

**Required Report:** Required - Public Distribution

**Date:** December 14,2020

**Report Number:** DR2020-0019

**Report Name:** Agricultural Biotechnology Annual

**Country:** Dominican Republic

**Post:** Santo Domingo

**Report Category:** Biotechnology and Other New Production Technologies

**Prepared By:** Virgilio Mayol

**Approved By:** Tiffany Landry

**Report Highlights:**

The Dominican Republic continues to be a strong market for U.S. bulk agricultural products (corn), intermediate goods (soybean meal), and high value consumer-oriented products (processed food products), reaching a total export value of \$1.4 billion in 2019. Despite a 2015 law that explicitly states the need for mandatory labeling of genetically engineered (GE) products that could potentially affect imports of GE raw materials, the law has yet to advance along the path to implementation and is not expected to do so in the short term.

## Section I. Executive summary

The Dominican Republic (DR) represents an important destination for U.S. feed grains, oilseeds, and processed food products. Although the DR has signed the Cartagena Protocol and a 2015 law which would restrict imports of genetically engineered (GE) products, the Government of the Dominican Republic (GoDR) has never actively sought to restrict such imports and has given no indication that it intends to do so.

Currently, the DR does not produce any GE crops or animals, nor are there any under development at this time. In recent years, however, more than a dozen crops have been reproduced in the DR via low-tech tissue culture, thereby contributing significantly to ensure crops, such as plantains and bananas, are resistant to pests and diseases. Additionally, there is no use of microorganisms to produce products with an economic value for commercial sale.

## Section II. Plant and Animal Biotechnology

### CHAPTER 1: PLANT BIOTECHNOLOGY

#### *PART A: Production and trade*

##### *a) Product development:*

N/A

##### *b) Commercial production:*

There is no biotech production in the DR, and the country does not plan to pursue it at this time. Several years ago, mid-sized local corn producers from the northern DR publicly requested that the Government approve the use of GE products in order to address the competitive challenges posed by large-scale corn imports. Similar requests have been repeated from time to time. Local producers have questioned the “inflexible” position of the Dominican Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) in prohibiting imports of corn seeds and other genetically engineered products that could help increase their productivity. However, the GoDR has not shifted its position on this matter.

##### *c) Exports:*

N/A

##### *d) Imports:*

The supply of almost all coarse grains and soybean products in the DR originates from the United States, Brazil, Argentina, and other markets where GE strains are common. Therefore, the poultry, swine, and dairy industries rely heavily on GE feed inputs for livestock development and finishing. The DR’s food processing industry also continues to rely heavily on U.S. soybeans, corn, and other oil to meet its needs.

Currently, no GE-specific import requirements are being enforced. Previously, the GoDR required that phytosanitary certificates accompanying corn shipments state that the product “does not contain GMO material.” However, this requirement was not enforced except for a brief episode in 2015 when MoA stopped two U.S. corn shipments, demanding certification stating that the product “does not contain GMO material.” After complaints from private industry, MoA permitted the entry of the product and committed to removing this requirement from the general corn import requirements. Later in 2015, the requirement was formally removed.

At this time, Post is not aware of any efforts by the GoDR, private importers, or Non-Government Organizations (NGOs) to actively exclude GE products. Despite a 2015 law that explicitly states the need for mandatory labeling of GE products, and which could potentially affect the importation of GE raw materials, the law has yet to advance along the path to implementation and is not expected to do so in the short term. (Please see below section on labeling.)

The following table captures export values for selected U.S. agricultural products to the Dominican market during calendar year 2019 (CY 2019):

**Export values of selected U.S. agricultural products to the DR, CY 2019**

<b>Product</b>	<b>Export value (in thousands of US\$)</b>
Soybean meal	184,376
Soybean oil	90,395
Corn	64,058
Other vegetable oils	15,723
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>354,552</b>

*Source: GATS, USDA*

*e) Food aid:*

Historically, the DR has not been a regular recipient of food aid. However, in recent years, the country has received food aid from the United States. During 2011, through the Food for Progress (FFPr) Program, the DR received a donation of 13,400 MT of soybean meal, which was monetized in the DR to carry out a bi-national program with Haiti. Also, in 2015, 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020, the DR received donations of soybean oil, yellow grease, and tallow for two FFPr programs being implemented in the DR. The presence of GE material has not been an issue in the country’s acceptance of these programs, nor are they expected to be a point of contention in the future.

*f) Trade barriers:*

As described above, the DR previously had rules in place that required phytosanitary certificates accompanying corn shipments to state that the product “does not contain GMO material.” However, this requirement was removed in 2015, and the country continues to import large volumes of corn of both U.S. and South American origin (usually in excess of 1.4 million metric tons annually).

## ***PART B: Policy***

### ***a) Regulatory framework:***

The Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MIMARENA), the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA), and the Ministry of Public Health (MSP) work together on the development and implementation of the national biotech policy. For example, the MoA (specifically its Plant Health Department) is responsible for regulating and assuring the safe entry of plant products into the country. This institution also collaborates and coordinates with the MSP on health-related issues concerning GE materials.

Several other public sector entities comprise a commission that meets periodically to discuss scientific aspects pertaining to biotech policy recommendations:

- ***The Institute for Research in Agriculture, Livestock and Forestry (IDIAF):*** This entity is supported by the GoDR, and its main objective is to conduct research in agriculture and forestry in the DR, and also to validate those research results.
- ***The National Council for Research in Agriculture and Forestry (CONIAF):*** This Council is a decentralized entity that seeks to strengthen, stimulate, and guide research efforts within the realms of agriculture and forestry. It offers financing through research grants and works closely with both the public and private sectors.
- ***The Center for Agricultural and Forestry Development (CEDAF):*** This Center is a non-profit organization that promotes sustainable development of the agricultural, livestock, and forestry sectors through training, informational courses, and workshops, as well as conducting sectoral analysis for the purpose of defining strategic goals. Its primary focus is to render agriculture more competitive, decrease poverty levels, and protect the environment.
- ***The Institute for Biotechnology and Industry Innovation (IIBI):*** Backed by the GoDR, the IIBI promotes technological development to enhance the DR's trade competitiveness in areas such as biotechnology and capacity building. It also manages the Centre of Vegetable Biotechnology (CEBIVE) to produce high quality plants with pest and disease resistance and endurance from environmental factors. The CEBIVE has established propagation lines of production of several plant varieties, such as bananas, plantains, orchids, etc.

In addition to the institutions above, the commission also includes participation from three of the country's leading universities, namely: 1) the Pedro Henriquez Ureña National University (UNPHU); 2) the Institute for Higher Learning in Agriculture (ISA); and, 3) the Autonomous University of Santo Domingo (UASD).

b) Approvals:

There is no approval process for GE events. Therefore, there are no lists of approved/registered plants/crops for import, export, or domestic cultivation.

c) Stacked or pyramided event approvals:

The GoDR does not require approval for stacked events.

d) Field Testing:

No domestic cultivation is allowed, including field testing.

e) Innovative Biotechnologies:

N/A

f) Coexistence:

In the DR, the coexistence between GE and non-GE crops is not regulated by the government, and current rules and regulations do not address this issue. The country is party to the Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) between the EU and the CARIFORUM countries and exports large quantities of organic bananas, cocoa, and coffee to the European market.

g) Labeling:

The DR does not require GE ingredients or content to be labeled on processed products. The current labeling requirements are found in [RTD 53 \(NORDOM 53\)](#), which is formally a technical regulation, but has only been partially enforced since 2008. That regulation follows the [Codex Stan 1-1985](#) and states that labeling should be in the Spanish language and meet other technical requirements but does not include any GE-specific requirements.

However, Article 33 of [Law 219-15 on Biotechnology Security](#), approved in 2015 and described below, requires that “*all products that are derived from GMOs must be properly identified through labeling.*” However, since it is not reflected in RTD 53, and Law 219-15 does not have separate implementing regulations, this labeling requirement is currently not being enforced.

h) Monitoring and Testing:

The DR is not testing for GE content.

i) Low Level Presence Policy (LLP):

The DR has no LLP policy.

*j) Additional Regulatory Requirements:*

None.

*k) Intellectual Property Rights (IPR):*

N/A, no domestic commercial cultivation.

*l) Cartagena Protocol ratification:*

In 2006, the DR became a signatory to the Cartagena Biosafety Protocol, and the Ministry of Environment and Natural's (MIMARENA) Biosafety and Forestry Directorate is the entity responsible for coordinating policy at the national level. MIMARENA is also responsible for drafting legislation and technical regulations regulating genetic resources and biosafety.

In 2015, the Dominican Congress approved [Law 219-15 on Biotechnology Security](#). The text creates a regulatory framework that encompasses national policy for biotechnology, an administrative and regulatory system for importing GE material, and a decision-making support system, coupled with a mechanism to facilitate social participation and consultation. The law calls for the creation of a National Commission for Biotechnology (CONABIO), formed by several ministries and private sector organizations, before beginning its implementation. The commission was created in 2017, but it has only met informally. Each institution that is a part of the commission, and with competence over specific topics (for example Ministry of Commerce on labeling), is expected to draft norms and regulations to implement the law. To date, draft norms and implementing regulations have yet to be drafted. However, legislation aimed at implementing the Cartagena Protocol has the potential to adversely affect trade in products comprised of GE material since labeling is contemplated in the proposed text.

The Dominican Congress also approved [Law 333-15 on Biodiversity](#) in 2015. The law creates a regulatory framework to conserve and promote sustainable use of biodiversity. So far, the country has not made progress in its implementation.

Both of the 2015 laws described above were in response to the DR's signing of the Nagoya Protocol. This protocol's stated objective is the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources, thereby contributing to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.

m) International treaties/Fora:

GoDR officials from the Ministries of Environment and Agriculture participate in international standard setting bodies when funding is available. In August 2019, the country participated in the open-ended working group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework celebrated in Nairobi, Kenya.

n) Related Issues:

N/A.

**PART C: Marketing**

a) Public/Private Opinions:

GE crops and food are not controversial issues in the DR, no active opposition groups exist, and there are no discernable public attitudes one way or another.

b) Market Acceptance Studies:

N/A.

**CHAPTER 2: ANIMAL BIOTECHNOLOGY**

**PART D: Production and Trade**

a) Product Development:

There are no GE animals for food production in the DR, and the country is not conducting research on them.

b) Commercial Production: N/A

c) Exports: N/A

d) Imports: N/A

e) Trade Barriers: N/A

**PART E: Policy**

a) Regulatory Framework: N/A

Animal biotechnology is not contemplated in the biosafety law.

b) Innovative Biotechnologies: N/A

c) Labeling and Traceability: N/A

d) Intellectual Property Rights (IPR): N/A

e) International Treaties/Fora: N/A

f) Related Issues: N/A

### **PART F: Marketing**

a) Public/Private Opinions: None. Not an issue of public debate or concern.

b) Market Acceptance/Studies: None.

## **CHAPTER 3: MICROBIAL BIOTECHNOLOGY**

### **PART G: Production and Trade**

a) Product Development:

There is no use of microorganisms to obtain economically valuable products and/or activities on a commercial scale.

b) Commercial Production: N/A

c) Exports: The DR exports alcoholic beverages, and processed products which may contain microbial biotech-derived food ingredients.

d) Imports: The only microbial biotech-derived food ingredients imported by the DR are those traditionally used in the production of alcoholic beverages, dairy products, and processed products. Likewise, the DR imports alcoholic beverages, dairy products, and processed products which may contain microbial biotech-derived food ingredients.

e) Trade Barriers: N/A

### **PART H: Policy**

a) Regulatory Framework: N/A

b) Innovative Biotechnologies: N/A

c) Labeling and Traceability: N/A

d) Intellectual Property Rights (IPR): N/A

e) International Treaties/Fora: N/A

f) Related Issues: N/A

**PART I: Marketing**

a) Public/Private Opinions: None.

b) Market Acceptance/Studies: None.

**Attachments:**

No Attachments