The overall objective of this project is worthwhile, but needs more analysis, prioritization, and technical substance.

The proposed project is a relatively small ($2.6 m GEF financing), but includes a significant number of outputs (e.g. 12 in paragraph 30, and 31 under Component 2). The majority of outputs are described generically, without much technical or scientific basis. For example, Para 27 says "activities" will be implemented to deliver GEBs, without specifics; and Para 28 discusses tourism fees, but lacks data on tourism numbers and trends. Finally, the main justification seems to be that if the project succeeds in ‘changing the rules’ (e.g. legislation, strategic plans, financial mechanisms), it will achieve the desired result, again without sufficient specifics or quantification, nor an understanding of how complex this process might be.

In summary, the main problem is not the idea behind this project, but insufficient scientific and technical detail to show how the long list of outputs is to be delivered. This is an important project, and planned on a large scale. An alternative, less risky option, might be to focus on the three pilot sites and use UNDPs ‘long-hook short-hook approach’ to identify key policies/rules/legislation that are limiting factors, and to focus on resolving rules.