



# Land Degradation Neutrality for Increased Resilience to Climate Change in Dominican Republic

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11402

**Countries**

Dominican Republic

**Project Name**

Land Degradation Neutrality for Increased Resilience to Climate Change in Dominican Republic

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

10/18/2023

**Review completed by PM**

12/1/2023

**Program Manager**

Fareeha Iqbal

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

## **GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET**

### **1. General Project Information / Eligibility**

- a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?
- b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments 11/30/23:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

### **2. Project Summary**

**Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?**

Secretariat's Comments 11/30/23:

Yes. It will deliver climate resilience as well as sustainable land management (LD) benefits.

Agency's Comments

### **3 Indicative Project Overview**

- 3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?**
- b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**

Secretariat's Comments 11/30/23:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

**3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?**

## Secretariat's Comments

12/6/23:

Cleared.

11/30/23:

Further information is requested.

Please reflect in the M&E, reporting on Gender Action Plan.

## Agency's Comments

12/06/23

Noted and addressed in the M&E component

**3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?**

**b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**

**c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

Secretariat's Comments 11/30/23:

Yes.

## Agency's Comments

### 4 Project Outline

#### A. Project Rationale

##### 4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

**a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?**

**b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?**

Secretariat's Comments 12/6/23:

CCA: Cleared.

LD: Cleared.

12/1/23:

Further information is requested.

LD comment: Please include additional information on the land tenure context and whether or not this could have a positive or negative impact on the sustainability of the project.

CCA comment: Please include further description of how the adaptation activities will not only support current climate variability but also exacerbation or introduction of new stresses with projected climate change.

## Agency's Comments

**12/06/23**

**1- LD Comment:** Additional information on the context of land tenure has been added to paragraph 25 (and its footnotes). During the project preparation phase, we will explore the tenure situation in the target areas as part of the socio-economic assessment.

In addition, FAO is developing an MSP to help integrate Tenure into LDN in practice, building on the Technical Guide to integrate the VGGT into LDN. We will ensure there is coordination between this project and the project under preparation if the issue of tenure is highlighted as a key issue.

**2-CCA Comment:** Noted. Additional information is provided in paragraph 20

### **4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT**

**a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**

**b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?**

**c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?**

**d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?**

## Secretariat's Comments

12/6/23:

Cleared.

11/30/23:

Further information is requested.

d) Stakeholder Engagement: The PIF includes a list of the stakeholders consulted. However, the project description does not reflect the findings of these consultation and the important role of the different stakeholders to achieve the project outcomes. Please provide further details on the role of the different stakeholders, and plans to carry out

further stakeholder analysis to inform the project stakeholder plan.

Agency's Comments

12/06/23

Noted. A stakeholder list with details on their role in the project has been added.

## **5 B. Project Description**

### **5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE**

**a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?**

**b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?**

Secretariat's Comments

11/30/23:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

### **5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING**

**Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**

Secretariat's Comments 11/30/23:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

### **5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK**

**a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?**

**b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).**

**c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area**

**d) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**

Secretariat's Comments 12/6/23:

Cleared.

11/30/23:

Further information is requested.

a) In section "Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project", the Agency mentions that it expects to play an execution role in this project. However, the LoE does not present FAO as an executing partner. Also missing is a letter of support from the OFP for this. For PIF stage, please remove any mention of FAO executing the project (this can be re-instated during the implementation phase if needed, but by following the established procedure for an Implementing Agency to carry out executing functions).

c) Please discuss how coordination will be ensured with relevant GCF, Adaptation Fund, and bilateral adaptation initiatives in the Dominican Republic.

Agency's Comments

**12/06/23**

a) Reference to FAO execution has been removed. The need for FAO direct support to help build national capacities in FAO designed tools and approaches will be discussed with the government during project preparation, and if they request it, the established procedure will be followed.

c) Noted. Please refer to the final bullet under paragraph 94 in the section on "Coordination and cooperation with ongoing initiatives and projects?"

**5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?**

**b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?**

Secretariat's Comments

12/6/23:

Cleared.

11/30/23:

Further information is requested for the SCCF-A Core Indicators.

i) We note that no value has been provided for SCCF Core Indicator 1. As adaptation is essentially about people's wellbeing, we assume the SCCF grant will be building the climate resilience of beneficiaries (people). Thus we request the agency to please provide a robust and impactful value for the Core Indicator 1 target, disaggregated by gender.

ii) We see that for Core Indicator 4, the percentage of female beneficiaries is only 20

percent. Please explain this figure. Please consider ways to benefit women equally through the project by identifying meaningful ways to enhance their climate resilience.

## Agency's Comments

12/06/23

- i) Core indicator has been updated
- ii) Please note that according to data from the last Agricultural Precensus of the Dominican Republic (2015)[1] only the 16.3% of national producers are women out of physically surveyed people. For this reason, at the PIF stage, the project sets a target of 20 % of women. During the PPG phase, affirmative actions and measures to identify and include in the project women producers, women producers? organizations and CSO with a focus on women equality operating in the area, will be carried out. Results will be based on a social and environmental assessment identifying specific needs and interests of women, ensuring that parity level is attained at project implementation phase.

[1] *FAO, Ministerio de Agricultura de la Rep?blica Dominicana, ONE, Uni?n Europea (2011). Precenso Nacional Agropecuario 2015: Informe de resultados. Retrieved at: <https://www.one.gob.do/media/saqjxqos/informe-final-de-resultados-precenso-nacional-agropecuario-censo-2015.pdf>*

**5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?**

Secretariat's Comments n/a

## Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

- a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?**
- b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?**
- c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat's Comments 12/6/23:

Cleared.

11/30/23:

Further information is requested on item (c) as the Environmental and Social risks

screening form has yet to be uploaded, although a detailed note on climate change risks has been uploaded.

#### Agency's Comments

**12/05/23**

Apologies for the oversight. The Environmental and Social Risk screening form has been uploaded to the portal.

#### **5.7 Qualitative assessment**

**a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?**

**b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?**

**c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?**

Secretariat's Comments 11/30/23:

Yes. The project will support transformational adaptation and reduce land degradation through a suite of policy and investment solutions that are scalable, integrated and durable.

#### Agency's Comments

#### **6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities**

**6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?**

Secretariat's Comments 11/30/23:

Yes.

#### Agency's Comments

**6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)**

Secretariat's Comments 12/6/23:

Cleared.

11/30/23:

Further information is requested.

Kindly provide further detail on the country's climate change strategy and NDS which have been referenced in the text. Please include the full title with the dates drafted or



period covered, as well as a sentence on the climate change adaptation priorities in the NDS.

Agency's Comments

**12/05/23**

Noted. This is addressed in paragraphs 98 and 99

**6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?**

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

**7 D. Policy Requirements**

**7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?**

Secretariat's Comments 11/30/23:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

**7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?**

Secretariat's Comments 12/6/23:

Cleared.

11/30/23:

Further information is requested.

Given that the project will be supporting drought and flood early warning systems, has/will the national hydrometeorological agency been consulted?

Agency's Comments

**12/05/23**

Noted and addressed in paragraph 79 and in the stakeholders table.

**8 Annexes**

**Annex A: Financing Tables**

**8.1 Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

**STAR allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat's Comments 11/30/23:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

**SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?**

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

**8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

Secretariat's Comments 11/30/23:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

**8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat's Comments 11/30/23:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

**Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?**

Secretariat's Comments 11/30/23:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

**Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?**

Secretariat's Comments 11/30/23:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

**Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?**

Secretariat's Comments 11/30/23:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

**8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?**

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

**Annex C: Project Location**

**8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?**

Secretariat's Comments 11/30/23:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

**Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating**

**8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?**

Secretariat's Comments

12/6/23:

Cleared.

11/30/23:

Further information is requested.

While a detailed note on climate risks for the country and the project has been annexed, The project's overall ESS risk is classified as moderate, and the Environmental and Social Risks screening form has not been uploaded. Please upload the Environmental and Social Risks screening form. In addition, please provide a plan to address moderate ESS risks during PPG.

## Agency's Comments

**12/06/23**

Apologies for the oversight. The ESS Risk Screening form has been uploaded to the portal.

Please note that for moderate-risk projects, FAO requires a limited social and environmental impact assessment (ESIA) and review. The ESIA will describe the potential environmental and social risks and impacts, and the appropriate mitigation measures. The ESIA will focus on the application of recognized good practices that will ensure the relevance of the interventions. Once the potential environmental and social risks and impacts of programme or project activities are identified, measures to mitigate, monitor and manage the impacts need to be established. Measures to manage and mitigate risks and impacts shall be reflected in an Environmental and Social Management Plan and included in the assessment. These further assessments will be carried out by the project team during PPG phase.

### **Annex E: Rio Markers**

**8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?**

Secretariat's Comments 11/30/23:

Yes.

## Agency's Comments

### **Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet**

**8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?**

Secretariat's Comments 11/30/23:

Yes.

## Agency's Comments

### **Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

## **9 GEFSEC Decision**

**9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?**

Secretariat's Comments 12/6/23:

Yes.

12/2/23:

Not yet. The agency is kindly requested to address the review comments and resubmit the PIF.

Agency's Comments

**12/06/23**

Noted. Project has been resubmitted to address comments above

**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval**

Secretariat's Comments 12/2/23:

1) LD comment: At CEO Endorsement, please better make the link to how the project will help to contribute to the LDN targets of the DR and also clearly indicate what are those targets. At the moment there doesn't seem to be a connection made between the specific sites identified and the LDN targets of the country.

Agency's Comments

**12/06/23**

Noted, please refer to additional information added regarding the LDN targets in paragraphs 100 and 101. The link will be strengthened during the PPG phase.

**Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>12/1/2023</b>	<b>12/6/2023</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>12/6/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		