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# Basic Data

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Information** |
| UNDP PIMS ID | 4955 |
| GEF ID | 5088 |
| Title | Conserving Biodiversity in Coastal Areas Threatened by Rapid Tourism and Physical Infrastructure Development |
| Country(ies) | Dominican Republic, Dominican Republic |
| UNDP-GEF Technical Team | Ecosystems and Biodiversity |
| Project Implementing Partner | Government |
| Joint Agencies | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| Project Type | Full Size |

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Description** |
| This project aims to mainstream BD management and SLM into tourism sector development and associated physical development, to address multiple threats to BD and ecosystem functionality. It also aims to address the indirect impacts of tourism developmentÔÇöin catalysing other economic activities that are leading to land degradation. Tourism and accompanying physical development is directly leading to BD loss in sensitive areas; rapid tourism growth is also catalyzing the in migration of people into these areas, and spawning other indirect threats that are leading to land degradation. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Contacts** |
| UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser | Mr. Lyes Ferroukhi (lyes.ferroukhi@undp.org) |
| Programme Associate | Mr. Edwin Chipsen (edwin.chipsen@undp.org) |
| Project Manager  | Jonathan Delance (jondelance@gmail.com) |
| CO Focal Point | María Eugenia Morales (maria.morales@undp.org) |
| GEF Operational Focal Point | Patricia Abreu (P.Abreu@ambiente.gob.do) |
| Project Implementing Partner | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| Other Partners | *(not set or not applicable)* |

# Overall Ratings

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall DO Rating | Moderately Unsatisfactory |
| Overall IP Rating | Moderately Unsatisfactory |
| Overall Risk Rating | Substantial |

# Development Progress

|  |
| --- |
| **Description** |
| **Objective****To ensure the conservation of biodiversity in ecologically important coastal areas threatened by the burgeoning tourism industry and associated physical development.** |
| **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Midterm target level** | **End of project target level** | **Level at 30 June 2017** | **Cumulative progress since project start** |
| 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 areasThe 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. | *(not set or not applicable)* | 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. | 1. An open process was initiated to address the gaps and challenges posed by the tourism legal framework vis-à-vis biodiversity. Workshops, meetings and interviews were conducted with authorities, private sector, key communities of the pilot provinces. The participation of the legal direction of the Ministry of Tourism maintained a strong participation in the process. The following documents were produced: -“Critical analysis matrix for the coastal marine  -"Gaps on regulated and non-regulated tourism activities linked to the conservation of coastal marine biodiversity" -“Tourist services and activities Regulation’s Proposal in Dominican Republic” -"Regulatory Framework for Strengthening the Conservation of Marine Coastal Biodiversity and Sustainable Tourism"  2. An inter-institutional technical coordination mechanism proposal, has been carried out, based on the participation of different actors from both Ministries. It was identified the collaboration needs for a comprehensive management of coastal and marine areas. The proposal derives to the Interministerial Coordination Bureau as an open forum for decision-making.  The interinstitutional collaboration was enhanced with some NGOs strategic alliances which were stablished to strengthen the interinstitutional collaboration. These NGO are: Counterpart International, AGROFRONTERA, ANAMAR, FUNDEMAR, Fundación Ecologica Punta Cana, GIZ.  Others participating institutions are: UASD – CIBIMA, MHNSD, National Botanical Garden, CODOPESCA, DR Academic of Science , Dominican Navy, Montecristi and Samana Municipallities, FEDOMU, DGODOT, CEBSE, ECOMAR, ATEMAR, Grupo Jaragua, TNC, Ecological Action Group and Dominican Reef Check.  3. Legal instruments contents into the “Compendio de Autorizaciones Ambientales”, were revised between technicians and the Project . These revisions are intended to determinate potentials regulated or not regulated tourism activities.  Protocols and regulars monitoring activities will strengthening the National Environmental Management System. Those technical and legal instruments were produced in the framework of the consultancy “Establecimiento de un Sistema de monitoreo y cumplimiento para la conservación de la biodiversidad costera y marina”.  - For endangered, priority Coastal and marine Ecosystems and species was developed a group of assessments protocols proposal. - An Assessment Implementation Action Plan was developed.  The assessments protocols will be an important component of the Environmental Assessment Process, in the coastal tourism projects that the Ministry of Environment is implementing.  The review and updating of the regulatory instruments involved was coordinated with the technical area of ​​the Vice-Ministry of Environmental Management.  4. The National Tourism Plan has not been completed in MITUR, like was the understanding while the PPG phase. Due to the fact that the PNDT was not completed as planned before starting the project, the target has been reviewed and it has been determined to develop environmental guidelines before the end of the year 2017 so that these guidelines are considered when the preparation of the National Plan in MITUR begins. On the other hand, Sustainable Tourism Models are being worked locally with the development of a sustainable tourism model for each pilot province.  |  The Project Steering Committe (Apr-18) agreed on presenting the proposal among 1. In this reporting period a work meeting between Ministries Legal departments led to a common understanding of the proposed modifications to the legal framework, however, the key is to involve high decision makers to approve and apply the recommendations. Viceministers and make a decision. Even so, no progress. Awaiting for the meeting in August.  2.The Project Steering Committe (Apr-18) agreed on presenting the proposal among Viceministers and make a decision. Even so, no progress. Awaiting for the meeting in August.  3. To enhance the scope and impact of the new Monitoring System of Species and Ecosystems, the project aimed to include considerations to the new coastal tourism projects. ToRs are elaborated seeking to include considerations of biodiversity to new tourism projects within the Environmental Management and Adaptation Plan (PMAA), a Plan required for all projects by the Ministry of Environment. At the time, some validation is still required in order to begin a consultancy no later than Q3 2018. The Ministry of Environment reviews and updates the Red List of Fauna, the project helped and in this case includes the coastal and marine part that never been published.  4. The proposed change of approach (Environmental Guidelines) given the non-existence of a National Plan for Tourism Development was accepted. Therefore ToRs were elaborated, socialized and validated. As for now is in place the evaluation of consultancy proposals, expected to begin the process in August 2018 and finish by the end of the year. |
| Financial framework to support the National Plan for Sustainable Tourism Development in coastal areas | No specific financial instruments that promote the development of sustainable tourism in coastal areas, with emphasis on BD conservation | *(not set or not applicable)* | Financial instruments in place to ensure the implementation of actions related to tourism impact on the marine and coastal areas | As for now a new ToR has been prepared for the promotion of a Special Strategic Program for Sustainable Tourism to be implemented by MITUR with the intention of obtaining greater financing from the national budget. A ToR draft has been prepared to propose a Sustainable Financing Mechanism for the management of coastal and marine biodiversity, which includes a portfolio of different funding sources.  | The ToR for the Elaboration of a Financial Mechanism were validated. All applications for a support staff vacancy were received, but the selection and hiring process of the selected candidate is pending for Q3. |
| # of hectares of critical ecosystem conservation | 13,180 ha. of mangrove forest 49,320 ha. of coral reefs 52,088 ha. wetlands109,880 ha. landscape /seascape area directly covered by the project | *(not set or not applicable)* | No net loss of critical ecosystems as a result of tourism activities (overlay of infrastructure / tourism activities on critical ecosystems) | Data on critical coastal and marine ecosystems in the province of Montecristi were checked and updated in coordination with the Director of Environmental Information within the Ministry of Environment. Field work visits and post coordination and georeferred data suggest that the ecosystem coverage has been stable. Land use maps with accurate information will be completed in the Q3 /2017.  | Maps of ecosystem update and land use were elaborated in the provinces of Samaná and Montecristi in coordination with the Environmental Information Directorate of the Ministry of the Environment. The coverage of mangroves in both provinces showed little difference from their original dimensions.  TBD ha. of mangrove forest TBD ha. of coral reefs TBD ha. wetlands |
| **The progress of the objective can be described as:** | **On track** |
| **Outcome 1****The policy, legal and planning framework in the tourism sector addresses the direct threats to biodiversity from coastal tourism development and activities.** |
| **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Midterm target level** | **End of project target level** | **Level at 30 June 2017** | **Cumulative progress since project start** |
| 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.Gaps in the Environmental Management System with respect to BD conservation in tourism development areas | *(not set or not applicable)* | National Tourism Development Plan fully addresses the protection of BD resources100% of tourism activities with impact on BD conservation are included within the Environmental Management System. | 1. The preparation of the National Tourism Plan has not been completed in MITUR. Due to the fact that the PNDT was not completed as planned before starting the project, the target has been reviewed and it has been determined to develop environmental guidelines before the end of the year 2017 so that these guidelines are considered when the preparation of the National Plan in MITUR begins. This offer has been socialized with the Minister's cabinet director office of MITUR.  2. The National Environmental Management System will be strengthened through the application of regular protocols and monitoring, generated as outputs of the consultancy: "Establishment of a monitoring and compliance system for the conservation of coastal and marine biodiversity". In particular, the application of monitoring will form an important part of the environmental assessment procedure for all tourism projects in the Coastal Zone. | 1. The proposed change of approach (Environmental Guidelines) given the non-existence of a National Plan for Tourism Development was accepted. Therefore ToRs were elaborated, socialized and validated. As for now is in place the evaluation of consultancy proposals, expected to begin the process in August 2018 and finish by the end of the year.  2. To enhance the scope and impact of the new Monitoring System of Species and Ecosystems, the project aimed to include considerations to the new coastal tourism projects. ToRs are elaborated seeking to include considerations of biodiversity to new tourism projects within the Environmental Management and Adaptation Plan (PMAA), a Plan required for all projects by the Ministry of Environment. At the time, some validation is still required in order to begin a consultancy no later than Q3 2018. The Ministry of Environment reviews and updates the Red List of Fauna, the project helped and in this case includes the coastal and marine part that never been published.  The inclusion and/or revision of procedures to regulate coastal tourist activities (gift shops, scuba diving school and aquatics - watersports) didn't report any advances. This will be persevered for Q3. |
| 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. Insufficient financial resources to guarantee needed actions for BD conservation. | *(not set or not applicable)* | Inter-institutional Consultative Group established between the Ministries of Tourism and Environment with appropriate guidelines and meetings. 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 | 1. An inter-institutional technical coordination mechanism proposal, has been carried out, based on the participation of different actors from both Ministries. It was identified the collaboration needs for a comprehensive management of coastal and marine areas. The proposal derives to the Interministerial Coordination Bureau as an open forum for decision-making.  2. A TdR draft has been prepared for the elaboration of a Special Strategic Program of Sustainable Tourism to be executed by MITUR. Linkage will be coordinated with the 2010-2030 END and the MEPyD Special Programs Department.  3. A TdR draft has been prepared to propose a Sustainable Financing Mechanism for the management of coastal and marine biodiversity, which includes a portfolio of different funding sources.  | 1. Project Steering Committee (Aph,18) decided to socialize the results among vice ministers and other decision making authorities in order to validate the proposed Interministerial Coordination Bureau. The project is insisting on having the mentioned meeting, however no advances can be noted. Given some coordination it is expected to have this meeting on August 2018, as the Project Steering Committee should gather early August.  2. At the time there is no specific direction on how to address the Special Strategic Programme for Sustainable Tourism. Some concerns regarding the elaborated ToRs suggested to have meetings with the Community Tourism project Unit of the Ministry of Tourism that is also seeking to implement Institutional arrangements for Sustainable Tourism. The project have had several meetings to establish synergies. However the decisions making is pending.  3. The ToR for the Elaboration of a Financial Mechanism were validated. All applications for a support staff vacancy were received, but the selection and hiring process of the selected candidate is pending for Q3. |
| Capacity to recognize good practices and apply Sustainable Tourism Models that contribute to BD conservation | There is no national certification system for BD-friendly hotels and destinations. | *(not set or not applicable)* | Manual for the Dominican 'BD-friendly' Sustainable Tourism Certification, aimed at tourist destinations and tour companies. At least 10% of tourism activities with BD-friendly certification within the pilot areas. Dominican System of Indicators for Sustainable Tourism. | 1. A ToR has been prepared for the elaboration of a Dominican Manual for the Certification of Sustainable Tourism and BD, and is in process to initiate socialization.  2. The business inventory has been completed throughout the Montecristi y Samaná coastal strip. It will be used as a baseline to determine the businesses with potential to obtain a certification. The Project carried out a diagnostic process (Biodiversity Check) about viability of a tourist company for being recognized environment friendly in Samaná, in order to evaluate the viability of its application in other accommodations. The plan of action was prepared to regulate businesses within the pilot provinces.  3. Comparable cases have been studied prior to the development of a ToR to determine the Dominican Indicator System for Sustainable Tourism. | 1. The Manual depends on the development of the certification process, at the time is not completed. Consequently no process will be reported for this period.  2. There is an approach elaborated by the project in synergy with GIZ which consists of working with an agency endorsed by the Global Sustainable Tourism Council (GSTC) to introduced indicators and proposals for the implementation of the certification in both pilot provinces. A meeting with the Vice ministry of Quality to make decisions based on the possibility of implementing this approach is pending.  The first group of businesses to be regularized in Montecristi and Samaná was selected. The monitoring and support process for the regularization will begin Q3 2018.  3. A draft of the TOR for the development indicators was elaborated. The validation from the Ministries of this draft to proceed with its publication is pending. |
| **The progress of the objective can be described as:** | **On track** |
| **Outcome 2****Operational framework to protect biodiversity , in areas highly vulnerable to the indirect effects of tourism development** |
| **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Midterm target level** | **End of project target level** | **Level at 30 June 2017** | **Cumulative progress since project start** |
| Capacity of sectoral ministries, the private sector, municipalities and community organizations to generate, use and share geographic, socioeconomic and biophysical information required for coastal and marine spatial planning, taking into account the indirect impacts of tourism on ecosystems | Capacity Development Scorecard : Overall Average Score: 16CR2/I4:1CR4/I13:1CR5/I15:0Areas to be improved:CR2/ I 4: Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues, but not about the possible solutions, or if they know about the possible solutions, are unaware of how to 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 | *(not set or not applicable)* | Capacity Development Scorecard : Scorecard:Overall Average Score: 22CR2/I4:3CR4/I13:3CR5/I15:2Specific improvements addressed through Awareness and Training Program regarding Biodiversity and Sustainable Tourism aimed at Public, private and community sectors:CR2/ I 4: Development of a program of awareness and training on efficiency in the implementation of solutions to 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. | Capacity Development Scorecard: Overall Average Score: 22 CR2/I4:2 Training programs given: -Public School Workshops (3 schools for a total of 115 students) Subjects worked: Coastal zone, importance of the oceans, coral reefs, coral reefs of Montecristi province, ban periods for ocean species. Importance and types of sea turtles. CR4/I13:1 Training programs in preparation: - Safe handling of seafood (training begins with members of a fishing community in Montecristi and one in Samaná) Target must be reviewed CR5/I15:0  | Capacity Development Scorecard: Overall Average Score: 19.5 CR2/I4: 2 CR4/I13: 1.5 CR5/I15:0  Target must be reviewed. Specifically for CR4: i15, the project has little or no impact on changing or improving this indicator. Therefore, this indicator should not be considered. Changing the internal evaluation schemes of local stakeholder exceeds the scope of the project, moreover it depends only on the interest of the stakeholder. |
| Management effectiveness to address the pressures of visitors in marine / coastal ecosystems located in tourism sites (215.91 km2 of land area and 1,034 km2 of marine area) | No tourism carrying capacity threshold established for Samaná and Montecristi coastal/marine tourism sites0 strategic plan / land use planning, or clear parameters for proper tourism development that integrates the coastal marine area and considers permitted, restricted and prohibited uses.0 Tourism Land-Use Plans (POTTS) revised, adapted and applied | *(not set or not applicable)* | Sustainable tourism carrying capacity thresholds established for selected areas: • 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(2) Tourism Land-Use Plans (POTTS) revised, adapted and applied |  1. A ToR draft has been prepared for the creation of a public use management model as a tool for handling the ecological and tourist carrying capacity of Cayo Arena. There is a proposal of tourist capacity for the coastal strip of Las Terrenas.  2. A ToR draft has been prepared to elaborate a Model of Sustainable Tourism in Samaná and a Model of Sustainable Tourism in Montecristi. Initiatives have been set to validate with tourism clusters and other groups and associations involved in the process.  3. The study of the POTTs elaborated between 2008 and today has been concluded, enriched with regional case studies. The necessary environmental guidelines to include and complement POTTs have been determined and inserted in the Guide of Environmental Planning in tourist zones. We are waiting for MITUR´s decision on which pilot province will begin the implementation of the guide.  | 1. The Public Use Tourism Management Model for Cayo Arena initiated Q2-2018 and expected to be completed on Q3-2018. This includes the considerations of carrying capacity, ecological resilience and a monitoring system of visitors experience and ecosystems health of the site. On the other hand, Las Terrenas is a complex area with multiple threats, an experience of Tourism Capacity within another tourism similar coastal strip (Bayahibe) is being evaluated to replicate the applicable experiences in Las Terrenas. However most of the data about the coastal resilience of Las Terrenas is based on the ecosystems. This data was gathered in order to develop the Land Use Plan of Las Terrenas, where the project actively participated.  2. A Sustainable Tourism Guide/Model, included in the Territorial Land Management Plan (POTT), is being elaborated for Montecristi. Once this POTT is concluded, the POTT of Samaná will be updated with the corresponding Sustainable Tourism Guide/Model.  3. The POTT for Montecristi is being worked on as the first pilot for the test and application of the completed Guide for the elaboration and/or update of Tourism Land Use Plans, this is programmed to conclude at the end of 2018. The mentioned Guide will be published at the end of 2018. |
| 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 | *(not set or not applicable)* | Dominican Sustainable Tourism Certification implemented in phases in the 2 pilots: • Samaná Destination Certification (Phase III) • Montecristi Destination Certification (Phase I) | Planned to begin next year. Progress has been made with the ToR draft of the Certification Manual. This year, the Dominican Republic's sustainable tourism indicators system is also expected to be developed.  | As a result of the completed Tourism Business Regularization Plan, the department of Companies and Services of the Ministry of Tourism and the project, are promoting a process to make the requirements of regularization more flexible for small destinations like Montecristi or Samaná. Without flexible regularization of these businesses the possibility of granting tourism quality badges is not possible. Regarding the badges, it was agreed with Mitur to introduce the necessary environmental guidelines to strengthen the existing Tourist Quality Distinctive of Mitur. Nevertheless, more involvement is necessary from decision makers in order to proceed. After a decision on how to address a certification/distinctive for tourism business and the National Sustainable Tourism Indicators System is completed, then it will be possible to conclude a certification for Sustainable Tourism destinations. |
| Threats to BD caused by tourism infrastructure, operations and visitor activities[1 of 8 sub-indicators] | Promotion of massive “sun and beach” tourist destinations accompanied by a lack of awareness and strategic marketing. | *(not set or not applicable)* | Communication and Awareness Campaign applied in Tourist Destination Pilots: "Different Tourism for a unique destination" | A ToR was prepared for the Design of the Communication and Visibility Strategy of the project, which includes campaigns for the pilot province. Various initiatives have been supported to promote the development of sustainable tourism in both provinces (eg 4th Festival del Marisco Ripiao in Sánchez, Samaná). The results of the different consultancies allow us to propose the inclusion of some changes in the traditional publicity of mass tourism, and to make changes through the inclusion of conservation criteria from the beginning of the environmental, general or thematic evaluation procedures. | The project’s Visibility and Communication Strategy was designed. The person which will work part-time to implement this strategy was selected. Hiring is still pending, expected for August 2018. The mentioned Strategy will not only focus on Biodiversity, it will include social elements such as gender equality in the tourism sector, among other important elements.   |
| Threats to BD caused by tourism infrastructure, operations and visitor activities[2 of 8 sub-indicators] | % Ecological damage to coral reefs due to tourism activities in Samaná TBD in Year 1 | *(not set or not applicable)* | % Ecological damage to coral reefs due to tourism activities in Samaná TBD in Year 1 and measured in Year 4 | Areas affected or damaged of coral reefs by direct tourism activities are not easily quantifiable.  Several scenarios were studied for an adequate approach of the criteria to be selected in order to quantify the direct damages caused by tourism to the corals of the pilot provinces of Samaná y Montecristi.  To date, the greatest threat posed by tourism on the coral reefs has been found in the Terrenas area, where the destruction of some 60m of reefs was confirmed with evident traces of destruction by anchors and broken reefs from fishermen and tourists boats.  At the moment there is a proposal to estimate tourism damage to be implemented as part of the monitoring efforts in 2017, thus allowing a baseline with sufficient scientific support. | The ecological damage that the coral reefs can received due to tourism in Las Terrena, Samaná was evaluated. The results were not determined due to the lack of conclusive elements. Other detailed evaluations and studies are required.  This goal must be considered for its dismissal given the complexity of properly assessing the environmental damage due to tourism activities. Other alternatives such as good scuba diving practices are being proposed by encouraging scuba diving centers/schools by creating programs of responsible activities with coral reefs certification. By narrowing the scope to this particular activity, it is possible to not only assess the damage but to also create a better way to involve tourism to consider biodiversity best practices. The project has already begin this process with GreenFins initiative and Reef Check DR.  |
| Threats to BD caused by tourism infrastructure, operations and visitor activities[3 of 8 sub-indicators] | 11 beaches known as turtle nesting sites in Samaná and 4 in Montecristi, with no conservation measures (e.g. controlled lighting) | *(not set or not applicable)* | 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 | In Montecristi province the visit of turtles has been rare in recent years. The latest reports are from the beaches:  1. Punta Presidente 2. Cayo 7 Hermanos 3. Los cayos de Montecristi (Repeated item 2) 4. Punta Rucia  In Samaná, historically turtle nesting reports have been on 11 beaches in the province:  1. Las Galeras 2. Punta Bonita \* 3. Limón \* 4. Playa El Valle \* 5. Las Terrenas 6. Las Canas 7. Punta Bonita, near of Portillo 8. Cosón \* 9. Colorada 10. Madama 11. Frontón. In recent years the most frequent sites are: Punta Bonita, Limón, Cosón, El Valle.  The goal should be reviewed as not all beaches are threatened by illumination, either subject to monitoring.  At the moment it has been determined the need to work with Punta Rucia in Montecristi and with Limón, El Valle, Cosón, Colorada and Madama in Samaná province.   In addition to the beaches mentioned, the project includes Costa Verde, La Granja and Buen Hombre in Montecristi and Portillo in Samaná.  On lighting will work with Punta Rucia in Montecristi and Punta Bonita, Limón, Las Terrenas, Cosón in Samaná.  A monitoring program for nesting, spawning and birth of Turtles Carey, Tinglar and Verde, is being carried out on the beaches of Cosón, El Valle, Las Terrenas, Portillo, Samaná; It is proposed to encourage hotels and users of coastal areas to implement a program of modification and replacement of lights in outdoor areas to reduce the amount of direct light incident on the beaches and the sea and protect the arrival of turtles that come to spawn at Beaches. There is already a proposed solution on lighting for Samaná. | Although there are other areas where sea turtles nesting has been reported,the majority of the chosen points in Montecristi didn't have reports of sea turtles nesting sighting in recent years, but the lighting of these areas does not represent a threat to the nesting because they are areas removed from the urban area. Signs to identified the beaches where turtle nest have been installed.  Samaná: signs were elaborated indicating the points where nests are found during the incubation process, as well as other signs indicating the proper precautions for the use of the beaches where Sea Turtles nest.   |
| Threats to BD caused by tourism infrastructure, operations and visitor activities[4 of 8 sub-indicators] | Whale watching tours governed by a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between key actors in Samaná. 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 | *(not set or not applicable)* | Proposal for an improved Regulation on whale watching in the Marine Mammal Sanctuary of the Dominican RepublicHistorical seasonal variations of the abundance of humpback whale mothers and calves number maintained | Draft of regulations for whale watching is completed. By now is being socialized in order to reach consensus. The indicator must be revised. The baseline was not assess correctly. The data must be presented as follows: Baseline Jan-March 2014: 170 Photo ID individuals 11 Female and calf 5 individuals with visible skin conditions/wounds. Jan-March 2017: 116 Photo ID individuals 19 Female and calf 1 calf by itself 2 individuals and 3 calves with visible skin conditions/wounds.  | The process of presentation of the formal regulations for the application of whale watching permits was facilitated, carried out, and put into execution early 2018.  Jan-March 2018: 107 Photo ID individuals 23 Female and calf 6 Female, calf and escort 1 dead calf stranded at Coson 1 calf alone at Las Galeras  |
| Threats to BD caused by tourism infrastructure, operations and visitor activities[5 of 8 sub-indicators] | 0% land-use/cover studies cover studies consider MA tourism development as a land use category | *(not set or not applicable)* | 100% land-use/cover studies consider MA tourism development as a land use category | Not a feasible target, out of the project scope.  | Not a feasible target, out of the project scope. |
| Threats to BD caused by tourism infrastructure, operations and visitor activities[6 of 8 sub-indicators] | 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 | *(not set or not applicable)* | 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 | Data on critical coastal and marine ecosystems in the province of Montecristi were checked and updated in coordination with the Director of Environmental Information within the Ministry of Environment. Field work visits and post coordination and georeferred data suggest that the ecosystem coverage has been stable. Land use maps with accurate information will be completed in the Q3 /2017. The mangrove coverage in both provinces appear to be stable, without noticeable decrease. The confirmation of this data will be granted by the updated final cartography.  The dune-beach systems that appear to have been affected are subject to periodic measurements and reforestation campaigns with herbaceous and creeping plants program. The results can be measured in the medium term.  | Maps of ecosystem update and land use were elaborated in the provinces of Samaná and Montecristi in coordination with the Environmental Information Directorate of the Ministry of the Environment. The coverage of mangroves in both provinces showed little difference from their original dimensions. Small patches of other marsh species (Drago) were not mapped and have been annexed. The mangrove area established …. for Montecristi and …. for Samaná.  Dune Stabilization: (33.2%)  343 mts La Playita 498 mts Playa Rincón 820 mts Playa Terrenas |
| Threats to BD caused by tourism infrastructure, operations and visitor activities[7 of 8 sub-indicators] | 100% of the Gift Shops sell Crafts made ​​from protected species | *(not set or not applicable)* | 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. | The inventory of all businesses of tourist vocation in Samaná and Montecristi coastal strip has been finished, from high tide to 1 km distance inland. Thirty-five gift shops were detected, of which only 13 have been regulated. To date all 13 (100%) are being monitored and none are selling products derived from protected species.  | Of the 13 identified, 2 of them are not working. During the last review carried out by the project’s staff in Samaná, one of them had for sale parts and derivatives of marine animals that were banned from commercialization by local legislation. It was determined that 90.9% of regulated gift shops comply with current regulations in the province of Samaná during this year.   |
| Threats to BD caused by tourism infrastructure, operations and visitor activities[8 of 8 sub-indicators] | 4 coastal PAs in pilot sites with partial visitor infrastructure, i.e. nature trails and observation decks, resulting in pressure impacts generated by tourists. | *(not set or not applicable)* | 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- Samaná: Las Terrenas and Marine Mammal Sanctuaryc) 2 Nature trails designed and built in Montecristi: - El Morro (Terrestrial Trail)- Cayo Arenas (Underwater Trail) | A) A carrying capacity assessment should be addressed by closing the 2017, the results will be used for designing the best infrastructure for boats in Cayo Arena. B) Signage for Montecristi: Cayo Arena is completed, el Morro is in the process of design and expected to be completed by the end of 2017. Signage for Samaná: Las Terrenas and the Marine Mammal Sanctuary are completed, however, secondary routes will be revised in order to enhance the signage. C) The trail in El Morro is 50% completed, other needs were identified and will be completed this 2017, also a Visitors Center for education and recreational purposes will be prepared given the chance of co-financing collaborators who are interested in education investings. The Cayo Arena underwater trail depends on the study referred before in item A.  | a) The study of carrying capacity of Cayo Arena concludes in Q3 2018. From this proposal, work to improve the anchoring space for boats will begin.  b) Road signs design for Montecristi is finished. Work will begin in Q3. Signposts are being designed for Cabo Samaná’s trail and is expected to be installed by the end of 2018.  c) The trail in El Morro is 50% completed, The Cayo Arena underwater trail depends on the study referred before in item A. However, synergies are being established with the Underwater Museum of Lanzarote, as an exchange of experience for the installation of a museum of this type in Dominican waters for Q3. The visitors center on the mangrove platform has been hired, it will be finished by Q4.      |
| **The progress of the objective can be described as:** | **On track** |

# Implementation Progress



|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Cumulative GL delivery against total approved amount (in prodoc): | 32.65% |
| Cumulative GL delivery against expected delivery as of this year: | 38.04% |
| Cumulative disbursement as of 30 June (note: amount to be updated in late August): | 926,923.16 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Key Financing Amounts** |
| PPG Amount | 77,138 |
| GEF Grant Amount | 2838792 |
| Co-financing | 16,034,799 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Key Project Dates** |
| PIF Approval Date | Apr 12, 2013 |
| CEO Endorsement Date | Mar 11, 2015 |
| Project Document Signature Date (project start date): | Jul 2, 2015 |
| Date of Inception Workshop | Feb 3, 2016 |
| Expected Date of Mid-term Review | Jan 2, 2018 |
| Actual Date of Mid-term Review | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| Expected Date of Terminal Evaluation | Apr 30, 2020 |
| Original Planned Closing Date | Jul 31, 2020 |
| Revised Planned Closing Date | *(not set or not applicable)* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Dates of Project Steering Committee/Board Meetings during reporting period (30 June 2017 to 1 July 2018)** |
| 2018-04-24 |

# Critical Risk Management

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Current Types of Critical Risks  | Critical risk management measures undertaken this reporting period |
| Environmental | As a large part of the activities are carried out in natural environments and especially in marine areas, it is important to be aware of the weather conditions and the effects that may occur due to natural changes, especially in the hurricane season. Travel schedules are always made thinking about this possibility. |
| Political | There is an important challenge on the political issue. Although the technical levels of both ministries are giving support to the proposals emanated by the project, it is necessary a greater involvement of the high levels of decision making. Without finding a solution to this risk, it will not be possible to deliver on time the products and impact that are intended to achieve through the project, especially those related to the tourism sector. |

# Adjustments

**Comments on delays in key project milestones**

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Manager: please provide comments on delays this reporting period in achieving any of the following key project milestones: inception workshop, mid-term review, terminal evaluation and/or project closure.** |
| No programmed milestones for this period.  |
| **Country Office: please provide comments on delays this reporting period in achieving any of the following key project milestones: inception workshop, mid-term review, terminal evaluation and/or project closure.** |
| *(not set or not applicable)* |
| **UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser: please provide comments on delays this reporting period in achieving any of the following key project milestones: inception workshop, mid-term review, terminal evaluation and/or project closure.** |
| *(not set or not applicable)* |

# Ratings and Overall Assessments

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Role** | **2018 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2018 Implementation Progress Rating** |
| **Project Manager/Coordinator** | Moderately Satisfactory | *- IP Rating provided by UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser and UNDP Country Office only -*  |
| Overall Assessment | The project has started this reporting period trying to implement the solutions and proposals derived from the studies and work that have been completed through the Project in previeus years. Noteworthy, significant advances in the implementation of some of the instruments elaborated such as the Species and Ecosystem Monitoring System, which is key to strengthening political and territorial planning in tourism development and a better management by the environmental authority.  At the moment in each pilot province the monitoring sites of prioritized species and ecosystems are mapped and established, as well as the ecosystems restoration interventions delimited by area and scope. The first coral nursery was installed and put into operation in Montecristi, in addition, a nursery of native/endemics coastal plants is set in Montecristi, from which, restoration of coastal vegetation has already been carried out in different parts of the province.  Another aspect to highlight is the joint work with the private sector of tourism, several trainings have been implemented on responsible tourism for business, the importance of coastal biodiversity for tourism. Also, they have participated in activities of restoration and beautification of coastal landscapes. On World Environment Day, the central activity was carried out with the Tourist Cluster of Samaná and some of the largest hotel business in the province. In Montecristi, World Oceans Day was also celebrated with private tourism businesses, carrying out nearly four activities alluding to coastal biodiversity and tourism.  However, there are still important challenges that must be addressed urgently in order to complete the project and meet the goals established mostly by decisions that have taken time to implement. The Tourism Business Regularization Plan, a clear course on the subject of biodiversity-friendly certifications and the inter-institutional coordination board have not been formalized, furthermore adjustments to the legal framework require decision to apply at the highest level of decision makers. Fortunately, the first meeting of the Project Steering Committee was held (Apr-2018), where these concerns were raised, it is expected that at the next meeting of the Project Steering Committee, decisions will be taken to address this situation, tentatively (Aug-2018).  Responding to the plethora of problems aimed by the project is not an easy task since there are many years of working and deciding in a way that must be changed to new approaches, furthermore is imperative a political will between two Ministries that mostly have worked separately and that must be empowered to decide this new approach of Tourism Development. In the interest of understanding the need for a change in the development model one of the strategies implemented at the end of this period was the realization of a Coastal Biodiversity and Tourism Symposium with technicians and mid-level managers of both Ministries discussing the approaches of other countries with great experience and successful examples of Sustainable Tourism. Fortunately, about 80 people from both Ministries participated in this activity. It is expected to see results of this event in the coming months in terms of empowerment and decision making.  |
| **Role** | **2018 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2018 Implementation Progress Rating** |
| **UNDP Country Office Programme Officer** | Moderately Unsatisfactory | Moderately Unsatisfactory |
| Overall Assessment | The DO Progress is Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) as the project is off track and is expected to partially achieve its end-of-project targets by project closure with shortcomings. This is because despite the fact that the project has developed multiple tools and instruments in order to promote the achievement of its objective (e.g.: a gap analysis of the incorporation of BD aspects in tourist projects and activities, a proposal for the modification of existing regulation and creation of new regulation that incorporates BD aspects in tourist projects and activities, a monitoring and enforcement system for the conservation of coastal and marine biodiversity, as well as an inter-institutional technical coordination mechanism proposal between Environmental and Tourism Ministries) it is still pending their proper ownership and their operationalization from both ministries in order to properly advance towards the goals of the project. The key achievement of Outcome 1 is that the policy, legal and planning framework in the tourism sector addresses the direct threats to biodiversity from coastal tourism development and activities. One of the main elements to achieve this outcome considered in the Project Document is that the National Tourism Development Plan fully addresses the protection of biodiversity resources. As reported last year, the preparation of the National Tourism Plan has not been completed by the Ministry of Tourism (MITUR). A process to start the design of environmental guidelines to be provided to MITUR to be used in the preparation of the National Tourism Plan has begun, ensuring that aspects related to the protection of biodiversity, especially in coastal areas of tourism, are considered. Likewise, it has been agreed the terms for the elaboration of a proposal of interinstitutional mechanisms to create, promote and strengthen monitoring and follow-up capacities to the Environmental Adaptation Management Plans (PMAA) of tourism projects with licenses granted by the Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry of Tourism. As well, the development of a financial structure proposal that can capture and allocate diverse financing for the sustainable use of coastal and marine biodiversity has started. There is still no advance in the operationalization of the Interministerial Coordination Bureau, despite a proposal based on the participation of different actors from both Ministries has been developed. Also, there has been very little advance regarding the Dominican BD Friendly Sustainable Tourism, but an approach of the methodology has been discussed in synergy with GIZ.  Count with an operational framework to protect biodiversity in areas highly vulnerable to the indirect effects of tourism development is the key achievement of Outcome 2. The capacity of sectoral ministries, the private sector, municipalities and community organizations to generate, use and share geographic, socioeconomic and biophysical information required for coastal and marine spatial planning, considering the indirect impacts of tourism on ecosystems, has improved. The overall average score of the capacity development scorecard has raised from 16 (baseline) to 19.5. A model of management of public use as tool of management of the capability of ecological resilience and tourist charge of Cayo Arena is quite advanced. As well, a Tourism Land-Use Plan for Montecristi, using for the first time the Guide for the elaboration and/or update of Tourism Land Use Plans, is advancing. Samaná’s Tourism Land-Use Plan will be updated to include the corresponding sustainable tourism criteria of the guide, once Montecristi’s Plan conclude. A visibility and communication strategy which include a communication and awareness campaign in the tourist destination pilots, was designed for the project. Its implementation is scheduled to begin on August 2018.  The IP rating is, as well, Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) because implementation is not proceeding as planned and faces significant implementation issues. Many of the delays are due to the speed of both ministries, specially MITUR, for the revision and validation of terms of reference, documents and products of the project. The most critical risk identified has to do with the ownership of the project by the Ministry of Tourism. UNDP had been advocating for the ownership of the project by the Ministry of Tourism and there has been some progress, especially with the technical level. Last April the Steering Committee met and reached multiple agreements to promote the progress of the project. As well, an increase in the frequency of meetings of the Steering Committee every three months as an adaptive management measure was agreed. Another risk has arisen with the change of the Minister of Environment last June. This change could slow down operations, monitoring of measures and decision-making at the project's political level, but some action has been taken in order to publicize the project and its importance to the new minister. The project has deliver a very positive collateral result which has to do with the active involvement of local public and private actors in the pilot zones increasing their awareness and conservation actions of coastal biodiversity.  |
| **Role** | **2018 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2018 Implementation Progress Rating** |
| **GEF Operational Focal point** | *(not set or not applicable)* | *- IP Rating provided by UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser and UNDP Country Office only -*  |
| Overall Assessment | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| **Role** | **2018 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2018 Implementation Progress Rating** |
| **Project Implementing Partner** | *(not set or not applicable)* | *- IP Rating provided by UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser and UNDP Country Office only -*  |
| Overall Assessment | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| **Role** | **2018 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2018 Implementation Progress Rating** |
| **Other Partners** | *(not set or not applicable)* | *- IP Rating provided by UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser and UNDP Country Office only -*  |
| Overall Assessment | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| **Role** | **2018 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2018 Implementation Progress Rating** |
| **UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser** | Moderately Unsatisfactory | Moderately Unsatisfactory |
| Overall Assessment | The Government of the Dominican Republic through the Ministry of Tourism and the Ministry of Environment requested assistance from the GEF to remove barriers to securing the long-term conservation of the country’s biological diversity in landscapes and ecosystems threatened by the expanding tourism industry. The ultimate project goal is to safeguard globally significant biodiversity of the Dominican Republic for the greater good of future generations. This is basically the main outcome expected from this initiative and the project proponent´s capacity to make it a national success and an example for the region will be assessed against this result. In the PRODOC, the project objective states that this initiative will ensure the conservation of biodiversity in ecologically important coastal areas threatened by the burgeoning tourism industry and associated physical development. The two main outcomes of the project are: 1) The policy, legal and planning framework in the tourism sector addresses the direct threats to biodiversity from coastal tourism development and activities; 2) Operational framework to protect biodiversity and ecosystems in areas highly vulnerable to the indirect effects of tourism development. This is the second PIR produced by this initiative. Based on the progress described by the project team and after substantial discussions with the country office, the RTA fears that last year´s concerns do not seem to have been fully internalized by the project proponents. In the first PIR, the RTA expressed that the project was dangerously moving off-track. The RTA recommended to put the priority on addressing the political and institutional bottlenecks and this should have been the focus of all the interventions in the current reporting period. Based on a strict analysis of the DO progress towards the objective, and looking at the lack of progress under component 1 which seems to be directly resulting from weak institutional ownership, the rating should be set at unsatisfactory. However, the RTA takes into account that the project team has tried to offset some of the delays by increasing the pace of the activities under component 2. The rating is therefore set as Moderately Unsatisfactory. The RTA is aware that the project team together with the CO office are working closely together to find operational and institutional solutions to resolve bottlenecks and unlock the potential of this initiative. However, iIt is worrisome to see that very little substantial progress has been achieved so far at the systemic level and it is particularly disappointing to see that the main areas of concerns remain the same as those signaled last year. These are : (i) uneven ownership of the initiative by all the key partners involved (ii) difficulties to kickstart strategic and game changing actions at the systemic level (iii) lack of progress on key partnerships with the private sector and Ministry of Finance that could leverage cofinance and more strategic momentum for this initiative. Ultimately, the project is supposed to achieve an impact on the development path of the country by supporting more sustainable and environmentally innovative practices in the productive sector which represents the engine of the economy in the DR. This is of course a very ambitious target, but it is after all the Government of the DR who sought international donor funding precisely to trigger a change in the way tourism business is conceived for the greater benefit of the country’s strategic ecosystems. To do so, under component 1, the project is supposed to stimulate a solid alliance between the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Tourism endorsed at the highest level. So far, this doesn’t seem to be happening. the formal inter-ministerial mechanism has not materialized, and it is not clear whether it will happen. An informal platform of discussion was put together last year which brings together technical staff essentially but no progress is reported under the current reporting period. Together these two institutions are expected to support new legislative and policy frameworks that ultimately should result in GEBs. This is not happening either and so far, very little new ground has been broken. In the absence of progress on the development of a new National Tourism Plan, the project is doing what it can to adapt to the situation. Last year it did a good job by producing a gap analysis of the existing legal frameworks (tourism and environment). This review revealed that the main gaps identified at the PRODOC stage remain largely unresolved. They are mostly related to enforcement capacities, the lack of coherent policies, the weak sectorial and institutional coordination, the weak political engagement and the difficulties to design, redirect and access innovative financial flows and instruments to support a more BD friendly tourism sector. The project has also supported the development of a proposal on how to address the gaps but has failed to advance much due to the difficulties to secure high-level political buy-in. Ultimately, this proposal will feed into the development of the environmental guidelines for the tourism industry which the project reports as a new activity that will replace the initial plan to mainstream BD conservation into the new National Tourism Plan. Since the latter isn’t happening the project felt the need to replace the work on the legislative framework with the development of environmental guidelines which will include criteria for BD conservation that were developed last year. Although the RTA recognizes the efforts of the project team to find ways to counterbalance the current inertia, he would also like to flag his strong concern with the fact that this change was not properly discussed with the UNDP Regional Center before proceeding. Adaptive measures are fine and even welcome, but they need to be conceived so that the relevance of the project remains intact and key outcomes are not affected. One key assumption that inspired the design of this project was precisely the fact that the Government was going to produce/update the tourism national plan and that the project would accompany this process. In fact, this was a central part of the project and three years down the road after CEO endorsement, the current situation partially threatens the raison d´être of this initiative. The questions that inevitably come to mind are: a) Should scarce GEF resources continue to be used to fund alternative activities that could theoretically be produced by the Ministry of Environment anyway? Instead, is there a possibility to use the GEF resources to trigger a serious national debate and review on the future scenarios for the tourism industry? Shouldn’t the project increase its efforts to mobilize resources and alliances to stimulate a national and sector wide discussion on the need for sustainable national policies and legal frameworks in the tourism industry? Shouldn’t the project also look for ways to bring in other sectors of the Government into the discussion such as the Ministry of Finance and even parliamentarians? The RTA understands that the Ministry of Finance has offered to support the discussion on the National Tourism Plan. The project could also look at the lessons learnt from the BIOFIN project or other similar initiatives to identify ways to bring in economic and climate scenarios as well as targeted scenario analysis to support discussions with the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Tourism. b) Does the project team have the strength and the strategic understanding to reverse the situation? What modifications could be triggered at this level so that a radical change in course can be secured? The RTA would like to remind that no extension will be granted (assuming of course that no major extraordinary event will affect the project). Therefore, the project team has little time to operate major strategic changes. Does it have the capacity and seniority to do so in the short time remaining?  Under component 1, the project has produced the environmental monitoring plan but it needs to be translated into a software and be mainstreamed within the Ministry of Environment. The project was also supposed to incorporate BD criteria into new tourism projects using the framework offered by the environmental management and adaptation plan which sectoral ministries must comply with for the design of new projects. Unfortunately, this too has not progressed much. The project team reports that ToRs have been prepared. Similarly, the project reports that ToRs are underway to support two key activities: (i) the Special Strategic Programme for Sustainable Tourism which is supposed to align with national development strategy and (ii) the development of a portfolio of financial schemes to support for example local entrepreneurship in the pilot areas. Basically, no substantial progress has been made to date and the RTA strongly urges the project proponents to pay attention to these two key results expected out of the project so that real progress can be reported on next year. ToRs are not results per se and it is a bit disappointing to see that it is all that the project team can reflect back at this stage given the resources allocated. The RTA would have expected more strategic progress on this activity at this stage. The work on the certification schemes has not progressed much either but strategic discussions are ongoing with GIZ and the steering committee has given its green light to advance on this important activity which will also have to report substantial level of progress next year. Component 2 is where the project seems to have focused the bulk of its efforts. This is understandable given the weak institutional buy in at high-level under component 1. The activities carried out include interventions such as: - Campaigns to reduce plastic in the Samana area which includes discussion with the private sector to establish targets in this pilot area which will be monitored by the project. - Campaigns to support voluntary contributions and commitments by private sector and local actors under SDG 14 in the Samana, Barahona, Puerto Palta and Santo Domingo - Agreements with academic centers offering curriculums in the field of Hotel management and architecture. Diplomas in the field of sustainability and environmental management will be developed. - Review of the tourism carrying capacity in the Montecristi area - Review of Coral reef damage in the area of Las Terrenas - Support to the development of land use plans in Las Terrenas in collaboration with USAID - Microcapital agreement with FUNDEMAR to support in the Samana area, the development over the next reporting period of coral nurseries as well as the assessment of appropriate areas for the repopulation of coral reefs, and finally the development of multisectoral local management plans. The project hopes to bring this experience to the Montecristi area as well. - Agreement with the Monitoring Center of Whales in Samana (CEBSE) to work on information material for tourists and operators - Development of the Sustainable Tourism Guide, included in the Territorial Land Management Plan (POTT) of Montecristi So clearly the project has continued to focus on targeted activities in the field. This is of course good but questions remain: In the absence of solid institutional and legal frameworks, enforcement capacities, private sector engagement, policies for sustainable tourism and a vision that takes into account the value of ecosystem services for the greater good of the nation, how sustainable and strategic are these site-specific interventions on the long run? Can they secure GEBs in the long run? Ideally, the project should be making progress under component 1 in parallel with the execution of field activities. This is unfortunately not happening. This situation should be a motive of concern both for the project proponents and the UNDP Country Office (CO). It should also be of serious concerns to the main partners of this initiative including the steering committee, the conventions focal points (CBD, UNCCD, UNFCCC) and ultimately the GEF national focal point. A new strategic GEF-6 initiative is soon going to be developed and a new GEF cycle is just around the corner. In this context and in the context of the Agenda 2030, the country needs to show the capacity to make optimal use of GEF resources to influence its development pathway and change the business as usual approaches. As reported last year, a lot of eyes are currently looking at this initiative. When it was designed, there was no other GEF initiative operating in the region with such a clear focus on the tourism industry. Since then, several countries have expressed their interest to access GEF resources to implement similar types of projects and the interest for lessons learnt from the Dominican Republic project is huge. The GEF and the CBD itself have put a lot of hope on these sorts of initiatives which they expect to be game changers and show that there are alternative win-win options to support a more sustainable and economically sound tourism industry. The DR just as the rest of the region is threatened by massive impacts from climate change and global extinction of biodiversity. This in itself should be a good reason to make optimal use of the GEF resources to support mainstreaming of BD conservation into productive sectors  The progress on implementation is obviously closely linked to the challenges faced overall by the project. With the slow progress achieved so far on the systemic activities of the project, there is a strong problem of balance between components. Also, the difficulties to make substantial progress under component 1 affect the efficiency of component 2. This ends up affecting the delivery rates which continue to be very low. The rating on implementation is set at Moderatly Unsatisfactory. If it wasn’t for the fact that the UNDP CO and the project team are now meeting bi-weekly to review progress and actively looking for ways to improve the situation the rating would actually deserve to be lower than that. As an immediate action, the project should dedicate the rest of the year to identify adaptive measures that will substantially increase delivery rates next year. This should be a priority and hopefully the MTR will provide us with concrete recommendations in this respect. For the time being, the RTA would like to leave the following consolidated recommendations which target both the progress towards project objectives and the challenges faced with the execution of the project since the two are intimately related in this case: - The MTR should be launched asap and before the end of the year to give the project proponents a chance to have the time to prepare a solid management response plan that will be reported on next year - To accelerate implementation rates and delivery, the project should make a proper review of procurement needs for 2019 already now and immediately start the hiring process of international specialized expertise to support the project team to carry out its most strategic work. International Experts should be hired asap to: (i) help identifying ways to accelerate progress under component 1 with a particular focus on all the policy and legislative gaps mentioned above. This includes supporting the development of a national policy framework with allies from the Ministry of Finance; (ii) support the development of public-private partnerships and innovative financial schemes; (iii) Support the development of an innovative certification schemes and the dialogue with private operators - Between now and December the project team should dedicate strong efforts to look for this external expertise and reflect in the new 2019 annual plan the strategy that will address the issues raised in this PIR - This PIR needs to be shared with the steering committee. A meeting should be convened earliest possible and before the preparation of the 2019 annual workplan. A critical review of the lack of progress under component 1 needs to happen and creative solutions in line with the spirit of the project need to be discussed. - As recommended last year, a project risk mitigation plan including a strategy to mobilize stronger partnerships and international expertise should be urgently defined and presented during the steering committee meeting. All project stakeholders should participate and an effort should be made to ensure strong presence from representatives from the tourism industry as well as civil society. Also presence from the Ministry of Economy and Planning should be secured - Project management costs need to be monitored very carefully by the UNDP CO so the allowed budget is not exceeded. No project extension will be granted. - New strategic alliances with national and international partners need to be forged. Parallel national discussions to unlock the political stand-still need to be triggered. Does the project team have the capacity to lead on that? If not, support will be needed. High-level meetings involving the senior management of the UNDP CO should be organized to discuss ways to unlock the potential of this highly strategic initiative. - As already recommended last year, the project proponents need to seek alliances at the highest level of the Government and include better the Ministry of Finance in the project. The country has engaged in the development of a MAPS process in line with national commitments viz the agenda2030. In this context, the project cannot be allowed to fail. If managed optimally and supported at the highest level of the Government, this initiative could provide the country with important SDG accelerators. The project clearly puts at the disposal of the country a true catalytic investment framework that will generate multiple benefits across multiple development goals if managed to its full potential. We cannot afford to miss this opportunity. - The project coordination unit needs to be strengthened and needs to receive the political back-up it deserves. The coordinator needs to manage the project and needs international guidance to support him. Efforts must be made to speed up approvals of ToRs, support project activities, support institutional dialogue so the project coordination unit can conduct its functions properly. Slow internal procedures and lack of responses clearly continue to affect the project team and this must be addressed. Also, each component should be led by very senior technical coordinators with enough institutional back up to conduct their work - The AWP 2019 must be carefully prepared to reflect concrete actions at the systemic level where the project has had the biggest difficulties to make progress. The project coordinator and the CO have met to identify project accelerators.The AWP should reflect these project accelerators. - A very clear strategy to diversify project partners and to engage better with key actors of the private sector as well as the civil society should be established. Please note that the RTA is insisting on making sure this strategy goes beyond a theoretical framework on paper. It must set the stage for very concrete agreements with the private sector and the government on the design of innovative financial incentives for BD friendly tourism development that should be reported on in a year from now. - Cofinance is a key element of GEF projects. In the context of the Dominican Republic, and as already stated last year, it is expected that the project should be able to mobilize partners from the private sector as well as from the Government and channel concrete investments to support project goals. The Mid Term review should put a strong emphasis on analyzing the project´s abilities to mobilize cofinance in line with original agreements signed-off in the PRODOC. - The CO needs to continue to support the project by engaging the highest level of the Government. There is a real reputational issue to be concerned with if the project is allowed to drift off-track as it is currently doing - The work on the national tourism plan should not be abandoned. Obviously, the project cannot on its won trigger this activity but as long as resources are available it should serve as a platform to support the discussions on the development of solid and sustainable national policy. A last word for the UNDP CO, the project team and the steering committee. Last year several recommendations were made that were clearly not given proper responses. This year a menu of options and a plan to respond to each recommendation should be prepared and shared with the Regional Center before the 2019 annual workplan is submitted. Within 2 months from the delivery of this PIR, a steering committee should be organized to review this year´s progress report , all its recommendations and the management response plan. 2019 will be crucial and it determine whether or not this project can be brought back on track and convert to a success story.  |

# Gender

**Progress in Advancing Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

This information is used in the UNDP-GEF Annual Performance Report, UNDP-GEF Annual Gender Report, reporting to the UNDP Gender Steering and Implementation Committee and for other internal and external communications and learning.  The Project Manager and/or Project Gender Officer should complete this section with support from the UNDP Country Office.

|  |
| --- |
| **Gender Analysis and Action Plan:** *not available* |
| **Please review the project's Gender Analysis. If the Gender Analysis is not attached or an updated Gender Analysis and/or Gender Action Plan is available please upload the document below or send to the Regional Programme Associate to upload in PIMS+. Please note that all projects approved since 1 July 2014 are required to carry out a gender analysis.** |
| *(not set or not applicable)* |
| **Please specify results achieved this reporting period that focus on increasing gender equality and the empowerment of women.** **Please explain how the results reported addressed the different needs of men or women, changed norms, values, and power structures, and/or contributed to transforming or challenging gender inequalities and discrimination.**  |
| Women have proven to be an important asset of the tourism sector in the Dominican Republic. The project has quantified the role and participation of women in the coastal tourism businesses of the pilot provinces and has seen the desire of growth by these women in the professional field. As far as possible, the project has tried in all the activities aimed at improving living conditions through tourism for women to be represented. In pilot sites, the project has encouraged Women's participation and Empowerment by considering the proper time for them to effectively assist to training and meetings. One particular training on Bird Monitoring and Watching for tourist, is led by a local Woman. The project also promotes new alternative livelihoods to improve woman's income in the tourist sector.  |
| **Does this project specifically target woman or girls as direct beneficiaries?** |
| No |
| **Please describe how work to advance gender equality and women's empowerment enhanced the project's environmental and/or resilience outcomes.** |
| *(not set or not applicable)* |

# Social and Environmental Standards

**Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)**

The Project Manager and/or the project’s Safeguards Officer should complete this section of the PIR with support from the UNDP Country Office. The UNDP-GEF RTA should review to ensure it is complete and accurate. For reference, the project's Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP), which was prepared during project design, is available below. If the project began before the SESP was required, then the space below will be empty.

|  |
| --- |
| **SESP:** [PIMS 4955 Coastal Marine Prodoc Annex UNDP Environmental and Social Screening Tool.docx](https://undpgefpims.org/attachments/4955/213708/1718034/1724902/PIMS%204955%20Coastal%20Marine%20Prodoc%20Annex%20UNDP%20Environmental%20and%20Social%20Screening%20Tool.docx) |
| **1) Please provide a brief update on the project’s social and environmental risks listed in the SESP. If the project has not prepared an SESP (i.e. if the project began before the SESP was required), then please indicate when that screening will be done (recommended before the Midterm Review and/or Terminal Evaluation, or after a significant change to the project context). If the project has updated its SESP during implementation, then please upload that file to this PIR. If any relevant grievances have arisen during the reporting period please describe them in detail including the status, significance, who was involved and what action was taken.** |
| *(not set or not applicable)* |
| **2) Have any new social and/or environmental risks been identified during project implementation?** |
| No |
| **If any new social and/or environmental risks have been identified during project implementation please describe the new risk(s) and the response to it.**  |
| *(not set or not applicable)* |
| **3) Have any existing social and/or environmental risks been escalated during implementation? For example, when a low risk increased to moderate, or a moderate risk increased to high.** |
| No |
| **If any existing social and/or environmental risks have been escalated during implementation please describe the change(s) and the response to it.**  |
| *(not set or not applicable)* |

# Communicating Impact

|  |
| --- |
| **Tell us the story of the project focusing on how the project has helped to improve people’s lives.** **(This text will be used for UNDP corporate communications, the UNDP-GEF website, and/or other internal and external knowledge and learning efforts.)** |
| The project has contributed to improve the capacities of local guides of nature and the strengthening of tourist businesses improving their competitiveness through more efficient and sustainable operations. More than 100 people in both provinces have benefited from technical training in tourism operations and have appreciated the support received by the project in their development and social wellbeing. |
| **What is the most significant change that has resulted from the project this reporting period?** **(This text will be used for internal knowledge management in the respective technical team and region.)** |
| The most significant contribution of the project has been to improve the awareness of decision makers, tourism businesses and local communities to see biodiversity as an opportunity to improve their living conditions and to visualize in the long term the benefits of conducting a responsible tourism activity with the environment and society. Besides, activities oriented to the use of land and tourist development already include sustainability criteria for pilot provinces and other territories that wish to work in the future in tourism development. |
| **Describe how the project supported South-South Cooperation and Triangular Cooperation efforts in the reporting year.** **(This text will be used for internal knowledge management within the respective technical team and region.)** |
| The project has worked together with GIZ in relating business to biodiversity. Here, experiences are shared with Costa Rica, Honduras and Mexico to strengthen best practices in the tourism sector with biodiversity and local communities. In addition, the First Symposium on Coastal Biodiversity and Tourism included the participation and experiences of other countries on sustainable tourism. |

**Project Links and Social Media**

|  |
| --- |
| **Please include: project's website, project page on the UNDP website, Adaptation Learning Mechanism (UNDP-ALM) platform, Facebook, Twitter, Flickr, YouTube, as well as hyperlinks to any media coverage of the project, for example, stories written by an outside source. Please upload any supporting files, including photos, videos, stories, and other documents using the 'file upload' button in the top right of the PIR.** |
| Project’s Website: www.proyectobcyt.com Facebook: https://www.facebook.com/proyectobcyt/?ref=bookmarks Twitter: https://twitter.com/proyectobcyt Instagram: https://www.instagram.com/proyectobcyt/ Project Page on the UNDP Website: http://www.do.undp.org  |

# Partnerships

Give the name of the partner(s), and describe the partnership, recent notable activities and any innovative aspects of the work. Please do not use any acronyms. (limit = 2000 characters).This information is used to get a better understanding of the work GEF-funded projects are doing with key partners, including the GEF Small Grants Programme, indigenous peoples, the private sector, and other partners. Please list the full names of the partners (no acronyms please) and summarize what they are doing to help the project achieve its objectives. The data may be used for reporting to GEF Secretariat, the UNDP-GEF Annual Performance Report, UNDP Corporate Communications, posted on the UNDP-GEF website, and for other internal and external knowledge and learning efforts. The RTA should view and edit/elaborate on the information entered here. All projects must complete this section. Please enter "N/A" in cells that are not applicable to your project.

|  |
| --- |
| **Civil Society Organisations/NGOs** |
| -Centro para la conservacion y ecodesarrollo de la bahia de samana y su entorno (CEBSE). Working with communities, training, coral and mangroves restoring, humpback whale monitoring. -Agrofrontera. Working with local communities of fisherman in the economic activity migration for tourism and the implementation of PAs Management Plans. -CounterPart International: Building capacity with locals and middle school training. -Fundacion Ecologica Punta Cana: New financing mechanisms, biodiversity monitoring, learning exchanges. -Die Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GIZ: Implementation of best practices for tourism business in biodiversity. -Japan International Cooperation Agency: Improving skills and community tourism products. -Fondo Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales: Allocation of funds for Montecristi protected areas and effective management of coastal-marine areas. -Reef Check Dominicana: Reef monitoring. -Grupo Ecológico Montecristi (Gremont): Bird Monitoring -Instituto Nacional de Formación Técnico Profesional: Capacity Building |
| **Indigenous Peoples** |
| N/A |
| **Private Sector** |
| -Cluster Turístico de Samaná: Supporting project activities. -Cluster Turístico de Montecristi: Supporting project activities. -Asociación de empresarios turísticos de Montecristi: Supporting project activities. -Galleon Divers: Reef monitoring.  |
| **GEF Small Grants Programme** |
| N/A |
| **Other Partners** |
| -Autoridad Nacional de Asuntos Marinos: Working on ecosystem functionality and Manatee monitoring. -Consejo Dominicano de pesca y acuicultura:Guidance and support for responsible fishing and monitoring. |

# Annex - Ratings Definitions

**Development Objective Progress Ratings Definitions**

(HS) Highly Satisfactory: Project is on track to exceed its end-of-project targets, and is likely to achieve transformational change by project closure. The project can be presented as 'outstanding practice'.

(S) Satisfactory: Project is on track to fully achieve its end-of-project targets by project closure. The project can be presented as 'good practice'.

(MS) Moderately Satisfactory: Project is on track to achieve its end-of-project targets by project closure with minor shortcomings only.

(MU) Moderately Unsatisfactory: Project is off track and is expected to partially achieve its end-of-project targets by project closure with significant shortcomings. Project results might be fully achieved by project closure if adaptive management is undertaken immediately.

(U) Unsatisfactory: Project is off track and is not expected to achieve its end-of-project targets by project closure. Project results might be partially achieved by project closure if major adaptive management is undertaken immediately.

(HU) Highly Unsatisfactory: Project is off track and is not expected to achieve its end-of-project targets without major restructuring.

**Implementation Progress Ratings Definitions**

(HS) Highly Satisfactory: Implementation is exceeding expectations. Cumulative financial delivery, timing of key implementation milestones, and risk management are fully on track. The project is managed extremely efficiently and effectively. The implementation of the project can be presented as 'outstanding practice'.

(S) Satisfactory: Implementation is proceeding as planned. Cumulative financial delivery, timing of key implementation milestones, and risk management are on track. The project is managed efficiently and effectively. The implementation of the project can be presented as 'good practice'.

(MS) Moderately Satisfactory: Implementation is proceeding as planned with minor deviations. Cumulative financial delivery and management of risks are mostly on track, with minor delays. The project is managed well.

(MU) Moderately Unsatisfactory: Implementation is not proceeding as planned and faces significant implementation issues. Implementation progress could be improved if adaptive management is undertaken immediately. Cumulative financial delivery, timing of key implementation milestones, and/or management of critical risks are significantly off track. The project is not fully or well supported.

(U) Unsatisfactory: Implementation is not proceeding as planned and faces major implementation issues and restructuring may be necessary. Cumulative financial delivery, timing of key implementation milestones, and/or management of critical risks are off track with major issues and/or concerns. The project is not fully or well supported.

(HU) Highly Unsatisfactory: Implementation is seriously under performing and major restructuring is required. Cumulative financial delivery, timing of key implementation milestones (e.g. start of activities), and management of critical risks are severely off track with severe issues and/or concerns. The project is not effectively or efficiently supported.