

Basic Project Data

Project GEF ID:

<i>Staff</i>		<i>Processing Status</i>	<i>Date</i>
Program Manager	Acquay	Processing Stage	
Implementing Agency	UNDP	Concept Pipeline Discussion	10/4/99
Regional Coordinator		PDF A - Agency Approval	
Executing Agency	National Government	PDF B - CEO Approval	
		Bilateral Project Review Meeting	
		Work Program Submission and Approv	
		CEO Endorsement	
		Agency Approval	
		Project Completion	

Cost Summary

Cost Item	Years	Amount (USD'000)
<u>Preparation</u>		
- PDF A		
- PDF B		\$0.35
- PDF C		
<u>Project Allocation</u>		
- Executing Agency Fees and Costs		\$0.00
- Project Managment Costs		\$0.00
- Other Incremental Costs		\$0.00

Completeness of Documentation

Focal Point..... Budget..... Logical Framework.....
 STAP Review..... Increment Cost..... Length.....
 Disclosure of Administration Cost..... Complete Cover Sheet....

1. Country Ownership

Country Eligibility

Cape Verde ratified the CBD on March 29, 1995; it is therefore eligible for GEF financing

Evidence of Country Ownership/Country-Drivenness

- (a) There is a letter of endorsement from the GEF operational focal point dated May 5, 1999 supporting the project;
- (b) The project proposal is consistent with the country's priorities as outlined in the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan; and
- (c) The government would contribute \$50,000 in co-financing, 12% of the total preparation cost.

2. Program and Policy Conformity

Portfolio Balance

It is a project focusing on a small island developing state (SIDS) which is an area of emphasis for the GEF biodiversity portfolio.

Program Conformity

The objectives of the project (see page 1) are consistent with the objectives of OP#1 and OP2 -- the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in arid and semi-arid ecosystems and coastal, marine and freshwater ecosystems.

Replicability

To be provided at Work Program Inclusion

Potential Global Environmental Benefits of Project

The potential global benefit of the proposed project is the conservation of flora and fauna of global significance, including endemic species in the country.

Site-specific global benefits would be provided in the project brief.

Sustainability

The following would contribute to the sustainability of the project activities:

- (a) transformation of Cape Verde's Red list into a legal instrument for the protection of endangered species;
- (b) harmonization of the institutional framework;
- (c) increased environmental awareness among stakeholder groups; and
- (d) creation of a national fund to cover post-project activities.

Baseline Course of Action

Information on baseline actions, at a conceptual level, is requested

Alternative Action Supported by project

Information on GEF alternative actions, at a conceptual level, is requested

Conformity with GEF Public Involvement Policy

The proposed activities for involving communities and civil society groups will be done at two levels. One is at

the national stage where a participatory design approach will be used in the creation of a system of protected areas (PAs) in a sample of 20 critical ecosystems. In this regard, preparation activities will include elaboration of techniques for community participation, including development of preliminary guidelines for integrated management at each site (para 5.1, p. 7). The other area is at the community level where indigenous knowledge will be used to identify biodiversity indicators, and to employ "traditional and classical knowledge channels" (para 5.4, p. 7). Further, p. 8 contains the preliminary list of NGOs to be involved: Plataforma das ONGs (an umbrella NGO); Organizacao das Mulheres do Cabo Verde (Women's Organization); and OASIS (Organization of Associations on the Island of Santiago). However, it is not clear whether these NGOs have already been involved in the initial stages, and what their expected roles would be during preparation.

The methods for participation include conduct of a ZOPP log frame workshop and the use of several workshops and consultations. As noted in p. 7, there will also be collection of socio-economic data "to help identify constraints" and it is assumed that this may constitute some form of social analysis at the site level. This may need some clarification.

On p. 6, the proposal mentions the formation of a National Environmental Fund to capture domestic benefits, but there is no follow-up description on how this component would be prepared, and whether there would be consultations with communities regarding establishment of such a fund. Similarly, there is reference to equitable sharing of benefits in p. 6, but it is not clear how the preparation work could lead up to this beyond the study of incentives (p. 7). The inclusion of community self-monitoring and evaluation (p. 6) is a promising approach. It may be clarified whether this component would be developed by NGO counterparts, especially the women's organization.

Other comments:

Alternative livelihoods. The description regarding development of alternative livelihoods in p. 7 may be clarified regarding the link to the statements on root causes in p. 3-4. For example, it is mentioned that degradation is caused largely by over-harvesting of coral (#18, p.4), but it is not clear whether preparation would engage in follow-up, and how alternatives can be closely defined with affected groups.

Additionally, as the causes in p. 3-4 demonstrate, the problems appear to be sectoral and sub-population specific. It looks like fishing communities engage in activities like over-fishing and coastal degradation separate from the over-harvesting of corals and sand and gravel extraction. There are also sub-groups of fuelwood gatherers and grazers. Yet, the preparation activities do not highlight a socio-economic analysis that takes such diversity into consideration.

Gender. It may be clarified that since a women's organization is identified as a participating NGO (p.8), that there would be some targeted gender component in the project. It may be clarified if this was just an omission, or if there would be some scope for incorporating gender considerations.

Legal aspects as enabling participation. It is notable that the project has a separate component on strengthening legal and institutional framework (p. 5, 7). One activity stated in p. 7 is to "identify legal obstacles to the integrated, sustainable use of biological resources by the rural communities." It may be clarified if this refers only to national laws, and whether there is consideration as well of local, village and traditional or customary laws.

Just a point of clarification: on this part of p. 7, this is the first time that invasive species are mentioned. I wonder why this is included.

Private Sector Involvement

3. Appropriateness of GEF Financing

Incremental Cost

To be provided in the project brief

Appropriateness of Financial Modality Proposed

To be provided in the project brief

Financial Sustainability of the GEF-Funded Activity

It is expected that the propose national fund would generate funds to sustain post-project activities.

Absorptive Capability

In view of the goal to cover 20 protected areas under the project in a country with limited capacity, technical assurance would be sought at Work Program Inclusion that the project designed would be consistent with the absorptive capacity of the participating agencies and organizations.

Cost Effectiveness

To be provided in the Project Brief

4. Coordination with Other Institutions

Collaboration

Preparation of PDF would involve government and non-government stakeholders.

Complementarity with Ongoing Activities

Information on complementary/on-going activities in Cape Verde is requested.

5. Responsiveness to Comments and Evaluations

Core Commitments

UNDP would provide \$30,000 for project preparation.

Linkages

Consultation and Coordination

Consistency w/previous upstream consultations, project preparation work, and processing conditions

Monitoring & evaluation: Minumum GEF Standards, ME plan, proposed indicators, lessons from PIRs and Project Lessons Study

Indicators

Implementing Agencies' Comments

World Bank's comments:

Cape Verde is one of the poorest nations in Africa, is highly donor dependent and suffers severe land

degradation. The islands do harbor some endemic species, especially among invertebrate and plant groups, but it is highly questionable whether setting up protected areas in the usual sense is the best way to achieve sustainable conservation in Cape Verde, especially as such a protected area network will have substantial recurrent costs. In addition, the PDF request talks of a total cost for the project of \$18 million, however it does not specify how much of this would be sought from GEF.

Root causes: The proposal gives a pretty good analysis of the root causes of biodiversity loss as well as of the nature of biodiversity in Cape Verde. However, it is not at all clear how a protected area project alone is going to handle the root causes issues. It is also difficult to figure out what specific pressures occur on each of the 20 specific sites mentioned. The proposal would benefit from descriptions of the features of those sites, for example in a tabular format with the size of each of the sites. Information given stays at a general level.

The description of the activities to be conducted can give the impression that a lot will be done to improve the local environment (see institutional strengthening), this would suppose a high baseline. Moreover, the diversity and the "melting pot" of the activities foreseen might make it difficult to assess the outputs and the outcomes of the project and assess how much the global environment features in Cape Verde will have improved thanks to the project.

The proposed project is incredibly ambitious and will address everything from protected area network, to alternative production technologies, sustainable management of terrestrial and marine resources and more equitable sharing of benefits. It is commendable that the national Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (BSAP) has identified all of these as priorities for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, but it would seem much more realistic to start with a more modest project that attempts to integrate biodiversity into some major donor investments into land degradation, re-afforestation or marine resource use to develop pilots that might then be replicated.

In summary this project seems overly ambitious. A sustainable use project that focussed on integrating biodiversity into projects already attempting to deal with the many root causes and real pressures on biodiversity in Cape Verde might be more likely to succeed than establishing a protected area network.

STAP Review

Council members' Comments

Technical Assurances

We would seek technical assurance at Work Program Inclusion that the proposed project is consistent with the absorptive capacity of the agencies and organizations that would be involved in project implementation.

Convention Secretariat

Other Technical Comments

Information is requested on why there is no specific activity under the PDF to design the national fund.

Further Processing

The proposed project concept/PDF request would be recommended for pipeline entry and CEO approval upon receipt of a revised project document reflecting the following agreed revisions (agreed at the Oct. 18, 1999 bilateral):

- (a) Information, at a conceptual level, on baseline and GEF alternative actions;
- (b) Information on complementary on-going activities;
- (c) Clarification on why there is no specific PDF activity focusing on the design of the national fund; and

(d) Clarification related to stakeholder involvement as outline in the "Conformity with GEF Public Involvement Policy" section above.

For Work Program Inclusion

Information to be provided in the project brief for Work Program Inclusion would include details on the following:

- (a) profile of project sites, including biodiversity and socioeconomic information;
- (b) issues to be addressed by the project and the root causes;
- (c) project components, including objectives and activities to be supported; and policy and legal framework, governance structures, etc. for the national fund;
- (d) baseline and incremental actions/incremental cost matrix;
- (e) public involvement in project preparation and expected involvement in project implementation and/or monitoring and evaluation;
- (f) logical framework and M&E plan
- (g) STAP review and Agency's response;
- (h) Preliminary implementation arrangements;
- (i) endorsement letter from the GEF Operational Focal Point; and
- (j) strategy to sustain project activities.