



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5524		
Country/Region:	Cape Verde		
Project Title:	Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into the tourism sector in synergy with a further strengthened protected areas system in Cape Verde		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; BD-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$52,123	Project Grant:	\$3,664,640
Co-financing:	\$15,521,542	Total Project Cost:	\$19,238,305
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Charlotte Gobin	Agency Contact Person:	Yves de Soye

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	08/21: Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	08/21: Yes, in a letter dated August 12, 2013. The STAR flexibility mechanism is requested. The total amount requested is US\$4,200,000.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	08/21: The remaining resources from BD and LD to be allocated are \$3,899,352. Please update the budget proposal accordingly. 08/27: The remaining resources to be	

		the budget proposal accordingly. Because Cape Verde is a flexible country, under Table D and F, use BD as the FA from which the remaining allocation amount comes from.	
		08/28: Cleared.	
	• the focal area allocation?	08/21: Please see comment above.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	08/21: N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	08/21: N/A	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	08/21: N/A	
	• focal area set-aside?	08/21: N/A	
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>	08/21: Yes, the project is well aligned with BD1 and BD2 objectives. The project will help achieve Aichi targets: 2, 5, 6, and 11. SMART indicators have been developed. Target for each expected outcomes will have to be developed at CEO endorsement. Cleared.	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	08/21: Yes, the project is consistent with country's national strategies and plans, including PANA-II, NBSAP, the National Protected Areas Strategy, and the National Strategic Plan for Tourism Development. Cleared.	
	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	08/21: The baseline is clear and focused. The key drivers of habitat loss and damage are clear. On-going initiatives and programs are well described and it is clear how the project will build upon them. However, please provide details of scale or magnitude of the two main	

Project Design		<p>example, how much habitat is lost to tourism development.</p> <p>08/27: cleared.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>08/21: Yes, the outcomes are well described, with indicators and clear expected outputs. however, please provide further information as detailed below:</p> <p>Component 1: Please provide more detail on the expected outcomes on the off-set mechanism which will be developed by the project, including the mechanism for joint management of biodiversity in ecologically sensitive areas and PA, involving tourism operators.</p> <p>Component 2: All the targeted PA will have to be defined for CEO endorsement and their METT shared. Sustainable financing of PA is key; more activity on this issue would have been welcomed. It is well noted that pilot activities will be developed in one island. By the time of CEO endorsement, more details are expected on this pilot, including the role of the private sector, and the expected revenue generated.</p> <p>08/27: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>08/21: Cape-Verde has an important level of species richness and endemism. Cape-Verde is one of the world's top ten coral reef biodiversity hotspots and is considered as an important Endemic Bird Area. The project will (i) improve the management effectiveness of 12,300 ha of PA, (ii) enhance control and reduction of pressures from tourism activities in PA and MPA, totalling 60,300 ha, and (iii) reduce adverse impact of artisanal</p>	

		MPA. Cleared.	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	08/21: A range of organizations is listed in Table A.2. Local communities including fisherman will play key role in Component 2. Please further articulate how they will be involved, how their capacity will be strengthened, and what long term benefit they will gain from this project. 08/27: Cleared.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	08/21: Yes, initial information on the potential risks and mitigation measures are provided. Further detail is expected at CEO endorsement. Cleared.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	08/21: Yes, the project is consistent and is properly coordinated with other initiatives. Cleared.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy 	08/21: The project will contribute to the consolidation and diversification of Cape Verde's tourism products by creating enabling conditions and harnessing sustainable form tourism and fisheries. Sustainability is based around the assumption that alternative being provided is financially more attractive to	

	<p>likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	support the additional costs of these sustainable practices. The project will mainly focus on four islands. These pilots could be then replicated to other islands. Cleared.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	08/21: Financing and cofinancing amounts are appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes. Cleared.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	08/21: The cofinancing ratio is about 1:4.1; which is fine. The cofinancing is in grant, from the government, UNDP, and the WB. Cleared.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	08/21: The Project Management Cost is about 4.9%; which is acceptable. Cleared.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> .	08/21: PPG amount requested doesn't deviate from the norm. Cleared.	

	report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	08/21: N/A	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	08/21: The project proposal cannot be recommended yet. Please address the issues raised above. 08/27: Please address the issue in Item3. 08/28: The project is technically cleared, and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	August 21, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 27, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 28, 2013	

*** This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**