



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

GEF ID:	5761		
Country/Region:	Dominica		
Project Title:	Supporting Sustainable Ecosystems by Strengthening the Effectiveness of Dominica's Protected Areas System		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5089 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$82,192	Project Grant:	\$1,707,306
Co-financing:	\$9,170,000	Total Project Cost:	\$10,959,498
PIF Approval:	May 09, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Lyes Ferroukhi

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	March 20, 2014 Yes. Dominica ratified the CBD in 1994.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	March 20, 2014 Yes. The OFP endorsed the project on 6 March 2014.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	3/20/2014 Yes.	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.  
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	3/20/2014 Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	N/A	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>? <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></p>	3/20/2014 Yes. This project is aligned w BD results framework and outlines the relevant Aichi Targets.	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	3/20/2014 Yes. This project clearly lists how it relates to the NBSAP and to other national sustainability strategies.	
	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	3/20/2014 Yes. The current situation in and around MTPNP has been well described as well as the challenges facing the broader Dominican National Park system.	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear,</p>	3/20/2014 Yes.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>Before CEO Endorsement please consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The inclusion of potential financial resources coming from biological research should be better clarified. This research could fall into two categories - medical research and general biology or ecology. For medical research (such as pharmaceutical discovery), there should be legal regimes to ensure fair benefits sharing. However, if this section is directed at the second categories (such as a study of parrot behavior or production of agroforestry systems) it seems counter to the goals of the project to seek financial resources from these projects as these projects will help support conservation. In this case, rules about working with local students and park staff may be more beneficial.</li> <li>2. Please further elaborate the mechanisms for ensuring financial sustainability of these investments. The focus on small scale tourism and the "Nature Island" initiative is very encouraging. However, more information about revenue from tourism (both small scale and cruise ship) as well as from improved agricultural practices is needed.</li> <li>3.</li> </ol>	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>3/20/2014</p> <p>Yes.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of:  a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, 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?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>3/20/2014   Yes. This project lists several CSOs and how they will be involved.</p>	
	<p>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)</p>	<p>3/20/2014   Yes. The project considers and address major risks.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>3/20/2014   Yes. This project does a good job of describing how it will relate to previous and existing projects on the island.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> </ul>	<p>3/20/2014   Dominica's decision as a country to be a "Nature Island" demonstrates a national initiative to take a path of sustainable development, avoiding the negative consequences seen in many of their neighbors in the Caribbean. This unique orientation is an important innovation in national development planning. This project will bolster this decision through support for the activities of the national parks and buffer zone areas.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>This project provides multiple strategies for ensuring the sustainability of these investments both through increases revenues from tourism as well as developing a specific national park unit within the government rather than having staff from different units work on NP issues. This combination of new and existing resources will help ensure sustainability.</p> <p>The environmentally friendly techniques and strategies developed for the buffer zone of the NP could be applied throughout the island and neighboring islands. The improvements and decisions made for the management of MTPNP can be applied at the other NPs in Dominica. This project can demonstrate how national park units can be successful in SIDS and other very small countries. Dominica potentially can serve as a model for a nature-oriented sustainable development pathway for other countries making decisions about how to develop.</p>	
	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?		
	16. Is the GEF funding and co-	3/20/2014	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes.	
	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?	3/20/2014  No. The co-financing numbers provided in Table A do not match the numbers in Table B and C. Please adjust accordingly.  3/26/2014  Yes.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	3/20/2014  Yes. It is in line with GEF standards.	
	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> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	3/20/2014  Yes. It is in line with GEF standards.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	3/20/2014  No. The project on the whole is very good. Please fix the issue with the numbers for co-financing and resubmit.  In addition, please address the issue of gender more expansively in the PIF and give an indication on how this will be fully considered in the project preparation and design phase.  3/26/2014  Yes. Thank you for including more information on ensuring the mainstreaming of gender and for fixing the budget inconsistencies.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	March 20, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 26, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* 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.