

## Building Resilience in the Wake of Climate Disasters in Southern Haiti

### Basic Information

**GEF ID**

10175

**Countries**

Haiti

**Project Title**

Building Resilience in the Wake of Climate Disasters in Southern Haiti

**GEF Agency(ies)**

UNEP

**Agency ID**

UNEP: 01624

**GEF Focal Area(s)**

Climate Change

**Program Manager**

Fareeha Iqbal

# PIF

## Part I – Project Informatic

### 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

Yes, it is aligned with LDCF strategic objectives CCA-1 and CCA-2.

#### Agency Response

### 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

FI, 10/19/2020:

Cleared, thank you.

FI, 10/15/2020:

Further information is requested:

- a) Climate change projections: The WB reference provided is from 2011, nearly 10 years ago. Is there more updated information available?
- b) In the context of COVID-19, please discuss whether and how the project can contribute toward green recovery and building back better.

c) Thank you for submitting a Theory of Change. Can you please integrate within it indication of which climate vulnerabilities/problems are being targeted by the proposed actions?

FI, 3/24/2020:

Thank you. Cleared.

FI, 3/9/2020:

Please delete the second-last para of section A1.6, which contradicts the beneficiary information of the last (highlighted) para.

FI, 4/26/2019:

Thank you. Cleared.

FI, 4/19/2019:

Further information is requested.

The Table B components appear sound and clear. However:

a) This is a resubmission of a pipelined project from GEF-6. While the funding request has been reduced (and one originally-proposed project site now omitted), it is not possible to determine how this project was revised and updated to reflect changes on the ground that would surely have occurred in the intervening two years. The agency is requested -- as is requested for all resubmitted pipelined proposals -- to provide a summary of changes and updates made that reflect the current realities and needs on the ground (such as changed status of baseline projects, etc.).

b) The agency has not provided information on scale of adaptation benefits, expected number of beneficiaries, etc. The excel file must be submitted that includes project metadata as well as indicative values for the Core Indicators for adaptation, disaggregated by sex.

### **Agency Response**

UNEP, 10/16/2020:

a) The information on climate projections has been updated with more recent sources (p. 8 of the PIF).

b) Information on how the project can contribute to toward green recovery and building back better in the context of COVID-19 has been added on p. 30-31 of the PIF.

c) The "intermediate states" and the "goal" in the Theory of Change diagram have been revised (p. 47 of PIF), to indicate the drivers of vulnerability (ecosystem degradation) as well as the climate impacts which are targeted by the project interventions.

UNEP, 3/11/2020:

The second-last paragraph of section A1.6 has been deleted from the portal entry

UNEP, 10/31/2019:

- a) There have not been major changes on the ground since the technical clearance of the GEF-6 project in February 2018. The only major substantive change made to the project design is the reduction in the number of sites from three to two: one coastal/marine, and one terrestrial. The selection between the initial two coastal/marine sites was made based on the selected site (Barraderes and Cayemites) being ecologically more varied (including reefs and mangroves, and in addition to the coastline, also small islands with vulnerable populations). The project budget as well as the quantitative targets in outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 were reduced accordingly, to account for the reduction in the number of sites. The formulation of several outputs in Components 2 and 3 was revised to improve their focus on results, and to strengthen connections between outputs and outcomes in the project Theory of Change. The project intervention strategy and planned activities have remained unchanged. The two baseline projects are still ongoing and relevant.
- b) The Excel file containing project metadata and indicative Core Indicator values has been completed and submitted.

## 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

FI, 4/14/20:

Cleared.

Comment from PPO, April 6,2020:

Table C: There is substantial co-financing from UNEP, based on parallel donor funded projects. In this case, please provide the name of the entity that provides the co-financing, rather than the name of implementing Agency for the project (UNEP).

11/18/2019:

Cleared.

10/3/2019:

Proposed co-finance from UN Environment (\$100,000) is extremely low. We strongly encourage GEF agencies to contribute larger amounts

of grant finance to demonstrate country commitment, especially in highly vulnerable LDC SIDS.

6/5/2019:

It is not yet clear how UNEP intends to support the implementation of this project and the achievement of the project objective with the level of Agency engagement as indicated in the proposed baseline and co-financing.

FI, 5/6/2019:

Not yet. We have noticed that UN Environment has not proposed any of its own co-financing toward this project, which is unusual. Please include co-financing from UN Environment toward this project.

4/26/2019:

Cleared.

FI, 4/19/2019:

Further information is requested.

The agency is requested to please identify whether the listed sources of co-finance are investment mobilized or recurrent expenditure.

## **Agency Response**

UNEP, 4/14/2020

The names of the entities that provide the co-financing from the two donor-funded projects implemented by UNEP have been inserted (instead of "UNEP"). Agency Response All listed sources of co-finance are recurrent expenditure.

UNEP, 10/31/2019:

An additional \$350,000 of co-financing from UNEP has been identified and detailed in the PIF. For the previously identified \$11.3M of UNEP co-finance, the cofinancier identified in Table C of Part I has been changed to UNEP, to clarify that these funds are implemented by UNEP. The total UNEP co-finance currently identified for the project is therefore \$11.65M, and overall co-finance is \$12.65M (or a ratio of 1 : 2.7). There are several other potential UNEP and other co-finance opportunities that will be further explored at PPG phase, including the recently-established Haitian Biodiversity Fund (FHB) outlined in the PIF.

UNEP, 23/9/2019:

As the two baseline projects are both UNEP-implemented initiatives, the proposed LDCF project will benefit from significant support from UNEP in its implementation and in the achievement of its objectives. Of the total co-financing of \$12.3M, initiatives implemented by UNEP

account for \$11.3M. The PIF provides information on how the proposed project will build on and link with the two baseline initiatives, and how its implementation will be enhanced by the investments made by them. Of particular relevance is the recent establishment of the Haitian Biodiversity Fund (FHB), which was officially created in May 2019 with support from UNEP provided through the Macaya Grand Sud project (one of the two baseline projects). The FHB aims at facilitating funding in the medium and long term for initiatives and actions carried out by local stakeholders for the conservation and preservation of biodiversity in Haiti. The creation of the Haitian Biodiversity Fund will contribute significantly to the implementation of the LDCF-project, as it is the key to bridging the financial gap to support the overall sustainable development in the Barraderes & Cayemites as well as the Macaya sites. The French Development Agency has pledged for a financial commitment amounting to 13 million USD to the FHB ([link](#)), in addition to 10 million USD pledged by the German Development Bank (KfW) ([link](#)). In terms of next steps, World Bank will now be supporting staffing and operations of the legally established entity, and UNEP will continue its assistance in capacity building, strategic planning and resource mobilization through the Macaya Grand Sud project. Information on the FHB and its establishment has been added in the PIF (under the description of the Macaya Grand Sud baseline project).

UNEP, 5/7/2019:

Co-financing from UN Environment has been included towards the project: USD 100,000 from the Global Adaptation Network (GAN). It should also be noted that all listed sources are investment mobilized, with the exception of the Government co-finance.

## **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**

Yes.

**Agency Response**

**The STAR allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

N/A

**Agency Response**

**The focal area allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

N/A

**Agency Response**

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes. Haiti is an LDC and eligible to access resources under the LDCF.

**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**

Yes, PPG has been requested and is within the allowable cap.

**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**

FI, 3/9/2020:

Cleared.

FI, 11/8/2019:

Please remove all indicator values entered in the online Core Indicators table, as this table currently only records indicators associated with the GEF Trust Fund. For the LDCF/SCCF, the supplied excel file suffices for now.

FI, 4/26/2019:

Yes. However, please see comment for item 6 of Part II.

FI, 4/19/2019:

Further information requested.

Please submit the excel file that includes project metadata as well as indicative values for the Core Indicators for adaptation, disaggregated by sex.

## **Agency Response**

The Excel file containing project metadata and indicative Core Indicator values has been completed and submitted.

UNEP, 23/9/2019:

Following consultations with the UNEP Haiti Country Office, the expected number of beneficiaries has been increased to 21,000. This considers also the populations in the immediate vicinity of the project intervention areas, that can be expected to directly benefit from the restoration of ecosystem services resulting from the project interventions. This figure accounts for the particular significance of the Macaya site as the source of all rivers in the Southern region of Haiti (10,000 beneficiaries), as well as the relatively higher population density of the Barraderes & Cayemites site (11,000 beneficiaries). These figures are still approximations, that would be further defined during the PPG phase.

UNEP, 5/7/2019:

The number of direct beneficiaries has been increased to 8,000, and the split between male/female beneficiaries has been corrected to 50/50.

UNEP, 5/5/2019:

6000 direct beneficiaries is equivalent to about 30,000 indirect beneficiaries, taking an average household size of 5, which follows the trend for other LDCF programming. The number of proposed direct beneficiaries will be more closely defined and, if possible, increased, in the PPG phase.

## **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**

Yes.

**Agency Response**

**art 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**

Yes. The root problem this project seeks to address is that the project zones are highly vulnerable to frequent and severe climate events that threaten local populations' livelihoods, food security and well-being. In order to improve socio-economic conditions, communities are undertaking maladaptive practices which degrade ecosystems and in effect render them more vulnerable in the face of climate events such as storms, hurricanes, droughts and floods, which are increasing in frequency and intensity. In addition, southwestern Haiti (where the project sites will be located) are exposed to extreme climate events such as coastal storms, floods, drought, and rainfall-induced landslides. Further, slow onset climate change will adversely impact agriculture and livelihoods, unless practices are changed. The PIF discusses various barriers to effective adaptation, such as unsustainable land management practices and lack of regulatory enforcement.

**Agency Response**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

FI, 3/24/2020:

Thank you for re-entering the Agency response. This item has been cleared.

FI, 3/9/2020:

(Please re-enter Agency response to earlier comment, which is not visible.)

FI, 4/26/2019:

Cleared. Adequate explanations have been provided.

FI, 4/19/2019:

Further information is requested.

i) Please see comment (a) for review item (2).

ii) Both of the baseline projects that constitute co-finance for the proposed project are being implemented by UN Environment. How will the

agency ensure that rigorous processes are in place to avoid conflict of interest and adhere to strict monitoring and reporting lines across the three projects?

**Agency Response** ii) The three projects will have separate project management teams, as well as monitoring and reporting structures and processes, ensuring that there is no overlap between the monitoring and reporting lines. The two ongoing baseline projects each have their dedicated project teams, including Project Managers and technical experts, as well as Project Steering Committees. The proposed LDCF project will have its own project management team (a joint UN Environment – MDE structure), with a Project Manager, an M&E specialist and a Financial and Administrative assistant, as well as technical experts and advisors. Furthermore, UN Environment Climate Change Adaptation Unit (CCAUC) will provide project oversight to the proposed LDCF project in its role as the Implementing Agency, to ensure full adherence with GEF and UN Environment policies and procedures.

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes. The project proposes to:

- (i) enhance environmental governance that can guide development, sustainability and enforcement of climate-resilient practices;
- (ii) rehabilitate environmental zones so that they may buffer vulnerable communities from negative impacts of floods and droughts and provide greater food security; and
- (iii) provide alternative livelihoods and economic opportunities through resilient value chains that are suited to the project implementation zones.

The components have been structured accordingly. Ecosystem-based adaptation and ecosystem-based disaster risk management measures will be implemented and, due to the topography of the areas as well as nature of issues faced, a ridge-to-reef approach will be adopted.

#### **Agency Response**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes. The proposed project is aligned with the GEF's strategy for the LDCF/SCCF for 2018-2022.

**Agency Response**

**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**

4/26/2019:

Yes, adaptation measures proposed appear to be additional to the baseline project activities.

**Agency Response**

**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**

FI, 3/9/2020:

Cleared.

10/16/2019:

Not yet. The proposed number of beneficiaries remains low relative to the size of the grant. Please address or provide an explanation, or consider reducing the requested GEF grant amount.

6/5/2019:

Not yet. The new adaptation strategy places an importance on systemic impact. Overall, the number of beneficiaries appears to be significantly lower than the majority of GEF-7 LDCF projects that have been technically approved and/or Council-approved. Please indicate the rationale for this and how the project is striving to achieve systemic impact.

FI, 5/6/2019:

Not yet.

(i) The proposed number of direct beneficiaries is still extremely low. As requested on 4/26, the agency is requested to significantly revise.

(ii) Please explain why a 60/40 split has been proposed for male/female beneficiaries (we would expect 50/50).

FI, 4/26/2019:

Adjustment is needed. Thank you for submitting the excel file with Core Indicators and Metadata. Please note that the number of proposed direct beneficiaries is very low for an LDCF grant of this size, which is half of Haiti's LDCF allocation for GEF-7. Please significantly revise the number of proposed direct beneficiaries.

FI, 4/19/2019:

Further information is requested.

Please provide the CCA Core Indicator targets, including expected number of beneficiaries (sex-disaggregated).

## **Agency Response**

The Excel file containing project metadata and indicative Core Indicator values has been completed and submitted.

UNEP, 10/31/2019:

The number of project beneficiaries is at this stage approximated at 100,000 and will be dened in detail at the PPG phase. ÈThis increased figure considers the wider direct benefits accruing, in particular, from (i) the establishment of climate-resilient protected area governance mechanisms and management plans, and (ii) the integration of climate-resilient risk reduction practices, methodologies and procedures in the national and departmental work programmes of the Ministry of Environment (MDE), Ministry of Agriculture (MARNDR) and Civil Protection Directorate (DPC). This is in addition to the population in the project intervention areas and their immediate vicinity, that can be expected to directly benefit from the restoration of ecosystem services resulting from the project interventions.

UNEP, 23/9/2019:

Following consultations with the UNEP Haiti Country Office, the expected number of beneficiaries has been increased to 21,000. This considers also the populations in the immediate vicinity of the project intervention areas, that can be expected to directly benefit from the restoration of ecosystem services resulting from the project interventions. This figure accounts for the particular significance of the Macaya site as the source of all rivers in the Southern region of Haiti (10,000 beneficiaries), as well as the relatively higher population density of the Berrardere & Cavemiteo site (11,000 beneficiaries). These figures are still approximations, that would be further defined during the PPG

Barradères & Cayemiles site (11,000 beneficiaries). These figures are still approximations, that would be further defined during the PPG phase.

5/7/2019:

The number of direct beneficiaries has been increased to 8,000, and the split between male/female beneficiaries has been corrected to 50/50.

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

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes.

This proposed project pilots innovative approaches, such as sustainable woodlots for charcoal harvesting, in areas where this has not yet been tested. The project also aims to establish governance mechanisms in protected areas, in which such structures do not yet exist, aiming to utilize these mechanisms to increase climate resilience in a participatory manner. The project also aims to explore new market linkages and new agricultural practices for green value chains that promote climate resilience and address food insecurity.

On sustainability, the proposed project is partnering with public institutions at different levels to ensure strong ownership; it aims to work with CBOs, including associations and cooperatives, supporting them to establish their own effective management structures during implementation; all of which will contribute to a broad-reaching participatory approach. The project promotes the integration of adaptation considerations into protected area management, which will help inform long-term plans for protected areas.

All proposed activities have potential for scaling up in the broader Caribbean region, particularly those which support ecosystem based adaptation and ecosystem based disaster risk management, as well as coral harvesting. Factors such as similar climate and oceanographic conditions, units of connectivity, similar fisheries and geographic proximity lend themselves well to regional scaling up.

### **Agency Response**

### **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**

Yes for PIF stage. Project areas have been identified on a map.

### **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**

FI, 3/24/2020:

Thank you for re-entering the response. This item has been cleared.

FI, 3/9/2020:

Please re-enter Agency response to earlier comment, which is not visible.

FI, 5/6/2019:

Cleared; thank you for the explanation.

FI, 4/26/2019:

Thank you. Please discuss how UN ENV is confident this project is still relevant and welcomed by all stakeholders.

FI, 4/19/2019:

Further information is requested.

The PIF states that consultations have taken place with communities and civil society groups, as well as private sector representatives. The agency is requested to clarify if these have taken place recently, or only during project identification stage in GEF-6, which would be over two years ago.



## **Agency Response**

UNEP:

The stakeholder consultations mentioned took place during project identification stage in GEF-6 (in 2017).

UNEP, 5/5/2019:

UN Environment has engaged in regular consultations with stakeholders since the submission of the PIF, as UN Environment is executing a project portfolio of about USD 20 million in Southern Haiti, and plays an active role in ecosystem-based adaptation and Eco-DRR activities in this region. The situation in Haiti remains dire, and stakeholders have continued to express an interest for these interventions. The last few months have seen increased political instability and a devaluation of the local currency which has resulted in strained economic circumstances, due to dependency on food imports. The necessity for investing in sustainable livelihoods and value chains has been recently expressed by farmer organizations, civil society organizations (Réhabilitation de l'Environnement (ORE), Peche Artisanale et Developpement Intégré (PADI), SOS Enfants Sans Frontières, Agronomes et Vétérinaires Sans Frontières (AVSF)), as well as social enterprises in the private sector (Aytika SA), departmental extension workers, and governmental representatives (MARNDR, MDE, CIAT).

## **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**

Yes. Though women are visibly involved in economic activities at the project locations, they tend not to benefit economically. The project will seek to support value chains that benefit women, to ensure that women are recipients of trainings, and that they are included in pilots that promote resilient approaches and planning. Indicators from the project will be disaggregated by gender and a gender gap analysis will be undertaken during project preparation to determine solutions that will benefit both men and women.

## **Agency Response**

## Private Sector Engagement

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

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/19/2019:

Yes for PIF stage.

The PIF mentions several aspects of proposed private sector engagement: (i) private sector actors in the vetiver and cacao industries have expressed their desire for having more reliable, climate-resilient production; (ii) private sector actors have highlighted the need for more diversified agricultural products that have undergone some processing (iii) value chain-specific approaches will be taken to engage the private sector, and will involve an inclusive strategy of intervention where the role of the private sector, producer organizations, and community-based organizations will be identified and coordinated at various stages of production.

### Agency Response

## Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

**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

FI, 10/19/2020:

Yes, cleared.

FI, 10/15/2020:

Further information is requested:

- a) COVID-19: In the risk matrix, please describe how risks from COVID-19 have been analyzed and mitigation strategies incorporated into the design. These should consider all aspects of project design and eventual implementation.
- b) The uploaded SRIF shows an overall Moderate Risk rating and states that identified risks will be addressed through community consultations during PPG. How will these consultations occur effectively in the COVID situation?
- b) Climate risks: In the section on climate risks in the online risk matrix (top row), please also discuss climate risks that are not related to extreme events, such as risks posed by changing temperature and rainfall regimes with climate change. Please also discuss proposed mitigation measures for identified risks, as well as the technical and institutional capacity in the country to address climate risks.
- c) If a climate risk screening methodology/tool was applied at concept stage, please submit this.

FI, 4/14/20:

Cleared.

Comment from PPO, April 6, 2020:

Section 5 of the PIF shows that some risks screening has taken place, but at this stage UNEP should be able to provide the completed Environmental, Social and Economic Review Note (ESERN) like other UNEP projects have. UNEP is requested to attach the review note and to indicate more clearly the preliminary overall risk classification of the project, as well as the types and risk classification of any identified risks and impacts, as well as any preliminary measures to address identified risks and potential impacts. The project has intensive community engagement related to forest and land, but the risk section identifies only climate risk. UNEP is requested to also discuss other environmental and social risks.

FI:

Yes.

### **Agency Response**

UNEP, 10/15/2020:

- a) COVID-19 related risks have been added to the risk matrix (p. 36-37), and mitigation measures have been outlined. Most of the mitigation measures have already been successfully employed in Haiti by UNEP during the ongoing pandemic. As a result, and also due to the relatively limited impact of COVID-19 in Haiti to date, the implementation of ongoing UNEP projects has not been severely affected.
- b) The approaches for organizing community consultations in the event of a COVID-19 resurgence have been outlined in the risk matrix.
- c) Climate risks beyond extreme events have been added in the risk matrix. Proposed mitigation measures have been identified and outlined, and the technical and institutional capacity in the country to address climate risks discussed.
- d) A climate risk screening methodology / tool was not applied at the PIF stage. We applied UNEP's Safeguard Risk Identification screening, in which a new Safeguard Standard 2 has been added on climate change risks.

UNEP, 4/14/2020:

The UNEP Safeguard Risks Identification Form (SRIF) (which is being piloted as an updated version of the ESERN) is attached. It identifies the preliminary risk classification of the project as “moderate” and elaborates on the risk identified. The most significant environmental and social risks have been added in the PIF risk table (section 5), and planned mitigation measures have been described. These will be further investigated during the PPG and the SRIF, along with risk mitigation plans, will be screened by the UNEP Safeguards advisor prior to submitting the CEO endorsement package to GEF Sec.

## 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

FI, 3/9/2020:

Cleared for PIF stage; the Ministry of Environment has been identified as the executing partner.

FI, 5/6/2019:

Yes. The agency is no longer proposing to co-execute the project.

FI, 4/29/2019:

The two projects referred to (with this same agency) were Council approved in GEF-5. Recent approvals for Haiti with other agencies do not have co-execution arrangements in place. Again, we encourage the agency to re-consider the proposed execution arrangement.

FI, 4/19/2019:

Justification is required.

The agency has stated that it will co-execute the project with the Ministry of Environment. Implementing Agencies are only allowed to undertake execution functions in very exceptional circumstances, with solid justification provided. In this instance there is neither a request from the Haiti OFP for such a co-execution arrangement, nor is there a precedence for IAs undertaking execution functions among recent Haiti projects that have been Council Approved, or CEO Endorsed/Approved, for either the GEF TF or LDCF. Strong justification for such arrangements will need to be provided, accompanied by a letter from the Haiti OFP for the PIF approval and by CEO endorsement at the

arrangements will need to be provided, accompanied by a letter from the Haiti OFP for the PIF approval and by CEO endorsement at the latest. The agency is encouraged to re-consider the proposed execution arrangement.

### **Agency Response**

Political instability continues to result in extremely high turnover within the Ministry of the Environment. In the past 10 years, Haiti has had approximately 10 Ministers of Environment, together with corresponding changes in government officers at technical and decision-making levels. This has in the past resulted in significant delays in project implementation and in ownership challenges due to (i) the recurring need to brief new leadership on project background and previous institutional engagements; (ii) short-term perspectives at leadership level contributing to fiduciary risks; and (iii) frequent changes in strategic high-level government directions. To manage such risks resulting from political instability, agencies in Haiti are frequently executing or co-executing projects with national counterparts (for example, UN Environment is currently co-executing two GEF projects with Ministry of Environment). The proposed project management arrangements, and specifically the proposed co-execution between UN Environment Country Office and Ministry of Environment (MDE), take into account the specific political circumstances and current capacity in Haiti, as well as the lessons learned from other projects in the country. The PPG will be an opportunity to revisit this proposed co-execution arrangement, and a capacity assessment and fiduciary risk assessment will be carried out. If, after these assessments, co-execution arrangements are still proposed, a clear separation of execution duties and implementation responsibilities will be established and a letter from the OFP will accompany the CEO Endorsement Request. In either case, MDE will appoint a National Director for the project, who will oversee project execution and chair Project Steering Committee meetings. The National Director costs will be covered by co-financing.

UNEP, 5/5/2019:

The reference to the co-execution arrangement has been removed from the PIF. The execution arrangements will be finalized during the PPG phase, based on a capacity assessment of the Ministry of Environment (and other institutions, if relevant). An appropriate partnership model will be identified and put in place to ensure the delivery of an impactful and efficient project.

### **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 on PIF/Work Program Inclusion

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/work Program Inclusion**

Yes, it is aligned with Haiti's NAPA, and the NAP (under development). It is also aligned with Haiti's INDCs and with its *National Policy on Climate Change: The vision of the National Policy on Climate Change*, yet to be formally adopted and which seeks to significantly reduce the vulnerability of Haiti's population by 2030.

#### **Agency Response**

#### **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**

Yes for PIF stage. The PIF outlines KM activities targeting various stakeholders, including learning from other countries in the region.

#### **Agency Response**

#### **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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

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

Yes.

Agency Response

### Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

## Agency Response

## 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

FI, 10/20/2020:

Yes.

FI, 10/15/2020:

Not yet. Please address comments of 10/15/2020 for review sheet item 2 (Table B) and the section on Risks.

FI, April 6, 2020:

Not yet. Please see comment from PPO for item 3 (Co-financing) of Part 1 of the review, as well as PPO comment in the Risks section.

3/24/2020:

Yes.

3/9/2020:

Please address review comments for Part I item 2, and Part II items 2 and Stakeholders section.

11/8/2019:

Not yet. Please see comment for item 6 of Part I (on Core Indicators). The values entered in the online Core Indicators table need to be removed.

6/5/2019:

Not yet. Please see review comments for item 3 of Part I (co-finance), and item 6 of Part II (adaptation benefits/core indicators). The GEF Sec would be happy to engage in a telephone consultation on this project.

10/18/19:



Not yet. Please address comments for item 3 of Part I, and item 6 of Part II of the review.

## **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

1. Please provide information on the Stakeholder engagement plan for the project, including how the communities will be engaged in implementation and their capacity built to provide value beyond the lifetime of the project.
2. KM: Please ensure that a robust plan for knowledge sharing and learning is developed for local communities and ensures that this project provides a genuine opportunity for development of their capacity.
3. Please provide geo-referencing of the project locations.
4. Given that the proposed LDCF project will be implemented in the context of two UN Env baseline projects, and also that UN Env is co-executing the project, the agency is requested to not include a budget request for vehicles or other equipment that can be shared across the projects.
5. Please provide further information on the private sectors actors to be engaged in the project.
6. Please discuss in detail how COVID risks were considered and will be mitigated.
7. Please discuss how the project will help in green recovery and to build back better in the COVID context (while delivering on its primary goal of adaptation to climate change).
8. Please undertake and submit the detailed climate risk assessment as well as information on any risk mitigation measures that were considered and included.
9. Please further elaborate on how the LDCF project will coordinate with and be complementary to the GCF project concept.

#### **Review Dates**

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/19/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/29/2019	10/31/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/6/2019	10/17/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/7/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/8/2019	

## PIF Recommendation to CEO

### Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

#### CONTEXT

This project is aligned with LDCF strategic objectives CCA-1 (increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer) and CCA-2 (mainstreaming adaptation). Haiti is an LDC SIDS with over 80 percent of its population living below the poverty line. It is highly vulnerable to adverse impacts of climate change due to its susceptibility to severe storms and other natural hazards, political instability, and periods of conflict. The project will be implemented in two zones in the southwest of Haiti, Macaya and Barraderes et Cayemites. Both have highly fragile and vulnerable ecosystems whose communities are exposed to hurricanes, cyclones, floods, droughts, landslides, earthquakes and tsunamis. Both zones have been identified by the Government of Haiti as having significant environmental value and have been declared as protected areas but as of yet, there are no marked boundaries or enforcement practices establishing them as such; the project will seek to build on and use the opportunity of these government plans to reduce vulnerability of the populations to adverse impacts of climate change.

#### PROJECT OBJECTIVE

To increase the adaptive capacity and resilience of communities residing amongst fragile ecosystems and vulnerable to recurring climate disasters.

#### COMPONENTS and RESULTS

The project will focus on identifying the most critical climate change related issues facing the communities of the two project zones, Macaya and Barraderes et Cayemites. Multi-stakeholder governance systems will be established; trainings on climate change risk, vulnerability and adaptation provided; and participatory climate resilient management plans developed that embrace ecosystem based

vulnerability and adaptation provided; and participatory, climate-resilient management plans developed that emphasize ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) and ecosystem-based disaster risk reduction (Eco-DRR) approaches. The national and sub-national programs of the Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Agriculture, and Civil Protection Directorate will be supported in inclusion of climate resilient risk reduction practices, methodologies and procedures. Importantly, policy tools will be developed to support national and departmental government in responding to identified risks.

The project will also deliver on-the-ground adaptation benefits. Climate smart agriculture will be implemented on 200 hectares of steep terrain; 30 km of coastlines and 35 km of riverbanks will be rehabilitated through targeted reforestation with climate-resilient coastal and riparian species; small-scale water capture and storage infrastructure will be built; and sustainable woodlots of fast-growing native and resilient species will be established.

Agricultural value chain assessment will be undertaken in the two zones, and training provided on at least one resilient value chain (e.g. castor oil, honey, fisheries, cacao, vetiver). Further, alternatives will be explored to the use of coral and sand for construction, and trainings provided on natural buffers as well as sustainable livelihoods for fishing cooperatives/associations.

Overall, the project is expected to directly benefit 100,000 people (of which, 50,000 will be women), mainstream climate resilience in at least two national or sub-national policies/plans, bring 200 hectares of land under climate resilient management, and train at least 240 people in identifying and managing climate change risk, vulnerability and adaptation.

#### INNOVATION, SUSTAINABILITY, SCALE-UP & GENDER

The project is innovative in seeking to establish formal governance systems for managing the two project zones, with the vision of managing them as protected areas in order to more effectively promote participatory measures that can build resilience of communities.

Efforts towards ensuring sustainability include working with public institutions as well as community-based organizations, associations and cooperatives (e.g., fishing cooperatives); reinforcing or supporting Government policies, such as by integrating climate change adaptation in protected area demarcation and management; heavy emphasis on learning by doing and on trainings targeting various stakeholders; and exploring alternative livelihood options and means of increasing returns from the land as an incentive to ensure better land stewardship. Local communities will be involved in project implementation.

The project's focus on capacity building, its exploration of resilient value chains, and the integration of climate change adaptation in disaster risk management approaches/policies, will all contribute to the potential of the activities to be scaled up/replicated elsewhere in the sub-regions or country.

Strong emphasis will be placed on gender equality; value chains that benefit women will be supported, and women will be recipients of trainings and included in pilots that promote resilient approaches and planning. A gender gap analysis will be undertaken together with a climate change vulnerability assessment during project preparation to determine the main climate change vulnerabilities relating to men and women, and solutions that will benefit each group.

The project will liaise with the private sector to seek opportunities for private-sector investments in supporting post-harvest supply chains.

The project will raise with the private sector to seek opportunities for private sector investments in supporting post-harvest supply chains, specifically in the areas of collection, transportation and distribution to markets.

The LDCF project will complement a proposed GCF project for which a concept has been submitted, which will focus on coffee value chains.

#### COVID-19 RISKS AND OPPORTUNITIES

The project has discussed COVID risks and provided risk mitigation measures. Also, it discusses how the project can offer opportunities in the context of COVID; it will deliver climate change adaptation benefits while contributing toward green recovery and building back better.

These opportunities will be further analyzed during project preparation.