



Integrated Landscape Management in Dominican Republic Watersheds

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10216

Countries

Dominican Republic

Project Name

Integrated Landscape Management in Dominican Republic Watersheds

Agencies

World Bank

Date received by PM

12/11/2020

Review completed by PM

5/20/2021

Program Manager

Asha Bobb-Semple

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/28/2021:

Cleared.

5/26/2021:

Please see follow up comments below.

-On Project Information: Kindly correct the expected completion date to 08/30/2026 in order to meet the 60 months duration.

1/25/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

5/26/21

Thank you, it was corrected

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/25/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/28/2021:

Cleared.

5/26/2021

Co-financing letters will need to be uploaded.

1/25/2021:

Please attach the co-financing letters.

Agency Response

5/26/2021

Cofinancing letters supporting cofinancing available are uploaded. Cofinancing amount in the datasheet was updated to reflect cofinancing amount supported by the existing letters.

Please note that It has been agreed with Plan Sierra that they will provide complementary resources to the project in the form of co-financing, principally related to agroforestry, though through other activities as well. The Ministry of Environment is currently finalizing the co-financing arrangements with Plan Sierra and expects to be able to update these figures, and include a letter, in the coming weeks. Once agreed and available, this information will be shared with the GEF

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/28/2021:

Cleared and accepted by the Program Manager.

5/26/2021:

On the budget, please see follow up comments below:

-Budget table was uploaded twice in the portal. Please delete one.

-On PMC: there is currently little proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC between the GEF portion and the co-financing portion. We note that the GEF contribution is around 4.6%, however the co-financing contribution to PMC is currently at 0.7%. As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, we encourage you where possible to increase the co-financing contribution to PMC.

1/25/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

5/20/2021

- budget table duplicate was deleted

- PMC on cofinancing was increased to \$700,000 as per consultation with the client.

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/25/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?

Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/18/2021:

Cleared

1/25/2021:

Yes. However, the core indicator table in Annex F, shows changes to the Targets since PIF stage. Please provide justification for the change in the note below the Core Indicator Table.

Agency Response

5/18/2021

Revised Annex F is attached and core indicators worksheet is updated in the online template. with the following explanation of changes in expected results since the PIF stage: Expected results have been revised since the PIF stage given the project has been further refined and intervention areas have been detailed, resulting in more accurate information on the project's activities and expected results. A thorough analysis of

expected results was carried out with multiple stakeholders to analyze the extent and coverage of the project's activities with references and assumptions based on results from existing projects in DR.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/25/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/25/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
5/20/2021:

Cleared

1/25/2021:

Not fully.

-The project describes encouraging the adoption of "improved germplasm". This raises concern with corporate control of seed stocks and upfront input costs for farmers. Who will manage the germplasm and address these issues?

-It is unclear that the extension officers will actually train at/work directly with the model farms. Please clarify.

-Component 3 ? Please include benefits for globally significant biodiversity as one of the criteria/minimum standard in site selection.

--Theory of change ? Please also include some assumptions that are specific to this project and internal to the logic of the project. What are the assumptions that relate to how the activities yield the project results?

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF_STAP_C.57_Inf.04_Theory%20of%20Change%20Primer_0.pdf

Agency Response

5/18/2021

- The adoption of improved germplasm refers to the genetic material in rice available at the national level, including that introduced by public and other research centers, private sector, NGOs, etc. There is no risk in terms of corporate control of seed stocks, as the production and sale of rice seeds is a regulated activity in the country (note: the state produces genetic rice seed and does not produce certified seed). The production and sale of rice seeds is regulated by Law 231 of Seeds of 1971 and its Regulation 271 of 1978, which establish how materials and types of materials are handled. A review of the Law (National Seed Law Project), currently awaiting congressional approval, will establish strict controls on the production, use and commercialization of seeds and will create a National Seed Office.

- Extension agents will participate in the training of technicians and producers in the demonstration plots. As BioArroz is a direct dependency of the Office of the Minister of Agriculture, extension agents already work in partnership with BioArroz through its various regional articulations, and therefore their participation in project activities is guaranteed. In particular, the participation of extension agents will be ensured through the program "Unit of service and agricultural development", which the Ministry of Agriculture has been carrying out since 2014 through the Department of Extension of the Vice Ministry of Extension and Training.

- Benefits for globally significant biodiversity are specified as one of the criteria/minimum standard in site selection. Revised Project Paper attached.

- The following assumptions have been added to the Theory of Change. Revised Project Paper attached.

- o Farmers will adopt improved rice production practices and producers will adopt agroforestry approaches.

- o Basin Committees will be established and functional, having the appropriate mandate to manage the watershed in an integrated manner.

- o Baseline data is accurate and effectively disseminated and incorporated in governance documents and selection criteria.

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/25/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/25/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/18/2021:

Cleared

1/25/2021:

Yes

Please specify the adaptation benefits as RIO Marker 1 was selected to Adaptation.

Agency Response

5/18/2021

Specifically, the project aims to improve the management of ecosystem goods and services to reduce natural resource degradation, impacts of poor territorial planning, and the country's vulnerability to droughts and floods, through interventions related to sustainable agricultural production and water consumption. To accomplish this, the project promotes inter-institutional collaboration for water and landscape management, which will ultimately strengthen the country's risk management and adaptation systems. Furthermore, through the ILM-LDN approach, the project will support the development

of a long-term vision and visible collaboration among different groups of stakeholders to achieve multiple landscape objectives. The latter typically include agricultural production, provision of ecosystem services (such as water flow regulation and quality, pollination, climate change mitigation and adaptation, cultural values); protection of biodiversity, landscape beauty, and recreation; and local livelihoods, human health, and well-being.

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/18/2021:

Cleared

1/25/2021:

We note the narrative on innovation mechanisms to facilitate sustainability and potential scale up. Please clarify what are the mechanisms being put in place for continuity of the Mancomunidades Planning Offices and the Basin Committees and where will they be anchored to ensure this continuity.

The same point applies to the training at different levels. Will a training of trainers program be put in place to ensure training can continue if necessary after the project ends?

Agency Response

5/18/2021

- The approach to work with mancomunidades (groups of neighboring municipalities) and Basin Committees are innovative approaches though they have a basis in law and existing structures. While implementation of integrated watershed management is relatively novel in the Dominican Republic, this approach has been tested in Yaque del Norte and Yuna, including through the Madre de las Aguas mancomunidad and the basin-level secretariat Presidential Commission for the Yaque del Norte River (CRYN). The Government is excited by the results and relevance of the Madre de las Aguas mancomunidad and the CRYN and hope to use this project to scale up this approach. Furthermore, the creation of Basin, Sub-basin and Micro-basin Committees is regulated by MARN's resolution 0022-2020. It should be noted that the selection of mancomunidades that will develop Strategic Plans for Mancomunal Territorial Development will be informed by the Social and Environmental Characterization. These

Plans will be the first-of-their-kind and to mitigate the risks that they will not be implemented, the Government noted the need for Mancomunidad Planning Offices (anchored in MEPyD) to oversee these efforts. To secure sustainability of these Offices, the Government will provide in-kind resources for their operation ? the project will provide some capacity building and equipment support as well. The project plans to initiate project activities related to mancomunidades and Basin Committees as early as possible, providing enough time for these to be functionally activated for the project.

- Yes, training activities are focused on government officials responsible for training and engaging farmers, producers, and communities on various aspects of the project. This will include training for government agencies that will implement and disseminate integrated landscape and watershed management approaches, Basin Committees that will oversee these integrated approaches, extension service officers and others who will train farmers and producers on good practices for sustainable production.

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/25/2021:

Yes

Agency Response
Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
N/A

Agency Response
Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/18/2021:

Cleared

1/25/2021:

Yes

Please incorporate the list/table of stakeholders engaged during design and planned for implementation in the portal submission.

Agency Response

5/18/2021

The following Table describes main project stakeholders, as well as their roles with regards to the Project: This table was entered in the relevant section of the online template.

Stakeholders	Mandate and relevant roles in the project
Project Implementation Unit (PIU) ? Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources.	The Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources will be the implementing agency and designated recipient of the GEF resources, which will establish a Project Implementation Unit (PIU). PIU will continue to administer project funds, supervise compliance with safeguard policies and carry out procurement and financial management (FM), as well as provide oversight of all project activities.

Ministry of Environment, and Natural Resources (MARN), Ministry of Economy, Planning and Development (MEPyD), and Ministry of Agriculture (MAG), including IDIAF.	Co-executing agencies. For the proposed project, the Inter-institutional Agreement with these institutions will be amended to reflect the execution of specific activities according to their technical area of expertise. MARN is the public agency responsible for the formulation of national policy related to the environment and natural resources and for ensuring sustainable use and management of renewable natural resources. MARN is also the GEF focal point. MEPyD is Responsible for land use planning and plays a key role in determining financial flows, national budgets and so on, with the relevant roll of Land Use and Territorial Planning Directorate (DGODT) in Component 1 implementation. MAG is Public agency responsible of the formulation and implementation of agricultural policies. It supports producers to improve their competitiveness and access to markets. The active involvement of this Ministry will be key for the effective implementation of the Component 2 and 3.
Steering Committee (SC)	The SC will be composed by the ministries of the Environment and Natural Resources, Agriculture; and Economy, Planning and Development (MEPyD). The Ministry of Environment will preside over. The SC makes strategic decisions to guide the implementation; approves the Operational Annual Plan and the Budget.
Consulting Committee (CC)	The CC will be integrated by a group of technical officers from different departments within the Ministries of the Environment (Protected Areas and Biodiversity, Forest Resources, International Cooperation, Social Participation and Gender); Agriculture (Viceministries of Planning and Extension, Bioarroz, and the Agroforestry Unit); MEPyD (Land Use Planning Directorate and the Water Board), and others such as IDIAF, INDRHI, Presidential Commission for the Yaque del Norte River Basin, GTI, FEDOM, Biodiversity Table, FAO, IICA, INDOCAFE, Cocoa Commission, Plan Yaque, Plan Sierra, Producers Associations, and Irrigation Boards. The CC ensures coordination and synergies among the different stakeholders involved, under the approach of Integrated Landscape Management.
MEPyD's National Water Coordination Board	Multisector national body in charge of coordinating entities and action to ensure water security in the country, and in charge of designing a National Strategy for Integral Water Management. This body will have an advisory role during project preparation and the and the project expected to strengthen it as a way to improve governance for land use planning.
Basin Committees	Basin Committees will be established under Component 1, based on some existing local multi-stakeholder committees to coordinate integral water management at the local level to improve governance for land use planning. It will include groupings of neighboring municipalities and multi-stakeholder groups such as water users and regulators at various levels to facilitate collaboration. Basin Committees will be essential for identifying potential for alignment, incentives, and coordination for resource use as well as advice and support to municipalities for territorial development and planning.
Municipal governments	Responsible for overseeing land-use management at local level, within their areas of jurisdiction. The involvement of these local governments is relevant for the design and implementation of the project, particularly for activities under component 1.
Rice producers' organizations, farmer associations, community action boards organizations	Rice, cocoa and coffee producers' organizations, local communities and rural users of natural resources are direct beneficiaries of the project in terms of enhancing capacities for governance systems, land use planning issues, and technical assistance.

Communities / vulnerable groups	The SEP includes a detailed information of each population and establishes specific measures for participation and activity implementation. Depending on the territorial particularities of each of the project activities, the relationship with these organizations will be developed, always opting for the most participatory, representative and transparent communication channels.
CSO	Civil society organizations promote and implement agricultural and environmental initiatives; and have a role in generating territorial organizational structures. They have been consulted during the project design and to participate in governance structures that the project aims to strengthen under component 1. Several NGOs are project partners on the ground, while others support the dissemination of project results and alignment with regional and national sustainable development strategies.
Other agencies and interested parts	The Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been developed during project preparation and provides detailed mapping with regards to key government agencies at a national and local level.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/25/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/25/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/18/2021:

Cleared

2/16/2021:

Not fully.

-Improved productivity can drive the conversion of natural habitats as the opportunity cost of maintaining natural habitats grows/farmers have greater resources. How will the project work to prevent these unintended consequences?

Agency Response
5/18/2021

The project mitigates the risks of improved productivity leading to increases in natural habitat conversion through its ILM approach which is further bolstered and governed by intersectoral governance and coordination bodies and approved integrated land use plans. Environmental Agendas will be developed for Yaque del Norte and Yuna through a participatory approach and will outline the long-term vision for the watersheds, including plans for production, conservation, and restoration. These will be further detailed and elaborated through Strategic Plans for Territorial Development which will outline how the Environmental Agenda is operationalized. Basin Committees facilitate dialogue, decision-making, communication, and knowledge sharing for land use planning and management at the landscape level. These Basin Committees will include groupings of neighboring municipalities and multi-stakeholder groups such as water users and regulators at various levels to facilitate collaboration and to ensure the long-term vision of the watersheds is maintained as documented in the Environmental Agenda. Furthermore, Mancomunidad Offices will coordinate the implementation of the Strategic Plans for Territorial Development. These efforts to govern and enforce integrated landscape management to prevent further habitat change and degradation will be supplemented by support directly to producers to increase their productivity in the

areas available to them now and to restore degraded areas to improve ecosystem functions in the watersheds.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/25/2020:

Yes

Agency Response
Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/25/2021:

Yes

Agency Response
Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/18/2021:

Cleared

2/16/2021:

-Yes, this has been elaborated in various sections of the PAD with the deliverables and timeline for the corresponding project component provided in the Monitoring & Evaluation Plan.

-We would recommend a specific connection with the work on ibis rice for learning and knowledge sharing.

Agency Response

5/18/2021

The intention is to use the results obtained in the demonstration plots to link the rice producers, the producers of surrounding farms, and technicians from the private sector and MARD to generate knowledge and learning based on demonstrated experience in the field. This approach will allow for knowledge exchange leveraging the scientific knowledge and technical skills of IDIAF, BioArroz and MARD as well as the practical experiences of the producers and all other stakeholders linked to Component 2 and other components of the project.

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/25/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/25/2021

Yes, the budget for M&E is included in the overall budget.

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/25/2021

Yes

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/25/2021:

No

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/25/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/18/2021:

Cleared

1/25/2021

No. Please add a note explaining the changes to the Core Indicator targets (See question 7) and GEF focal area programming objectives since the PIF stage. The GEF Data Sheet submitted in 2019 has an additional focal area programming objective (specifically included LD1-3) which is no longer included in Table A.

Agency Response

5/18/2021

Table A is edited to add LD1-3 objective. The project is expected to support restoration which could fall under LD-1-3, however, this depends on the selection of sub-projects that will be carried out during project implementation and will not be confirmed until then. Restoration would be carried out under Component 3 through 1-3 sub-projects, depending on selection, for restoration and protection of riverbanks, wetlands, and riparian forests and/or the restoration of degraded and fragmented forest ecosystems. Sub-projects could also focus on agroforestry as well.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/25/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/25/2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/25/2021

Yes

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/25/2021

Yes

Agency Response
Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
N/A

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/28/2021:

All follow up comments have been addressed. The project is technically cleared and recommended for CEO Endorsement.

5/20/2021:

All comments have been addressed. The project is technically cleared and recommended for CEO Endorsement.

2/16/2020

Not at this time. Please address the comments above.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	2/16/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/20/2021	

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)	5/26/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/28/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations