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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 Satisfactory |
| Overall IP Rating | Moderately Unsatisfactory |
| Overall Risk Rating | Substantial |

# Development Progress

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Objective or Outcome** | **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** | **Target level at end of project** | **Level at 30 June 2016** | **Cumulative progress since project start** |
| *(not set or not applicable)* | 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. | 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. | *(not set or not applicable)* | 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.  |
| *(not set or not applicable)* | 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 | Financial instruments in place to ensure the implementation of actions related to tourism impact on the marine and coastal areas | *(not set or not applicable)* | 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.  |
| *(not set or not applicable)* | # 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 | No net loss of critical ecosystems as a result of tourism activities (overlay of infrastructure / tourism activities on critical ecosystems) | *(not set or not applicable)* | 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 progress of the objective can be described as:** | **Progress not set** |
| **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** | **Target level at end of project** | **Level at 30 June 2016** | **Cumulative progress since project start** |
| *(not set or not applicable)* | 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 | 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. | *(not set or not applicable)* | 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. |
| *(not set or not applicable)* | 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. | 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 | *(not set or not applicable)* | 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.  |
| *(not set or not applicable)* | 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. | 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. | *(not set or not applicable)* | 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. |
| **The progress of the objective can be described as:** | **Progress not set** |
| **Outcome 2:** | **Operational framework to protect biodiversity , in areas highly vulnerable to the indirect effects of tourism development** |
|  | **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Target level at end of project** | **Level at 30 June 2016** | **Cumulative progress since project start** |
| *(not set or not applicable)* | 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 | 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. | *(not set or not applicable)* | 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  |
| *(not set or not applicable)* | 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 | 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 | *(not set or not applicable)* |  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.  |
| *(not set or not applicable)* | 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) | *(not set or not applicable)* | 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.  |
| *(not set or not applicable)* | 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. | Communication and Awareness Campaign applied in Tourist Destination Pilots: "Different Tourism for a unique destination" | *(not set or not applicable)* | 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. |
| *(not set or not applicable)* | 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 | % Ecological damage to coral reefs due to tourism activities in Samaná TBD in Year 1 and measured in Year 4 | *(not set or not applicable)* | 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. |
| *(not set or not applicable)* | 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) | 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 | *(not set or not applicable)* | 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. |
| *(not set or not applicable)* | 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 | 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 | *(not set or not applicable)* | 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.  |
| *(not set or not applicable)* | 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 | 100% land-use/cover studies consider MA tourism development as a land use category | *(not set or not applicable)* | Not a feasible target, out of the project scope.  |
| *(not set or not applicable)* | 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 | 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 | *(not set or not applicable)* | 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.  |
| *(not set or not applicable)* | 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 | 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. | *(not set or not applicable)* | 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.  |
| *(not set or not applicable)* | 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. | 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) | *(not set or not applicable)* | 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.  |
| **The progress of the objective can be described as:** | **Progress not set** |

# Implementation Progress



|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Cumulative GL delivery against total approved amount (in prodoc): | 18.34% |
| Cumulative GL delivery against expected delivery as of this year: | 26.37% |
| Cumulative disbursement as of 30 June (note: amount to be updated in late August): | 520,743.99 |

|  |
| --- |
| **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 | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| Expected Date of Mid-term Review | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| 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 2016 to 1 July 2017)** |

# Critical Risk Management

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Current Types of Critical Risks  | Critical risk management measures undertaken this reporting period |
| Environmental | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| Operational | The implementation of project's actions, as well as its proposed measures in the tourism sector, require greater efforts of MITUR to speed up its impulsion. |

# 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 delays presented. Inception workshop on time and mid-term review should be on time.  |
| **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.** |
| None of the key project milestones where programmed on this reporting period. So far, there have been no delays in the key project milestones.  |
| **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** | **2017 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2017 Implementation Progress Rating** |
| **Project Manager/Coordinator** | Satisfactory | *- IP Rating provided by UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser and UNDP Country Office only -*  |
| Overall Assessment | The Project has fully established the Project Management Unit, by now its fully operational and the members of the team have a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities. The team is solid and as time goes by the outcomes are being delivered faster. Furthermore, the local coordinators for each pilot sites are working since January 2017 and all the office equipment for operating and monitoring are set.  The project has achieved important and collaborative connections and agreements with many of the national and local stakeholders. NGOs, Academia, and local governments are working closely with the project team and by it, their bond has been strengthening. At some point, this is generating a new flow of co-financing and enhancing the project’s impact.  The Ministry of Environment’s commitment to the project is increasing and its personnel is supportive on accelerating the work to achieve the project’s outcomes faster. As for the Ministry of Tourism, is important to point out their acknowledgement of biodiversity as one of the main subjects in their regulations and plans at many levels, however, bigger efforts must be made to attract more empowerment of the project’s goals and understanding of the importance of the outcomes at the highest levels of decision making.  As for the main objectives of the project - big outcomes have been accomplished. At a systemic level, four main outputs already completed are key to the next steps for mainstreaming biodiversity in the tourism sector. The necessary environmental guidelines to include marine and coastal biodiversity in order to complement the Tourist Land Use Plans (POTTs) have been set, resulting in the Guide of Environmental Planning in tourist zones. A detailed analysis of the legal framework of key tourism projects and/or activities have been completed, resulting in the proposal for some new regulations that are imperative for a responsible and biodiversity respectful tourism. Furthermore, the Coastal and Marine Ecosystems monitoring system has been completed, throughout a great and open participation of many organizations where they created protocols to monitor ecosystems and designed a framework that links data to action to develop policies and/or regulations that will be a key component to enhance capabilities of the nation to report SDGs progress and other international conventions. Finally, the proposal for a Coordination Mechanism Unit between both ministries has been recently accomplished.  In the pilot sites, seeking to ensure the understanding of the project’s desired results and the benefits that these provinces will obtain by them, the project completed a set of meetings and workshops with the majority of local stakeholders. Many actions are showing the commitment and presence of the project thus many local organizations are working closely with the project’s implementation plan in order to enhance impact. To date, more than 300 hundred students from middle schools have participated in a training or active conservation activities related to marine ecosystems and tourism. All local governments received training in land use planning considering biodiversity. Mangrove restoration activities are in place, diagnosis of coral reefs for restoring completed, the coastal tourism businesses that need guidance to be part of Sustainable Tourism Certification are determined and a plan for intervention is completed.  This reporting period is showing a faster rate of implementation, almost getting to what the initial plan was set in the ProDoc. Now comes the time for implementing many of the plans created and bigger challenges will be faced. |
| **Role** | **2017 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2017 Implementation Progress Rating** |
| **UNDP Country Office Programme Officer** | Moderately Satisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory |
| Overall Assessment | A rating of MS is assigned because despite the delays that the project drags since the start, it is understood that if critical risks are well managed and adaptive management continues to be applied when required, the project will achieve its end-of project targets by project closure with minor shortcomings. Many processes aimed at the achievement of key products have been set in motion. A gap analysis of the incorporation of BD aspects in tourist projects and activities was developed. Based on that analysis, a proposal for the modification of existing regulation and creation of new regulation was produced. Those proposals constitute the base of discussions to assure that the DR’s legal framework for tourism incorporates BD aspects for all projects and tourism activities. As well, an inter-institutional technical coordination mechanism proposal was developed thanks to the inputs and views provided by the Environmental and Tourism Ministries, as well as other institutions involved in the management and use of BD in areas of tourism development. The project will continue to support the process of establishment of the inter-institutional technical coordination mechanism. A monitoring and enforcement system for the conservation of coastal and marine biodiversity is been developed with the support of the project. Once this system is established, the National Environmental Management System will be strengthened to ensure BD conservation in areas of tourism development. The target related to the inclusion of the axis of sustainability and BD conservation in the National Plan of Tourism was reviewed since the National Tourism Plan has not been elaborated yet, as expected. It has been determined, as an adaptive management measure, to develop environmental guidelines that will be considered when the process of elaboration of the National Plan begins. Worth mentioning that Sustainable Tourism Models are being worked locally with the development of a sustainable tourism models for each pilot province. Annual workplan for the period has not been fully implemented. However, in the second half of the year the execution has accelerated and it is expected that the project continues at a rapid pace until catching up with the programming. The most critical risk identified has to do with the ownership of the project by the Ministry of Tourism. Technical meetings have arisen this concern. As well, UNDPs Deputy took the concern to the Environment Minister so it can be addressed at the highest level. UNDP will continue to advocate for the ownership of the project by the Ministry of Tourism, both politically and technically.  |
| **Role** | **2017 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2017 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** | **2017 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2017 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** | **2017 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2017 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** | **2017 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2017 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 where the tourism industry is operating. The ultimate project goal is to safeguard globally significant biodiversity of the Dominican Republic and this is the key outcome this initiative will be assessed against. The project objective is to 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. Based on the progress described in this PIR and based on discussions held with the country office, the RTA is concerned that this initiative is currently dangerously moving towards a situation where it could easily end up off-track next year if appropriate actions are not taken to address major bottlenecks that are slowing down the implementation of this initiative. Based on a strict analysis of the DO progress towards the objective, the rating should be set at unsatisfactory. However, based on the fact that this is the first PIR of the project and taking into account 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, the rating is set as Moderatly Unsatisfactory.  The main areas of concerns could be summarized along the following points: (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 that could leverage cofinance and more strategic momentum for this initiative. Just based on a review of the DO progress tab, it is clear that there is very uneven progress across the components and most key systemic activities which this project will in the end be assessed against have remained practically untouched. The general impression, confirmed by the CO, is that the project still struggles to gain necessary momentum within the Ministry of Tourism in particular despite project efforts made by both leading Ministries to strengthen an inter-institutional coordination mechanism as reported in this year´s PIR. The project team who has a foot in both key Ministries in charge of this initiative is therefore struggling to make progress in that context and this is what motivates the identification of a critical risk that the RTA supports and has discussed extensively with the CO.  As a response to the institutional bottlenecks, the project team has for now essentially put its focus on preparing the ground for field activities. However, after more than a year of implementation (project signed in July 2015, project coordinator hired in November 2015) this is clearly not enough. The GEF, UNDP and the Convention on Biodiversity which the Dominican Republic has signed and ratified, have all put great hopes on this mainstreaming initiative. Following CBD COP13 in Cancun, a very strong recommendation and an urgent plea was made to Governments around the world to accelerate their efforts to improve sectorial practices and to strengthen environmental sustainability in sectors such as tourism, agriculture, mining, forestry and fisheries. Also, countries in the region have used the design of this initiative as a model to develop their own GEF funded tourism initiative. In other words, the Dominican Republic GEF project is operating in an international context where all eyes are put on it and regional expectations in particular are high. At the national level too, expectations are sky high. The tourism industry is the engine of the economy and the sector is essentially relying on coastal, marine and mountain ecosystems to attract visitors from around the world. At the same time it is also relying on the services that these ecosystems are offering the sector essentially for free so that the industry can thrive ( coastal protection, water, climate regulation, fisheries). However, the recent passage of Hurricanes Irma and Maria reminded us all how vulnerable the ecosystems that the tourism industry relies on are. In some key tourism hot spots located in the northern parts of the country, entire beaches and coastal ecosystems were devastated. At the same time these events also remind us of how important it is to invest in the conservation and proper management of healthy natural habits to help the country better cope with shocks and impacts.  The analysis that the project conducted to assess gaps in existing legislation and institutional frameworks reveals that the issues to resolve in the Dominican Republic are not so much related to the lack of adequate laws, regulations and institutional mandates. The big gaps that still remain largely unresolved are 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 real BD friendly tourism sector. These issues were already identified in the PRODOC and it is on these systemic issues that the project needs to seriously speed up concrete and game changing actions that will reflect in the country´s legal and policy framework. This will not happen if the institutional engagement and leadership of the key project proponents are not stepped up substantially and the project team receives full empowerment to lead this work. In that sense, the fact that the National Tourism Plan has not yet been elaborated, as also reported in this PIR, should actually be turned into an opportunity for the key stakeholders involved including the UNDP Country Office. The work advanced by the project to develop environmental guidelines for the tourism industry is a good step forward. The current efforts led by the project to design a monitoring and enforcement system for the conservation of coastal and marine biodiversity is also very important but we obviously expect that the Government will use all these inputs and the platform offered by this GEF investment to step up its effort towards developing a solid innovative national tourism plan guided by a clear vision towards promoting climate resilience and environmentally sustainable practices.  Based on the current snapshot of the project progress towards securing GEBs and looking at the slow project delivery results reflected under the IP tab, the RTA is seriously concerned that the progress on implementation is also getting off-track. The rating under this tab is set at Moderately Unsatisfactory. GEF resources invested to support a very innovative initiative in a field of great potential could go wasted if very forceful institutional measures are not taken to address the bottlenecks. This would obviously send a very wrong message to the GEF as an important and strategic donor who has supported the Dominican Republic for many years. It would also go against all the national and international efforts to align development along the agenda 2030 that seeks to promote more sustainable development pathways. Too many activities included in the 2017 AWP were not achieved and sometimes not even started and in 2018 this dynamic will have to be addressed and changed. Funding for the project coordination unit is limited to the established ranges imposed by the donor and reflected in the PRODOC. By no means can this be modified or increased as it happened in previous projects in the past. In this context it is important to remember that project extensions are not any longer granted and this initiative must deliver within the established deadline of April 2020.  Therefore, based on this review and taking into account the critical risk identified and the slow progress on implementation, the RTA recommends the following actions geared towards supporting improvements that should be reflected next year under the DO and IP tabs :  1) A project steering committee meeting should be convened urgently before the end of the year and before final approval of the 2018 annual work plan. The steering committee should review this year´s PIR, read all the recommendations, assess the current institutional bottlenecks and agreed on a plan to accelerate project implementation in 2018. Also a project risk mitigation plan including a strategy to mobilize stronger partnerships 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. 2) The RTA recommends that the project team seeks alliances at the highest level of the Government and includes better the Ministry of Economy and Planning in the project. In the current context where the country is engaging in the development of a MAPS process in line with national commitments viz the agenda2030, this initiative cannot be left behind. If managed optimally and supported at the highest level of the Government, this project could provide with the type of SDG accelerators that the countrie needs to identify. 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 to align the project with national development goals in the era of the SDGs 3) Strengthen and empower the project coordination unit of this initiative. The project manager should be exactly as the name suggests it: a manager in charge of making sure that the project progresses according to established plans and agreements in the PRODOC. The current coordinator has an important experience in the development of GEF projects and counts on the full support of UNDP. In order to bring the initiative back on track in 2018, he will need to be much more empowered by the Government and all the institutions involved to lead this complex initiative. This means that a real effort must be made to speed up approvals of ToRs, support project activities, support institutional dialogue so the project coordination unit can conduct their function properly. Slow internal procedures and lack of response clearly affected the project team until now 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. 4) The AWP 2018 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 to identify project accelerators that could support this initiative to catch up on some of the time lost until now. The AWP should reflect these project accelerators. 5) A very clear strategy to diversify project partners and to engage better 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. 6) Cofinance is a key element of GEF projects and it is also a key issue currently being discussed at the international level in the ongoing design process of the GEF-7 architecture. In the context of the Dominican Republic, it is expected that the project should be able to mobilize partners from the private sector as well as 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. 7) The RTA would like to command the CO for its efforts to lead on several high-level and technical troubleshooting meetings. Several meetings have taken place to discuss and review project bottlenecks, identify project champions and define a strategy to speed up project implementation. In the next reporting period, the supervision and the support of the CO will be crucial and will have to continue to be stepped up. 2018 will be an important year for the project. Progress achieved in the upcoming reporting period will determine whether this initiative will be able to achieve established goals as agreed with the donor or not.  |

# 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.

|  |
| --- |
| **Has a gender analysis been carried out this reporting period? Please note that all projects approved in GEF-6 (1 July 2014 through 30 June 2018) are required to carry out a gender analysis.** |
| No |
| **If a gender analysis was carried out what were the findings?** |
| *(not set or not applicable)* |
| **Does this project specifically target woman or girls as direct beneficiaries?** |
| No |
| **Please specify results achieved this reporting period that focus on increasing gender equality and improving the empowerment of women.** **Results reported can include site-level results working with local communities as well as work to integrate gender considerations into national policies, strategies and planning. 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.** |
| The project design did not address any direct action for gender equality. However, the project was subject to a regional assessment, including DO-CO, fortunately, the project was invited to include some ways for it to develop the gender perspective and from that moment all the ToRs, consultancies, workshops or any other activity has the scope of gender equality embedded.  |

# 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.)** |
| As for Dominican Republic, tourism is one of the main economic activities supporting a big part of the population. Within the pilot provinces a strong effort is being conducted to create new livelihoods in tourism based on the local biodiversity.  Some activities include the training as local guides, diving/snorkel boat captains, handmade crafts, among other activities that reduce the pressure on the marine biodiversity. As for this period, no quantitative advantages can be noted, however for the next period the project could have a better appreciation of this social, economic and environment benefits, including the participation of women in tourism.  |
| **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 understanding of local communities about the relationship between biodiversity and tourism. Many of whom have expressed their strong support to the project initiative, including small business.  |
| **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.)** |
| *(not set or not applicable)* |

**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.  |
| **Indigenous Peoples** |
| N/A |
| **Private Sector** |
| -Cluster Turístico de Samaná: Supporting project activities. |
| **GEF Small Grants Programme** |
| N/A |
| **Other Partners** |
| -Autoridad Nacional de Asuntos Marinos: Working on ecosystem functionality and Manatee monitoring. |

# Grievances

**Environmental or Social Grievance**

This section must be completed by the UNDP Country Office if a grievance related to the environmental or social impacts of this project was addressed this reporting period. It is very important that the questions are answered fully and in detail. If no environmental or social grievance was addressed this reporting period then please do not answer the following questions. If more than one grievance was addressed, please answer the following questions for the most significant grievance only and explain the other grievance(s) in the comment box below. The RTA should review and edit/elaborate on the information entered here. RTAs are not expected to answer these questions separately.

|  |
| --- |
| **What environmental or social issue was the grievance related to?** |
| *(not set or not applicable)* |
| **How would you rate the significance of the grievance?** |
| *(not set or not applicable)* |
| **Please describe the on-going or resolved grievance noting who was involved, what action was taken to resolve the grievance, how much time it took, and what you learned from managing the grievance process (maximum 500 words). If more than one grievance was addressed this reporting period, please explain the other grievance (s) here.** |
| *(not set or not applicable)* |

# 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.