Strengthening the National Capacity for Implementing the Enhanced Transparency Framework in Dominican Republic (CBIT II Project)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
12346
Countries
Dominican Republic
Project Name
Strengthening the National Capacity for Implementing the Enhanced Transparency Framework in Dominican Republic (CBIT II Project)
Agencies
UNEP
Date received by PM
5/18/2026
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Patricia Marcos Huidobro
Focal Area
Climate Change
Project Type
MSP

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
5.18.2026 PM:

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
5.30.2026 PM:

Cleared.

5.18.2026 PM:

No. Please add a paragraph explaining the problem to be addressed, i.e. elaborate in one paragraph what the current gap on transparency is.

Agency's Comments
Response:29/05/2026

Agency?s Comments- 26/05: The project summary has been revised to include a concise paragraph describing the main transparency gaps addressed by the project, including limitations in the operationalization of the National Transparency System, incomplete ETF-aligned transparency modules, fragmented data flows, and continued dependence on external technical support for UNFCCC reporting and climate-related decision-making.

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
5.18.2026 PM:

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
5.30.2026 PM:

Cleared.

5.18.2026 PM:

No. Please note there?s scope for capturing gender dimensions in Outcome 2, specifically, Outputs 2.2., 2.3 and 2.4. Also, under M&E, please reflect that reports submitted (mid-terminal review and terminal evaluation) include gender-specific results and progress in the implementation of gender action plan. Finally, include a reference on how the CBIT-GSP gender tool kit will be applied to this project.

Agency's Comments
Response:29/05/2026

The project has been revised to further mainstream gender dimensions under Outputs 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 through the integration of gender-responsive indicators, sex-disaggregated data, and consideration of differentiated climate vulnerabilities, participation, and access to climate finance where relevant. The revised outputs also strengthen the integration of gender-responsive approaches into NDC tracking, adaptation and vulnerability assessment processes, and transparency-related planning activities.

In addition, the Monitoring and Evaluation component has been updated to ensure that Mid-Term Review and Terminal Evaluation reports assess gender-specific results and progress in implementation of the Gender Action Plan. The Knowledge Management section now includes reference to the application of the CBIT-GSP Gender Toolkit to support gender-responsive implementation, stakeholder engagement, communication, knowledge products, and capacity-building activities throughout project implementation.

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
5.18.2026 PM:

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

5.18.2026 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

5.30.2026 PM:

Cleared.

5.18.2026 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

1. Kindly explain how the project will coordinate with the CBIT Global Support Program (SGP).

2. In several instances, the PIF mentions the "on-going GEF-UNEP BTR1-NC4". However, kindly note this combined report was submitted to the UNFCCC on December 30, 2025. Please amend the PIF accordingly.

3. The PIF also mentions "develop national Technology Needs Assessment (TNA) for mitigation and adaptation". TNAs are completely separate reports, could you please clarify what the exact contribution from the CBIT II project is to the TNA of the country?

Agency's Comments

Response:29/05/2026

1. The PIF has been revised to strengthen coordination arrangements with the CBIT Global Support Programme (CBIT-GSP). The project will engage with the CBIT-GSP through regional and global knowledge-sharing activities, technical exchanges, peer learning, and capacity-building support related to ETF implementation and transparency system

operationalization. Relevant tools, methodologies, lessons learned, and good practices from the CBIT-GSP will be incorporated into project implementation, stakeholder engagement, and knowledge management activities.

2. References in the PIF to the ?ongoing GEF-UNEP BTR1-NC4? have been revised to reflect that the combined BTR1-NC4 report was submitted to the UNFCCC on 30 December 2025. The document now consistently refers to the BTR1-NC4 as a completed process and clarifies that CBIT II will build upon the methodologies, data systems, QA/QC procedures, institutional arrangements, technical recommendations, and lessons learned generated through this process to strengthen future ETF-related reporting capacities.
3. The PIF has been revised to clarify the reference to the Technology Needs Assessment (TNA). CBIT II will not develop the TNA itself. Instead, the project will strengthen transparency-related capacities, institutional coordination, data systems, and information flows relevant to technology-related information for mitigation and adaptation planning and reporting processes, including future TNA-related activities where relevant.

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

5.18.2026 PM:

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

5.18.2026 PM:

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
5.18.2026 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments
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
5.18.2026 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments
5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments
5.18.2026 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments
5.6 RISKs

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

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
5.18.2026 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments
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

5.18.2026 PM:

Yes.

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

5.18.2026 PM:

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

5.18.2026 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

5.18.2026 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments
5.18.2026 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments
7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments
5.18.2026 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments
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
5.18.2026 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments
5.18.2026 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments
5.18.2026 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments
5.18.2026 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments
5.18.2026 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments
5.18.2026 PM:

Yes.

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
5.18.2026 PM:

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

5.18.2026 PM:

N/A. Enabling activities do not require co-financing.

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country?s(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

5.18.2026 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

5.18.2026 PM:

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

5.18.2026 PM:

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

5.18.2026 PM:

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
5.18.2026 PM:

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
5.18.2026 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments
5.18.2026 PM:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

5.18.2026 PM:

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
5.18.2026 PM:

N/A.

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments
6.4.2026 PM:

Cleared.

5.30.2026 PM:

Cleared. Please remove the yellow highlights in the document and send back to the GEF for final approval.

5.18.2026 PM:

Not cleared. Please address comments above.

Agency's Comments02/06/2026 We will remove the highlighted text and resubmit the clean version of the document to the GEF for final approval.
9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

5.18.2026 PM:

At CEO Approval stage, please consider the following:

1. Adding deliverables to the different outputs.

2. Recording what was achieved during CBIT-1 and how the new project will build on the outcomes of CBIT-1 while filling the gaps identified during stakeholder consultations, FSV/ICA/TER process of previous national communications and the Terminal Evaluation. It is suggested to describe this in a table for better clarity, an example given below:

	1	**2**	**3**	**4**
	Gaps related to capacity identified in previous FSV/ICA/TER/ information sharing/exchange of views process of last 2-3 reports	Gaps identified during stakeholder consultation (Group or individual including requests from the Government on capacity required to comply with ETF)	Gaps addressed by CBIT 1 or activities of any other agency like ICAT/PATPA/etc.	Gap Ter of C bui cap area
Institutional Coordination				
MRV/GHG Accounting				
MPGs/CRTs/CTFs				
NDCs				
FTC, Adaptation				
Other				

Agency's Comments

Response:29/05/2026

Thank you for the constructive recommendations provided at CEO Approval stage. The project team acknowledges the importance of further strengthening the clarity and continuity of the proposal.

1. Deliverables under outputs
   The project document will be revised to further specify key deliverables under each output, as appropriate. This will help improve the clarity of the implementation

framework, facilitate monitoring of progress, and provide greater visibility regarding the expected technical products and capacity-building results throughout project implementation.

2. Linkages with CBIT-1 and added value of the proposed project
   The project has been designed to build directly on the achievements, lessons learned, and remaining gaps identified under CBIT-1. In response to the recommendation, the project document will further elaborate how the proposed activities complement and scale up previous efforts, while addressing priorities identified through stakeholder consultations, the FSV/ICA processes, previous National Communications, Biennial Transparency Reports preparation processes, and the Terminal Evaluation of CBIT-1.

To enhance clarity and traceability, a dedicated table is included below summarizing:

•Key achievements under CBIT-1;
•Remaining gaps and challenges identified;
•How the proposed project activities respond to these gaps and strengthen institutional and technical capacities under the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF).

Capacity Area	**Gaps identified through previous ICA/TER/BTR processes**	**Gaps identified during stakeholder consultations**	**Progress achieved under CBIT I / other initiatives**	**Remaining gaps identified**	**How CBIT II will address gaps**	**Relevant CBIT II Outputs**
Institutional Coordination	**Fragmented institutional coordination and limited standardized data-sharing arrangements for ETF reporting**	**Need for sustained inter-institutional coordination and operational procedures across ministries and subnational actors**	**CBIT I supported establishment of the National MRV System and coordination arrangements under Decree 541-20**	**Need to further operationalize institutional arrangements and ensure long-term sustainability and stakeholder engagement**	**Strengthen operational protocols, institutional coordination mechanisms, and stakeholder participation for the National Transparency System**	**Outputs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3**
MRV / GHG Accounting	**Inconsistent sectoral data flows, QA/QC limitations, and varying institutional capacities for GHG inventory preparation**	**Need for continuous technical training and improved sectoral data management**	**CBIT I strengthened national GHG inventory capacities, QA/QC approaches, and technical expertise**	**Remaining gaps in continuous data flows, institutionalization of capacities, and ETF-aligned reporting**	**Enhance sectoral data systems, institutionalized training, QA/QC procedures, and technical capacities for ETF-compliant inventories**	**Outputs 2.1, 3.1**

MPGs / CRTs / CTFs	**Limited practical experience with ETF reporting requirements and reporting tools**	**Need for enhanced understanding of MPGs and ETF reporting formats across institutions**	**BTR1/NC4 process strengthened understanding of ETF requirements and reporting methodologies**	**Further practical capacities and institutionalization of ETF reporting processes required**	**Support operationalization of transparency modules and strengthen ETF reporting capacities and tools**	**Outputs 1.1, 2.1, 3.1**
NDC Tracking	**Limited systems for tracking implementation progress and indicators across sectors and territories**	**Need for improved subnational engagement and integration of adaptation and mitigation indicators**	**CBIT I supported NDC tracking methodologies and MRV institutional arrangements**	**Limited integration of territorial information, adaptation indicators, and stakeholder coordination**	**Strengthen NDC tracking module, data flows, indicators, and stakeholder capacities at national and subnational levels**	**Output 2.2**
FTC / Adaptation	**Limited systematic collection and integration of adaptation and climate vulnerability information**	**Need for improved vulnerability information management and adaptation-related reporting capacities**	**Existing adaptation information generated through NAP and related initiatives**	**Fragmented adaptation data flows and limited institutional coordination for adaptation reporting**	**Develop risks and vulnerability module and strengthen adaptation-related transparency capacities**	**Output 2.3**
Climate Finance	**Limited systems to track climate finance flows and private sector participation**	**Need for improved transparency and monitoring of climate finance information**	**Initial climate finance tracking efforts supported through national climate finance initiatives**	**Lack of integrated climate finance tracking and reporting capacities**	**Develop climate finance module and strengthen capacities for climate finance transparency**	**Output 2.4**

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		5/29/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)		6/2/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)		

	PIF Review	Agency Response
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		