ADAPTATION FUND BOARD SECRETARIAT TECHNICAL REVIEW OF PROJECT/PROGRAMME PROPOSAL

PROJECT/PROGRAMME CATEGORY: Regular-sized Project Concept

Country/Region: **Dominican Republic**
Project Title: **Enhancing climate resilience in San Cristóbal Province, Dominican Republic - Integrated Water Resources Management and Rural Development Programme**
AF Project ID: **DOM/NIE/Water/2016/1**
IE Project ID:
Requested Financing from Adaptation Fund (US Dollars): **9,954,000**
Reviewer and contact person: **Andrew Chilombo**
Co-reviewer(s): **Mikko Ollikainen**
IE Contact Person: **David Luther**

Review Criteria	Questions	Comments on 24 January 2017	Comments on February 14 2017
Country Eligibility	1. Is the country party to the Kyoto Protocol?	Yes.	
	2. Is the country a developing country particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change?	Yes.	
Project Eligibility	1. Has the designated government authority for the Adaptation Fund endorsed the project/programme?	Yes. Letter dated 16 January 2017.	
	2. Does the project / programme support concrete adaptation actions to assist the country in addressing adaptive capacity to the adverse effects of climate change and build in climate resilience?	**CR1:** Given the key role of livestock production in the socio-economic situation of the 51% of the population in Cristobal, beyond the water points/dams, please strengthen the demonstration of how the project's interventions would reduce the vulnerability of communities and make them more adaptive to shocks of climate change.	**CR1:** Yes, generally.

	3. Does the project / programme provide economic, social and environmental benefits, particularly to vulnerable communities, including gender considerations, while avoiding or mitigating negative impacts, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund?	**CR2:** The Project document justifies the establishment of Provincial Climate Change Adaptation Monitoring Committee (PCCAMC), however it has not indicated the operations of the Committee, including how it would be funded beyond the project. Would it be absorbed in the existing entities (Governance, local governments, MEPYD, COE, Ministry of Public Health, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, INDRHI and INAPA)? It should be clarified why it was not opted to strengthen existing coordination bodies at municipal and community level, instead of creating PCCAMC.	**CR2:** Partly addressed. The concept has clarified and provided the rationale for the establishment of PCCAMC. However, there is still lack of certainty what will become of PCCAMC after the proposed project comes to a term. The fully-developed proposal should consider the approach and clarify a) whether all stakeholder representatives in PCCAMC will be absorbed by the post-project institutional arrangement, such as ministries, especially taking into account that some of the stakeholders might come from the non-governmental sector; and how PCCAMC in reality can be a collaborative framework carrying out the 4 stated functions (p. 51) without having or needing an administrative structure (on p. 50 PCCAMC is referred to as a collaborative Management Structure).
	4. Is the project / programme cost effective?	Yes, generally.	
	5. Is the project / programme consistent with national or sub-national sustainable development strategies, national or sub-national development plans, poverty reduction strategies, national communications and adaptation programs of action and other relevant instruments?	Yes.	
	6. Does the project / programme meet the relevant national technical standards, where applicable, in compliance with the	Yes, according to current information.	

	Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund??		
	7. Is there duplication of project / programme with other funding sources?	No.	
	8. Does the project / programme have a learning and knowledge management component to capture and feedback lessons?	Yes.	
	9. Has a consultative process taken place, and has it involved all key stakeholders, and vulnerable groups, including gender considerations?	Yes.	
	10. Is the requested financing justified on the basis of full cost of adaptation reasoning?	Yes.	
	11. Is the project / program aligned with AF's results framework?	Yes.	
	12. Has the sustainability of the project/programme outcomes been taken into account when designing the project?	Yes.	
	13. Does the project / programme provide an overview of environmental and social impacts / risks identified?	Yes.	
Resource Availability	1. Is the requested project / programme funding within the cap of the country?	Yes.	

	2. Is the Implementing Entity Management Fee at or below 8.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget before the fee?	Yes.	
	3. Are the Project/Programme Execution Costs at or below 9.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget (including the fee)?	Yes.	
Eligibility of IE	4. Is the project/programme submitted through an eligible Implementing Entity that has been accredited by the Board?	Yes.	
Implementation Arrangements	1. Is there adequate arrangement for project / programme management?	n/a (Not required at the project concept stage.)	
	2. Are there measures for financial and project/programme risk management?	n/a (Not required at the project concept stage.)	
	3. Are there measures in place for the management of for environmental and social risks, in line with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund?	n/a (Not required at the project concept stage.)	
	4. Is a budget on the Implementing Entity Management Fee use included?	n/a (Not required at the project concept stage.)	
	5. Is an explanation and a breakdown of the execution costs	n/a (Not required at the project concept stage.)	

	included?		
	6. Is a detailed budget including budget notes included?	n/a (Not required at the project concept stage.)	
	7. Are arrangements for monitoring and evaluation clearly defined, including budgeted M&E plans and sex-disaggregated data, targets and indicators?	n/a (Not required at the project concept stage.)	
	8. Does the M&E Framework include a break-down of how implementing entity IE fees will be utilized in the supervision of the M&E function?	n/a (Not required at the project concept stage.)	
	9. Does the project/programme's results framework align with the AF's results framework? Does it include at least one core outcome indicator from the Fund's results framework?	n/a (Not required at the project concept stage.)	
	10. Is a disbursement schedule with time-bound milestones included?	n/a (Not required at the project concept stage.)	

Technical Summary	With three components focused on 1) community level implementation of water resource management activities; 2) rural development through diversification of livelihoods; and 3) capacity building and capacity development to manage climate-related risks, the proposed project will seek to enhance the resilience and adaptive capacity of rural livelihoods to climate impacts and risks on water resources in San Cristóbal province. As it was presented, the initial technical review observed that the proposal did not meet the requirements of the Adaptation Fund. Information was missing in important sections, and the review requested for clarification on important specifics of proposed activities and how they tie together in the general project design as a whole. In addition, the initial review also requested that the proponent clarify how the suite of Adaptation Fund investments will enhance the adaptive capacities of

	communities and how the proposed components were aligned together to respond to the objectives outlined in the proposal. Other concerns that the initial technical review raised included anticipated economic, social and environmental benefits of the proposed; demonstration of cost-effectiveness; lessons learned from other projects and projects; and sustainability strategy of the proposed project. The previous technical review made the following: (A) Observations and recommendations that need to be addressed while developing the full proposal: • The proposal should provide additional detail to better articulate how keeping livestock and engaging in other activities related to reducing pressure on natural resources address adaptive capacity needs in the project area; • The proposal should clarify further how '*the integration of the community is a key factor towards empowerment and ownership of the projects'* constitutes cost effectiveness; • The proposal should provide additional information regarding the authorizing or clearing institutions of relevant national technical standards; and • The proposal should clearly and systematically include stakeholders' specific roles, including those of communities and NGOs. (B) Observations and recommendations that need to be addressed before the concept can be endorsed: • In addition to systematically identifying pressure points within the ecosystems in San Cristobal, the proposal should clarify what needs to be changed in the way the ecosystem is managed to increase water availability, linking that to increasing the carrying capacity of the ecosystem through lowering the irrigation pressure, improving the opportunity and skills around dry season farming, lowering siltation of water systems and increasing the soil moisture content through increased forest cover; • The proposal should convincingly justify the proposal to establish the Provincial Climate Change Adaptation Monitoring Committee (PCCAMC), and clarify its sustainability beyond the life of the project; • The proposal should clarify and identify the 'other resources and economical resources' to justify and demonstrate how partnerships will make this project cost effective; • The proposal should justify the full cost of adaptation reasoning by fully addressing what needs to be changed in ecosystem management vis-à-vis the carrying capacity of the ecosystem through lowering the irrigation pressure, improving the opportunity and skills around dry season farming, lowering siltation of water systems and increasing the soil moisture content through increased forest cover; and • The proposal should fully address and strengthen the clear logic and coherence of water management, livelihoods and capacity building in the project area. The current technical review has made the following clarification requests: CR1: Given the key role of livestock production in the socio-economic situation of the 51% of the population in Cristobal, beyond the water points/dams, please strengthen the demonstration of how the project's interventions would reduce the

	vulnerability of communities and make them more adaptive to shocks of climate change CR2: The Project document justifies the establishment of Provincial Climate Change Adaptation Monitoring Committee (PCCAMC), however it has not indicated the operations of the Committee, including how it will would be funded beyond the project. Would it be absorbed in the existing entities (Governance, local governments, MEPYD, COE, Ministry of Public Health, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, INDRHI and INAPA)? It should be clarified why it was not opted to strengthen existing coordination bodies at municipal and community level, instead of creating PCCAMC The final technical review finds that the proposal has addressed CR1. Regarding CR2, while developing the full proposal, the proponent should consider the approach and clarify a) whether all stakeholder representatives in the proposed Provincial Climate Change Adaptation Monitoring Committee (PCCAMC) would be absorbed by the post-project institutional arrangement, such as ministries, especially taking into account that some of the stakeholders might come from the non-governmental sector; and b) how PCCAMC in reality can be a collaborative framework carrying out the 4 stated functions (p. 51) without having or needing an administrative structure (on p. 50 PCCAMC is referred to as a collaborative Management Structure).
Date:	20 February 2017