



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

|  |   |                              |                       |
|--|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| GEF ID:                                    | <b>5088</b>   |                              |                       |
| Country/Region:                            | <b>Dominican Republic</b>   |                              |                       |
| Project Title:                             | <b>Conserving Biodiversity in Coastal Areas Threatened by Rapid Tourism and Physical Infrastructure Development</b> |                              |                       |
| GEF Agency:                                | <b>UNDP</b>   | GEF Agency Project ID:       | <b>4955 (UNDP)</b>    |
| Type of Trust Fund:                        | <b>GEF Trust Fund</b>   | GEF Focal Area (s):          | <b>Biodiversity</b>   |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | <b>BD-2; BD-2; Project Mana;</b>  |                              |                       |
| Anticipated Financing PPG:                 | <b>\$0</b>  | Project Grant:               | <b>\$2,838,792</b>    |
| Co-financing:                              | <b>\$13,684,525</b>   | Total Project Cost:          | <b>\$16,523,317</b>   |
| PIF Approval:                              |   | Council Approval/Expected:   | <b>April 01, 2013</b> |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval                   |   | Expected Project Start Date: |                       |
| Program Manager:                           | <b>Andrew Velthaus</b>  | Agency Contact Person:       | <b>Lyes Ferroukhi</b> |

| 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 country eligible?  | 08/20/2012: Yes.  |  |
|                                | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?                                   | 08/20/2012: Yes, in a letter dated January 14, 2012 requesting for the project a total of US\$ 3,329,949 and requesting a PPG budget of about US\$ 90,909 from the GEF.   |  |
| Agency's Comparative Advantage | 3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? | 1/8/2013 AWV: This is now a full biodiversity mainstreaming project, well within UNDP's comparative advantage.<br><br>08/20/2012: Yes, UNDP is well in its role, assisting Dominican Republic in conserving biodiversity and land degradation in coastal areas. |  |

\*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 11-22-2010

| Review Criteria       | Questions  | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>  | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|
|                       |  | Furthermore, UNDP Dominican Republic has a well-established group of professionals in its environment team.   |  |
|                       | 4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?                | 08/20/2012: N/A   |  |
|                       | 5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?                           | 08/20/2012: Yes, the project is well aligned with UNDP Dominican Republic 2012-2016 Country Programme Document, which identified the need to improve the sustainability of the tourism sector and sustainable management of natural resources. UNDP has a country office including an Environment team. |  |
| Resource Availability | 6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): |   |  |
|                       | • the STAR allocation?   | 08/20/2012: Yes   |  |
|                       | • the focal area allocation?   | 08/20/2012: Yes, to date, the country has access to US\$4,192,943 from BD focal area and US\$720,000 from LD focal area.  |  |
|                       | • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access   | 08/20/2012: N/A   |  |
|                       | • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?  | 08/20/2012: N/A   |  |
|                       | • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund  | 08/20/2012: N/A   |  |
| Project Consistency   | 7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?                  | 1/8/2013 AWV: The land degradation component has been removed. The biodiversity component completely aligns with the BD focal area results framework. We clear on this.   |  |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
|                 |           | <p>9/23/2012</p> <p>BD (AVelthaus) Thank you for separating out Table A per outcome and assigning associated budgets. After consideration, we agree that the project does not need to track BD2 output 3 for this project.</p> <p>LD (MBakarr) - The alignment with LD3 is still lacking since there is no evidence of engagement by rural land users in implementing SLM to reduce pressures from competing land uses. The focus on tourism impact clearly indicates that the proposed project has no clear links to agro-ecosystem management, and therefore should not be financed with LDFA resources.</p> <p>08/20/2012: The project is consistent with BD result framework, and is clearly consistent with BD objective 2. However, we understand that the project will support the development of certification system. Therefore, BD2 output 3 should be added.</p> <p>The project objectives need to be clarified regarding the LD objective. Land Degradation Objective 3 is the reduction of pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape. The key outcomes are harmonization and coordination between sectors in support of SLM, and the adoption of SLM good practices,</p> |  |

| Review Criteria | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
|                 |   | <p>supported by the provision of financial resources to rural land users which will enable them to sustain and upscale good practices. Therefore, please, further detail the current land uses (tourism and agriculture sectors), how sectors are competing for land area and natural resources. Please, further detail the planned activities to achieve the output 2.3, in accordance to LD and BD objectives.</p> <p>Finally, Table A has to present a breakdown per outcome (with an associated budget).</p> |  |
|                 | <p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p>   | <p>1/8/2013 AWV:</p> <p>As noted above, this is now a BD-only project, and appropriate FA objectives are identified.</p> <p>9/24/12</p> <p>LD (MBakarr) - As noted in #7 above, the reference to LD3 is not justified by the project design and focus.</p> <p>08/20/2012: The project objectives are relevant to BD objective 2, but they need to be clarified regarding the LD objectives (as raised under item 7).</p>   |  |
|                 | <p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p> | <p>1/8/2013: As noted below, this biodiversity-only project aligns with national strategies relating to biodiversity and tourism development. We clear on this.</p> <p>9/24/12</p>   |  |

| Review Criteria | Questions  | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|--|--|
|                 |  | <p>LD (MBakarr) - Consistency with NAP for implementation of UNCCD is highlighted, but the emphasis on addressing tourism impacts in the project does not qualify for GEF project support under the LD focal area.</p> <p>08/20/2012: The project is consistent with the national strategies related to biodiversity conservation and tourism development. The project will contribute to The National Development Plan Strategy 2030, the NBSAP, the Protected Area System Master Plan 2010-2030, and the National Tourism Development Plan (PEDTURD). However, the proposal should also provide the link with the UNCCD and the current NAP.</p> |  |
|                 | <p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>       | <p>9/23/2012: Thank you for the further elaboration in the PIF and UNDP responses on the targeted audience for training in conservation-compatible tourism. We believe the explanation is sufficient and we clear.</p> <p>08/20/2012: We understand that 300 people will be trained in conservation-compatible tourism and in the application of land use plans. However, please elaborate further on the targeted audience.</p>   |  |
|                 | <p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on</p> | <p>9/23/2012: Thank you for including budgetary information on protected areas support in paragraph 27 of the PIF. We clear on this issue.</p>   |  |

| 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 data and assumptions?   | 08/20/2012: The baseline description gives useful information on on-going activities. We understand that the public investment in the environment and tourism sector is significant and it is expected to be maintained or increased over the next five years. However, please, provide updated information regarding the budget allocated to the PA system.  |  |
|                 | 12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits? |   | 08/20/2012: Yes.   |
|                 | 13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?  | 1/8/2013 AWV: The incremental reasoning of this effort to mainstream conservation into tourism development is clear.<br><br>08/16/2012: Yes, we understand that the project arrives at a crucial time when the government proposes to create a new national tourism development plan. The project will complement the national baseline investments to support SLM interventions that improve sustainability of ecosystem service and to reinforce the national protected area network. |  |
|                 | 14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?  | 08/20/2012: Yes, the approach to develop 2 components (table B) well reflects the integration that is needed to ensure alignment of outcomes for long-term sustainability.  |  |

| Review Criteria | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
|                 | 15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?   | 08/20/2012: Yes.   |  |
|                 | 16. 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? | 9/23/2012: We believe the description of socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, is sufficient. We clear.<br><br>08/20/2012: Preliminary information is given on the socio-economic benefits for tourism and fisheries sectors. However, please provide more information regarding the socio-economic benefits including the gender dimension for the other land-users, in the targeted areas. |  |
|                 | 17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?   | 9/23/2012: We believe the information provided on the involvement of CSOs and land users is sufficient. We clear.<br><br>08/20/2012: Preliminary information is provided. However, please further detail how CSO and land-users will be involved.  |  |
|                 | 18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)   | 08/20/2012: Information on the potential risks and mitigation measures have been included.   |  |
|                 | 19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?  | 08/20/2012: Yes, the project is consistent with past and on-going related initiatives. We understand that the PPG phase will identify the coordination mechanisms with key partners and on-going related projects.   |  |

| Review Criteria   | Questions  | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>  | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-------------------|--|---|--|
|                   | 20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?   | <p>9/23/2013: The information provided on coordination arrangements is sufficient. We clear on this.</p> <p>08/20/2012: We understand that the ministry of environment will be in charge of guiding activities related to BD, and that the ministry of tourism will co-implement some of the core outputs. However, please provide further information on the coordination arrangements among the different ministries involved and other key stakeholders, and about the day-to-day life of the project.</p> |  |
|                   | 21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?     |   |  |
|                   | 22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?               |   |  |
| Project Financing | 23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?  | <p>1/8/2013: Project management costs are 4.87% of project budget. We clear.</p> <p>08/20/2012: The GEF project management cost represents 4.7% of the GEF project budget; which is fine.</p>   |  |
|                   | 24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | 08/20/2012: The funding and co-financing per objective is appropriate.  |  |
|                   | 25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing;<br>At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided. | 1/8/2013: The cofinancing ratio remains at a robust 1:4.8. We clear.  |  |



| Review Criteria                   | Questions  | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
|                                   |  | 08/20/2012: The co-financing ratio is 1:4.8, which is satisfactory.  |  |
|                                   | 26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?                   | 1/8/2013: UNDP is still bringing \$350,000 to this project.<br><br>08/20/2012: Yes, the co-financing brought by UNDP, US\$ 350,000 in the form of a grant, is in line with its role.   |  |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? |  |  |
|                                   | 28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?  |  |  |
| Agency Responses                  | 29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:  |  |  |
|                                   | • STAP?  |  |  |
|                                   | • Convention Secretariat?  |  |  |
|                                   | • Council comments?  |  |  |
|                                   | • Other GEF Agencies?  |  |  |
| <b>Secretariat Recommendation</b> |  |  |  |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage       | <b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>  | 1/8/2013<br><br>UNDP has amended the project to focus only on biodiversity mainstreaming in the tourism sector. We believe this is a solid proposal. It is technically cleared for possible inclusion in a future work program.<br><br>9/24/12<br><br>The PIF in its current form does not adequately justify the use of LD focal area resources and therefore cannot be |  |

| Review Criteria                             | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|--|--|
|   |   | recommended. The project does align well with BD focal area objective 2, as it seeks to mainstream biodiversity conservation in tourism development in the Dominican Republic. We, therefore, recommend that this project be reformulated as a project only using biodiversity resources under BD objective 2.<br><br>08/20/2012: The PIF cannot be recommended at this stage, please address the issues raised in the review sheet. |  |
|   | 31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.  |  |  |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | 32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG? |  |  |
|   | <b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>   |  |  |
| Review Date (s)                             | First review*   | August 20, 2012  |  |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)  | September 24, 2012   |  |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)  |  |  |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)  |  |  |
|   | 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.**

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

| Review Criteria | Decision Points | Program Manager Comments |
|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------|

|                            |   |   |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| PPG Budget                 | 1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate? | 1/8/2013 AWW:<br><br>This PPG will fund preparation activities that are appropriate for a project of this type, including validation of target sites and collection of baseline information, analysis of national and local capacities, and development of key project documents, such as the M&E plan. In terms of coordination, a multi-stakeholder platform will be established to advise on project development, including the government, private sector, and civil society. |
|                            | 2. Is itemized budget justified?                                    | 1/8/2013 AWW:<br><br>The moderate budget of \$77,138 is justified, and this will be supported with \$320,000 in co-financing.   |
| Secretariat Recommendation | <b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>                        | 1/8/2013 AWW:<br><br>We recommend approval of this PPG.   |
|                            | 4. Other comments   |   |
| Review Date (s)            | First review*   | January 08, 2013  |
|                            | 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.