

REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project
TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Conserving Biodiversity in Coastal Areas Threatened by Rapid Tourism and Physical Infrastructure					
Development					
Country(ies):	Dominican Republic	GEF Project ID: ¹	5088		
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4955		
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Environment and	Submission Date:	December 16,		
	Natural Resources; Ministry of		<mark>2014</mark>		
	Tourism				
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	60		
Name of Parent Program (if		Project Agency Fee (\$):	269,685		
applicable):					
➤ For SFM/REDD+					
➤ For SGP					
➤ For PPP					

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD-2	Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation.	Output 2. National and sub-national land-use plans (5) that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation	GEFTF	1,638,832	7,000,000
	Outcome 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks.	Output 1. Policies and regulatory frameworks (2) for production sectors.	GEFTF	1,064,780	8,233,059
		Sub-total		2,703,612	15,233,059
		Project management cost	GEFTF	\$135,180	801,740
			2,838,792	16,034,799	

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To ensure the conservation of biodiversity in ecologically important coastal areas threatened by the burgeoning tourism industry and associated physical development.

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Co- financing (\$)
Component 1. The policy,	TA	- Regulatory and enforcement capacities in place to monitor, avoid, reduce, mitigate and	1.1 Regulatory framework to strengthen the control and prevention of ecological impact in vulnerable	GEF TF	1,064,780	8,233,059

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the <u>Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework</u> when completing Table A.

legal and planning framework in the tourism sector addresses the direct threats to biodiversity from coastal tourism developmet and activities. offset adverse impacts on biodiversity of tourism and associated infrastructure development and tourism products and services, resulting in strengthened conservation of 25,800 ha. of mangrove forest, 8,805 ha. of coral reefs, 5,035 ha. of beaches and dunes, 27,46 ha. of sea grass beds and 1,972,842 ha. of coastal marine protected area, plus further ha. in ecological corridors.

-Capacities to plan, budget and enforce landscape management across institutions sustain conservation outcomes in priority watersheds, and coastal ecological corridors resulting in:

- Increased budget allocations to coastal ecosystem management
- A reduction in the number of infractions with environmental licensing.
- Better management effectiveness in addressing visitor pressures in coastal marine PAs and their buffer zones and watersheds in 2 key coastal project sites (Montecristi and Samana-Los Haitises) covering 4,323 km² of terrestrial surface and 1,112 km² marine area.
- -Reduction in threats from tourism infrastructure, operations and visitor activities, resulting in:
- -Stability or increase in coral abundance (TBD Yr 1), sea grass beds and populations of key target and indicator species in the 2 selected project sites:

Humpback whale relative abundance in Samana between 1.5 to 2.1 whales / hour for whale watching; mother and baby whales in the bay during the season: 20-36

Nesting beaches of sea turtles (green, leatherback and hawksbill turtles) under protection with monitoring: 15

-A reduction in the sale of wildlife curios to 0% of the Gift Shops sell Crafts made from

coastal areas including:

- Updated National Tourism
 Development Plan includes explicit
 guidance and regulation and timeline for
 the specific needs of protected areas and
 other sensitive coastal and marine areas
 with regard to tourism planning and
 management, including intangible core
 areas, impact reduction and offset
 measures; investment in product
 differntiation, and diversification into
 nature-focused products sensitive to
 environmental concerns and biodiversity
 friendly guidelines for siting of hotels;
- Strengthened EIA mechanisms, permitting and licensing tools for avoiding, reducing, mitigating impacts from tourism and codified in land use plans;
- **Proscription of land uses** defined in sensitive areas;
- -Protocol with technical and economic guidelines to move forward recovery and restoration processes in areas degraded by tourism activity, focused on biodiversity and ecosystem processes;
- -A system of penalties for malfeasance in the tourism sector developed and adopted reflecting BD-friendly classification system and the clarifications in the mandates of the different agencies responsible for enforcement and prosecution;
- Compliance and Monitoring system in place to evaluate acceptable limits of change in biodiversity-important areas to support adaptive measures to reduce direct impacts;
- Establishment of the Threshold of Sustainability for Tourism in selected coastal PAs including core tourism management capacities, interpretation facilities and monitoring established at 2 critical sites:
- **1.2** A nationally approved biodiversityfriendly certification system for hotels is developed as part of the classification system of MITUR and adopted by hotels;
- 1.3 Multisectoral financing framework for cost-effective support to the sustainable implementation of the National Tourism Development Plan in coastal areas;
- **Economic incentives** for promoting the adherence of the private sector to the

		protected species; Curios and crafts made and sold of local products, without any use of protected species.	reformed policies and regulations; - Exisiting fiscal mechanisms adjusted to ensure flow of appropriate levels of investment, particularly from the tourism sector, private enterprises and land developers, into coastal and marine biodiversity conservation; - Enhanced capacity of MA to determine, apply, collect, reinvest and manage tourism use fees and concession revenues at site level.			
Component 2. Operational framework to protect biodiversity, in areas highly vulnereable to the indirect effects of toursim development	TA	Improvement in capacity of sectorial ministries, private sector, municipalities and community level organizations to generate, use and share geographic, socioeconomic, and bio-physical information needed for landscape level planning planning and coastal management purposes that take into consideration the indirect effects of tourism and related development on ecosystems (inappropriate infrastructure placement, including roads, agriculture, forestry, water use, wildlife hunting and other development triggered by an increase in disposable incomes from tourism activities), as measured by: -UNDP's Capacity Development Scorecard: Baseline Average Score of 16 -2 Tourism Land-Use Plans (POTTS) revised to include BD and land-use criteria, adapted and applied Appropriate climate resilient landscape management tools implemented by local communities in key biodiversity rich areas of the 2 selected project sites totaling 7000 ha resulting in: i) reduced ecosystem degradation (measured by decrease in extent of degraded areas); ii) maintenance of ecosystem functionality. This reduces threats to coastal biodiversity and lead to improved habitat integrity and connectivity across the 2 pilot areas:	2.1 Incorporate recommendations from the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) into land use plans and tourism permitting (covering physical development, water use, waste management and other threats); - defining spatial areas where development should be avoided, where it may be permitted - but subject to management controls, and what mitigation and offset requirements are needed. 2.2 Landscape level planning tools established and applied by key stakeholders including: - Updated and accurate vulnerability maps, database and integrated interinstitutional Geographical Information Systems making information on landuses, ecosystem typology and services as well as vulnerability levels available as support to planning, enforcement, monitoring and decision making for tourism and related development; - Landscape land use plans reviewed adopted and implemented by both MA and MITUR including strengthened tourism land use plans (POTTS) covering priority watersheds and coastal corridors in selected areas with inventory and planning instruments in place defining specific land uses and management regimes in priority BD areas including ecosystems and habitat degradation mitigation measures as well as areas for conservation and connectivity appropriate to different site types based on reliable, standardized and uniform data and monitoring protocols; -Training program institutionalized and 300 people targeting the MA, MITUR, MEPyD, Private sector, Tour Operators, municipalities and community councils trained by end of the project on conservation compatible tourism and on	GEF	1,638,832	7,000,000

the application of the land use plans 2.3 Improved community based resource management in 7000 ha of key BD areas based on the Protocol developed in component 1 addresses NRM at rural user level and at hotel sitings. These will include: - Community-based environmental and management plans based on resource management options and zoning to address encroachment, coastal erosion, fire control and prevention, water management, agricultures practices and wildlife hunting; -Rehabilitation of degraded dunes, wetlands and mangrove areas to increase connectivity; - Reducing plastic waste, protecting freshwater flows into mangrove areas, and elimination of sea grass removal practices		
SUB-TOTAL	2,703,612	15,233,059
PROJECT MANAGEMENT COSTS	\$135,180	801,740
TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	2,838,792	16,034,799

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	In-kind	300,000
National Government	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	Grant	5,834,799
National Government	Ministry of Tourism	Grant	9,550,000.00
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	350,000
Total Co-financing	-		16,034,799

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

	Type of		Country Name/		(in \$)	
GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Focal Area	Global	Grant	Agency Fee	Total
	Trust rund		Giobai	Amount (a)	$(b)^2$	c=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	Diodivanaity	Dominican	2,838,792	269,685	3,108,477
UNDP	GEF IF	Biodiversity	Republic			
Total Grant Resources			2,838,792	269,685	3,108,477	
						ļ

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

² Indicate fees related to this project.

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	89,000		89,000
National/Local Consultants	999,800	Under review	999,800

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF³

The project design closely follows the objectives, outcomes, components, GEF budget and co-financing specified in the PIF. There has been no change in the GEF budget total, while the co-financing budget total increased by almost US\$3M. The only significant variation to the project components is as follows:

- a) Activities related to (2.1) Strategic Environmental Assessment, have been moved from Component 2 to Component 1 so that the results and recommendations provide guidance to the elaboration of the updated NTDP, with an expected downstream impact during pilot implementation. The PIF suggested the application of a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) on the impacts of tourism development on coastal biodiversity to be conducted in Outcome 2. However, the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) has a sectoral focus and as such is more effective at the systemic level. The application of a SEA on the current National Tourism Development Plan will highlight entry points and strategic areas for improvement to be included in the updated NTDP to decrease the impacts of tourism development on coastal biodiversity.
- A.1 <u>National strategies and plans</u> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc. NA
- A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities. NA
- A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage: NA
- A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address: The Project Document contains substantially expanded information and analysis regarding the baseline project and problem issues. This represents a strong and well-reasoned platform for project implementation. However, the baseline project and core challenges identified during project preparation were not substantially different from those identified in the original PIF.
- A. 5. <u>Incremental /Additional cost reasoning</u>: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated <u>global environmental</u> benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project: NA
- A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks: N/A
- A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives:

This project will build on and complement a number of initiatives being implemented currently in the areas of biodiversity conservation and sustainable tourism development. GEF/UNDP is supporting the MA's Re-Engineering of the PA system project. This focuses on establishing the institutional and legal framework required to facilitate the financial sustainability of the PA system. Key outcomes of this project will serve as a critical input to the current

³ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter "NA" after the respective question.

project. For example the current project will ensure that the PA valuation and fee systems proposed will be adopted and implemented at PAs in the two key project areas. The GEF/UNDP/UNEP CLME Program to develop ecosystem-based fisheries zoning plans on the coral reefs and regulatory framework at Montecristi NP will form an integral part of the current project. The project will also incorporate lessons learnt in the field of local land use planning and application of natural resource management tools from an earlier GEF funded initiative through UNDP: Sustainable Land Management in the Upper Sabana Yegua Watershed System which operated in an area of influence of the Montecristi bay. Additionally, lessons learned from community based approaches developed by the Small Grants Programme in Dominican Republic (SGP/GEF-UNDP) will be considered in the pilot interventions.

The project will also identify coordination mechanisms with key partners such as IDB, JICA, World Bank and USAID and build upon the work currently underway described in the baseline section. The project will incorporate experiences learnt and scale up relevant site specific management and planning tools developed by these partners. In particular the project will capitalize on the progress made on tourism diversification, regional tourism clusters and private sector engagement especially in the la Romana –Bayahibe area, Parque Nacional del Este and in Punta Cana.

Counterpart International (2014) has been working in partnerships with local communities and partners of Montecristi to develop sustainable resource management plans that benefit both coastal ecosystems and the people that depend on them for their livelihoods. This fieldwork, and recent success in standardizing the scientific methodologies behind quantifying blue carbon, is blazing a trail toward incentivizing its conservation. By creating a system for blue carbon accounting that will accurately value these soils, communities can participate in conserving and restoring them. BLUE CARBON is engaging coastal communities, foundations & the private sector in the climate change solution. Communities working with Counterpart will conserve portions of mangrove forest and sea grasses within the 137 kilometers of park coastline. Coastal ecosystems – which include mangroves – are as effective, or more effective than tropical forests at storing carbon.

Regionally, this project is aligned with other GEF projects being prepared associated with the "Caribbean Challenge" Initiative (CCI), including potential national projects in the Bahamas and Jamaica, and a sub-regional project in the Eastern Caribbean. The "Caribbean Challenge" was developed from the concept of the Micronesia Challenge, in which 5 Pacific island nations pledged to protect 20% of their marine resources by 2020 and leverage \$100 million for conservation. While CCI countries are developing their National Conservation Trust Funds, the Caribbean Biodiversity Fund (CBF), a \$42 million regional endowment, is gearing up to support protected area management through annual disbursements to the national funds. The project is also aligned with the Global Island Partnership (GLISPA). Launched in March 2006, GLISPA aims to build leadership and partnerships committed to actively address critical island issues and support the implementation of the Island Biodiversity Programme of Work under the Convention for Biological Diversity (CBD) and other related global policies.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

Stakeholder participation was emphasized during project preparation through the participation of representatives of government agencies, donors, NGOs, private enterprises and local community groups through formal and informal discussions. The Strategic Results Framework workshop brought together a variety of stakeholders to discuss barriers, solutions, strategies, activities and priority regions for project intervention. MA and MITUR staff facilitated the Tracking Tool and Capacity Development Scorecard scoring exercises. The project design is fully vetted and stakeholder supported.

Project implementation will ensure the same emphasis on participation and inclusivity. Formal implementation guidance will be offered by a project steering committee comprised of representatives of key organizations. Stakeholder committees will be established at each pilot site to formalize participation. Stakeholders will also be integrated within project inception, planning, monitoring, and evaluation activities. Project management tools such as the project inception, annual work plans, mid-term review, and final evaluation will be made available to all interested stakeholders. The project management office, located in MITUR, will be responsible for catalyzing both formal and informal stakeholder participation.

Project activities will engage a wide and complex stakeholder base. Under Outcome 1, national, state, and local

level stakeholders will inform the design of regulatory reforms through programs and seminars that facilitate outreach and participation. Under Outcome 2, national and local stakeholders will benefit from numerous training programs that emphasize peer-to-peer communication, participation, and learning. Local community members will benefit from BD conservation management and tourism planning that sets in place lasting participation pathways.

The project has benefited from high-level government support since its initiation, particularly from top-level policy makers in both MA and MITUR. The table below represents the expected roles of each of the key stakeholders during the implementation of the project:

Stakeholders	Project Implementation Role
Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MA) Vice Ministry (VM) Coastal Resources; VM Environmental Management, VM Protected Areas and Biodiversity	MA is the GEF focal point and the public agency responsible for the formulation of national policy related to the environment and natural resources and to ensure the sustainable use and management of renewable natural resources and the environment. MA will be in charge of guiding activities related to BD conservation, and policy issues through the implementation of national plans and policies related to conservation of BD. Specific dependent vice ministries and Directorates listed may be involved to a greater or lesser degree with specific aspects of implementation. Co-implementer of the project with the Tourism Ministry
MITUR - Ministry of Tourism Technical VM; Direction of Planning and Projects	Regulates and promotes the tourism sector. Responsible for Planning, scheduling, organizing, directing, promoting, coordinating and evaluating the activities of the Tourism Industry in the country, in accordance with the objectives, goals and policies established by the Executive. Co-implementer of the project with the Environment Ministry.
MEPYD –Ministry of Economic Planning and Development	Responsible for land use planning and key role in determining financial flows, national budgets and so on. The MEPYD has as part of its functions lead and coordinate the formulation, management, monitoring and evaluation of macroeconomic policy and sustainable development and the National Development Strategy.
Directorate General of Land Use and Development -DGODT	Responsible for planning and formulation of public policies for sustainable development in the territory, as a spatial expression of economic, social, environmental and cultural policies of society and inter-sectoral and inter-institutional coordination between different levels of public and private entities. The project will support the Local Development Sectoral Tables strengthened in Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Tourism in pilot sites.
Municipal Governments	Responsible for overseeing land-use management at local level, within their areas of jurisdiction, for ensuring that management strategies are appropriate to local needs and for ensuring that the needs of local stakeholders are taken into account in the definition of management strategies. The municipality, as a public administration entity, has independent exercise of its functions and powers with regards to the restrictions and limitations established by the Constitution, the organic law and other laws; it has its own assets, legal personality and capacity to acquire rights and contract obligations, and generally fulfilling their purpose in the terms established by law 176-07.
	The project will involve them in Technical assistance and training for the sectoral committees of Local Development on issues of Biodiversity and Sustainable Tourism

	The project will engage Municipal Environmental Units-UGAMs.
Ministry of Industry and Trade (MIC)	Promotes sustainable development of productivity and competitiveness of industry, commerce and SMEs, through the formulation and implementation of public policies. Recognized as the leading institution, implements effective public policies that contribute to the improvement of productivity and competitiveness, promoting the development and innovation of the commercial and industrial sector.
Central Bank of the DR	The Central Bank of the Dominican Republic's main objective is to maintain price stability, by constitutional mandate and the Monetary and Financial Law 183-02. It is a source for Socioeconomic information relevant to the project, as well as Tourism Satellite Accounts.
Ministry of the Treasury	Manages public finances, supervises and controls the Tax Policy. The General Direction for Internal Revenue and the Customs Bureau depend on this ministry, particularly with regards to the benefits provided for in Law No. 158-01 CONFOTUR.
ANAMAR – National Authority on Marine Affairs	Newly created government research and conservation agency with budget. The Ministry of Environment is a member of ANAMAR's Administrative Council.
CIBIMA (Centro de Investigaciones de Biología Marina) Public University institution of Universidad Autónoma de Santo Domingo (UASD)	This institution conducts research on coastal marine resources besides being a source of information for impact and vulnerability studies that have been conducted, addresses the issues of climate change and marine biodiversity. UASD institution. This organization can contribute to the study and research required for the project
NGOs, Private institutions	, Associations
FEDOMU	The Dominican Federation of Municipalities (FEDOMU) associating and representing municipalities and municipal districts of the Dominican Republic Training and technical assistance to members of Asociación de Municipios
(CDCT) Dominican Consortium of Touristic Competitiveness	Groups the regional tourism clusters to promote competitiveness, sustainability and equity in the tourism sector. Functions of the consortium include providing technical assistance to the clusters on environmental protection, community engagement, product diversification and SME promotion. The coordination of the pilot project will be in Samana and Montecristi
National Business Support Network for Environmental Protection –ECORED	Promote the integration of the business sector in the development of a culture of conservation and sustainable management of natural resources and the environment of the DR. Members of this organization will participate in the training and awareness program in biodiversity conservation and sustainable tourism
ASONAHORES- The National Hoteliers Association	A key actor in the Tourism sector, representing major national hotel operators, restaurateur and private tourism sector, its members have developed large extensions of coastline. ASONAHORES encourages and strengthens the sustainable development of the hospitality industry in the Dominican Republic. Members of this organization will participate in the training and awareness program in

	biodiversity conservation and sustainable tourism.
OPETUR- Tour operator association	A key actor in the sector mobilizing hotel guests and cruise passengers to coastal destinations.
CEBSE - Center for the Conservation and Eco- Development of the Samana Bay and its surroundings	Its goal is the conservation and sustainable development of natural and cultural resources of the Bay of Samaná and natural areas surrounding it, with the active participation of communities This organization can contribute to the study and research required for the project
Fundación Dominicana de Estudios Marinos INC FUNDEMAR	Organization dedicated to promoting, advising, planning the sustainable use of marine ecosystems and resources through research, education and conservation policies. It has a technical team with scientific rigor, dedication to service and efficiency capable of actions and projects to achieve the objectives of the organization. This organization can contribute to the study and research required for the project
Programa EcoMar	NGO specialized in coastal marine biodiversity (OBIS data provider in the Caribbean Node) with experience in tourism impacts and tourism carrying capacity assessment. Non-lucrative institution of scientific and educational character, approved by the Presidential Decree 943 of September 19, 2001, in Dominican Republic. The main research lines of Programa EcoMar are: environmental education and management, fisheries, coastal marine ecology and biodiversity.
UNIBE – PUCMM-O&M : Private Tourism Business Schools	This organization can contribute to the study and research required for the project Source of tourism research and research capacity. This organizations can contribute to the study and research required for the project
Multilateral and Bilateral	Cooperation
UNDP, Dominican Republic	This Office is committed to the welfare of the people, working to address the major challenges of national development, promoting economic growth with equity and institutional. It has high importance to the Project in its role as Implementing Agency
ART GOLD RD Programme	The ART Initiative supports and provides advanced technical assistance for economic development to Local Economic Development Agencies (LEDA) active in numerous countries and different ART programs in order to strengthen and internationalize the process of local economic development, in line with national policies implemented by countries. In RD starts in 2008. ART DGODT Coordinates with the programs and topics on territorial development planning and risk management.
Japan International Cooperation Agency-JICA	The role of JICA is to effectively provide support to the process of "Dynamic development" which refers to the creation of self-reinforcing virtuous cycles of mid- to long-term economic growth and poverty reduction in a constantly changing environment of developing countries where a variety of issues arise simultaneously and get entangled each other. JICA will provide creative, highly effective support toward this end, at times moving swiftly and at times acting from the longer-term perspective as the situation calls for.
USAID	USAID supports the Dominican Republic in democracy and governance, improving electoral processes and strengthening the participation of civil society in a responsible political system.
	The role in the project would be the use of the documents of the Samaná area made

	during the Environmental Protection Program. The clusters have been supported by USAID
Local communities	Local communities and rural users of natural resources will be direct beneficiaries of the project in terms of enhancing capacities for governance systems, planning issues, participation tools.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

The proposed project will have various socioeconomic benefits for the citizens of the Dominican Republic, contributing to the goal of enhancing the quality of life for a nation that has been challenged in recent years by natural disasters, rising food and fuel prices and high levels of unemployment. For coastal areas, conservation activities that arrest the degradation of coastal ecosystems (coral reefs, mangroves, seagrass beds, beaches, etc.) will produce widespread benefits by increasing the country's resilience to climate change impacts. In addition, the Dominican Republic's economy is highly dependent on tourism, thus the inclusion of BD conservation in Tourism regulations for coastal and marine areas will lead to improved economic revenue, food security and livelihoods. The country stands to benefit from a major economic boost by preventing the degradation of both terrestrial and marine ecosystems that are attractions for visitors, and generating tourism-related employment and income for many Dominicans over the long term.

The generation of tourism activities that are based on BD conservation principles will serve to maintain tourism-based, forest-related and fisheries-based livelihoods and contribute to overall food security, as well as protect communities from flooding, erosion, etc. Improved coastal water quality, marine habitat protection, and reductions in fishing pressure in critical habitat areas (through improved regulations and enforcement, and the provision of alternative fishing options) will enable local inhabitants and the tourism sector to sustainably exploit near-shore coastal biodiversity resources more effectively (e.g. reduced fish catch effort) and thus provide savings in costs of operations, and will prevent the decline of fish stocks important for local fishermen, including high value species such as lobster. Direct income generation will be increased for local communities through sustainable-tourism employment (in scuba diving / snorkelling, crafts, gastronomy and tour guiding), participating in PA management activities including maintenance, monitoring, research and BD monitoring, as well as the sale of souvenirs, food, and craft products.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

The project development team has taken a qualitative approach to identifying the alternative of best value and feasibility for achieving the project objective in line with the GEF Council's guidance on assessing cost-effectiveness of projects (Cost Effectiveness Analysis in GEF Projects, GEF/C.25/11, April 29, 2005).

The project pilots are also cost-effective in several ways. The pilot sites were selected using several criteria related to cost-effectiveness, such as co-financing opportunities. Moreover, the sites were selected for their high concentration of tourism (or potential thereof), high revenue generation potential, along with their biodiversity significance. The pilot demonstrations will effectively build capacity, while capturing tangible benefits to biodiversity and thus further increasing the project contribution to capturing global benefits. Furthermore, the pilots are cost-effective means of determining the financial feasibility of project results before considering them for upscaling. The cost information from the pilots will add important information to support the decision to replicate best practices from the project across larger geographic and thematic areas. In particular, given the Government's focus on increasing tourism, especially in coastal/marine areas, the tools and activities that are generated and piloted through the project will be vital to the development of sustainable tourism nation-wide. The Project will also use cost-effective measures, such as the use of the existing Protected Areas Forum, as well as the Dominican Tourism Forum (http://fodatur.com/), for promotion and sharing of Lessons Learned beyond the Dominican Republic to

other countries. Hence, GEF will achieve significant national and international impact with limited funds.

Cost effectiveness will also be monitored as an integral part of the monitoring and evaluation process. The project budget provides for independent financial auditing on a yearly basis.

Finally, cost effectiveness is ensured through a prescribed project management process that will seek the best-value-for-money. UNDP rules as well as MA and MITUR rules employ a transparent process of bidding for goods and for services based on open and fair competition and selection of best value and best price alternatives. Procurement will be managed by UNDP in coordination with MA and MITUR ensuring the application of all effective regulations. An independent committee is utilized for all procurement of personnel and selection of contractors.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M &E PLAN:

The project will be monitored through the following M& E activities. The M& E budget is provided in the table below.

<u>Project start:</u> A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 3 months of project start with those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, UNDP Country Office (CO) and where appropriate/feasible regional technical policy and program advisors as well as other stakeholders. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year annual work plan.

The Inception Workshop will address a number of key issues including: (a) Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. (b) Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and RSC staff vis à vis the project team. (c) Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. (d) The Terms of Reference (TOR) for project staff will be discussed again as needed. (e) Based on the project results framework and the relevant GEF Tracking Tool if appropriate, finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks. (f) Provide a detailed overview of reporting, M&E requirements. The M&E work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled. (g) Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit. (h) Plan and schedule Project Steering Committee (PSC) meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organization structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first PSC meeting should be held within the first 2 months following the inception workshop.

An Inception Workshop report is a key reference document and must be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

<u>Project Implementation Workplan</u>: Immediately following the inception workshop, the project will be tasked with generating a strategic workplan. The workplan will outline the general timeframe for completion of key project outputs and achievement of outcomes. The workplan will map and help guide project activity from inception to completion. To ensure smooth transition between project design and inception, the inception workshop and work planning process will benefit from the input of parties responsible for the design of the original project, including as appropriate relevant technical advisors.

<u>Quarterly:</u> Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform. Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Report (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot. Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

<u>Annually (Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR))</u>: This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (30 June to 1 July). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements.

The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following: (a) Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative); (b) Project outputs

delivered per project outcome (annual); (c) Lesson learned/good practice; (d) AWP and other expenditure reports; (e) Risk and adaptive management; (f) ATLAS QPR; (g) Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) are used by most focal areas on an annual basis as well.

<u>Periodic Monitoring through site visits:</u> UNDP CO and the RSC will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the PSC may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP RSC and will be circulated no more than one month after the visit to the project team and PSC members.

Mid-term of project cycle: The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Review during mid-point of project implementation (project months 28 – 29). The Mid-Term Review will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization and terms of reference of the mid-term review will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The TOR for this Mid-term review will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the RSC and UNDP-GEF. This independent expert will be recruited at least six months prior to the planned commencement of the mid-term review. The management response and the review will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the mid-term review cycle.

<u>End of Project:</u> An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final PSC meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term review, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The TOR for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the RSC and UNDP-GEF.

The Final Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the <u>UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC)</u>. The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the final evaluation.

During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's results.

<u>Learning and knowledge sharing:</u> Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation through lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

Communications and Visibility Requirements

The project will comply with UNDP's Branding Guidelines, which can be accessed at:

http://intra.undp.org/coa/ branding.shtml.

Specific guidelines on UNDP logo use can be accessed at: http://intra.undp.org/branding/useOfLogo.html. Amongst other requirements, these guidelines describe when and how the UNDP and the logos of donors to UNDP projects are used. For the avoidance of any doubt, when logo use is required, the UNDP logo needs to be used alongside the GEF logo. The GEF logo can be accessed at:

http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF logo

Full compliance will also be observed with the GEF's Communication and Visibility Guidelines (the "GEF Guidelines"), which can be accessed at:

http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08 Branding the GEF%20final 0.pdf.

These guidelines describe when and how the GEF logo needs to be used in project publications, vehicles, supplies and other project equipment. These Guidelines also describe other GEF promotional requirements regarding press releases, press conferences, press visits, visits by Government officials, productions and other promotional items. Where other agencies and project partners have provided support through co-financing, their branding policies and requirements will be similarly applied.

Audit Clause

The project will be audited in accordance with the UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies.

M&E Workplan and Budget

Type of M&E	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$	Time frame
activity		Excluding project staff time	
Inception Workshop & associated arrangements + report	 PM UNDP CO UNDP GEF Project Team Service contract to arrange/run workshop and produce report 	Indicative cost: 4,000 (stakeholder consultations, service contract, translation)	Within first two months of project start up
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Purpose Indicators	 PM will oversee the hiring for specific studies and institutions, delegate responsibilities to relevant team members, and Support from International consultant-sets up long term M+E Plan 	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop. Indicative cost 26,900 (establishment of GIS, species monitoring)	Start, mid and end of project
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress and Performance (measured on an annual basis)	 Oversight by Project GEF Regional Advisor and PM Measurements by regional field officers and local IAs Local consultant to support M+E 	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation. Indicative cost 15,000	Annually prior to APR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
APR/PIR; GEF-4 Biodiversity Tracking Tool; METT	Project TeamUNDP-COUNDP-GEF	Indicative cost: 0	Annually
Steering Committee Meetings and relevant meeting proceedings (minutes)	PM UNDP CO	Indicative cost: 0	Following Project IW and subsequently at least once a year
Quarterly status reports	■ Project team	Indicative cost: 0	To be determined by Project team and UNDP CO
Technical reports	Project teamHired consultants as needed	Indicative cost: 5,000	To be determined by Project Team and UNDP-CO
Project Publications (e.g. technical manuals, field guides)	Project teamHired consultants as needed	Indicative cost: 15,000	To be determined by Project Team and UNDP-CO
Mid-term External Review	 Project team UNDP- CO UNDP-GEF RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 	Indicative cost: 25,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final External	Project team,	Indicative cost: 25,000	At the end of project

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ Excluding project staff time	Time frame
Evaluation	 UNDP-CO UNDP-GEF RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team) 		implementation
Terminal Report	Project teamUNDP-COExternal Consultant	Indicative cost: 5,000	At least one month before the end of the project
Lessons learned	 Project team UNDP-GEF RCU (suggested formats for documenting best practices, etc) End of Project Event 	Indicative cost: 0	Yearly
Audit	UNDP-COProject team	Indicative cost:16,000 (average \$3000 per)	Yearly
Visits to field sites (UNDP staff travel to be charged to IA fees)	UNDP Country OfficeUNDP-GEF RCU (as appropriate)Government representatives	Indicative cost: 10,000 (3-4 visits per year)	Yearly
TOTAL INDICATIVE UNDP staff and travel	E COST Excluding project team staff time and expenses	US\$ 146,900	

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(s) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(s):): (Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter(s) with this form. For SGP, use this OFP endorsement letter).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Patricia Abreu Fernández	Vice Minister for	MINISTRY OF	12/19/2012
	International Cooperation	ENVIRONMENT	

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, Executive Coordinator	<u> </u>	December 16, 2014	Lyes Ferroukhi, Regional Technical Adviser, EBD	+507 302- 4576	lyes.ferroukhi@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK:

Objective	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective: To ensure the conservation of biodiversity in ecologically important coastal areas threatened by the burgeoning tourism industry and associated physical development.	Institutional and Policy Framework mainstreams BD conservation principles in the tourism sector	The legal framework for tourism does not properly address the issues of BD conservation or differentiate between projects / activities in PAs Weak levels of collaboration between the institutions involved in the management and use of BD in tourist areas The National Environmental Management System has gaps that do not ensure the BD conservation in areas of tourism development The National Plan of Tourism is out of date and does not include criteria for BD conservation.	Legal framework for tourism incorporates BD aspects for all projects and tourism activities. Strong strategic alliance between MA, MITUR and all institutions involved in the management and use of BD in areas of tourism development (Coordination Group) National Environmental Management System fully strengthened to ensure BD conservation in areas of tourism development New model of tourism includes the axis of sustainability and BD conservation in the National Plan of Tourism.	Inter-institutional agreements and work plans to ensure the conservation of BD in areas of tourism development Regulatory Framework updated by MA-MITUR National Tourism Development Plan updated	Improved monitoring and compliance capacity of MA guarantees BD friendly tourism Political will to collaborate and assign resources Increase in budget allocation
	Financial framework to support the National Plan for Sustainable Tourism Development in coastal areas # of hectares of critical ecosystem conservation	No specific financial instruments that promote the development of sustainable tourism in coastal areas, with emphasis on BD conservation 13,180 ha. of mangrove forest	Financial instruments in place to ensure the implementation of actions related to tourism impact on the marine and coastal areas No net loss of critical ecosystems as a result of tourism activities (overlay of infrastructure / tourism activities on	System of Financial instruments BD2 Tracking Tool New site survey and land use areas with	Resource availability Private sector interest Technical capacity to improve the assessment of land
		49,320 ha. of coral reefs 52,088 ha. wetlands 109,880 ha. landscape /seascape area directly covered by the project	critical ecosystems)	tourism development as a land use category BD2 Tracking Tool	use cover

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Outcome 1. The policy, legal and planning framework in the tourism sector addresses the direct	Regulatory and enforcement capacities to monitor, avoid, reduce, mitigate and offset adverse impacts of tourism on biodiversity	National Tourism Development Plan does not adequately address BD conservation criteria.	National Tourism Development Plan fully addresses the protection of BD resources	Legal framework for Tourism revised and published	Political will to update NTDP
threats to biodiversity from coastal tourism development and activities.	·	Gaps in the Environmental Management System with respect to BD conservation in tourism development areas	100% of tourism activities with impact on BD conservation are included within the Environmental Management System.	Field reports from MA / MITUR	
	Conservation sustained by institutional capacity to plan, budget and enforce land management	There are no specific criteria or guidelines that guide effective coordination to address issues of BD and sustainable tourism development.	Inter-institutional Consultative Group established between the Ministries of Tourism and Environment with appropriate guidelines and meetings.	Guidelines Minutes	Political will to collaborate
		Insufficient financial resources to guarantee needed actions for BD conservation.	Special Strategic Programme for Sustainable Tourism aligned with END 2010-2030, developed and implemented. Portfolio of financial schemes created and implemented, i.e.: Loans to small entrepreneurs - credit instrument, i.e. "Green Credit". At least 1 financial mechanism established and under implementation within the pilot areas	Loan documents to small entrepreneurs	Resource availability Private sector interested and engaged

Capacity to recognize good	There is no national	Manual for the Dominican 'BD-	Manual for the
practices and apply Sustainable	certification system for	friendly' Sustainable Tourism	Dominican 'BD-
Tourism Models that contribute	BD-friendly hotels and	Certification, aimed at tourist	friendly'
to BD conservation	destinations.	destinations and tour companies.	Sustainable
			Tourism
		At least 10% of tourism activities with	Certification
		BD-friendly certification within the	
		pilot areas.	System of
			Indicators for
		Dominican System of Indicators for	Sustainable
		Sustainable Tourism.	Tourism

Output 1.1

- Regulatory framework to strengthen the control and prevention of ecological impact from tourism in vulnerable coastal areas

Output 1.2:

- Multisectoral financing framework for cost-effective support to the sustainable implementation of the National Tourism Development Plan and appropriate BD conservation incentives in coastal areas

Output 1.3:

- A nationally approved biodiversity-friendly certification system for the tourism sector

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Outcome 2.	Capacity of sectoral	Capacity Development	Capacity Development Scorecard:	Capacity	
Operational	ministries, the private sector,	Scorecard ⁴ :	Scorecard:	Development	
framework to	municipalities and community	Overall Average Score: 16	Overall Average Score: 22	Scorecard	
protect biodiversity,	organizations to generate, use	CR2/I4:1	CR2/I4:3		
in areas highly	and share geographic,	CR4/I13:1	CR4/I13:3		
vulnerable to the	socioeconomic and	CR5/I15:0	CR5/I15:2		
indirect effects of	biophysical information	Areas to be improved:	Specific improvements addressed		
tourism	required for coastal and	_	through Awareness and Training		
development	marine spatial planning, taking	CR2/ I 4: Stakeholders are	Program regarding Biodiversity and		
	into account the indirect	aware about global	Sustainable Tourism aimed at Public,		
	impacts of tourism on	environmental issues, but not	private and community sectors:		
	ecosystems	about the possible solutions,			
	_	or if they know about the	CR2/ I 4: Development of a program of		
		possible solutions, are	awareness and training on efficiency in		
		unaware of how to	the implementation of solutions to		

⁴ CR2: Capacities to Generate, Access and Use Information and Knowledge; Indicator 4: Degree of environmental awareness of stakeholders

CR4: Capacities for Management and Implementation; Indicator 13: Availability of required technical skills and technology transfer

CR5: Capacities to Monitor and Evaluate; Indicator 15: Adequacy of the project/programme evaluation process

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Management effectiveness to address the pressures of visitors in marine / coastal	participate. CR4/I13: Capacity and technological needs are identified as well as their sources. CR 5/I 15: None or ineffective evaluations are being conducted, with no adequate evaluation plan or the necessary resources No tourism carrying capacity threshold established for Samaná and Montecristi	address local environmental issues. CR4/I13: Development of a mechanism for updating and renewing Environment-based skills and technologies. CR 5/I 15: Development of a strategic environmental assessment process with sustainability criteria and appropriate action plans for tourist destinations. Sustainable tourism carrying capacity thresholds established for selected areas:	Assessments of tourism carrying capacity for	
	ecosystems located in tourism sites (215.91 km2 of land area and 1,034 km2 of marine area)	O strategic plan / land use planning, or clear parameters for proper tourism development that integrates the coastal marine area and considers permitted,	 Montecristi: Cayo Arenas. Samaná: Las Terrenas. 2 Community Based Integrated Plans for Sustainable Tourism Development: Integrated Sustainable Tourism Destination Plan of Samaná Integrated Sustainable Tourism Destination Plan of Montecristi 	Samaná and Montecristi Integrated Plans for Sustainable Tourism Development	Community interest
		restricted and prohibited uses. 0 Tourism Land-Use Plans (POTTS) revised, adapted and applied	2 Tourism Land-Use Plans (POTTS) revised, adapted and applied	Updated POTTS	Political will to update POTTs
	Climate resilient landscape management tools for the development of sustainable tourism implemented by local communities in key biodiversity rich areas of the 2 selected project sites totaling 7000 ha	0 BD-friendly certification for destination/ tourist services	Dominican Sustainable Tourism Certification implemented in phases in the 2 pilots: • Samaná Destination Certification (Phase III) • Montecristi Destination Certification (Phase I)	Dominican Sustainable Tourism Certificates	Climate change- induced changes in pilot areas

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Threats to BD caused by tourism infrastructure, operations and visitor activities	Promotion of massive "sun and beach" tourist destinations accompanied by a lack of awareness and strategic marketing.	Communication and Awareness Campaign applied in Tourist Destination Pilots: "Different Tourism for a unique destination"	Materials from Communication and Awareness Campaign	
		% Ecological damage to coral reefs due to tourism activities in Samaná TBD in Year 1	% Ecological damage to coral reefs due to tourism activities in Samaná TBD in Year 1 and measured in Year 4	Assessment report on coral reefs	
		11 beaches known as turtle nesting sites in Samaná and 4 in Montecristi, with no conservation measures (e.g. controlled lighting)	15 nesting beaches of sea turtles identified and under protection with monitoring, including establishment and compliance with a Regulation on lighting of nesting sites in tourist areas	Assessment report on turtle nesting grounds	
		Whale watching tours governed by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between key actors in Samaná.	Proposal for an improved Regulation on whale watching in the Marine Mammal Sanctuary of the Dominican Republic	Updated regulation instrument Records from Seasonal	
		From January to March in Samaná Bay: relative abundance between 1.5 to 2.1 whales / hour for whale watching; mother and baby whales in the bay during the season: 20-36	Historical seasonal variations of the abundance of humpback whale mothers and calves number maintained	monitoring and Photo-ID	
		0% land-use/cover studies cover studies consider MA tourism development as a land use category	100% land-use/cover studies consider MA tourism development as a land use category	Field reports from MA / MITUR	

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
		Ecosystem coverage in pilot areas: Montecristi -8,447 Hectares of mangrove forest representing an estimated 12,670 tons / year of carbon capture Samaná -7,080 Hectares of mangrove forests representing an estimated 10,632 tons / year of carbon capture	Tourism-based measures for recovery and stabilization maintain or increase ecosystem coverage in pilot areas: Montecristi -8,447 Hectares of mangrove forest representing an estimated 12,670 tons / year of carbon capture Samaná -7,080 Hectares of mangrove forests representing an estimated 10,632 tons / year of carbon capture -5 km dune stabilization in Las Terrenas Municipality	Field reports from MA / MITUR	
		100% of the Gift Shops sell Crafts made from protected species	0% of the Gift Shops sell Crafts made from protected species; Curios and crafts made and sold of local products, without any use of protected species.	MA Inspection and surveillance reports	
		4 coastal PAs in pilot sites with partial visitor infrastructure, i.e. nature trails and observation decks, resulting in pressure impacts generated by tourists.	4 coastal PAs in pilot sites with sufficient visitor infrastructure: a) Cayo Arena PA Pilot in Montecristi has docks for boats b) Signage: -Montecristi: Cayo Arenas and El Morro	MA Inspection and surveillance reports Field reports from MA / MITUR	
			- Samaná: Las Terrenas and Marine Mammal Sanctuary c) 2 Nature trails designed and built in Montecristi: - El Morro (Terrestrial Trail) - Cayo Arenas (Underwater Trail)	Reports on project progress / website	

Output 2.1 Landscape level planning tools established and applied by key stakeholders
Output 2.2: Improved community based resource management in 7000 ha of key BD areas addresses NRM at rural user level and at hotel sitings

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Comments	Response	Reference
GEF Secretariat		
N/A – no pending issues on Review Sheet		
STAP		
N/A – no pending issues in comments below:		
STAP welcomes this excellent project, which		
addresses the intense and increasing threats to the		
coastal ecosystems and the catchment management		
systems that impact on them in the most		
biologically diverse country of the Caribbean.		
The descriptions of the project framework, the		
baseline description of threats, and the barriers to		
overcoming them, and current activities addressing		
these, are concise and well-articulated using		
pertinent and quantified information.		
The incremental reasoning around interventions for		
GEF support is realistic and clearly targeted to		
those facets in which GEF investment can have the		
greatest catalytic impact. Given the recognized		
capacity challenges, the proposal for an		
institutionalized training programme that will		
incrementally develop professional capacity, is		
especially welcomed, in view of the frequent		
failure of ad-hoc and short term training initiatives.		
Germany	Local communities and rural users of natural	Section III,
Germany requests that the following requirements	resources will be direct beneficiaries of the	Part I Pilot
are taken into account during the design of	project in terms of enhancing capacities for	Strategies
the final project proposal; in addition, Germany	governance systems, planning issues,	
requests that the Secretariat sends draft final	participation tools. In particular, the project	
project documents for Council review four weeks	will engage local communities in the design	
prior to CEO endorsement:	and implementation of BD-friendly tourism	
	models in the pilots of Outcome 2, including	
The project proposal focusses on some of the core	activities to be generated within and	
environmental and development challenges of the	surrounding the pilot areas. Through the	
Dominican Republic. During the project	identification and provision of alternative	
formulation, the following aspects should be taken	livelihood activities (e.g. sustainable nature-	
into account:	based tourism) for local populations – both	
- The role of the local population in the design and	private landowners and local/indigenous communities - the project will enhance local	
development of alternative management models	support for conservation, and will stimulate	
(land use, ecotourism, etc.), and in the	the development of self-reliance and	
establishment and management of protected areas	sustainable economic use of biodiversity	
should be reflected in the project design. We	resources. The project will also work directly	
consider it necessary to precisely define the extent	with local populations to access increased	
to which the local population can participate in	funding from various development funds to	
decision-making processes to design and to	support sustainable economic alternatives	
implement the project. We also highly recommend	within and surrounding pilot areas.	

Comments	Response	Reference
establishing a multi-stakeholder platform to ensure		
establishing a multi-stakeholder platform to ensure overall support of the project;	With regards to the formation of a multi-stakeholder platform, the project will address this at an institutional level, as well as at the local level. In Output 1.1, to address the incipient levels of collaboration between the institutions involved in the management and use of BD in tourist areas, an Interinstitutional Technical Coordination mechanism will be created between the Ministries of Tourism and Environment. The project will promote this as a strong strategic alliance and inter-institutional collaboration between MA, MITUR and all institutions involved in the management and use of BD in areas of tourism development. At the Pilot level, the establishment of a local multi-stakeholder platform will be determined through the development of the Integrated	Section I, Part II, Subsection 2.2, Output 1.1
	Sustainable Tourism Destination Plans for	
	both Samana and Montecristi.	
- The valuation of the ecosystem services should include all service areas of biodiversity (ecological, economic, social, traditional, educational, etc.), analyze conditions and trends, describe dependencies, describe who impacts on them, and who are winners and losers when it comes to their utilization and management;	Coastal and marine biodiversity in the DR sustains a major component of the country's GDP. The project will transform how the value of ecosystems and biodiversity is integrated into tourism development planning. To determine the most effective and sustainable approach to achieve this, the project will conduct a Strategic Environmental Assessment and updating of the National Tourism Development Plan at the national level through Output 1.1. This SEA will consider all service areas of biodiversity (ecological, economic, social, traditional, educational, etc.), analyze conditions and trends, users, impact, and highlight winners and losers regarding their utilization and management, particularly in the context of tourism development. Furthermore, the value of ecosystem services will be considered in the design and implementation of Integrated Sustainable Tourism Destination Plans for both Samana and Montecristi at the pilot level. An economic valuation study was conducted by	Section I, Part II, Subsection 2.2, Output 1.1
	Wielgus, J., E. Cooper, R. Torres y L. Burke and published in 2010: Capital Costero: República Dominicana as part of the World Resources Institute's Coastal Capital series, which aims to provide decision-makers in the Caribbean with information and tools that link the health of coastal ecosystems—including	

Comments	Response	Reference
	coral reefs, mangroves, and beaches with the	
	attainment of economic and social goals: http://www.wri.org/our-work/project/coastal-	
	capital-economic-valuation-coastal-	
	ecosystems-caribbean. WRI and its local	
	partners conducted economic valuation	
	studies of coral reefs and mangroves at	
	national and subnational levels in five	
	countries: Trinidad and Tobago, St. Lucia,	
	Belize, the Dominican Republic and Jamaica.	
	The project will not conduct another study	
	specific to tourism, rather it will use the	
	results of this study to identify and build support for policies that help to ensure healthy	
	coastal ecosystems and sustainable economies	
	within the objectives of the project	
- Page 5, Para 6 refers to the creation of local work	The original PIF envisioned a joint BD-LD	Section I, Part
commissions to combat desertification in arid	intervention, but this was adjusted to a BD-	II, Subsection
areas. In this context, the Dominican Inter-	only project. While the project is designed to	2.2, Output
Institutional Coordination Mechanism for the	align its interventions with the END, the focus	1.1
implementation of the UNCCD, the GTI (Grupo	of the approved PIF is exclusively on coastal-	
Tecnico Inter-Institucional) should be involved	marine areas, rather than inland arid areas. As	
closely to provide lessons learned from similar	such, the project will not be working directly	
experiences in the border region between the	on the creation of local work commissions	
Dominican Republic and Haiti;	related to arid areas, rather, it will incorporate the theme of Sustainable Tourism into the	
	goals of the National Development Strategy	
	(END) 2010-2030 through the elaboration of	
	a Special Strategic Programme for Sustainable	
	Tourism, as well as ensuring MITUR has the	
	necessary resources to operate.	
- When it comes to developing adaptation	While the project does not focus on the	Section I, Part
measures, ecosystem-based approaches or "natural	development of adaptation measures, the	II, Subsection
solutions" should always be considered	mainstreaming of BD conservation criteria	2.2, Output
systematically in wider adaptation efforts both on the community and national level;	within the tourism sector will safeguard the integrity of coastal-marine ecosystems that are	1.3
the community and national level,	vital to Dominican Republic's resilience to	
	Climate Change. This will be reflected in the	
	National BD-Friendly Certification System's	
	consideration of zoning guidelines for	
	Adaptation and complemented by the creation	
	of a Dominican System of Indicators for	
	Sustainable Tourism. The project will use	
	information developed through the National	
	Communications and NAPA (supported by UNDP) regarding tourism and coastal areas as	
	issues to be addressed in the Adaptation Plan.	
	This information will be updated in 2015,	
	providing timely inputs for this project.	
	In addition, Technology Needs Assessment	
	proposals and proposed models for adaptation	
	in the tourism sector will be considered,	

Comments	Response	Reference
	prepared by MA with support from UNEP;	
	this will include nature-based approaches.	
- With regard to improving governance both in the environmental and tourism sector, the entire range of available policy instruments should be considered (e.g. not only command and control instruments, but also information instruments, codes of conduct, voluntary industry agreements & standards, certifications, fiscal incentives, etc.);	Through Output 1.1, the project will support a thorough review by MA and MITUR of the current legal framework for tourism to determine where biodiversity conservation and sustainable uses are already considered, as well as elaborate recommendations for inclusion, where appropriate and possible, such that by project end all tourism projects and activities will consider BD criteria. It is anticipated that a broad range of policy instruments will be considered, including those that are voluntary in nature, and that this review will result in the updating, elaboration and implementation of regulations to guide tourism activities such as the observation and protection of wildlife species in coastal areas, including the sustainable operation of cruise and/or tour boats in coral reef areas and/or marine wildlife watching, i.e. whale watching in Samana. This will be bolstered by the definition of proscriptive land uses in sensitive areas, such as dumpsites, indiscriminate anchoring on reefs, and deforestation of mangroves for hotel construction, among others. The results of this will be reflected in Output 1.3's National BD-Friendly Certification System and complemented by the creation of a Dominican System of Indicators for Sustainable Tourism. The project will also support the strengthening of coordination spaces and technical information used for decision-making between the two ministries in Output	Section I, Part II, Subsection 2.2, Outputs 1.1 and 1.3
- With regard to tourism development, the project proposal does not yet include any information on the sustainable tourism services which shall be offered in the two targeted regions. Therefore, we request a more detailed description of the proposed sustainable tourism services in the final project document to evaluate the feasibility of the project and the extent to which conservation of biodiversity in coastal areas and local community development can be integrated into the project;	1.1. The project will support the development and implementation of BD-friendly certification for destination/tourist services through an Integrated Sustainable Tourism Destination Plan for both Samana and Montecristi as part of the pilot interventions: (i) Humpback whales will be evaluated, monitored and photo-identified in Samaná Bay, as well as measures to guarantee sustainable sightings of the whales. (ii) Sea turtles in Samaná and Montecristi will be the focus of research regarding nesting sites, as well as the design and placement of effective signage. (iii) Evaluation of the carrying capacity in selected coastal/marine tourism zones, for	Section I, Part II, Subsection 2.2, Output 2.2

Comments	Response	Reference
	orienting further tourism development with a BD-friendly approach.	
	(iv) Development of measures for	
	rehabilitation of degraded dunes, beaches and	
	wetlands.	
	(v) An assessment of coral reefs of	
	Montecristi in places where tourism activities	
	are developed to determine effective measures	
	to ensure the physical protection of the reef	
	and the placement of demarcation and	
	mooring buoys in the areas of boating and	
	diving activities.	
	(vi) Building of 2 Nature Trails in the	
	Protected Areas of El Morro and Cayo Arenas	
	(underwater).	
	(vii) Appropriate identification and signage of	
	tourism areas in coastal/marine zones in order	
	to prevent damages to BD conservation status.	
- From our experiences, we do not recommend	The project will support the development and	Section I, Part
developing a nationally approved certification	implementation of environment-friendly	II, Subsection
system for the hotel industry, which is focusing	certification for destination/tourist services	2.2, Output
only biodiversity issues. We would like to	through an Integrated Sustainable Tourism	2.2
emphasize the importance of certification systems	Destination Plan for both Samana and	
that holistically integrate all sustainability	Montecristi as part of the pilot interventions.	
dimensions;	The expectation is that this certification	
	process will generate benefits related to BD,	
	as well as other factors including but not	
	limited to CC resilience, water and soil	
	quality, and socio-economic, to name a few.	
	The project has been designed on the premise	
	that "sustainable" tourism is not simply BD-	
	based, but also includes an important social	
	component as part of the abovementioned	
	Integrated Sustainable Tourism Destination	
	Plan. Thus the pilots are designed to be	
	inclusive and catalyze opportunities for	
	marginalized populations with the expectation that this in turn will further generate important	
	environmental benefits.	
- Regarding the training of stakeholders in	Based on the results of the Capacity	Section I, Part
conservation of biodiversity and sustainable	Development Scorecard conducted during the	II, Subsection
tourism, we would like to underline that training	PPG, the project will develop a programme	2.2, Output
measures have to be ensured not only in the	for public, private and community awareness	2.2, Output 2.1
beginning but throughout the entire project phase	and training (non-formal) aimed at	=
and they should be sustained after completing the	Biodiversity and Sustainable Tourism sectors	
project;	to address the lack of knowledge among the	
	tourism sector, the private sector, land-	
	owners, and staff of local public institutions.	
	The programme will include biodiversity	
	friendly tourism development strategies as	
	well as tools for the application of legal	
	framework and incentives to adopt sustainable	

Comments	Response	Reference
- Since the activities between the MA (Minist Environment and Natural Resources) and its ecotourism department, the MITUR (Ministry Tourism) and the Ministry of Economy, Plant and Development do not seem to be coordinated, we would like to point out the importance the coordination of their activities to facilitate coherent framework for sustainable initiatives this, existing coordination measures and initiativity within the Dominican Republic should be considered.	practices. It is envisioned that at least 300 people representing MA, MITUR, MEPyD, Private sector, Tour Operators, municipalities and community councils will be trained by the end of the project on BD friendly tourism practices. The training is designed to be ongoing and institutionalized so as to ensure continual follow-up and refreshers beyond the project's lifetime. To address the incipient levels of collaboration between the institutions involved in the management and use of BD in tourist areas, an Inter-institutional Technical Coordination mechanism will be created between the Ministries of Tourism and a Environment. This will take into account the ecotourism plan developed by JICA between	Section I, Part II, Subsection 2.2, Output 1.1
USA USA		
N/A – no pending issues in comments below:		
We believe that this project is very relevant at timely in light of the attention responsible tou development in protected areas has recently received in local media. The project appears thave included all of the necessary stakeholder and its impacts will likely be appreciated by the surrounding communities in the Samana and Monte Christi areas.	rism o rs,	
GEF Secretariat Comment	Response	Reference
	*	
14. The FA strategy framework states that 2 policy and regulatory frameworks will be targeted, but the text only focuses on tourism. The Tracking Tool measures BD mainstreaming in both tourism and fisheries policy, therefore, this is not clear. Please clarify.	The project will directly impact tourism policy at the national level, and planning and land use at the local level. The project will also have an indirect impact on the fisheries sector by strengthening the control and prevention of ecological impact from tourism in vulnerable coastal areas, The Tracking Tool has been revised accordingly.	Tracking Tool (rows 17, 25-32, 133-168)
27. There are two problems in the TT. First, the TT is measuring two sectors for policy mainstreaming, fisheries and tourism,	The main focus of the project is biodiversity and tourism.	Tracking Tool (rows 17, 25- 32, 133-168)

but the logframe only tracks changes in tourism. Please clarify what sector(s) are the focus of the project. Please also see comments above in question 14 on the FA strategy framework.

Second, the TT provides a measure of progress in policy mainstreaming that is

Second, the TT provides a measure of progress in policy mainstreaming that is already at the highest level achievable, therefore, it calls into question why the policy mainstreaming elements of the project are even needed. Please review the TT section on policy mainstreaming again with this in mind and provide an explanation and clarification.

The project will address fisheries indirectly, as detailed below and in the revised Tracking Tool:

- -The regulatory framework to strengthen the control and prevention of ecological impact from tourism in vulnerable coastal areas, see Output 1.1. regarding the updated National Tourism Development Plan (NTDP) which will ensure the protection of BD resources (ecosystems, species and fisheries).
- The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) will revise the permits and licenses of tourism activities that have a high impact on BD (sport fishing centers and diving, cruises, tour agencies).
- The nationally approved biodiversity-friendly certification system for the tourism sector will develop Guidelines for the ecolabelling of fish products for tourism (see Output 1.3).
- The project will support synergies with other ongoing initiatives related to tourism SMEs in Samaná and Montecristi, that will contribute to addressing encroachment, coastal erosion, fire control and prevention, water management, agricultural practices, destructive fishing practices (arrastre and bleach), destruction of reefs, turtle and egg capture, and collection of corals. This will be addressed by the Awareness and Training Program regarding Biodiversity and Sustainable Tourism aimed at public, private and community sectors.

Thanks for your comment on the measure of progress in policy mainstreaming. There was a misunderstanding while filling out this section and what had been entered was the end result that the project seeks to achieve. This has now been corrected and reflects the current status.

29. However, the characterization that a GEF request was the reason that the LD component be removed is inaccurate. The

The text has been corrected.

CEO EndReq

LD component was removed as the proposal was unable to demonstrate any linkage to the LD strategy, thereby making it ineligible for LD Funds. Please correct this.

Annex B

33. In addition, please note that paragraph 149 which is copied below is not consistent with GEF policy:

149. In order to accord proper acknowledgement to GEF for providing funding, a GEF logo should appear on all relevant GEF project publications, including among others, project hardware and vehicles purchased with GEF funds. Any citation on publications regarding projects funded by GEF should also accord proper acknowledgment to GEF. The UNDP logo should be more prominent - and separated from the GEF logo if possible, as UN visibility is important in its capacity as GEF Implementing Agency.

Please delete the last sentence which is not consistent of GEF policy. Please refer to GEF/C.40/08.

The following text replaces paragraph 149, in accordance with GEF policy:

Communications and visibility requirements:

Full compliance is required with UNDP's Branding Guidelines. These can be accessed at http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml, and specific guidelines on UNDP logo use can be accessed

at: http://intra.undp.org/branding/useOfLogo.html. Amongst other things, these guidelines describe when and how the UNDP logo needs to be used, as well as how the logos of donors to UNDP projects needs to be used. For the avoidance of any doubt, when logo use is required, the UNDP logo needs to be used alongside the GEF logo. The GEF logo can be accessed

at: http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo. The UNDP logo can be accessed at http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml.

Full compliance is also required with the GEF's Communication and Visibility Guidelines (the "GEF Guidelines"). The GEF Guidelines can be accessed at: http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08 Branding the GEF% 20 final 0.pdf. Amongst other things, the GEF Guidelines describe when and how the GEF logo needs to be used in project publications, vehicles, supplies and other project equipment. The GEF Guidelines also describe other GEF promotional requirements regarding press releases, press conferences, press visits, visits by Government officials, productions and other promotional items.

Where other agencies and project partners have provided support through co-financing, their branding policies and requirements should be similarly applied. ProDoc paragraph 149

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁵

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 77,138			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent Todate	Amount Committed
1. Validation of target sites; species and baselines for on-the-ground intervention in the FSP	20,000	4,035	15,965
2. In depth analysis of national and local capacities related to the conservation of BD in areas targeted by current and future tourism development	28,538	22,038	6,500
3. Development of key project design elements	28,600	16,796	11,804
Total	77,138	42,869.00	34,269.00

If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.