	3,411,644	338,356	3,900,000
Total GEF Resources			150,000	3,411,644	338,356	3,900,000

Agency Response

Cleared

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

UNEP RESPONSE 17/04/2020: to RECOMMENDATION SECTION

Additional explanation to the co-financing was added.

GEFSEC DECISION**RECOMMENDATION**

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-6-20

No. Please address the outstanding issues listed above.

4-16-20

On Co-financing: Please elaborate on the definition/ approach used to determine "investment mobilized". The current description "The Government of South Africa investments mobilized are extrapolated from the MTEF project/programme-based budget allocations for the contributing Departments and Public Institutions" simply refers to extrapolation of expenditure framework.

4-20-20

Yes. This PIF is Recommended for Technical Reasoning.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

CONTEXT: Biological invasions are a growing environmental problem worldwide and South Africa is home to a large and growing number of invasive species. Of the 2033 alien species recorded (or assumed to be present) outside of cultivation or captivity in the country, *775 are known to be invasive*, 388 are known to be naturalized but not invasive, and 355 are present, but not naturalized. The project will contribute to strengthening the national capacity to implement South Africa's *National Invasive Species Strategy and Action Plan* (NISSAP). The project will focus GEF investments on addressing some of the key gaps in managing the first three stages of invasion (introduction, establishment and expansion) through a combination of species-based, area-based and pathway-based approaches. It will however emphasise the strengthening of biosecurity along high risk introduction pathways and specifically target activities that result in the protection of globally significant terrestrial, aquatic, coastal and marine biodiversity (species, habitats and ecosystems) from the impacts of biological invasions. The project will, wherever practicable, direct its efforts to the management and control of those invasive species that also impact on food security, human health and the livelihoods of rural communities (notably in the fishing, forestry and agriculture sectors), particularly in the areas where the poorest people may be dependent on biodiversity-based products for food, fuel and construction material.

PROJECT: The project has the following Components: COMPONENT 1. It is focused on improving the operational management of high-risk introduction pathways for the priority alien invasive species considered to have a detrimental impact on South Africa's globally significant biodiversity, and that also constitute a significant risk to rural livelihoods. The outputs and activities under this component will collectively contribute to strengthening the country's surveillance capacity at key entry points (i.e. points of import) in the form of border controls, monitoring, early detection and quarantine measures. COMPONENT 2. It is focused on strengthening the

role of the broader community in biosecurity activities, particularly in pre-border and post-border risk analysis, surveillance, detection and reporting. COMPONENT 3: It is focused on supporting efforts to improve the effectiveness of control measures that address individual species, with an emphasis on the eradication and biological control of targeted invasive alien species considered a high risk to South Africa's global biodiversity values and food security.

RESULTS: The project will improve the management of Prince Edward Islands Special Nature Reserve (33,400 ha) by supporting the eradication of the house mouse (*Mus musculus*) from Marion Island and implementing biosecurity protocols to prevent future introductions of the house mouse to Marion Island and Prince Edward Island. The project will also contribute to improving the conservation status of a number of threatened seabird species in the Southern Ocean (Sooty Albatross EN, Light-mantled Albatross NT, Grey-headed Albatross EN, Grey Petrel NT, White-chinned Petrel VU and Kerguelen Tern NT), including nearly half of the world's population of Wandering Albatrosses (VU). Furthermore, the project will seek to reduce the impact of eight Category 1b plant invasive species over a total area of at least 300,000 ha. The project will contribute to achieving Aichi Target 9 ('By 2020, invasive species and their pathways should be identified and prioritized') under Strategic Goal B ('Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity') of the CBD's Strategic plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020

INNOVATION, SUSTAINABILITY AND POTENTIAL FOR SCALING UP: The project will introduce several measures that are innovative in South Africa to address the threats of IAS. These include: i) Establishing and implementing an inter-agency operation center to improve coordination and cooperation in the surveillance of IAS at key entry points; ii) Developing a biosecurity risk management capacity at the main harbors; iii) Establishing a centralized national biosecurity information system with dedicated biosecurity risk analytic capacities. Sustainability is premised on improving the efficiencies and cost-effectiveness of the responsible public institutions (DEFF, DALRRD, SANBI, etc.) in implementing the invasive species regulations along high risk introduction and post-introduction pathways. It is anticipated that, by project end, the responsible institutions will be able to significantly improve their biosecurity surveillance capabilities using the existing budget allocations and staff capacities. Potential for national upscaling post-project is high in the following areas: (i) establishing biosecurity capabilities (including BRA/TCs, biosecurity detection dogs and/or sea container and bulk-cargo inspections and treatment) at all ports of entry; (ii) upscaling the full release, and mass rearing, of the project-developed biocontrol agents; (iii) upscaling the integration of biosecurity issues into the private sector; (iv) broadening the scope and reach of the involvement of civil society in contributing to building the knowledge on IAS; and (v) rolling out the adopt-a-river program nation-wide.

CO-FINANCING: Co-Financing (all coming from different Government Departments), is in the amount of \$22.6 million (Recurrent Expenditures = \$16.1 million and Investment Mobilized = \$6.5 Million).