



**GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS  
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND**

GEF ID:	9424		
Country/Region:	Dominican Republic		
Project Title:	Mainstreaming Conservation of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services in Productive Landscapes in Threatened Forested Mountainous Areas		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5761 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4 Program 9; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$180,000	Project Grant:	\$8,176,165
Co-financing:	\$54,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$62,176,165
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Sarah Wyatt	Agency Contact Person:	Lyes Ferroukhi,

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	<p>March 12, 2016</p> <p>This PIF is overall strong with good links to the GEF strategy. The project lists the Aichi Targets addressed. However, please address the following issues:</p> <p>- There seems to be good alignment of project locations with areas of high priority for globally significant</p>	

<sup>1</sup> 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>biodiversity, such as KBAs and their buffer zones, which is a real strength of this proposal. However, this information is not contained in the PIF. Please include more information on the specific biodiversity values targeted through the selection of these sites. Only one site has biodiversity value listed on page 17. The explanation need not be lengthy, but explain the global significance of the biodiversity in each area. Please consider the possibility of including unprotected KBAs within the target areas. A map would be helpful to clarify the locations of project activities.</p> <p>- Invasive species - The GEF-6 Biodiversity Strategy has a specific approach to IAS.                      "The 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. 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."</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Please provide more detail on the IAS component and ensure that it is in line with the biodiversity strategy.</p> <p>- Indicators - Table B needs to be refined as discussed in #5. However, while improving the clarity, there also needs to be clarity on the indicators to be used. It can be difficult to tease them out from the text of Table B. Please focus on measurable and concrete indicators rather than simply capacity building (as an example).</p> <p>March 31, 2016</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for addressing these issues.</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>March 12, 2016</p> <p>Yes. This project is aligns with national strategies.</p>	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>March 11, 2016</p> <p>No. This PIF does not address issues of financial sustainability and sustainability project activities, which is the focus of this question. On page 20, the financial sustainability of the extension program is mentioned, but it is not described how this will be assured.</p>	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>March 31, 2016</p> <p>Yes. However, during PPG please ensure that the sustainability of project activities is accounted for, particularly 3.1 and 1.2.2.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>March 12, 2016</p> <p>No, please clarify the following.</p> <p>- Co-financing - the co-financing numbers are impressive and several co-financing opportunities are identified, but not discussed in the PIF. Please identify where the major cofinancing amounts will be used, particularly from other donors, and what discussions have already occurred about this project.</p> <p>March 31, 2016</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for the clarifications.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>March 11, 2016</p> <p>No, this project still needs to clarify issues related to the activities listed.</p> <p>- Outcomes and outputs - Table B is excessively long and a bit confused about what outcomes and outputs are. It may benefit from some reorganization. Please revise Table B to be more concise and follow GEF</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>guidance on outcomes and outputs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Output 1.2.1 - It would be helpful to provide a better and more clear linkage between the GIS mentioned in output 1.1.1 and output 1.2.1</li> <li>- Outcome 1.2 - Will the outcome only be the proposal of financial sustainability options or their actual piloting and implementation?</li> <li>- Payments for Ecosystem Services - This subcomponent receives one sentence in the PIF. GEF STAP guidance has shown that PES schemes need to have defined providers, payers, and a program architecture in order to be successful. Please provide this information and make good use of the guidance in the STAP advisory document from 2010.</li> <li>- Under output 1.1.1 - please clarify what is meant by "monitoring the state and evolution of endemic and native species", specifically in monitoring the evolution of species.</li> <li>- Corridors - Corridors have many different meanings and design strategies. Different paths can result from different target species and priorities. How will they be developed? How big will they be? Will there be any involvement of research and/or scientific guidance in the designation of corridors?</li> <li>- Is beekeeping going to be a major</li> </ul>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>part of the activities in site 1? This common alternative livelihoods activity often doesn't yield the expected benefits by itself.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Carbon calculations - projects requesting SFM resources must include calculations of Carbon benefits. EX-ACT is often used for similar projects, but any commonly accepted tool can be used.</li> <li>- As this project is requesting SFM resources, please include forests in the title.</li> <li>- Livelihood activities should have a direct relationship to GEBs. For instance, ecotourism promotion needs a strong justification about how it is generating GEBs.</li> <li>- Is Madre de las Aguas currently part of MAB or will the project promote application to MAB?</li> <li>- In addition, please make sure the table on page 18 is entirely in English.</li> <li>- Credit mechanism - this component looks particularly interesting and innovative, we look forward to receiving a detailed explanation at CEO Endorsement.</li> </ul> <p>March 31, 2016</p> <p>Yes. However, at CEO Endorsement please clarify relationship with MAB</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		(as it is mentioned in Table B and para 37). Also, clarify how to the sustainability of the CISA program benefits (environmental services protected) will be ensured along with the financial sustainability of the program. Lastly, please ensure that ecotourism support is both innovative and has a clear tie to supporting the delivery of global environmental benefits.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	March 11, 2016  Yes. This project does a good job of including CSOs and addressing gender components.	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	March 11, 2016  Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	March 12, 2016  Yes. However, it is worth noting that this project would leave only \$2,262 remaining in the LD STAR focal area allocation.	
	<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>• Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	March 12, 2016	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>No. This project is requesting more than the 2:1 ratio of SFM resources. Please revise the budget. This project requests a total of \$3.05 million from the SFM set aside.</p> <p>March 31, 2016</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for the clarification.</p>	
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>March 12, 2016</p> <p>This project is not recommended for clearance at this time. Please address the issues raised above.</p> <p>March 31, 2015</p> <p>Yes. The revisions made were welcome and strengthened the project. The PM recommends CEO PIF clearance.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	March 17, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 31, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		



## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.