

## PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR) FY 2021

**GEF - IDB  
PIR # 3**

**IMPORTANT: The reporting period is GEF Fiscal Year (July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020, to June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2021)**

### PROJECT GENERAL INFORMATION

<b>Project Name:</b>	Managing the Human-Biodiversity Interface in the Southern Marine Protected Areas of Haiti				
<b>Project's GEF ID:</b>	9803	<b>Project's IDB ID:</b>	HA-G1036	<b>Overall Stage:</b>	Disbursing (From eligibility until all the Operations are closed)
<b>Country/ies:</b>	Haiti				
<b>GEF Focal Area:</b>	Climate Change, Biodiversity				
<b>Executing Agency:</b>	MINISTÈRE DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT				
<b>Project Finance:</b>	Total disbursements of GEF Grant resources as of end of June 30th, 2021 (cumulative)				US\$350,000.00
<b>Project Dates:</b>	Date of First Disbursement				5/1/2019
	Agency Approval Date				8/30/2017
	Effectiveness (Start) Date				1/11/2018
	Original Last Disbursement Expiration Date <sup>1</sup> (OED)				7/11/2021
	Current CED				8/25/2021
	Estimated Operational Close Date <sup>2</sup> (EOC)				11/23/2021
<b>Project Evaluation:</b>	Actual Date of EOC, if applicable				
	Mid-term Date (Expected)				N/A
	Terminal evaluation Date (Expected)				7/21/2022

<sup>1</sup> For the GEF, this is equivalent to the project's "Expected Completion Date".

<sup>2</sup> For the GEF, this is equivalent to the project's "Expected Financial Closure Date".

## DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE RATING (DO) & ASSESSMENT

Make an overall assessment and provide a rating<sup>3</sup> of “likelihood of achieving project objective” during the period (2020-2021). Describe any significant environmental or other changes attributable to project implementation.

**Project Objective:** The general objective of the project is to contribute to improving the conservation and management effectiveness of the Grosse Caye/Zone humide d'Aquin and Olivier/Zanglais MPA. The specific objectives are to: (i) improve fishery management in MPAs; and (ii) mitigate climate change through critical ecosystems restoration.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT (DO)	RATING
<p>Despite the progress made between 2019 and 2020 on the contractual engagement of teams and firms, to perform critical product activities, contractual approaches could not be completed until the summer of 2021. Thus, only awareness activities were conducted during 2020 and 2021.</p> <p>Although essential, these activities do not allow for the concrete achievement of the restoration objectives set by the project, particularly for marine ecosystems. Concerning the coastal ecosystems (mangroves), restoration activities should begin in the summer of 2021, which will allow the project to partially achieve its environmental objectives. These activities will take place in the last year of the program, which will also limit the anticipated cumulative impacts.</p> <p>To maximize the positive environmental externalities, the implementation will focus on mangrove restoration rather than marine ecosystem restoration since it requires less experimental interventions that are difficult to conduct in the current fragile context. The classification has therefore been changed to Unsatisfactory (U)</p>	U

## PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

Between June 2020 and June 2021, Project implementation has advanced on the procurement processes for critical products (CO2 and Mangroves). However, these processes could not be concretized (not signed) because of the health and socio-political situation in the country but also following a questioning of the activities by the Ministry. Finally, after several consultations, these processes should be signed in August 2021.

These processes condition the extension that the project will have to request since the last disbursement date was July 11, 2021. Given the exceptional circumstances (assassination of the President on July 7), the bank authorized a 45-day extension to allow the Ministry to provide all the necessary justifications.

<sup>3</sup> See Annex 1: Definition of Ratings.

**With the extension request, a focus on priority activities for the next 12 months will be made:**

1. **On the operational side**, With the arrival of the new administration (which was replaced again in July 2021) several evaluation missions were conducted to improve the implementation of the project. During this evaluation period, it was decided by the Ministry to suspend the new commitments. This situation led to heavy delays in execution especially concerning critical products, so the procurement was fully conducted.
2. **On the technical side**, regarding the **Component 1**, focusing on the management of fisheries, that will be developed at the end of 2020 and in 2021, the following activities have been conducted:
  - a. An awareness and training plan on protected species has been developed. It will be conducted by teams from the Ministry accompanied by NGOs specialized in the field. Due to insecurity and travel difficulties, these activities could not be implemented.
  - b. The project team collaborated with the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) Haiti team to finalize the MPA management plan. The firm initially hired for this work did not continue its contract due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the inability to travel to Haiti. The management plan should be ready by the end of 2021 and will include the fishery access plan.
  - c. The team identified alternative economic activities (beekeeping) that could be financed in the communities most dependent on coastal and marine ecosystems.
3. **The Component 2** aiming at preserving coastal and marine ecosystems has been identified as a priority for 2020-2021.
  - a. The procurement process for the realization of the MPA CO2 ecosystem methodology has been launched in 2020 and should be finalized in August 2021.
  - b. The procurement process for the preservation and restauration of the mangroves have been launched in 2020 and should be finalized in August 2021.
  - c. Field missions were conducted by the technical team to identify potential restoration sites as well as communities to be specifically targeted under the preservation plan. Those communities, most of which have an extractive use of natural resources, will also be those targeted as a priority for experimenting with alternative economic activities. Regarding these activities, the following ones have already been identified: beekeeping, salt farming and aquaculture. These visits have notably allowed to update the diagnosis and specially to identify the areas of new pressures (hotel construction and mangrove cutting).

## IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING (IP) & ASSESSMENT

Insert here an assessment and provide ratings<sup>4</sup> of overall Implementation Progress, including information on progress, challenges, and outcomes on project implementation activities from July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2020, until June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2021. **As applicable, please include information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19.**

OVERALL ASSESSMENT (IP)	RATING
<p>Despite the progress made between 2019 and 2020 in strengthening project management and execution, the level of implementation is unsatisfactory (U).</p> <p>There are several reasons for this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The entire team (technical and administrative) is located in the south of the country. In 2020-2021, numerous insecurity problems have isolated the project from the capital on several occasions (blocked roads) leading to chronic and systematic administrative blockages (signing of documents at the central level).</li> <li>Changes in administrations at the central level do not facilitate ownership of the processes (different teams between procurement and contracting) which slows down commitments.</li> <li>The project supervision unit has limited capacity to anticipate risk factors despite supervision support.</li> </ol> <p>To mitigate all these external and internal factors, a planning workshop was held in June 2021 (see Overall Risk). It facilitated the prioritization of activities even if it meant that some activities had to be cancelled and therefore, in the end, it would not be possible to achieve all the objectives set (see Likelihood of Achieving Project Global Environmental Objective). Finally, following this workshop, it was recommended to extend the project by 12 months (July 2022) to implement the activities identified as priorities. Thus, the Date of the TER was changed to July 2022 instead of July 2021.</p>	U

## RISK RATING & ASSESSMENT

Make any adjustments necessary to the assessment ratings<sup>5</sup> of overall Project Risk<sup>6</sup> that you provided in the last PIR (2019-2020). Please include details and remedial measures for High and Substantial Risks, specifying who will be responsible for these measures.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT (RISK)	RATING
<p>In the wake of the deterioration of the socio-political context, institutional instability, and the COVID-19 pandemic between 2020 and 2021, the risk indicator has been re-evaluated at High (1). In fact, despite the technical and administrative strengthening efforts, few activities have been carried out (mainly awareness raising activities). Numerous delays have accumulated and in view of the remaining implementation time (12 months) it seems impossible that all the project objectives will be achieved.</p>	H

<sup>4</sup> See Annex 1: Definition of Ratings.

<sup>5</sup> See Annex 1: Definition of Ratings.

<sup>6</sup> These should include risks identified at CEO Endorsement AND any new risks identified during implementation.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT (RISK)	RATING
<p>Considering this, a planning workshop was organized in June 2021 to define the measures that will ensure the achievement of two critical outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Outcome Statement: Increased CO2 storage capacity of Marine Protected Areas ecosystems</li> <li>b. Outcome Statement: Strengthened national and local authorities' capacities in monitoring CO2 storage.</li> </ul> <p>The prioritization of activities was done according to the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Contracting process launched.</li> <li>b. Capacity of operators to execute in a context of fragility (presence of local firms).</li> <li>c. Level of readiness of activities (focus on operational and not experimental).</li> <li>d. Capacity of the Ministry to supervise.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, it was decided to strengthen the supervision of the project implementation team by involving the Ministry's technical teams at the central and local levels. The involvement of these teams will take place from the planning of activities to facilitate ownership and avoid delays due to a lack of inter-institutional communication as in the past.</p> <p>Finally, all current contracts have been revised (especially those involving international firms that can no longer travel to Haiti since 2020) to adapt the modalities of intervention: remote support, strengthening of local teams and sometimes cancellation of activities.</p>	

## STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Please add information on any progress, challenges, and outcomes with regards to stakeholder engagement, based on the project's activities during its implementation through the 2020-2021 GEF Fiscal Year. **As applicable, please include information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19.**

A kick-off meeting was held in July 2019 to present the project and its objectives. Since then, an important communication work with other stakeholders and partners of the Ministry of Environment (MDE), the National Agency of Protected Areas (ANAP) and the IDB in the project area was conducted to facilitate the implementation of the project and promote synergies in the area.

Field missions have also been conducted to identify local stakeholders and communities to be integrated in the activities of the project.

The steering committee for protected areas was scheduled to meet in May 2020 but the meeting was postponed indefinitely due to the COVID-19 crisis and insecurity. It is also important to note that the project area in the south of Haiti is increasingly landlocked due to insecurity problems restricting travels from Port au Prince and growing problems of access to electricity and telecommunications.

## GENDER

Please add information on any progress, challenges, and outcomes with regards to any and all gender-responsive measures that were undertaken in the project's activities during the 2020-2021 GEF Fiscal Year. Also: Were indicators on gender equality and women's empowerment incorporated in the project's results framework? (Yes/No). If applicable, include the indicator with its baseline, target, and current value (2020-2021).

During outreach activities, teams ensured that all communities were targeted, including women.

Regarding the restoration of mangroves to come, it is expected that the restoration plan will consider the women's communities in the implementation modalities.

## KNOWLEDGE

Please add information on knowledge activities and products developed in relation to the project (with GEF or non-GEF resources), with special emphasis on activities carried out during the 2020-2021 GEF Fiscal Year. **As applicable, please include information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19.**

The teams have conducted an awareness campaign among local actors on the objectives of the protected area and the contribution of the project to its proper management. (output 1.3).

During the planning workshop in June 2021, it was decided to strengthen awareness activities, especially in the schools of the beneficiary communities. This will include the presentation of coastal ecosystems and their roles for the communities (fishing, protection of the coast ...). To do this, the project will rely on the experience of the Ministry of Environment and its local partners.

## PROJECT MODIFICATIONS

Please report any significant modifications made to the project design since July 1st, 2020. (The basis for comparison is the Project Results Framework Matrix included in the original Request for CEO Endorsement Document.) This should be based on the Project Results Framework Matrix included in the original Request for CEO Endorsement Document.

CATEGORY	YES/NO	APPROVED BY	DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE AND EXPLANATION
Objective	No		
Outcome	No		
Output/Activities	No		
Other	No		

## EXTENSIONS OR OTHER MODIFICATIONS

Has the project been granted any extension or other modification covered by the OA-420 from July 1st, 2020, until June 30th, 2021? If yes, please explain below. **As applicable, please include information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19.**

Yes. Given the exceptional circumstances (assassination of the President on July 7), the IDB authorized a 45-day extension to allow the Ministry to provide all the necessary justifications.

In addition, although project implementation has advanced on the procurement processes for critical products (CO2 and Mangroves) during 2020-2021, these processes could not be concretized (not signed) because of the health and socio-political situation in the country but also following a questioning of the activities by the Ministry. For this reason, in order to implement the activities identified as priorities, the project team will have to request a 12-month extension. Thus, the Date of the TER was changed to July 2022 instead of July 2021.

## LESSONS LEARNED / BEST PRACTICES

If the project generated any lessons learned or best practices during the 2020-2021 GEF Fiscal Year, please provide a short description. **As applicable, please include information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19.**

### Findings:

The project is carried out far from the capital where the Ministry of the Environment is located. This lack of proximity does not facilitate the appropriation of the project by the central teams which causes delays and sometimes even mistrust.

### Recommendations:

When a new ministerial team arrives, it is essential to revalidate the project supervision process and identify the focal points for each institution involved.

### Challenges:

As the project is launching his activities, its presence on the field is so far limited. However, the different field missions, conducted to prioritize project activities and areas of intervention as well as to identify communities to work with, have helped to identify important challenges for the project.

Hence, many agricultural activities in the project area (especially rice cultivation) have developed to the detriment of mangrove ecosystems, which have been destroyed for land use or fuelwood production. However, these activities are now threatened directly by the by the salinization of the land and rising sea levels. Communities directly threatened by these phenomena are therefore now demanding the restoration of ecosystems, especially since similar mangrove restoration operations have been carried out in other areas of southern Haiti. There will therefore be a balance to be found between the restoration and preservation of ecosystems and the preservation of economic and agricultural activities.

## **ANNEX 1. DEFINITION OF RATINGS**

### **Development Objective Ratings**

1. **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
2. **Satisfactory (S):** Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
3. **Marginally Satisfactory (MS):** Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits.
4. **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU):** Project is expected to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives.
5. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.
6. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

### **Implementation Progress Ratings**

1. **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of **all** components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
2. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of **most** components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action.
3. **Marginally Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of **some** components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with **some** components requiring remedial action.
4. **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of **some** components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with **most** components requiring remedial action.
5. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of **most** components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
6. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of **none** of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

### **Risk ratings**

Risk ratings will assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risks of projects should be rated on the following scale:

1. **High Risk (H):** There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
2. **Substantial Risk (S):** There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.
3. **Modest Risk (M):** There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/ or the project may face only modest risks.
4. **Low Risk (L):** There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/ or the project may face only modest risks.