

Land degradation neutrality initiative in Southern Haiti

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11238

Countries

Haiti

Project Name

Land degradation neutrality initiative in Southern Haiti

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

4/13/2023

Review completed by PM

4/25/2023

Program Manager

Asha Bobb-Semple

Focal Area

Land Degradation

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

5/15/2023:

Cleared

4/25/2023:

a) Yes

b) Yes, however please reconsider the project classification. Even though the flexibility mechanism is being used, the project is mainly an LD project.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

b) Comment address. The project classification was revised to reflect it is a LD project (which have climate change co-benefits).

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

25/4/2023:

Yes

Agency's Comments

3 Indicative Project Overview

- 3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?**
b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

25/4/2023:

a) Yes

b) Yes

Agency's Comments

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

5/15/2023:

Cleared

5/1/2023:

-Please integrate gender perspectives in Outcome 4 as well

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

Comment Address: A gender perspective was added in Outcome 4. Please see page 18.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

5/1/2023:

5/15/2023:

Cleared

a) Yes

b) On the proportionality of the PMC: the co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$19,483,190 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$974,159 instead of \$692,800 (which is 3.5%). 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. Please make the necessary adjustments.

c) Yes

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

b) Comment Address. Co-financing amounts have been adjusted in the Indicative Project Overview sheet. Please see page 4.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

5/15/2023:

Cleared

4/25/2023:

a)

-Actual data (on the degraded landscapes) would augment the discussion of the problem. Please include.

-Please expand on the climate change context including vulnerabilities and potential future scenarios.

-The information on the drivers is satisfactory for PIF stage. Please expand on these at PPG.

b) Barriers have been identified. Please identify the enablers.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

a) Comment Address.

- Availability to actual data on degraded landscapes is one of the barriers to achieve LDN in Haiti. This was highlighted in the project barriers (please see Information barriers p.11). Information on % and number of hectares considered to be severely eroded was added in section ?1) *Global environmental problems that need to be addressed?* (please see page 5). Please also see information in page 7 on ?Project intervention area and problem to be addressed?:

?The South Department suffers from land degradation due to deforestation and unsustainable agricultural practices (the local population has limited know-how of sustainable land management (SLM) and sustainable agricultural practices. The South Department is ranked second, with 42.9% of its territory affected by land degradation. Deforestation in the department is very high, with the Tiburon ? Port Salut watershed having deforestation in 86% of the slopes above 40%. Main drivers for the deforestation are related to the dependency on firewood (households resort to chopping trees and selling firewood as well) and the lack of alternative livelihood opportunities (tree cutting for land expansion for agriculture and cash generation through firewood or charcoal production and sales, as well as timber sales). For the South Department, the percentage of soils with high risk of erosion range from 50% at Les Cayes basin up to 81% at the Tiburon-Port Salut basin (ranking this watershed four in the country with higher risk of erosion); the deforested area in slopes above 40% at the South, reaches 87% at the Tiburon-Port Salut basin. Accelerated erosion affect the agricultural production cycle and lead to production loss from the highlands to the coastal environment, severely affecting those with a heavy reliance on subsistence agriculture?.

- Climate change context was enhanced in section ?1) *Global environmental problems that need to be addressed?*. Please see page 7.

b) Comment Address. A table with how the project aims at addressing the different barriers was added. Please see page 12.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

5/15/2023:

Cleared

4/25/2023:

a) Yes

b) Discussion on resilience to future changes in drivers has not been included. Please consider.

c) Yes

d) Key stakeholders have been identified, however there is no discussion on the private sector in particular those working on provision of finance or credit. Please include.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

b) Comment Address. To ensure interventions and incentives align with current and future drivers of deforestation and land degradation (and climate hazards), the following tools will be used to inform restoration plans (the table below was added in the PIF, in the description of activity 1.1.2.1 *LDN restoration committees created/strengthened in selected landscapes for LDN target setting, to formulate and implement restoration plans*. Please see page 16):

Tool	Application
GIS analysis	To be blended with the data collected through participatory assessment of land degradation and participatory analysis of the land degradation drivers;

Participatory land-use mapping and planning	Will be used to analyze the different land uses and risk zones in the municipalities and to inform landscape restoration plans;
The opportunity mapping tool	Recently applied by UNEP in the South Department, will be used for identifying areas in need of ecological restoration that can deliver ecosystem services for DRR & adjacent areas highly exposed to climate hazards.
Participatory monitoring, evaluating & learning (MEL)	For monitoring the impact of SLM and LDN achievement

In addition, national and local authorities, extensionists and farmers will be supported and will have their capacity strengthened for planning and implementing SLM solutions contributing to achieving LDN and to increase their resilience to climate change.

d) Comment address. A paragraph was added in the Stakeholders subsection page 10, on extension services by the private sector that will be involved in component 3. However, at this stage, the private sector wasn't identified for the provision of finance or credit (to be further assessed during the full proposal development). A GCF co-financed activity in component 3 includes encouraging farmers to adopt diversification strategies by providing them financial incentives through an E-Voucher system.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

5/15/2023:

Cleared

4/25/2023:

a) Yes, please see comments below for revision:

-The project has noted 3 different objectives- in this section, the project overview and the project summary. Please confirm the one that is correct and ensure that it is consistent throughout the document.

-Please correct the references to the LDFA Objectives. The Objectives listed are from GEF-7, not GEF-8. The project aligns with LD Objective 1, 2 and 4.

b) Yes and sufficient for PIF stage, however please see comments below for clarification/consideration.

1. For Output 1.1.1 there is also an opportunity to be explicit in the output name that LDN targets will be defined. Please consider.
2. Output 1.1.2 indicates participatory assessment of SLM practices, but the sole activity (Activity 1.1.2.1) indicates establishment of restoration committees and preparation and implementation restoration plans. There seems to be a mismatch, or the Output could be expanded or split to cover all these areas, please clarify. In addition, Output 1.1.4 refers to landscape management plans. Are these to be developed as well?
3. Output 1.1.4- Please clarify the activities the GEF financing will be covering and please be more specific on the name of the outcome. What capacities will be strengthened?
4. Output 1.1.3- are there plans to work with the Forestry Department, given the deforestation is a major issue?
5. Are there considerations to include an LDN Decision Support system to support the cross-sectoral mechanism?
6. Component 2 indicates an allocation of \$3.4M for restoration of 3719ha of land at a cost of \$809 per hectare. Please explain the value for money of this investment? What are the expected co-benefits in terms of number of persons, potential income, avoided costs.
7. Re Output 2.1.2 *Restoration and management of coastal ecosystem*, please be more specific on where the restoration will take place.
8. Outcome 3.1 refers to work on value chains but it is not clear what that will involve. The narrative is only focused on the small farmers (producer level). Please clarify.
9. How is the project proposing to work around the issue of land tenure?
10. Component 4- Knowledge management and a lack of a systematic process of documenting, sharing and utilizing lessons from past projects was cited as a challenge in the project rationale. How is this project proposing to do things differently?
11. How are NGOs/CBOs and private sector going to be involved to support project implementation overall? The project description does not define their role.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

a) Comment address.

- The project objective is to: 'promote SLM for the recovery and restoration of prioritized landscapes that sustain environmental services and food security'. Please see page 13, 'B. Project description' and page 15 'Theory of change diagram'- Paradigm shift objective. The project objective was adjusted in the summary and project overview sections to ensure consistency- Please see pages 2 and 3.
- LDFA objectives were corrected. Please see page 14, 15 (ToC diagram) and 34.

b) Comment address. Please see each answer below.

1. Added as recommended.

2. The activity title was amended- Please see page 16.

'Activity 1.1.2.1 LDN restoration committees created/strengthened in selected landscapes for conducting participatory assessment, to formulate and implement restoration plans'. The project activity description is already aligned with Output 1.1.2: 'Local farmers' associations will be engaged in landscape restoration committees and their capacities strengthened to conduct a participatory assessment of SLM practices and develop a participatory landscape restoration plan (to be implemented in Component 2)'. The text was corrected in Output 1.1.4 as follows: 'While activity 1.1.2.1 supports the design of landscape restoration plans'.

3. Activities implemented under output 1.1.4 will be co-financed by the GCF. The Output name was amended as follows 'Output 1.1.4 *Capacities and awareness of institutions at local and national levels strengthened to support achieving LDN*'. Capacity of institutions at national and municipal level will be strengthened in terms of collection, management, processing, integration of climate information into sectoral analysis and dissemination of data for investment planning. Currently, data management is not yet automated or systematically performed in Haiti. It is necessary to build capacities to extend the analysis of hydrometeorological information to the sectors of agriculture, livestock, food security, health, fisheries, and water resources management. Enhancing information services for climate change adaptation in these sectors through the introduction and integration of climate and water-related analytical tools will develop government capacity to overcome the current gap in climate and water-monitoring and use of climate information for climate resilient agriculture for progress on achieving land degradation neutrality. This activity will strengthen the capacities of the technical staff from MARNDR and MoE and will result in effective and improved government capacity to manage land use, water resources and information for a climate-resilient agriculture sector, thus contributing for achieving LDN.

4. The forest department is under the Ministry of Environment (MoE), with whom the project will be implemented in close collaboration. the Ministry of Environment (MoE), who is also the National Designated Authority (NDA), is mandated to coordinate and oversee the implementation of the project through the Project Steering Committee (PSC).

5. In activity 1.1.1.1, the project will support the conduction of a baseline assessment on land cover and land cover change, soil organic carbon and land productivity at national and local scales for establishing LDN indicators. LDN indicators will be assessed at the national level and a monitoring system on LDN indicators and implementation will be integrated in a national land use monitoring system. The data collection will be done through multiple sources such as official statistics and surveys (at national and local levels). This baseline assessment will enable providing a scientific ground to define national LDN targets and to develop a strategy involving different sectors for decision

making, defining interventions, achieving and monitoring the progress towards the LDN targets defined. As a complementary action, a participatory assessment and documentation of SLM practices that avoid or reduce land degradation and restore ecosystems and its services will be conducted in Output 1.1.2. The information generated in these activities will be integrated in the monitoring system, providing inputs to decision making and to the evaluation of activities contributing to the LDN targets achievement. The possibility and implications (technically and financially) of implementing a LDN Decision Support system to support the cross-sectoral mechanism in output 1 should be assessed during the PPG phase.

6. The budget allocated for activity 2.1.1.1 - Restoration of 3,338 ha of degraded lands at watershed level through woodlots and agroforestry includes the following categories of investment: Professional/ Contractual Services; Equipment; and Training/ workshops, and conference for putting in place the restoration committees, conduct assessments, and restore degraded lands through woodlots and agroforestry. It is expected that in this activity representatives from existing farmers organizations and institutions are mobilized and have their capacity strengthened to develop and implement consultative and participatory landscape restoration plans through SLM practices. A defining element of the proposed participatory approach is the cost-share strategy which is a key element to guarantee long-term sustainability of restoration activities and SLM practices and secure ownership of the adaptation outcomes over the short and long term. It will provide a baseline for continuing communities' investments in proposed activities beyond project end. The participatory approach will seek project stakeholders' co-investments of time and resources. It will empower local communities to make investment decisions in the use of their land resources, while volunteering their time and effort to implement and monitor project activities. Agroforestry will be promoted to diversify livelihoods and generate profits from non-timber forest products. With a focus on providing sustainable sources of fuelwood, while reducing soil erosion and increasing water infiltration, activities will also focus on the establishment of energy woodlots; the promotion of an appropriate grass and bush cover for soil conservation.

7. Output 2.1.2 *Restoration and management of coastal ecosystem* is co-financed by the GCF and aims to improve the climate resilience of coastal ecosystems and fishing areas by restoring the mangrove, the native sea grape forests and wetlands at the reef level. These coastal ecosystems will benefit from reduced soil erosion and runoff and other restoration and SLM practices in upstream locations outlined in Output 2.1.1 (at the ridge and lowland-level). This output will be implemented by UNEP and will build on its extensive experience on restoration of coastal ecosystems through integrated coastal zone management. This experience includes: (i) working in the project's targeted communities through local organizations of women, fishermen and farmers on mangrove restoration and sustainable livelihoods associated with ecosystems' protection and enhancement, including honeybee pilot models in the mangroves of Saint Jean du Sud and (ii) working in support to the ANAP (national agency for protected areas) on formulating and implementing management plans for Port-Salut-Pointe Abacou and Tiburon-La Cahouane marine protected areas (MPA). The protection and restoration of mangrove forest aims at improving the resilience of coastal communities. This will be achieved by supporting income-generating alternatives (aimed at remedying the economic dependence of local communities on the charcoal production) to restore mangrove plots and avoid deforestation on the low land. Based on lessons learned from UNEP this type of measures needs to consider social and cultural aspects. Charcoal production remains such a profitable activity that it is hardly conceivable for a charcoal producer to abandon this activity in favour of another which requires extensive learning and therefore has a long payback time. Charcoal burners benefiting from the project can turn to alternative activities without producing any significant effect because the majority continue to engage in traditional negative practices. Therefore, substitution activities should be accompanied by support aimed at making traditional activities more effective: i.e. wise use of mangrove

resources, lowland areas designated to be used for planting energy forests ? using fast-growing fuelwood species, and promote the use of fruit trees such as mangos and cashew nuts to increase food security and economic benefits. Critical areas for mangrove restoration and conservation and for forest plantations (firewood) will be identified in a participatory way during the project implementation. This will lead (i) the community to own the initiative and (ii) decision-makers to incentivate climate-resilient coastal development as a cost-effective climate-risk reduction measure. In line with the participatory landscape restoration approach, the project will work with coastal communities that rely on mangrove for charcoal production. The project will build capacities and introduce incentives to local communities to adopt sustainable practices. This will be achieved by increasing their access to alternative businesses -e.g. honey production, mangrove plantation, fast-growing fuelwood species plantations- that, in addition, will open significant opportunities for women to participate in the resulting benefits. The protection and wise use of mangrove resources - along with planting energy forests and enhancing the use of fruit trees such as mangos and cashew nuts - will support the conversion of charcoal burners to beekeeping and foster the planting of honey species around mangroves. All these income generating activities have a number of benefits, e.g.: increase food security and generate alternative income as a safety net in case of disaster. Besides, they aim at reducing the pressure on mangroves and sustaining the implementation of restoration practices. By diversifying livelihoods along the coast with the proposed alternative businesses, the pressure on mangroves will be reduced.

8. Output 3.1.2 ?Targeted SLM-friendly value chains fostered through market linkages, enhancing resilience and socio-economic benefits? in Outcome 3.1 will be co-financed by the GCF and will promote the regeneration, diversification and intensification of mixed agroforestry systems with a focus on increasing yields and supporting and developing staple crops and high-value fruit tree species (particularly mango, cashew, citrus, avocado). In combination with adaptation interventions relating to staple crops, and soil and water conservation techniques learned (in output 3.1.1, financed by the GEF), agroforestry will be promoted at the farm-level with a focus on native or naturalized fruit tree species showing high value chain potential in an effort to diversify livelihoods and generate profits from non-timber forest products which is a national government priority. Access to credit and financial products is essential to help farmers invest in their enterprises, to diversify their economic activities, increase their yields and generate revenue all year-long. All of these efforts contribute to reduce land degradation and for the greater resilience of food production systems and households. The majority of smallholder farmers do not use formal financial services such as bank accounts, mobile money or microfinance institutions (MFIs) and often live far from banks and microcredit institutions branches. Smallholders often manage their household finances outside formal channels and very few rely on local, informal lending, savings circles, or similar mechanisms. In this context, the provision of targeted "smart grants" coupled with a participatory agricultural extension approach (FFS) could be a powerful tool to facilitate farmers' access to adaptation packages (e.g. seeds, services, etc.) needed to sustainably increase production and productivity. The project will provide direct and conditional financial support to farmers to choose agricultural goods from pre-selected options in pre-approved stores to be used in climate resilient agricultural practices. The incentive will be provided in the form of an electronic voucher (e-voucher) to purchase adaptation packages of inputs from pre-approved local implementing partners. The project will use the FFS approach to raise farmers' awareness about the operationalization of the incentive mechanism. Additional information was added in the PIF. Please see page 20.

9. The project isn't working directly on the land tenure issue. However, component 4 includes a participatory outreach and awareness on land degradation and also includes increased climate awareness, disseminate project results, encourage climate-resilient and sustainable farming practices and facilitate community level discussions around pressing climate-adaptation and land degradation related issues, for example land tenure and local

customs and preferences. Also, any activity that may potentially lead to changes in land tenure agreements, or may cause restriction in access to resources will be excluded from the project. The Environmental and Social Management Plan to be developed during the PPG phase comprises questions to screen out social and land tenure risks.

10. This project proposes to capture, document, and disseminate (through a communication strategy to be developed as one of the project activities in output 4.1.1) lessons learned from the project.

11. NGOs/CBOs and private sector are participating in the participatory assessment process and restoration committees in Output 1. In addition, they will benefit from capacity building in co-financed activities in component 3.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments

5/15/2023:

Cleared

4/25/2023:

Not fully. Please define the BAU scenario to allow for a proper assessment of the the Incremental cost reasoning.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

Comment Address. Please see text added on BAU scenario in page 21.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

5/15/2023:

Cleared

4/25/2023:

a) , b),

-Please provide a justification for the execution of the project by UNEP. This should also be supported by a request from the OFP.

-Please provide an indication of the proposed project management arrangements

c) Yes. Please however describe how the project intends to coordinate with the proposed Ecosystem Restoration IP child project and ensure there is no duplication?

d) Yes, the information is sufficient for PIF stage.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

a) b) Comment Address. At global level, FAO and UNEP are strengthening their collaboration in the framework of the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration (2021-2030). In Haiti, UNEP has been an important player in advancing the integrated resilient landscape approach and the green economy approach promoting sustainable and resilient value chains which bears positive impacts on the environment and on livelihoods. Past projects implemented by UNEP have had similar approaches in line with this GEF project with emphasizes on ecosystem rehabilitation at landscape level, livelihoods development and governance. In Haiti, considering the long partnership UNEP has with the MoE and in view of the extensive implementation of green and blue economy initiatives, UNEP will be the Implementation Agency (IA) for all the project activities financed by the GEF (with the exception of activity related to the Farmer field schools -FFS, to be executed by the MARNDR). After 10 years working with government bodies, international cooperation including UN and non-UN agencies, NGOs and local stakeholders in the South department and in the ?Grand Sud? region, UNEP has demonstrated its added value in implementing concurrent and coherent projects in the South Department where this GEF project will be implemented. It will be a key stakeholder to provide information such as best practices and key lessons learned to drive the GEF project forward.

- A diagram on the project implementation arrangement was included in the PIF. Please see page 22.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

5/15/2023:

Cleared

4/25/2023:

a) Yes

b)

-Yes they are achievable, however please see comment above on the cost per hectare. Is there room to deliver higher GEBs under Core Indicator 3.

-Please also include an estimate for Core Indicator 6.

-Please also include other potential co-benefits related to livelihoods, income etc as well as adaptation benefits.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

- Further assessment will be conducted at the PPG phase in order to develop the project detailed budget and verify the possibility of delivering higher GEBs under Core Indicator 3- Area of land restored (Hectares).

- Comment Address. EXACT preliminary calculation, as a result of the restoration activities and sustainable management land practices (78,602 has), the total of GHG avoided will be -1,681,513 ton Co2eq, according with EXACT preliminary calculations. Further confirmation will be developed during PPG stage in order to confirm this number.

- Please see text on other potential co-benefits related to livelihoods and adaptation benefits in page 24.

?In addition, it is expected that the project will indirectly benefit all the population that depends on agricultural production for their livelihoods in the project intervention areas. They will benefit indirectly from increased food security resulting from restored land use and enhanced and more stable production, and increased opportunities for employment in agricultural tasks and value addition. They will get access to inputs, services and knowledge to adopt sustainable land management and resilient agriculture practices. Indirect beneficiaries would include charcoal value chain actors, marketers and consumers of agroforestry products, smallholder farmers, as well as watershed residents and fuel-wood users. Their participation and behavior change are necessary to achieve the project results.?

15/12/23

Core indicator 6 adjusted. **Core indicator 6: As a result of the *restoration activities in 3,338 ha* of degraded lands at watershed level through woodlots and agroforestry woodlots and agroforestry techniques, *and sustainable management land practices 16, 378 has* (including 131 ha in MANGROVES and 250 ha of coastal ecosystems -tidal marsh) *the total of GHG avoided will be -1,254,147 ton Co2eq*, according with EXACT preliminary calculations. Further EXACT exercise confirmation will be developed during PPG stage in order to confirm this number.**

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?

b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?

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

Secretariat's Comments

5/15/2023:

Cleared

4/25/2023:

- a) Some of the information provided in the risk table has not been included in the project description. Please ensure this is incorporated.
- b) Please justify the Political and Governance risk rating at Moderate. Should this be High?

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

- a) Comment Address. Please see text added in page 6.
- b) Comment Address. Agreed. The rating for the Political and Governance risk was changed to 'High'.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?**
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?**
- c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?**

Secretariat's Comments

5/15/2023:

Cleared

4/25/2023:

- a) Yes integrated and there are plans to facilitate durable outcomes. Please expand on how the transformative levers will be applied.
- b) Please include the innovative elements of the project and mechanisms for scale up.
- c) Yes there is a plan to ensure alignment with the Ministry of Agriculture as well as national climate change plans.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

- a) Comment address. Please see text added in page 14.

b) Comment address. Please see text added for Innovation and scaling-up potential in page 21.

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

5/15/2023:

Cleared

4/25/2023:

Please see comment above on alignment with LDFA objectives.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

Comment address. LDFA objectives were corrected throughout the document.

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

5/15/2023:

Cleared

4/25/2023:

Yes., however please be more explicit regarding alignment with UNCCD processes.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

Comment Address. Please see text added in page 28 and text in the description of activity 1.1.1.1, page 15:

?The Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) indicator 15.3.1 will be reported through the monitoring of the UNCCD set of sub-indicators (land cover and land cover change, soil organic carbon and land productivity).

Following the UNCCD scientific conceptual framework for LDN, data indicators will be collected at the national level and local levels to assess the land degradation baseline in Haiti. The data collection will be done through multiple sources such as official statistics and surveys (at national and local levels). This baseline assessment will enable providing a scientific ground to define national LDN targets and to develop a strategy involving different sectors for decision making, defining interventions, achieving and monitoring the progress towards the LDN targets defined.?

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

4/25/2023:

N/A

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

4/25/2023:

See comments below.

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

5/15/2023:

Cleared

4/25/2023:

Yes, however please include the dates of consultation.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

Comment address. During the PIF development, due to Haiti's situation of political instability resulting in conflicts and violence, one single consultation was conducted on the 23rd of February. The date is indicated in page 29. Further consultations will be held on the Project Preparation stage.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

4/25/2023:

Yes

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

4/25/2023:

Yes

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments
8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments
4/25/2023:

Yes

Agency's Comments
8.3 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?

Secretariat's Comments
5/15/2023:

Cleared

5/1/2023:

-Please revise the source of co-financing to ?Donor Agency?.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

Comment address. Changes into the Cofinancing table.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

4/25/2023:

Yes

Agency's Comments

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

4/25/2023:

Yes

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

5/1/2023:

A new LoE will be required to make the following corrections:

--the LOE template used mixes parts of GEF-7 (second paragraph) with GEF-8 (table). Please utilize the correct GEF-8 template.

-the sources of funds in the LoE need to match the sources of funds in the portal.

-in the General Project Information UNEP and the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development are shown as the Executing Partners. However, in the LoE it is FAO the institution endorsed by the OFP. Please confirm, who is the executing agency and make the changes as needed in the LoE.

Note: If the Country decides FAO to be the executing partner, they could keep FAO in the new letter ? however, this implies (a) to remove paragraph UNEP and the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development from Portal; (b) to get a letter of support signed by the OFP

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

Comment Address. UNEP and the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development are the Executing Partners, Changes in the LoE was done accordingly.

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

4/25/2023:

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

5/15/2023:

Cleared

5/1/2023:

-Please include the overall risk rating in the portal.

- Please make the ESS risk rating consistent in the PIF. Please make both ESS Risk rating of the Environmental and social risk in the section of "Risks to Project Preparation and Implementation" (page 29) and the Policy requirement section of the ESS risk rating (page 40) consistent. The Environmental and social risk in the section of "Risks to Project Preparation and Implementation" (page 29) said risk is "low", but the Policy requirement section of the ESS risk rating said risk is moderate. (page 40).

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

Comment Address.

- Overall risk rating change in the portal.

- Rating for the Environmental and social risk in the section of "Risks to Project Preparation and Implementation" was corrected to ensure consistency. Please see page 25.

-Climate Screening is already in the system.

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

5/15/2023:

Cleared

4/25/2023:

Not fully.

-Given the potential to deliver on CI6 please consider the RIO marker for Mitigation

-Given the RIO Marker rating of 1 for Climate Change Adaption, please see comment above under Question 5.4 on adaptation benefits.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

- According with a preliminary EXACT calculation related to the project potential contribution for climate change mitigation, the RIO Marker for mitigation is modified and change to 1. The total potential of GHG mitigation was included under core indicator 6 (-1,681,513 Ton Co2 eq)

- In order to reinforce Rio Marker for Climate change adaptation, information about climate change adaptation benefits was include. Please see text in pages 24 and 25:
?Core indicator 4: In activity 3.1.1.1, the project will promote and implement soil conservation and water management techniques and practices contributing to the maintenance and improvement of ecosystem services and the **resilience of rain-fed agricultural production systems.**?

?Activity 1.1.3.1- Cross-sectoral collaboration and dialogue for the implementation and promotion of ecosystem restoration, 3000 direct beneficiaries are estimated which corresponds to 500 people per municipality targeted by the project. In Activity 1.1.3.2 - Capacity building for the integration of LDN targets and **climate resilient** agricultural practices at landscape level in the national and regional action plans, the project will build the capacities of MoE and MARNDR and other relevant actors (123 people trained) on how to integrate landscape vision for **ecosystem-based adaption** and land

degradation neutrality into policy and actions plans. In activity 3.1.1.1- Promotion and implementation of soil conservation and water management techniques and practices **contributing to the resilience of rain-fed agricultural production systems**, it is expected that 4,500 smallholders will be applying sustainable and **climate resilient agricultural** practices on farmer fields schools (in the South department, women-led farms represent a quarter (24.5%)) of inventoried farms.

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

5/15/2023:

Cleared

4/25/2023:

Please include specific keywords for the taxonomy.

Agency's Comments

5/12/23

Comment Address. Taxonomy adjusted in the GEF portal.

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) 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 to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

5/15/2023:

All comments have been addressed. The PIF is technically cleared and recommended for approval.

5/12/2023:

-Please ensure all changes are made in the portal version of the PIF. Currently the edits have only been made to the uploaded version.

-On the CI6, please reassess and disaggregate the direct emissions benefits from the indirect. The direct should only reflect the specific intervention areas of the GEF project.

5/1/2023:

The PIF is not yet technically cleared. Comments need to be addressed.

Agency's Comments

15/5/23

Comment Address. We check all the data in the GEF Portal

- EXACT was run again an GHG corrected. Adjusted PIF and CORE Indicator worksheet and EXACT calculation is include also in the portal with the following note:

Core indicator 6: As a result of the *restoration activities in 3,338 ha* of degraded lands at watershed level through woodlots and agroforestry woodlots and agroforestry techniques, *and sustainable management land practices 16, 378 has* (including 131 ha in MANGROVES and 250 ha of coastal ecosystems -tidal marsh) *the total of GHG avoided will be -1,254,147 ton Co2eq*, according with EXACT preliminary calculations. Further EXACT exercise confirmation will be developed during PPG stage in order to confirm this number.

**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/
Approval**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/25/2023	5/12/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/29/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/12/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/15/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		