



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9869		
Country/Region:	Dominican Republic		
Project Title:	Strengthening the capacity of the Dominican Republic to generate climate information and knowledge in the framework of the Paris Agreement		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CBIT-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$30,000	Project Grant:	\$1,100,000
Co-financing:	\$360,000	Total Project Cost:	\$1,460,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Milena Vasquez	Agency Contact Person:	Geordie Colville

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	MGV/JDS, March 29, 2018: Yes, the project is aligned with the CBIT Programming Directions.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MGV/JDS, March 29, 2018: Yes, the project is aligned with the Dominican Republic's national strategies and plans, including its NDC and National Communications, the National Climate Change Policy, the National Development Strategy 2011-2030 and	

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)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		the Climate Change Compatible Economic Development Plan.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>MGV/JDS, March 29, 2018: Please address following comments:</p> <p>a) Difficulty retaining technical capacity and high staff turnover is identified as a key challenge. As the project will be carrying out significant training activities, we suggest the project thinks of multiple ways to ensure capacity is retained. In particular, as it is not explicitly stated, we hope that the training materials and any outputs will be documented in different formats.</p> <p>b)As part of the institutional arrangements for its GHG emissions reporting program, DR wants to utilize members of Academia to help address high staff/personnel turnover at the government level. Given the natural turnover within a general university setting, please elaborate as to why this is appropriate and/or fundamental for DR's circumstances.</p> <p>c) Please also explain how the project will ensure the sustainability of the hardware and software acquired through the project, including earmarking local resources for future</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>repair and updates.</p> <p>MGV/JDS, March 29, 2018: The project has been considerably redesigned from the initial proposal. It is evident that a gap analysis considering all existing and relevant activities and initiatives in the country was carried out and that this proposal builds upon those findings. We note that there is already quite a bit of existing support, in particular for the AFOLU sector via UN-REDD, on mitigation monitoring via the Information Matters project, on long-term planning, particularly in adaptation via the GCF, on the institutionalization of a transparency framework via ICAT, and on updating of inventories and describing actions, gaps and needs via the GEF-supported BUR.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the proposal identifies additional technical and capacity gaps to meet the requirements of the enhanced transparency framework under the Paris Agreement that this CBIT project aims to address. In particular these include: -Staff turnover, lack of institutionalized technical guidelines, and loss of technical capacities provided via international support -Lack of local capacity for data</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>collection, monitoring, reporting and verification to a wider number of people and embedded in national training programs to ensure retention</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Lack of capacity to track climate finance, domestically and internationally, as to estimate financial needs to implement climate change strategies -Lack of activity data and emissions factors, primarily in the energy and transport sectors, but also for IPPU, waste, cement, livestock, biomass, marine and aviation sectors. -Limited capacities on GIS and land use planning to monitor, analyze and reduce GHG emissions related to energy and transport -Limited technological equipment to collect and analyze GHG data (GPS, cameras, computers and software) -Missing a formal long-term participatory process to revise the NDC, create long-term scenarios, and involve relevant stakeholders <p>No additional comments. Please address related comments above and below.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>MGV/JDS, March 29, 2018: The project consists of one component with two project outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Outcome 1: Technical and 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>technological capacities for mitigation data collection, monitoring, reporting, and verification are strengthened -Outcome 2: Dominican Republic's is able to track and update their NDC through a participatory process</p> <p>Please address the following comments:</p> <p>a) We suggest separating the project into two components to more accurately reflect the different focus of these outcomes and associated outputs.</p> <p>b) Also, please highlight the targeted audience for each Outcome in Table B.</p> <p>c) Output 1.1 and Output 1.5 are not directly relevant to the rest of the Outputs under Outcome 1. Consider rearranging them.</p> <p>d) Unclear as to whether Outputs 2.1 and 2.3 overlap with the work that ICAT is carrying out. In addition, NDC revision in itself is not supported by the CBIT, rather support to track NDCs and clarify NDC information.</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs</p>	<p>MGV/JDS, March 29, 2018: Yes, the project will involve a number of actors from civil society and will be</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	considered?	gender-sensitive.	
Availability of Resources	7. 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? 	MGV/JDS, March 29, 2018: The project is requesting a total of \$1,237,350 of resources from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	MGV/JDS, March 29, 2018: The project is requesting a total of \$1,237,350 of resources from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 	MGV/JDS, March 29, 2018: The project is requesting a total of \$1,237,350 of resources from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>MGV, July 24, 2017: Given that the GEF recently approved funding for the Dominican Republic's first Biennial Update Report implemented by UNDP, which is not referenced in this PIF, with significant overlap in proposed activities, we recommend the agency to rethink the scope of this project. P.M recommends agency to contact the GEF Secretariat to discuss further.</p> <p>MGV/JDS, March 29, 2018: Please address comments above.</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Review Date	Review	July 24, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 29, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. 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)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	Additional Review (as necessary)		