

Part I: Project Information		
GEF ID	10217	
Project Title	Leveraging biodiversity for economic growth in Dominica (GEF PIF name)/Leveraging Eco-Tourism for Biodiversity Protection in Dominica (WB PID name)	
Date of Screening	6-Dec-19	
STAP member Screener	Rosie Cooney	
STAP secretariat screener	Virgina Gorsevski	
STAP Overall Assessment		Minor issues to be considered during project design. STAP welcomes the project entitled "Leveraging biodiversity growth in Dominica" from the World Bank. STAP believes that the project is very clear and well-written, with a coherent theory of change that sets out a clear set of pathways to achieve the key outcomes. There is a clear problem statement and the intervention is well-tailored to address it. The major weakness of the project is that it sets out to promote nature-based tourism without building in the measures that would help to ensure that it actually contributes to biodiversity conservation - ensuring revenue gained is returned to conservation/management measures. The proposal indicates this "should" happen, but doesn't specifically ensure that it will. All tourism has negative impacts, and it is only biodiversity-positive where these are outweighed by its benefits - so a clear pathway to ensure the latter do occur needs to be built in.
Part I: Project Information		
B. Indicative Project Description Summary		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	The project's objective is "improve management of Dominica's three national parks and the Waitukubuli trail". This is clear and concise, but articulation in terms of GEBs would be helpful.
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes, subject to the major assumption outlined below.
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	Yes.
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes, but only if the assumption set out below is correct, and/or actively built into the project.
Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project. Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	
1. Project description. Briefly describe:		

1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)	Is the problem statement well-defined?	Generally yes. However, the problem statement both says that tourism is dependent largely on protected areas, and is a key economic sector, and also that PAs/biodiversity makes a low contribution to economic growth. Which is correct? There is little information on decline of biodiversity and/or forest cover in Dominica - just a high-level statement that these are threatened. More information on threats and declines in biodiversity/forest cover would be very helpful to understand the context better. The problem statement also states both that PAs have been extended while biodiversity decline has increased, AND that PAs help to reduce biodiversity loss. This likewise is contradictory. Is this intended to say that PAs COULD help reduce biodiversity loss, if managed better? Or that biodiversity loss would have been even worse without the PAs?
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	They are well described but not supported by adequate data - see above.
	For multiple focal area projects: does the problem statement and analysis identify the drivers of environmental degradation which need to be addressed through multiple focal areas; and is the objective well-defined, and can it only be supported by integrating two, or more focal areas objectives or programs?	
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	No.
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	No.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	No.
	For multiple focal area projects:	
	are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators;	
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	No.
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	There is a clear theory of change, and a clear pathway for achievement of benefits. The logic is well worked out and clear. However, the weakness in the theory of change and the overall project logic is the return of benefits from increased visitation to management of the PA. Without this, the impacts on PAs and biodiversity could actually be increased. All tourism has impacts, in terms of e.g. spread of invasive alien species, litter, infrastructure etc. Increases in nature-based tourism only result in a net gain for conservation if these impacts are offset by mechanisms including the one articulated here - increasing the revenue available for management and conservation. However, the project only indicates that this return of revenue to PAs "should" happen - it does not appear to be built into the design. This is a key assumption that underpins some of the logical steps in the TOC, and should be clearly articulated, as if this assumption is wrong these outputs will not lead to the desired outcomes/results.

	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives? 	Overall these are clear and well thought-through. The graphic and clear TOC in the Annex is very welcome. What does "by improving regulation and enforcement of its natural capital" (p9) mean? Regulation and enforcement is not the same thing as conservation and management. The support to Kalinago communities to develop ecotourism enterprises is very welcome, but in order for this to be successful, it is likely that more than planning and capacity-building is required - building legitimate and equitable local institutions for management and distribution of revenues is likely to be critical to avoid elite capture and promote long-term sustainability.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions? 	Yes, but the key assumption is identified but not adequately addressed in project interventions.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes? 	No.
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	Yes (if successful).
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?	Yes.
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Yes.
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Yes.
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	None articulated.
7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up	Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?	Not possible to determine.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	No.
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		

<p>2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities. If none of the above, please explain why. In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.</p>	<p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</p>	<p>It is concerning that there are specific activities planned for Indigenous territories, but it appears no consultation with Indigenous communities has been carried out (only the government Ministry responsible). It should be ensured that the Indigenous communities actually want and are supportive of these interventions before any further project planning goes ahead. Current the proposal only states that there will be a mechanism for consultation during implementation, which appears inadequate. FPIC is a basic requirement. The language should shift from consultation during implementation of a pre-developed project plan, to engagement of relevant stakeholders to inform and influence project planning.</p>
	<p>What are the stakeholders' roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project design, to achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?</p>	<p>The text on private sector engagement reads as if the biodiversity management measures are being undertaken in order to lay the basis for private sector engagement. But promoting private sector engagement is in itself not fundable through GEF. How will engagement of the private sector contribute to achievement of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use?</p>
<p>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis). Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? Yes/no/ tbd. If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: access to and control over resources; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services. Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Gender dimensions have been articulated and preliminary response measures described.</p>
	<p>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</p>	
<p>5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design</p>	<p>Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?</p>	<p>None assessed.</p>
	<p>Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?</p>	<p>Not possible to determine.</p>
	<p>For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p>	
	<p>· How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately?</p>	<p>Not assessed.</p>
	<p>· Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?</p>	<p>No.</p>
	<p>· Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?</p>	

	What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?	
6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives	Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?	No.
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	No.
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	No.
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	
	Is there an adequate mechanism to feed the lessons learned from earlier projects into this project, and to share lessons learned from it into future projects?	None described.
8. Knowledge management. Outline the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, and how it will contribute to the project's overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	None described.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	
STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed	
1. Concur	STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. The proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.	
	<i>* In cases where the STAP acknowledges the project has merit on scientific and technical grounds, the STAP will recognize this in the screen by stating that "STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal and encourages the proponent to develop it with same rigor. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design."</i>	
2. Minor issues to be considered during project design	STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:	
	(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;	
	(ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.	
	The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.	

<p>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p>	
	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required. The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>	