



Dominican Republic: Integrated productive landscapes through land use planning; restoration; and sustainable intensification of rice crops in the Yaque Norte and Yuna Watersheds

Basic Information

GEF ID
10216

Countries
Dominican Republic

Project Title
Dominican Republic: Integrated productive landscapes through land use planning; restoration; and sustainable intensification of rice crops in the Yaque Norte and Yuna Watersheds

GEF Agency(ies)
World Bank

Agency ID
World Bank: P170848

GEF Focal Area(s)
Multi Focal Area

Program Manager
Asha Bobb-Semple

PIF

Part I – Project Informatics

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019 ABS:

Yes. However please consider using LD sub-objective 1-3 as well, as this component looks at forest restoration, which is a key intervention in Component 3 of the project and will be reported on under sub-indicator 3.2 which has been selected.

For internal accounting, if a project has selected a restoration indicator (in particular in this case forest) then we need to align it with the funding for this area, which comes from sub-objective 1-3.

Please see additional comments on Biodiversity in the sections below.

Please update and submit the GEF Data Sheet taking into consideration the comments above and other comments below.

5/2/2019 ABS:

Cleared.

5/12/2019:

Please see additional comments at the end of the review sheet.

5/13/2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response LD Sub-objective 1.3 has been added and the datasheet has been updated accordingly.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019 ABS:

Please complete Table B including Outcomes and Outputs, (differentiating between the two), estimated targets and indicators as well as GEF and Co-financing allocations per Outcome.

5/2/2019 ABS:

Cleared

Agency Response Table B remains the same (only with outcomes) since the team has confirmed that at this stage, information about products, target and indicators is not needed given the harmonized templates and procedures with WB.

Co-financing

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, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019 SW:

Yes, however please explore co-financing and coordination with non-World Bank or government activities or projects.

5/2/2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response

Engagement will be sought with IDIAF (Dominican Institute of Agriculture and Forestry Research) and projects such as Bioarroz from the Ministry of Agriculture who are exploring SRI technology.

Coordination will take place also with the National Ecosystem Restoration Program , and the Protected Area Directorate (Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources)

Also particularly in the upper sections of Yaque del Norte and Yuna specific engagement for this proposed project will be sought with the Emission Reduction Program executing entities:

- 1) National Quisqueya Verde Program
- 2) Agroforestry Project of the Presidency
- 3) Payment for Environmental Services Program (Cuenca Yaque del Norte)

Indocafe Agroforestry System with shade-grown coffee

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019:

Please re upload the Letter of Endorsement. We receive an error message when trying to open it.

5/2/2019:

Cleared

5/12/2019:

Please see additional comments at the end of the review sheet.

5/13/2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response Endorsement letter has been re-uploaded to the portal. However, despite re-uploading it, the link to the letter in the Portal datasheet continues not to work. This has been brought to the attention of IT. Please refer to the letter in the documents section of the Portal (uploaded multiple times).

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019:

Yes. To be checked against the Endorsement Letter when resubmitted.

5/2/2019:

Yes. The Dominican Republic is fully flexible.

Agency Response Endorsement letter has been re-uploaded to the portal.

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019:

Yes. To be checked against the Endorsement Letter when resubmitted.

5/2/2019:

Yes. The Dominican Republic is fully flexible.

Agency Response

Endorsement letter has been re-uploaded to the portal

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response**Project Preparation Grant**

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019:

Yes. At CEO Endorsement stage please adjust the Duration of Accounting to 20 years as per our guidelines.

Agency Response**Core indicators**

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019:

Yes

Agency Response

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019 SW:

Please uncheck the following boxes: Focal areas, protected areas and landscapes, biomes, influencing models, stakeholders, beneficiaries, behavior change [this is not using any behavior change approaches], type of engagement, Enabling Activities.

Please provide justification for the Rio Marker for CCA of 1.

5/2/2019 ABS:

Cleared.

We note that you have had difficulties with entering and saving the correct Taxonomy in the Portal and we have noted that the accurate Taxonomy is uploaded in the GEF Data Sheet.

Agency Response

We unchecked the above in the Portal datasheet, but the Portal is not saving these edits. There is a known issue with the taxonomy field, as confirmed with WB IT on May 1. To avoid further delay, we are resubmitting as is.

Rio Markers for CCA 1 been modified to zero as adaptation is not a significant objective of this project.

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/15/2019 ABS:

Yes, however not all barriers seem to have been included. The text as presented does not refer to any deficiencies in institutional capacity. This is being addressed largely in Component 1.

5/2/2019 ABS:

Cleared.

Agency Response Further explanation on institutional capacity weaknesses for land use planning has been included in PID and in the Project Justification section of the Datasheet.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019 SW:

Not fully.

Please provide additional information on coordination or using lessons learned from existing GEF projects, including those working on cacao and coffee in other parts of the country.

5/6/2019 SW:

Cleared.

Agency Response

It has been further clarified that both coordination and synergy generation with other GEF-6 and GEF-5 projects will be sought during project preparation, and that lessons learned from previous GEF projects and other projects the country is implementing will be used.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019 ABS & SW:

Not fully.

General comments on the biodiversity aspect.

It would be helpful to have more specific information on the biodiversity values that will benefit from this work. The description does not need to be long, but any details on why DR's freshwater biodiversity is important would be helpful. Also, beyond humpback whales – what can be found in Samana Bay for biodiversity? How about montane biodiversity where the restoration work will be done?

Specific comments:

Component 1

- please specify what is meant by 'strengthening capacities' of government entities. Is it training and/or provision of land assessment and monitoring tools/software or something else?
- How will the sub-watershed level land use planning process be used to inform the district and national level planning process. How will this activity be catalytic? What is the existing national or policy framework?
- There is mention of 'Generation of information about biodiversity; land suitability; land degradation (soil erosion and salinization); water balances; GHG emissions for targeted landscapes' Please clarify the use of the information. Will it be used to inform the land use plans, or the SLM/restoration mechanisms to be implemented?

Component 2

- Please indicate the added value of the GEF investment in this research? Is it going to inform a specific policy or strategy, further investment opportunities, facilitate south-south exchange and knowledge sharing with other System of Rice Intensification (SRI) or non-SRI countries? Please specify.

- A key element of upscaling is access to finance and inclusion of other actors in the supply chain such as traders. Please indicate how this is being addressed and consider the sustainability factor.
- What SLM interventions will be carried out with small holder farmers beyond the demonstration sites?

Component 3

- The title of this component is different between the PID and the Portal.
- How will the project ensure that these changes are sustainable?
- How will the project use these activities to catalyze larger change?
- How will areas for restoration be selected?

5/6/2019 ABS &SW:

Responses are noted.

However, in reference to the biodiversity values of Samana Bay – and the explanation provided on the importance of working on water quality because of a Critically Endangered gecko. The justification provided needs to be improved as geckos don't live in the water and the listed threats are habitat loss. The other option would be to remove the specific reference.

During the PPG and at CEO Endorsement we would like to see:

- an expanded description of the linkages between project activities and biodiversity benefits.
- Component 1- additional information on how the sub-watershed level land use planning process will be used to inform the district and national level planning process as well as demonstrate how it will catalyze change or improvements;
- Component 2-additional details on how other aspects required for scaling up, such as access to finance will be dealt with in the project or if it is being addressed by other initiatives;
- Component 3- additional details on how the project will use these activities to catalyze larger change

5/10/2019 SW:

Cleared

Agency Response

Specific comments have been addressed in PID by providing further detail.

Under component 1, both governance and technical capacities of key stakeholders in charge of land use planning decision making will be strengthened. This will include, on the hand, workshops and training to strengthen coordination about key entities and create awareness about the importance of mainstreaming ecosystem considerations into land use planning. On the other hand, it will include: (i) assessments of biodiversity; land suitability; land degradation; water balances, and GHG emissions; (ii) technical training to use key information for land use planning and to monitor the implementation of land use plans; (iii) and equipment for key local agencies. Further detail has been included in PID to clarify this.

For component 2, a clarification has been added to the PID indicating that research and its dissemination will contribute to create awareness about SRI technology and promote further investment opportunities by farmers to adopt technology, as well as to inform policies from the Ministry of Agriculture oriented to support the rice sector.

As explained in the text, beyond visits to demonstration sites, farmers will receive technical assistance from extension services, that will help them adopt the SRI system.

For component 3, comments have been addressed in PID.

Title has been corrected in the portal.

The PID provides a general explanation on how restoration areas will be selected: Site prioritization will take into account prioritized areas under the FCPF ER-Program and under the National Action Program to Fight Desertification (PAN-LCD); and farmers will participate on a voluntary basis.

5/7/2019 TTL/WB CU

Thank you for your comments. Reference to Critically Endangered gecko is removed from both PID and PCN.

Project team will include more information following your recommendations during project preparation (expanded description of the linkages between project activities and biodiversity benefits. -Component 1- additional information on how the sub-watershed level land use planning process will be used to inform the district and national level planning process as well as demonstrate how it will catalyze change or improvements; Component 2-additional details on how other aspects required for scaling up, such as access to finance will be dealt with in the project or if it is being addressed by other initiatives; Component 3- additional details on how the project will use these activities to catalyze larger change

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019:

Please see comment above under Question 1, Part I – Project Information Focal area elements.

5/2/2019 ABS:

Cleared

Agency Response This has been addressed by including LD subobjective 1-3.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019:

Not fully. Please see additional comments on the alternative scenario re the Research activities.

5/2/2019 ABS:

Cleared

Agency Response This has been addressed in PID.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019:

Yes

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019 ABS & SW:

Please include information in relation to innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project .

This project would benefit from considering how it can promote the scaling-up of project outcomes beyond the life of the project. For instance, improvements in farmer production and sustainability should yield greater farmer incomes and therefore not need as much support from outside resources to help implement. How will the project build on this?

5/2/2019 ABS:

Cleared.

Agency Response This has been addressed in the sub section "Value-Added of GEF Involvement in the Project Demonstrated through Incremental Reasoning" in PID.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019:

Yes

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019:

Yes

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019:

Yes. Please ensure that gender considerations are factored into Table B.

5/2/2019:

Noted. At CEO Endorsement, please ensure additional details on gender are factored into Table B, the Project Context and project description.

Agency Response

We understand that at this stage gender considerations do not need to be included in Table B because of harmonized templates with World Bank.. However, as explained in the PID, gender considerations are an important component of the project and Project will be Gender Tagged, following WB guidelines

5/7/2019 TTL/WB CU

Thank you. We will ensure that more details on gender are included in the Table B and relevant project documents at the endorsement stage

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019:

Yes

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019:

Please consider climate change/climate vulnerability factors in the risk section.

5/2/2019 ABS:

Cleared

Agency Response Climate related risk factors have been included in PID.

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019:

Please provide further details on how the project will be coordinated at the national level as well as possible coordination with other related non-Bank and non-GEF funded projects.

5/2/2019 ABS:

The revision has been noted. At CEO Endorsement stage we expect to see additional details on how the project will be coordinated at the national level as well as possible coordination with other related non-Bank and non-GEF funded projects.

Agency Response

The coordination with other GEF Projects has been further explained in the PID.

5/7/2019 TTL/WB CU

Thank you.

At CEO Endorsement stage project team will provide additional details on project coordination at the national level and to the extent possible on coordination with other related non-Bank and non-GEF funded projects.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019 SW:

Not fully.

Please include information about how this project aligns with DR's NBSAP.

5/6/2019:

No, the project documents still lack any reference to DR's NBSAP. Please include how the project is aligned with the NBSAP.

5/10/2019 SW:

Cleared.

Agency Response

The requested information has been included in PID.

5/7/2019 TTL/WB CU

Thank you. Reference to relevance and linkages to DR NBSAP 2012 is provided in the project documents (PID and PCN)

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019:

Yes

Agency Response

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019:

Please re upload the Endorsement Letter as we are getting an error message when trying to access it.

5/2/2019 ABS:

Cleared

Agency Response Endorsement letter has been re-uploaded, but despite this we also get an error message. This has been brought to the attention of IT. It is saved multiple times in the documents section of the Portal.

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/12/2019:

Our policy team has identified a minor discrepancy with the PIF submission. The BD figure in Table A does not match the BD figure in Table D. Please also ensure that the BD figures in the PID, GEF Data sheet and the PCN also align.

Please correct and resubmit for clearance.

5/13/2019:

Cleared.

The PIF and PPG are technically cleared and recommended for PIF approval.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/6/2019:

During the PPG and at CEO Endorsement we would like to see:

- an expanded description of the linkages between project activities and biodiversity benefits.
- Component 1- additional information on how the sub-watershed level land use planning process will be used to inform the district and national level planning process as well as demonstrate how it will catalyze change or improvements;
- Component 2-additional details on how other aspects required for scaling up, such as access to finance will be dealt with in the project or if it is being addressed by other initiatives;
- Component 3- additional details on how the project will use these activities to catalyze larger change
- Ensure additional details on gender are factored into Table B, the Project Context and project description.

-Additional details on how the project will be coordinated at the national level as well as possible coordination with other related non-Bank and non-GEF funded projects.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/17/2019	4/30/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/6/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/10/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/12/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/13/2019	