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

**Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation**

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10175
**Countries**

Haiti
**Project Name**

Building Resilience in the Wake of Climate Disasters in Southern Haiti
**Agencies**

UNEP
**Date received by PM**

4/9/2022
**Review completed by PM**

10/28/2022
**Program Manager**

Fareeha Iqbal
**Focal Area**

Climate Change
**Project Type**

FSP

# PIF □
# CEO Endorsement □

**Part I ? Project Information**

**Focal area elements**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 10/20/2022:
Cleared.

5/27/22:
Not yet. Please change the expected implementation start date.

Agency Response

UNEP, 9/30/2022:
The expected implementation start date has been changed to 1 January 2023.

**Project description summary**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEF Sec, 11/9/2022:
Cleared.

Updated comment, 11/4/22:
Not yet.
PMC proportionality: the co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportional with the GEF contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of $21,709,267, the expected contribution to PMC must be around $1,085,463 instead of

$859,285 (which is 3.9%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which in this case means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and/or the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach similar proportions. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

5/27/22:
Yes.

Agency Response
UNEP, 11/8/2022:
The co-financing contribution to PMC has been increased to USD 1,087,899 (5%) to reach similar proportions with the GEF contribution.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response
**Co-financing**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEF Sec, 11/9/2022:
Cleared.

Update, 11/4/22:
Not yet: In the co-finance table, please change the organization for CECI to "Other" (instead of Civil Society Organization).

10/20/22:
Cleared.

5/27/22:
Not yet.
a) Table C includes miscategorizations across each row. Please consult the GEF Co-

finance Policy and select the correct categories/labels.
b) The co-finance letters have not been provided. Kindly submit these.
c) As all the co-finance has been identified as 'recurrent expenditure', which translates to in-kind co-finance as per GEF Cofinance Policy, please endeavor to also mobilize investment (e.g., through grants).

### Agency Response

UNEP, 11/8/2022:
The classification for CECI has been changed to ?other? in the co-finance table.

UNEP, 9/30/2022:
a) The categories in Table C have been corrected, in line with the GEF Co-finance Policy.
b) The co-finance letters have been added in the submission. Please note that co-finance from ILO has been removed. Even so, co-finance is higher than planned at PIF approval.
c) The categorization of co-finance has been corrected (see point a), to indicate that it is in fact investment mobilized.

**GEF Resource Availability**

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

### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 11/9/2022:
Cleared.

Updated comment, 11/4/22:
Adjustment needed. The budget table has been included in the uploaded documents but also needs to be included as Annex E in the Portal template entry for the CEO endorsement. Please upload it, after which any comments may be provided on the budget itself.

5/27/22:
Yes.

### Agency Response

UNEP, 11/8/2022:
The budget table has been added in Annex E of the Portal template entry.

**Project Preparation Grant**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 5/27/22:
Yes.

Agency Response
**Core indicators**

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/20/22:
Cleared.

5/27/22:
Not yet. The values entered in the submitted excel file are ok. However, please fill these LDCF indicator values in in the online Portal entry.

Agency Response
UNEP, 9/30/2022:
The LDCF core indicator values have been added in the Portal entry.

**Part II ? Project Justification**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/27/22:
Yes.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/27/22:
Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/27/22:
Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/27/22:
Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/27/22:
Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/27/22:
Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/27/22:
Yes, these elements have been adequately discussed.

Agency Response

**Project Map and Coordinates**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/27/22:
Yes.

Agency Response

**Child Project**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

**Stakeholders**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/20/22:
Cleared.

5/27/22:
Please provide a brief additional para in the Portal entry on how NGOs and CSOs will be directly engaged in this project, both as beneficiaries and in execution of the project.

## Agency Response

UNEP, 9/30/2022:

An additional paragraph has been added in the Portal entry (in Section 2 on Stakeholder engagement) to complement the information provided on the engagement of NGOs and CSOs as project beneficiaries and partners.

**Gender Equality and Women?s Empowerment**

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

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/27/22:

Yes. A Gender Analysis and Action Plan has been submitted for this project.

## Agency Response

**Private Sector Engagement**

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

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/27/22:

Yes, the private sector will be engaged in identification and strengthening of sustainable, resilient value chains for diversified processed agricultural products.

## Agency Response

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

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

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/27/22:

Yes.

Agency Response

**Coordination**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/27/22:

Yes. The project will coordinate with ongoing or upcoming GCF and other multilateral or bilateral adaptation or related projects/initiatives.

Agency Response

**Consistency with National Priorities**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/27/22:

Yes.

Agency Response

**Knowledge Management**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/20/22:

Cleared.

5/27/22:

Not yet. We appreciate the close scrutiny of lessons learned from other projects, to inform the proposed project. However, please also discuss how knowledge and best practice emerging from the proposed project will be exchanged with all stakeholders. By CEO endorsement stage we expect to see an outline of the communications and

knowledge management strategy. (This was requested in the comments provided at PIF stage, to be considered for CEO endorsement stage.)

### Agency Response

UNEP, 9/30/2022:
The lessons learned tables have been deleted, allowing the KM strategy to be seen more clearly, including information provided on the plans for the dissemination of the knowledge and best practice emerging from the project. The lessons learned tables can be found in the project document, Section 3.1. An outline for the Knowledge Management and Communication Strategy has been added in Section 8 on Knowledge Management, to guide the development (and eventual implementation) of the Strategy as budgeted for under Output 1.6 of the project.

**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

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

### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/27/22:
Yes.

### Agency Response

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

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

### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/27/22:
Yes.

### Agency Response

**Benefits**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/20/22:
Cleared.

5/27/22:
Please discuss how the project will support green and resilient recovery in the face of COVID-related socio-economic impacts.

Agency Response

UNEP, 9/30/2022:
The project?s contributions to green and resilient recovery in the face of COVID-related socio-economic impacts have been outlined in Section 10 (Benefits) of the CEO Endorsement Request.

**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/27/22:
Yes.

Agency Response

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 5/27/22:

Yes.

Agency Response

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 10/20/22:

Cleared.

5/27/22:
Not yet. Similar to the matrix provided for the STAP comments, please include a brief table listing the GEF SEC comments provided during PIF review to be considered at CEO Endorsement stage.

Agency Response

UNEP, 9/30/2022:
A table with responses to the GEF Secretariat comments provided during PIF review has been added in Annex B of the CEO Endorsement Request.

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 10/20/22:
Cleared.

5/27/22:
Please provide these in tabular form as for STAP comments, to enable greater clarity in viewing.

Agency Response
UNEP, 9/30/2022:
The information has been reformatted in tabular form in Annex B of the CEO Endorsement Request.

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 5/27/22:
Yes.

Agency Response
**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 10/20/22:

Cleared.

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 5/27/22:

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 11/9/2022:
Yes.

Updated comment, 11/4/22:
Not yet. Please address comments relating to adjustments needed to PMC and to the cofinance table. Please also upload the budget as Annex E in the Portal entry, so that comments may be provided on it.

10/24/22:
Yes, this is technically cleared for CEO Endorsement.

5/27/22:
Not yet. Please address the review comments

**Review Dates**

| | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
|---|---|---|
| **First Review** | **6/15/2022** | |
| **Additional Review (as necessary)** | **10/24/2022** | |
| **Additional Review (as necessary)** | **11/4/2022** | |
| **Additional Review (as necessary)** | **11/9/2022** | |
| **Additional Review (as necessary)** | | |

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**