



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW SHEET FOR MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

GEF ID:	10054		
Country/Region:	Dominican Republic		
Project Title:	Promoting Climate-smart Livestock Management in the Dominican Republic		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-2 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$1,540,585
Co-financing:	\$8,141,408	Total Project Cost:	\$9,681,993
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Asha Bobb-Semple	Agency Contact Person:	Carmelo Gallardo

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	5/7/2018 ABS: Yes. the project is aligned with CCM 2-4.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	5/7/2018 ABS: Yes. However please see additional points for consideration under Question 5.	
	3. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	5/15/2018 MGV: Not quite. While the project is in line with the National Development Plan as well as national strategies on Desertification and	6/5/2018: Point taken. Alignment with NDC has been included on page 47 of the CEO Endorsement request.

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>Drought and Climate Change Adaptation in the Agriculture Sector, there is no reference to the Dominican Republic's NDC in the CEO Endorsement Request. Please include an explanation on how the project is aligned with the NDC as per the ProDoc (p.41).</p> <p>6/6/2018 MGCV: Alignment with the Dominican Republic's NDC has been added. Comment cleared.</p>	
Project Design	<p>4. Does the project sufficiently indicate the drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>5/15/2018 MGCV: The scaling up and market transformation strategy is relatively weak. Please consider developing a national CSLM strategy or at least a roadmap based on the lessons learned from the pilot intervention in the Yuna Watershed. Please provide any additional considerations that may strengthen this aspect to ensure replication of CSLM practices at the national level.</p> <p>6/6/2018 MGCV: The argument for scaling up and market transformation has been strengthened. Comment cleared.</p>	<p>6/5/2018:</p> <p>a) Point taken. Output 1.1.4 "A national CSLM strategy based on the lessons learned from the pilot intervention in the Yuna Watershed, defined and agreed among key stakeholders" has been included in the Project Results Framework (see Appendix 1 Project Document and Table B CEO Endorsement Request)</p> <p>b)</p> <p>i) The national strategy to be developed within the framework of this initiative will be integrating public and private actors of national relevance (government institutions, industries, associations and federations of producers, academia, research centers, and international cooperation agencies), in order to facilitate the transfer of lessons learned that result from this pilot experience in the Yuna basin.</p> <p>ii) The Project will strengthen the capacities of public and private institutions, especially DIGEGA's Extension Service, in relation to the implementation of good agricultural practices</p>

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
			<p>(GAP) and technologies for climate-smart/low emission livestock management, articulated with the platform for the management and transfer of knowledge. Project lessons learned will be multiplied among extension agents at the national level, thus guaranteeing specialized technical assistance in climate-smart/ low emissions livestock.</p> <p>iii) CONALECHE and Banco Agrícola as financial entities with national scope, will offer credit to producers at a national level that require financing to implement GAP and technologies for climate-smart livestock management.</p> <p>The project will be linked to other initiatives that are ongoing, being formulated or under pipeline, national in scope, such as livestock NAMA, and other priority country watersheds, like the Sustainable Watershed Management Program-funded by the Word Bank and Ministry of Economy, Planning and Development (MEPyD), which would be directly linked to the actions and results generated from this intervention.</p> <p>Kindly see paragraphs inserted on page 29 of the CEO Endorsement Request and 71 of the Project Document.</p>
	<p>5. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>5/15/2018 MGCV: The identified barriers and prioritization could be further clarified:</p> <p>- Please further clarify barrier (i) which refers to a lack of integrated policies and weak coordination. How specifically do the two key ministries involved in the livestock sector (MARENA and the Ministry of Agriculture) do and do not coordinate on the sector, including with other relevant institutions, including</p>	<p>6/5/2018:</p> <p>a) Regarding Barrier i): MARENA and the Ministry of Agriculture currently do not have specific operational mechanisms to inter-relate climate change and livestock management issues. Neither protocols, nor tools – including logistics – are in place to facilitate this cooperation among ministries. Therefore, the production and the environment sides remain as thematic silos with no cross-feeding in the field.</p> <p>In addition, there is an absence of strategies and</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>producer and academic organizations? How will the project specifically address this at a national level?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On barrier (ii) please further clarify what are the existing capacities to estimate emissions from the livestock sector as well as existing framework for MRV systems at MARENA. - How will the project address barrier (iv), specifically the issue identified that "few extentionists work in areas where livestock production take place"? - Please clarify further the existing financial mechanisms in the livestock sector. Reference is make of a high level of unpaid debt at CONALECHE, but there is no explanation of what and how CONALECHE supports producers. - Further, please clarify the need for PPPs in the sector. Which private sector entities are being considered and with what arrangements are they expected to be involved in climate-smart livestock investments? What is the existing level of private sector involvement in the sector or in similar arrangements (i.e. PES)? - Please clarify how the Yuna river basin characteristics represent the national livestock sector. Is the combination of land use, number of producers per land area, production size, etc. reflective of the overall national picture? Please also 	<p>plans that foster collaboration among the ministries. Policies remain sectorial, and no cross-cutting policies dealing with climate change and environment are in place.</p> <p>Regarding the lack of coordination between the ministries and the academia and the private sector: at present, no work plan is in place to address a short, medium and long-term strategy aimed at transforming livestock into a more sustainable and low-emission activity. The link between climate change research and livestock sector needs is weak at national level. The project will address both sub-barriers through the CLSM national strategy based on the Yuna basin pilot. Please see paragraphs inserted on page 8 of the CEO ER and page 21 of the Prodoc.</p> <p>The project proponents have identified the Units that will support inter-ministerial coordination during project lifetime and after project closure: the Department of GHG Inventories that belongs to the Directorate of Climate Change of the Ministry of Environment; the Risk Management and Climate Change Department of the Ministry of Agriculture; and the Focal Point of Climate Change of the General Directorate of Livestock. These three units have been leading this project design along with FAO.</p> <p>In matters of watershed management and natural resources, the Ministries of Agriculture, Environment, and the National Institute of Hydraulic Resources (INDRHI) signed on March 18, 2013 a Collaboration Agreement for the installation of the National Soil Conservation Service (SNCS). Its main purpose is to reestablish a soil and water conservation structure at the national level with capacity to reach the users of</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>explain why the Yuna river basin was chosen as the area of intervention beyond it being a priority watershed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please also clarify why the project is focusing on family farming from a GHG mitigation potential perspective as there is no information on the distribution of producer types and their relative contributions to the national GHG emissions in the sector. <p>6/6/2018 MGCV: All comments have been adequately addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional information on barrier (i) has been added. - Addition information on existing capacities for MRV of GHG in livestock sector provided. - Training will also apply to technicians from producer's organizations and NGO technicians who have a wider reach. - Additional information on CONALECHE's support for dairy producers through soft rate loans has been added. - The argument for exploring PPPs in the sector has been strengthened. - The properties of the Yuna river basin have been expanded to strengthen the argument for choosing it as a pilot that 	<p>arable land in the watersheds. To this end, FAO and IICA currently offer technical assistance to both Ministries through the Soil and Water Catalytic Project, to put the SNCS into full operation.</p> <p>With the purpose of contributing to consolidate the coordinated actions between both Ministries, within the strategy that will be designed to promote climate-smart livestock management-institutional roles will be clearly defined. Ministries will work with producers' organizations, academia and the private sector, in a coordinated manner, with the aim to promote a transformation of the traditional livestock production model towards a more sustainable model, low in emissions, and to contribute to the conservation of natural resources.</p> <p>See description added on page 17 of the CEO ER and pages 28-30 of the Prodoc</p> <p>b) The existing capacities to estimate GHG emissions in the livestock sector consist of organizational structures and trained personnel to carry out GHG inventory, in addition to the collaboration among the institutions linked to the topic.</p> <p>Regarding the level of governance, a Department of GHG Inventories belongs to the Directorate of Climate Change of the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources. In addition, in the Ministry of Agriculture there is a Department of Risk and Climate Change, which has trained personnel, in the same way the General Directorate of Livestock has a focal point of climate change, which has been trained in GHG inventory work. In terms of personnel, in recent years 12 technicians have been trained from</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>could be scale up. It represents 16% of land dedicated to cattle raising and producers are already well organized.</p>	<p>various institutions, with support from different initiatives, such as the CD REDD I and II of the Coalition for Rainforest Nations (CfRN). Also the Economic Development compatible with Climate Change (DECCC) Plan project, with the support of CfRN and GIZ.</p> <p>Additionally, the REDD- Centro American Commission of Environment and Development (CCAD)-GIZ project trained on land use and land use change, and GHG inventories for the AFOLU sector, which includes the livestock area. The Project "Report for Results-based REDD+" is currently underway with the support of CfRN focusing on the development of national capacities in the field of REDD+. The FCPF Readiness Project provides extensive support in the establishment of a REDD+ environment in the country, which includes the assessment of livestock lands and the creation of an MRV system in the AFOLU sector. It is expected that with the development of this pilot initiative for the Yuna river basin, the information base and the application of appropriate methodologies to estimate GHG emissions from livestock will be strengthened and made accessible to all the country's producers.</p> <p>See description added on page 9 of the CEO ER and page 22 of the Prodoc</p> <p>c) In addition to training the extension agents that already exist within the livestock sector (DIGEGA-MEGALECHE), the project will be training technicians from producers' organizations, such as FEGACIBAO, as well as NGO technicians linked to the livestock and Environment sector. The latter will contribute to strengthen the technical capacity to assist</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
			<p>producers in a coordinated manner with government extension agents (DIGEGA-MEGALECHE), with the aim to implement climate-smart livestock management, both in the Yuna basin and at the national level.</p> <p>-Also within the framework of the project, extension agents of the National Soil Conservation Service of the Ministry of Agriculture will be incorporated. There are currently 228 technicians nationwide (52 technicians belong to the Yuna basin), who have already been trained by FAO and IICA (through the Soils and Water Catalytic Project) in soil and water conservation, agroforestry and sustainable livestock.</p> <p>See description inserted on pages 20-21 of the CEO ER and pages 30-32 of the Prodoc</p> <p>d) The livestock sector operates through credit programs managed by Banco Agrícola and CONALECHE. Additionally, some milk processing industries and savings cooperatives at the provincial and regional levels have specific credit programs to finance new technologies and improvements for livestock farmers. The Ministry of Agriculture also has a mechanism to mitigate the effects of climate disasters in the form of agricultural insurance.</p> <p>As a Council whose purpose is to promote a national dairy policy, CONALECHE is chaired by the Ministry of Agriculture and is made up of the following institutions: Ministries of Public Health and Industry and Commerce, five producers federations, a producers cooperative, the most prominent milk</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
			<p>processing company, representatives of medium and small dairy farms, the National Board of Cattle Ranchers, the Association of Milk Producers, the Dominican Agro-Business Board, Banco Agrícola and the Milk Importers.</p> <p>CONALECHE receives its funding from the following sources:</p> <p>(a) a monthly contribution from the State from the proceeds of imports of dairy products; (b) a contribution from the producers for each liter of milk sold to the milk processing plants, manufacturers of cheese and other milk products; and, (c) a contribution from the processing plants for each liter of milk sold.</p> <p>Of all the proceeds CONALECHE receives, 50% is distributed in the form of loans to milk producers for the promotion and development of the national livestock sector, with soft rates and terms of up to twelve years. Additionally, 40% is destined to funding DIGEGA's livestock and animal health extension programs; while the remaining 10% funds CONALECHE's administrative expenses the promotion of the consumption of milk and milk products. It is important to note that the rate of past due and unpaid loans from the credit program averages 15%.</p> <p>CONALECHE also offers direct technical assistance on good manufacturing practices, quality and safety to dairy processing plants. Furthermore, it assists small dairy processors to obtain their sanitary registry, facilitating the commercialization of quality and innocuous dairy products.</p> <p>Currently, CONALECHE is coordinating actions to establish a registry of milk producers at the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
			<p>national level, information that will serve the present initiative in the Yuna basin to update the number of producers and, at the same time, to estimate and monitor the level of GHG emissions through the MRV system. This registry of dairy producers will contribute to closing the information gap identified as one of the barriers to the development of the livestock sector. Please see description on page 10 of the CEO ER and pages 24-25 of the Prodoc.</p> <p>e) The entities that are being considered to finance public-private partnerships, with an aim to promote climate-smart livestock management, are those that process and market milk and meat at the national level. First, they would benefit from procuring products of better quality and at the same time, with a lower level of GHG emissions generated per unit of milk and meat marketed. They could encourage climate-smart livestock management, by paying differentiated prices to farms certified by the government as low in GHG emissions. Both, the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Agriculture, together with private companies (industries), can establish incentive mechanisms for providing ecosystem services, based on the good practices implemented by the farms to become climate-smart. Such initiatives could include planting trees, protecting riverbanks, managing solid waste (manure), improving productive efficiency, among others. Please see description inserted on page 11 of the CEO ER and page 25 of the Prodoc</p> <p>f) The Yuna river basin has an important livestock activity where small (<20 heads of</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
			<p>cattle) and medium (20-100 heads of cattle) producers converge, with low presence of large producers (>100 head of cattle). Their production is based on grazing and semi-stable systems, as in much of the country. It is important to highlight that the producers that affect this basin are well organized in 15 associations and a federation (FEGACIBAO). This would facilitate the implementation of actions for transforming the basin into a pilot area, making it possible to develop a climate-smart livestock model with the potential to extend to other cattle- producing areas of the country.</p> <p>The Yuna river basin concentrates around 16% of the area of land dedicated to cattle raising (FAO-EU Pre-census, 2015), which is why it is considered necessary to ensure that the livestock activity, especially in the upper and middle part of the basin, is developed under a model of sustainable livestock production. This would contribute to conserve the natural resources of the basin, reducing erosion, protecting water sources and increasing forest cover, through the reforestation of zones that need restauration of ecosystem functions (water and soil protection) and the implementation of silvopastoral production systems integrating tree, forage and cattle management, as a strategy to reduce CO2 and mitigate the GHG emissions generated by livestock.</p> <p>Please see description inserted on page 12 of the CEO ER and page 14 of the Prodoc</p> <p>g) The country has 2.5 million heads of cattle, of which 50% correspond to cattle for dual purposes (milk and meat), 31% exclusively for meat and</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
			<p>19% just for milk (ECLAC, 2016). According to the Dominican Association of Farmers (ADHA, 2010), more than 80% of dairy farms in the Dominican Republic are family owned. They contribute more than 50% of the nationally produced milk and meat, and they occupy more than 50% of the land dedicated for cattle raising, approximately 600,000 Ha, thus having a significant impact on the generation of GHG emissions from livestock activity. Please see insertions on pages 15-16 of the CEO ER and page 25 of the Prodoc</p>
	<p>6. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBS?</p>	<p>5/7/2018 ABS/MGV:</p> <p>Not fully.</p> <p>The project design could benefit from the following considerations.</p> <p>-Table B-Where applicable it would be useful to make the outputs measurable and to include indicators on the co-benefits, such as hectares of land to be improved, no. of farmers to benefit from CSLM on their farms and from training, no. of extension officers to benefit from training etc.</p> <p>-Output 1.1.1 refers to the CSLM strategy which will be initially implemented in specific provinces in the Yuna Watershed. It will be useful to ensure that the strategy includes a roadmap for implementation throughout the DR to ensure replicability and upscaling or even further and preferably, develop a national CSLM strategy with a pilot</p>	<p>6/5/2018:</p> <p>a) Point taken. Table B has been revised and target indicators have been included. Please see CEO ER and Appendix 1 of the Prodoc</p> <p>b) Point taken. Please see response 4 a) above.</p> <p>c) The project will promote the enhancement of watershed management through the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Technology transfer of good agricultural practices (GAP) for GHG emission reduction, such as: tree planting of livestock areas at risk of erosion, reforestation of riverbanks, soil conservation and management of solid waste in livestock farms. -Training of technicians and producers on the conservation of natural resources in livestock farms. -Promotion of participatory processes to raise awareness among stakeholders of the livestock sector and other stakeholders on the importance

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<p>implementation in the Yuna Watershed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Output 1.1.2, Table B specifies enhancement of watershed management. Can you indicate the specific watershed management activities that will be included and how this fits into the overall project? - Output 2.1.1- Please confirm what portion of the GEF contribution will cover farm-level technologies. -Output 2.2.1- how will this be institutionalized? Will there be an updated training programme or curriculum at agricultural training institutions/colleges? - Output 2.2.2 - would these business plans target farms that are not part of the 500 pilot direct beneficiaries or would it focus on additional CSLM implementation beyond the pilot intervention and if so, what would that be? Please also clarify how these beneficiaries would be selected. Please also clarify if there is a relationship between the PPPs from Component 1 and these business plans. <p>6/6/2018 ABS/MGV:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Table B- Comment cleared - Output 1.1.1 - Comment cleared. 	<p>of the management of natural resources in the basin and its impact to mitigate GHG emissions. Lessons learned from these interventions will feed the design of a national CLSM strategy (see output 1.1.4 newly inserted). Please see description inserted on page 18 of the CEO ER and page 28 of the Prodoc</p> <p>d) 39% of the requested GEF contribution will cover farm-level technologies, including: i) technical assistance of Consultants to implement technologies at the farm level (Animal Production / CSLM Specialist and Farm Management / Extension Specialist and National MRV Specialist); ii) Component 3 (MRV); iii) Contracts within output 2.1, and a portion of outcome 3.1; iv) planting materials and supplies. See more details of this contribution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Specific technical assistance to implement GAPs that promote climate smart livestock management encompass: the establishment of silvopastoral systems, protein banks, living fences, management of paddocks and manure, genetics improvement techniques, and follow up to field activities. ii) Specific technical assistance to design an MRV system to estimate GHG emissions generated by cattle farms, including protocols, on site sampling, lab tests and follow up to field activities. iii) Procurement of planting materials (seeds and supplies) to implement silvopastoral systems in pilot farms. iv) Training sessions for producers to implement GAPs to promote CSLM, including workshop logistics (venues, meals, material reproduction,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Output 1.1.2 - Comment cleared - Output 2.1.1 - Comment cleared - Output 2.2.1 - Comment cleared - Output 2.2.2 - Comment cleared. 	<p>among others). Please see insertions on page 24 of the CEO ER and page 57 of the Prodoc</p> <p>e) Project training programs will be developed by experts in different technical areas such as climate-smart livestock management, extension, gender, business plans development, and MRV, among others. These experts, together with academia and research centers, will conduct the trainings for extension agents; these, in turn, will be training the producers for the implementation of GAPs in climate-smart livestock management. The training programs, which should ensure the inclusion of the gender equality approach in their contents, will be officially handed to DIGEGA to incorporate into its training programs for technicians and producers. In the same manner, the training programs will be shared with universities that teach agricultural and environmental sciences, in order to update and strengthen their curricula. Please see insertion on page 21 of the CEO ER and page 32 of the Prodoc</p> <p>f) The business plans will target individual producers or associations of producers within the Yuna river basin, which are part of the 500 direct beneficiaries of the project. The selection of the beneficiaries will be conducted by an inter-institutional commission composed of the organizations that make up the project and with a representation of the producers. The commission, with the support of the Gender expert will define the selection criteria, ensuring compliance with the principles of social inclusion and gender</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
			<p>equality and avoiding any type of discrimination or bias, including -but not limited to- sex, age, colour, ethnicity, language, religion, political affiliation, national or social origin, disability, economic position and sexual orientation.</p> <p>g) Public-private partnerships will help to guarantee the viability and sustainability of the business plans. The business plans will be one of the ways in which the results of the PPPs - established to promote the transformation of traditional livestock towards a more sustainable activity- will be reflected at a practical level. Both the public-private partnerships and the business plans will form an integral part of climate-smart livestock management strategy, at the pilot level in the Yuna basin and eventually, when it is scaled up at the national level.</p> <p>Please see insertions on page 22 of the CEO ER and page 32 of the Prodoc</p>
	7. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	5/7/2018 ABS: Yes.	
	8. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	5/7/2018 ABS/MGV: - We note that upwards of 60% of the budget covers consultant costs, many of whom are coordinating activities. Please clarify the need for this level of support for consultants. 6/6/2018: Cleared. Justification has been provided on the budget allocation for consultants.	6/5/2018: The HR/Consultants component of the proposal totals US\$ 710,626. This represents 46% of the total budget US\$1,540,586 (and 40.8% of total GEF funding US\$1,741,692). The structure of this component responds to the Government's expressed ideas on what would work best to carry out project activities in the field: a Technical Coordinator per each Component as well as a National Project Coordinator, overall responsible for the Project. The number of consultancies on

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
			specific technical areas are aimed to develop and strengthen staff's technical capacities at all levels in the Ministry of Environment, the Ministry of Agriculture and farmer organizations.
	9. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	5/7/2018 ABS: Yes.	
	10. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	5/7/2018 ABS: Yes	
	11. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	5/15/2018 MGV: Thank you for submitting the CCM tracking tool. While there is some explanation on the annual estimate for GHG mitigation in Annex C, it is not completely clear. Please further elaborate how the target was estimated, including whether it relates to the direct interventions in 500 farms. Further, please provide an estimated indirect target for GHG emissions if it is not included in the current target per GEF methodologies and update the estimate in Table F accordingly. 6/6/2018 MGV: Comment cleared.	6/5/2018: a) Both the baseline and mitigation scenarios were estimated based on the number of farms targeted by the project (500 farms in the Yuna basin) targeting 77,000 animals in total. Livestock GHG emissions were estimated based on FAO's GLEAM model. GLEAM is a modelling framework that simulates the interaction of activities and processes involved in livestock production and the environment. The results include both direct (manure management and enteric methane) and indirect (feed production) sources of emissions related to dairy farming in Dominican Republic. Carbon sequestration potential was estimated based on the estimates proposed by Henderson et al. (2015) and the project area. The mitigation scenario presented in the document represents the adoption of sustainable agro-forestry (silvo-pastoral) practices in dairy farms and is an example of the possible

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
			<p>interventions that can be applied in the project region.</p> <p>The intervention would affect the productivity of the herd and the quality of the feed. The effects on reduced emissions are a result of the possible increment in forage quality, which would reduce enteric methane emissions and nitrogen excretion, combined with the reduction of the number of replacement animals required, thus reducing overall GHG emissions from the herd.</p> <p>The application of improved practices to promote sustainable livestock can reduce total GHG emissions from 10 to 40% and increase herd productivity (milk and meat) from 10 to 70%, thus reducing both overall emissions and emission intensity by unit of product.</p> <p>b) Indirect GHG emissions due to feed production are already included in the current emission reduction estimate (emissions related to feed production: 39,556 tonnes CO₂ eq (baseline) and 18,487 tonnes CO₂eq (target scenario), reduction equivalent to 53%).</p> <p>Kindly see insertions on pages 26 and 53 of the CEO ER, and pages 123-124 of the Prodoc</p>
	12. <i>Only for Non-grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	N/A	
	13. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	<p>5/7/2018 ABS:</p> <p>Yes the project is coordinated with a number of other GEF and non-GEF funded projects looking at forests, land, mitigation and livestock issues. The project will also share lessons with similar projects in Ecuador and Uruguay.</p>	
	14. Does the project include a	5/7/2018 ABS:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	Yes	
	15. Does the project have description of knowledge management plan?	5/7/2018 ABS: Yes	
Availability of Resources	16. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	5/7/2018 ABS: Yes	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	5/7/2018 ABS: Yes	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	N/A	
Recommendations	17. Is the MSP being recommended for approval?	5/15/2018 ABS/MGV: Not yet. Please address comments in questions 3, 5, 6 and 11. 6/5/2018 ABS/MGV: The PM recommends this project for technical clearance. A final decision on clearing, however, will be made based on availability of resources in the final months of GEF-6.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Review Dates	First Review	May 15, 2018	June 05, 2018
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 06, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		