



## Project Implementation Report (PIR)

FY 2022

GEF - IDB

PIR # 4



**IMPORTANT:** The reporting period is GEF Fiscal Year (July 1st, 2021, to June 30th, 2022)

### 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 operations are closed)
<b>Country/ies</b>	Haiti				
<b>GEF Focal Area</b>	Biodiversity, Climate Change				
<b>Executing Agency</b>	MINISTÈRE DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT				
<b>Project Finance</b>	GEF Trust Fund	\$1,826,485			
	Co-finance at CEO Endors./Approv.	\$ 10,600,000			
	TOTAL Project Cost (GEF Grant + co-finance)	\$12,426,485			
<b>Disbursements</b>	GEF Grant disbursed as of end of previous fiscal year	\$350,000			
	GEF Grant disbursed as of end of this fiscal year	\$1,123,472			
<b>Project Dates</b>	Agency Approval Date	08/30/2017			
	Effectiveness (Start) Date	1/11/2018			
	First Disbursement Date	5/1/2019			
	Expected Completion Date (in Convergence: OED)	7/11/2021			
	Current Closing Date (in Convergence: CED)	11/25/2022			
	Expected Financial Closure Date (in Convergence: EOC)	2/23/2023			

	Actual Date of Closure (in Convergence: CO)	
<b>Project Evaluation</b>	Mid-term Date (Planned)	N/A
	Mid-term Date (Actual)	N/A
	Terminal evaluation Date (Planned)	12/31/2023
	Terminal evaluation Date (Actual)	

### Development 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.

### Development Objective Rating (DO) & Assessment

#### PREVIOUS RATING

#### NEW RATING

Despite the progress made in 2021 with the signature of two major contracts regarding the preservation of the mangrove, the level of execution of the project remains very low. Several activities from the first component of the project had to be cancelled. The classification has therefore, been established still as Unsatisfactory (U).

U

U

### Project Status Update

In June 2022, the project is in its final months of implementation, with a project completion date of August 25, 2022. A Special Extension Request (up to 3 months) is being discussed to insure the closing of the operation. If this extension is granted, no new commitments will be made after 08/25/2022.

Between June 2021 and June 2022, significant progress has been made in the implementation of the second component of the project (regarding the preservation of mangroves) while the activities concerning the first component had to be revised downwards given the short time remaining for execution. The activities of component 2 have been targeted within the 2021-2022 previous extension, as those to be carried out in priority. With this, the implementation unit followed the planning established. The following sections detail the implementation context, the operational situation of the unit and the level of progress of the activities.

Despite this progress, concerns have been raised regarding the quality of the service provided by one of the operators in charge of the mangrove restauration. Indeed, the PMU is conducting an evaluation of the work done and one of the options is the termination of the contract due to the lack of quality and progress as agreed. This potential termination will negatively affect the achievement of the objectives initially set.

Execution context: The project's progress has been made in an increasingly deteriorated national context, with Haiti facing an exacerbated political, security and economic crisis. Two contextual elements are particularly relevant here to understand the state of execution of the project:

- The gang war raging in Port-au-Prince has a strong impact on the southern peninsula of the country where our project is taking place. The peninsula is hence cut off from the rest of the country and travel to the capital has become very difficult.
- On August 14, 2021, the South Peninsula was hit by a powerful earthquake affecting the area of execution of the project. This greatly affected the project team (local destroyed) and deteriorated the already difficult living conditions of local communities. Following this

earthquake, it was decided by the Ministry of Environment to focus on activities directly benefiting the local communities.

Operational aspects: With the arrival of a new minister in July 2021, better collaboration between the Ministry of Environment and the execution unit were established. A Ministry focal point participates in weekly activity planning meetings. However, the executing unit encountered significant operational difficulties during the year with the resignation of its administrator in December 2021 and is facing difficulties in recruiting a contracting specialist.

The team has been working at full strength since March 2022 and has suffered from these various movements in terms of human resources.

Technical aspects:

- On component 1, two activities had to be cancelled due to the limited execution time remaining: i) the guidelines in implementing fishery regulation tools in marine protected areas and ii) the implementation of the fisheries management plan. Regarding the pilot alternative economic projects, they were redefined to integrate the impacts of the earthquake. Two main activities should be executed within the execution's remaining timeframe: i) the development of beekeeping in the mangroves and ii) the valorization of sea products through the purchase of fishing gears promoting sustainable fishing and conservation equipment.
- On component 2, the methodology for assessing carbon storage by mangroves has been developed, and PMU staff trained in its use. It could be used for other Haitian mangroves. The mangrove restoration plan for the marine areas of Aquin Saint-Louis du Sud has been developed and is currently being implemented. The plan has been approved. However, its implementation might not be possible if the contract of the operator is terminated for a lack of quality and performance.

Implementation Progress		
Implementation Progress Rating (IP) & Assessment	PREVIOUS RATING	NEW RATING
<p>Important steps were realized by the end of 2021 with the implementation of the activities on the mangroves and the completion of activities on the field as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Launch of mangrove restoration activities (restoration plan and planting activities);</li> <li>- Finalization of training related to the proper management of marine protected areas and coastal ecosystems;</li> <li>- Finalization of the development of the CO2 methodology and associated training;</li> <li>- Identification and initiation of procurement processes for community-based activities in support of communities affected by the 2021 earthquake and dependent on marine protected area coastal ecosystems.</li> </ul>	U	MU

Therefore, the progress of the project has been rated Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU) for fiscal year 2022.		
--	--	--

## Project Risks

Project Risks		
Risk Rating (RISK) & Assessment	Previous Rating	New Rating
<p>The project's implementation has taken place within an increasingly deteriorated national context, with Haiti facing an exacerbated political, security and economic crisis. Two background elements are particularly relevant to understand the state of the execution of the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The political turmoil and violence in the streets of Port-au-Prince has had a strong impact on the southern peninsula of the country where our project is taking place.</li> <li>- The earthquake on August 14, 2021, which mainly affected the area of execution of the project. This led to focus on activities directly benefiting the local communities.</li> </ul> <p>To address these socio-political risks, the project and the IDB have put in place the following mitigation measures that will be applied until the end of the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adapted and scenario-based planning related to the risks.</li> <li>- Weekly planning supervision meetings</li> <li>- Prioritize market survey of suppliers and service providers available to work in this context before the launch of the procurement process</li> <li>- Prioritization of activities with a local focus and a strong operational character</li> </ul>	H	H

## Stakeholder Engagement

Following the 2021 earthquake, which affected the area of intervention of the project, many requests have been made to the project team to support the recovery plan (both at the local and national levels). From experience, the implementation unit has engaged in a dialogue with communities and local authorities to define needs and, above all, to clearly explain what can and cannot be supported by the program. It is based on these exchanges that the end-of-project priority activities (Action Plan) were established.

Recommendations: The ongoing situation in Haiti, once more highlights the importance to establish the trust from local communities and stakeholders since the beginning of the project as it is crucial to secure their support and ownership of the Program even in the most chaotic or circumstances.

## Gender

There are no specific gender indicators defined in the project results matrix.

Recommendation: A milestone indicator could have been added to track the gender dimension throughout the project.

## Knowledge

The carbon methodology developed for this project is relevant to other Haitian mangroves. It was specifically designed to consider the difficulties of collecting local data and to be used by protected area managers.

Recommendation: Since this methodology must be valued by the Ministry, the accessibility of the tools created must always be taken into account, to facilitate their appropriation and dissemination.

## Lessons Learned / Best Practices

For some implementation units, planning should not only be done on the scale of an annual operation plan but also on a much tighter monthly or weekly basis. Supporting this tighter planning will facilitate the execution of activities.

Recommendation: More regular activity monitoring meetings should have been held between the execution unit and the Ministry to identify potential bottlenecks and set forth implementation priorities.

## Challenges

Adaptation, readiness and flexibility: these three elements are key factors for the conduct of the project in the current fragile context. Indeed, with the socio-political unrest and insecurity, the project has been "isolated" on several occasions because the access road to the South was blocked. These repeated events have had serious effects on the implementation, sometimes leading to the cancellation of contracts for firms that could no longer travel to the site.

Faced with this, the team has had to revise the modus operandi on several occasions to maintain the achievement of objectives while proposing solutions adapted to the context. For example, the participation of local partners in all groups of firms is requested. Furthermore, all activities are phased, and implementing partners are asked to maintain this "milestones" approach.

With the earthquake of August 14, 2021, the project's resilience will be further challenged during the final year of implementation.

The balance between decentralization of implementation and centralization of authority is sometimes difficult to maintain in a context of fragility. The entire project team (management and technicians) is located in the implementation area in the South of Haiti. With the successive crises since 2020, access to the capital has been blocked and impossible for several weeks. The only means of access to Port au Prince, and therefore to the central Ministry for the signing of documents and approval of the strategic directions of the program, is the plane. Not only does this considerably increase operating expenses, but it also has a strong impact on the pace of implementation, depending on the

accessibility of the capital. The project has found itself isolated several times because of this lack of accessibility. It is therefore necessary to find a balance between delocalization and the autonomy of local teams without becoming totally isolated from the central level.

A technical director based in project implementation area should be granted sufficient decision-making powers, such as the ability to sign contracts and payment orders, to limit the administrative constraints that slowed down the implementation of the Program. In addition to this decentralization, it is imperative to promote ownership of the project by the central Ministry (to avoid isolating the project) by designating a focal point at the central Ministry level who will be responsible for liaising between the project and the Ministry's management.

### **Project Results Framework Modifications**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>YES NO</b>	<b>APPROVED BY</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE AND EXPLANATION</b>
Outcome	2019	NO	IDB	NONE
	2020	YES	IDB	Update Baseline and/or Baseline Year (when there was a previous value): Initially the year of reference was 2019, however the project was approved in 2018. Thus, the date has been updated.
	2021	NO	IDB	NONE
	2022	NO	IDB	NONE
Output/Activities	2019	NO	IDB	NONE
	2020	NO	IDB	NONE
	2021	NO	IDB	NONE
	2022	NO	IDB	NONE

### **Project Extension or Other Modifications**

A Special Extension Request (up to 3 months) is being discussed to insure the closing of the operation. If this extension is granted, no new commitments will be made after 08/25/2022.

## **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.



