

Strengthening the climatic resilience of the drinking water sector in the South of Haiti

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10320

Countries

Haiti

Project Name

Strengthening the climatic resilience of the drinking water sector in the South of Haiti

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

12/2/2021

Review completed by PM

7/19/2022

Program Manager

Tshewang Dorji

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

12/21/21:

Yes.

Agency Response

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

2/28/22:

Cleared.

12/21/21:

- a) We urge immense care/caution in using sodium hypochlorite to ensure that no harmful byproducts are ingested by communities;
- b) The ratio of PMC mapped to LDCF to the total LDCF grant is 4.6%. The ratio of PMC mapped to co-finance to the total co-finance is 0.4%. The two ratios need to be the same. Please adjust.

- c) The PIF stated that water use metering would be an implemented activity of this project. We are unable to see it at CER stage. Please re-include.
- d) Please provide greater specificity on the activities to be supported under Component 2, with an indication of scale. Approximately how many "groundwater-level meters, rainfall gauges, discharge measurement tools and other equipment" will be installed? We find that the PIF-stage GEF Sec comment (for CEO Endorsement stage) requesting greater clarity on " proposed investments and activities" has not yet been adequately addressed.

Agency Response

01/25/22:

- a) The water treatment systems will be managed by the regional office of DINEPA. Attention will be paid to the quality of the products and the dosage to be used.

Reference: ProDoc, page 42

- b) The PMC percentage of the co-financing has been adjusted to 4.6%.

Reference: CEO ER, pages 3?7

- c) This is well noted. The inclusion of water consumption metering systems under the project has been clarified in the description of Output 3.1.4 and its relevant sub-activities.

Reference: ProDoc, page 41. CEO ER, page 46

- d) This is well noted. Additional detail has been added throughout the "Expected Results" section to provide greater specificity on the activities to be supported under Component 2.

Reference: ProDoc, pages 22?43

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 2/28/22:

Cleared.

12/21/21:

The last row of Table C needs to be adjusted, as recurrent expenditure cannot be categorized as grant co-finance. Please refer to the GEF's Cofinancing Policy.

Agency Response

01/25/22:

Co-financing was identified through extensive discussions with key institutions, donor agencies and organizations in Haiti. These discussions helped identify synergies between the interventions, sites, and beneficiaries of the proposed project. The breakdown of co-financing has been done according to the importance of the activities and the identified synergies. There was no major change between the co-financing in the FIP and the co-financing in the project document. Table 3 gives details about the co-financing and the proposed project. The requirements of the co-financing Policy and Guidelines have been taken into account.

Reference: ProDoc, pages 42-48

The necessary change has been made.

Reference: CEO ER, page 7

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 7/6/22:

Cleared.

Update, May 15, 2022:

Please address the following comments on the budget:

1. On Table B and the project budget table provided in Annex E : It looks like Component 2 (\$515,000) includes not only the budget for Component 2 provided in the project budget table (\$160,000 + \$139,900 + \$124,600 = \$424,500) but also the M&E budget (\$90,500). Therefore, please include in Table B, Component 2, the expected outcomes and outputs for M&E. In addition, if we look at the M&E budget table (in section 9: Monitoring & Evaluation), the total is \$93,000 does not match the \$90,500 stipulated in the project budget table. Please verify and make sure all the budget lines match across all budget tables.

2. On the budget:

a. Unspecified miscellaneous costs cannot be funded by GEF resources. Please remove this item from the budget table and adjust accordingly.

b. An international M&E Officer and a local M&E expert have been charged across the components. Please charge these activities to the M&E budget.

12/21/21:

Yes.

Agency Response

06/22/2022

Reference: Prodoc page 77-78, CEO ER page 9

The financing presented in Table D is adequate and the project demonstrates a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives.

The Project considered 2 alternative strategies to achieve the proposed outcomes:

Scenario 1: Focus only on the supply side of water management and water access issues.

In this scenario the Project would invest in i) deskreview and elaboration of plans for interventions on the water distribution networks, ii) Inventory and quality characterisation of groundwater aquifers in the target, iii) civil engineering works to procure and install physical structures of the water distribution network which would total about 800,000 USD

Scenario 2: Implement a comprehensive approach by addressing watershed management upstream, water source protection as well as water supply and demand-side (management) for greater efficiencies. Investments include i) participative and inclusive consultation and awareness sessions informing communities and the GoH on water management adaptation strategies and climate-resilient water supply by means of a continuous information- and knowledge-generation system; and ii) performing cost-benefit analyses of different adaptation strategies developed as per the different predicted climate change scenarios identified, iii) training programmes implemented to strengthen community capacities and awareness ? with specific strategies to target female-headed households for sustainable and equitable monitoring and usage of drinking water. The costs add up to 3,000,000 USD

These scenarios were considered from technical as well as cost-efficiency considerations. If evaluating short term minimum cost, scenario 1 is a clear winner. However, considering long term benefits and costs, scenario 2 is better as it promotes long term sustainability due to community-based and participatory climate-resilient water resource management and sustainable land-use planning. Therefore, choosing scenario 2 allows the implementation of a more comprehensive solution that will ensure the sustainability and the ownership by the population over the long term.

Reference: CEO ER, pages 2-7

An M&E section has been added in Component 2 of Table B including associated co-financing

1. Reference: ProDoc page 72, CEO ER pages 97, 98

The amounts in the M&E budget table have been corrected

2. A. Reference: ProDoc pages 80-91

The miscellaneous costs have been removed in the budget

B. Reference: ProDoc pages 80-91

The Project M&E Officer and local M&E expert have been moved to the M&E in the budget.

Additional changes:

Reference: Prodoc Pages 1, 22-32, 34, 35, 38-41, 43, 44, 72, 73-74, 77-78, 80, 83, 92-94; CEO ER pages 1, 81, 82, 85

After analyzing the particularity and complexity of this project, which includes both the aspect of water resources protection and the aspect of use by the population, it was decided by mutual agreement that the UNDP and the MDE will explore the possibility of having a third-party organization to facilitate the implementation of this project.

Following a mapping of potential actors and a HACT assessment with low-risk ranking level, HELVETAS has been selected to fulfill this role alongside MDE and DINEPA with oversight provided by UNDP as a GEF Agency. As a result, the project implementation modality has been changed to Non-Governmental Organization Implementation

HELVETAS is the implementing partner (GEF Executing Entity)

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 12/21/21:

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

3/25/22:

Cleared.

2/28/22:

Further information is requested:

- a) For sub-indicators 2.1.1, 2.1.2 and 2.1.3, could you please select the sector (for 2.1.1) and include some information in the Comment section provided? It would be helpful to have qualitative, and not just quantitative, information. Thank you.
- b) Output 1.2.2 in Table B is for participatory climate change vulnerability assessments, yet no value has been provided against sub-indicator 2.1.4, which pertains to vulnerability assessments. Can you please include information?
- c) While values have been entered for number of people to be trained in the Core Indicators table, they do not appear under sub-indicator 2.3. Can you please correct this?

12/21/21:

Please select all appropriate sub-indicators in the results framework. It is unlikely that any adaptation project would have a zero value for Core Indicator 4. Also, despite inclusion of sub-components on awareness-raising, the relevant sub-indicator (3.3.2) has a zero value. Similarly, despite supporting vulnerability assessments for water; building capacity to mainstream climate change into water resources; and trainings; the relevant sub-indicators currently have zero values.

Agency Response

3/23/22:

- a) 2.1.1 Sector : Water

Comment section: Despite the Haitian government's efforts to incorporate climate change into national planning processes, consideration in regulatory frameworks related to drinking water management in Haiti has been limited. Under this project, two regulatory instruments - DINEPA and OREPA Sud - related to the management of drinking water supply in Haiti will be revised to take into account the impacts of climate change on water resources.

- b) Output 2.1.4

Number of assessments conducted: 5

Comment : 5 vulnerability assessments will be conducted and will target the watersheds, recharge areas and springs of Cresson, Bodarie, Prêchet, Cascade Pichon and K-Royer.

- c) Output 2.3.1

Total of people trained: 100 Women: 40 Men: 60

Of which total number of people at the line Ministries: 60 Women: 24 Men : 36

Of which total number of community / association : 40 Women : 16 Men : 24

Output 2.3.2

Number of people with raised awareness : 100

Women : 40 Men : 60

Comment: It was estimated that 5 people from each of the water governance structure (MoE, DINEPA, OREPA, CTE, CATEPA and selected community NGO) will be trained or sensitized on climate change impacts on water resources and appropriate adaptation measures.

Please note however that after several attempts, the comment above (for 2.3.2 only) could not be saved. It seems the technical issue is with GEF Portal.

01/25/22:

There seems to have been a mistake in filling out the project information in the GEF portal when submitting the project. This has now been corrected.

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

12/21/21:

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

12/21/21:

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

2/28/22:

Cleared.

12/21/21:

See above comment (in review item on Table B) requesting greater clarity on proposed investments and activities.

Agency Response

01/25/22:

Thank you, this is well noted. As mentioned above, additional detail has been added throughout the "Expected Results" section to provide greater specificity on the activities to be supported under Component 2.

Reference: ProDoc, pages 22-43

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/21/21:

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/21/21:

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

12/21/21:

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

2/28/22:

Cleared. Please ensure that the poorest and most vulnerable will not be deprived use of these important services on the basis of their inability to pay.

12/21/21:

The discussion on sustainability includes mention of exploring "willingness to pay". Please note this was not included/mentioned at PIF stage. We advise very strong caution where it comes to the criteria for making the vulnerable poor pay for access to water, especially through a project which should support easier water access for all, including the poorest. Please discuss how it will be ensured that such an approach will not impose greater pressure and vulnerability on communities.

Agency Response

3/23/22:

Reference:: ProDoc, pages 40-41

Well noted. It will be ensured that the poorest and most vulnerable will not be deprived use of these important services on the basis of their inability to pay.

Pages 40 and 41 in the ProDoc: ?Currently, several of the target communities do not pay for water provision, predominantly because of the minimal financial capacity within the communities, as well as cultural and societal beliefs that water is a free commodity. As a result, water consumption volumes remain unmonitored, allowing for the unsustainable use of water resources and limited information for effective management. The effectiveness of SAEPs? water supply is also disrupted by the creation of illegal piping connections within the target communities, driven by communities? water supply needs. Under this output, LDCF funds will be used to develop an O&M framework based on lessons learned from existing efforts of HELVETAS as part of the REGLEAU project, specifically relating to rehabilitation of SAEPs. In addition, willingness-to-pay (WTP) assessments will be conducted among the target communities. Moreover, Project Social Impact Assessments (PSIAs) will be conducted determine the social impacts that the implementation of water tariffification systems may have on the target communities of the project.

Based on the abovementioned lessons learned, PSIAs, as well as WTP assessments, equitable financial plans ? focussing specifically on the South-East Department ? for O&M of the five target SAEPs will be developed. This financial plan will include a monitoring and tariff system to promote the sustainability of the O&M of the SAEPs. Additionally, water consumption metering systems will be installed to ensure sustainable and equitable water use and distribution under future scarcity scenarios. The financial plan will fund O&M plans that will also be developed under this output, the ensure adequate reinvestment of the tariffs. However, seed funding ? by government institutions, donors, or loans ? will be required to operationalise the physical elements of the SAEPs before the tariff system can be implemented. Implementation of the ESMF and subsequent management actions will be fulfilled by the Project SES Specialist to ensure that financial plans developed as a result of interventions under this output do not result in unequal access to water during project implementation, as well as after project closure.

01/25/22:

This section has been reviewed. Additional information?s have been added

Reference: ProDoc, page 57?60
CEO ER, page 59?62

An Approach of Payment for environmental services was considered at the PIF stage and is still being considered. A small fee will be set according to the decision among the local members of the SAEP. It is therefore necessary to ensure that the financial contribution for the proposed service can be borne by the subscribers according to their level of vulnerability and in compliance with the regulations (ethical sustainability). The community members contributions will be used to maintain the technical assets in good condition after the life of the project. It also allows for the maintenance and renewal of the assets to guarantee the operation of the service for present and future users.

Reference: ProDoc, page 59
CEO ER, page 61

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

2/28/22:

Cleared. Lat/long coordinates have been supplied below the map.

12/21/21:

A map has been provided and a table of lat/long coordinates. Is it possible to include a geo-referenced map?

Agency Response

01/25/22:

The target water sources and supply systems for project interventions stretches across the following six watersheds in the South-East Department of Haiti: i) Anse-?-Pitre; ii) Baintet; iii) Belle-Anse; iv) C?tes de Fer; v) Grande Rivi?re de Jacmel; and vi) Marigot. The boundaries of the six watersheds are shown on the Figure 10 of the CEO ER (Page 62).

Reference: CEO ER, page 62.

A new georeferenced map with sources and watershed boundaries has been added to the Prodoc and CEO ER

Reference: CEO ER, page 64

ProDoc, Annex 3, page 102

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

2/28/22:

Cleared.

12/21/21:

Please also endeavor to engage communities and local NGOs/CSOs directly in project implementation, so they are more than passive beneficiaries. Please discuss how this will be done.

Agency Response

01/25/22:

A detailed Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) has been developed for this project and is presented as Annex 8. A list of stakeholders to be engaged during the implementation phase is presented in Table 1 on page 6 of the SEP. In addition, in Table 7 on page 50 of the ProDoc, details are presented on stakeholder engagement and South-South cooperation within the proposed project. Further, a Stakeholder Engagement Report has been added to the submission package (Annex 13i).

Reference: SEP: Table 1 on page 6

ProDoc: Table 7 on page 50

CEO ER: page 70

Regarding engagement of communities and local NGOs/CSOs in project implementation, information is presented in the SEP on page 5, under Section 3: Stakeholder engagement during project implementation. This information has also been reflected on page 70 of the CEO EL and Table 7 on page 50 of the ProDoc.

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

2/28/22:

Cleared.

12/21/21:

Is it possible to capture indicators for factors that will directly address women's vulnerability, e.g., reduction in distance traveled to collect water, increase in women's income, etc.?

Agency Response

01/25/22:

Following the various field missions and virtual consultations, a gender analysis and a gender action plan (GAP) were developed as part of the project's development. Activities with gender-specific indicators were also developed. In addition, the gender dimension has been mainstreamed throughout the project document and during the project development process. Unfortunately, there is insufficient baseline data available to introduce more granular gender-responsive indicators than those listed in the GAP.

Reference: ProDoc, pages 52-57, and Annex 10

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

2/28/22:

Cleared.

12/21/21:

The section on Private Sector is blank in the CER. Please discuss if and how the project will engage the private sector in adaptation. We see mention throughout the document but the actual section on Private Sector is missing.

Agency Response

01/25/22:

Thank you. Private sector involvement has been elaborated on in the CEO ER under Section 4. At present, the private sector plays no major financial role, however there is scope for private funding during implementation phase if parties are interested.

Reference: CEO ER, page 79

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

3/25/22:

Cleared.

2/28/22:

We are still unable to see potential implementation risks from Covid entered in the Risks table. Please include.

12/21/21:

Please discuss potential risks from COVID-19 to project consultations and implementation.

Agency Response

3/23/22:

Reference: Prodoc page 130, 49
CEO Endorsement Page 81

The various social and environmental risks, including climate risks, associated with project implementation have been identified and mitigation measures have been proposed through the environmental and social framework and in the project risk log.

Risks related to COVID 19 have also been added to the table as follow :

The resurgence of new variants of COVID-19, impacts the implementation of project activities.

Workshops, trainings and meetings will be held virtually or in a mixed format. For activities that require bringing people together, COVID-19 protective materials will be used, and physical distance will be respected.

01/25/22:

COVID-19 could represent a risk for the implementation of some project activities. A paragraph related to the risk posed by COVID-19 has been included in the document.

Reference: ProDoc, page 51

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

2/28/22:

Cleared.

12/21/21:

Please advise where we may find information on coordination with relevant GEF and non-GEF initiatives in the country. Please include, if relevant, discussion on coordination with planned or ongoing GCF-supported initiatives.

Agency Response

01/25/22:

The institutional arrangement for the implementation of the project is clearly defined. The role and responsibilities of the various stakeholders are clarified.

Reference: ProDoc, page 73?76

At the time of preparation of the project document, there were no GEF-funded projects or ongoing GCF initiatives in the proposed project area. However, the LDCF project will work on possible synergies with any GEF project that comes to the area during the implementation of this project. The project will also develop coordination/synergies with the projects listed in the table below that will still be running during project implementation. For those that will come to an end, this project will be able to capitalize on the actions implemented and the lessons learned. This will help avoid duplication of actions and better address future interventions.

Reference: ProDoc, page 43

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

12/21/21:

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

12/21/21:

Yes.

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/28/22:

Cleared.

12/21/21:

The ESMF presents information in a scattered manner. Please include a summary para in the ESS section of the Portal entry. Please also clarify how the climate change risks identified in the ESMF will be addressed. (The ESMF states: "Outputs and outcomes sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change or disasters. Most particularly, climate change could compromise tree reforestation and agroforestry activities by increasing temperatures beyond vegetation tolerances.")

Agency Response

01/25/22:

With regards to the climate change risks identified in the ESMF ? pertaining to the agroforestry and reforestation interventions ? suitable climate-resilient species will be identified and listed in the agroforestry technical packages to be developed at implementation stage under Output 2.3.2 ? this has been made clearer in the ProDoc.

The project is part of the sustainable access to drinking water for the population of targeted localities in the South-East department of Haiti, by improving the resilience of the drinking water supply to the effects of climate change. This department is highly vulnerable to climate change, which, combined with massive and ongoing environmental degradation and systemic poverty, creates major challenges to human development. The project will raise awareness of the vulnerability of the water sector to climate change among the population and local authorities, develop regulatory tools, build the capacity of local authorities in water resources management, and promote conservation, management and drinking water supply practices. The beneficiaries will be national institutions (DINEPA, MDE, MARNDR, local authorities) and local communities (86 target communities, including 338,728 individual beneficiaries). The project will also provide environmental benefits through the reforestation of upstream watersheds that supply the populations of the targeted communes with drinking water. At the time of the development of this project, certain risks that could have negative environmental and social impacts were identified. These are related to the tree nurseries, reforestation and agroforestry activities, the protection of spring perimeters, the rooftop water collection system, the preparation of financial frameworks for operation and maintenance, and the engagement of contractors and stakeholders. The overall risks are moderate to substantial. Thus, an ESMF (Environmental and Social Management Framework) has been developed during this PPG phase and a Proportionate ESMPs (Environmental and Social Management Plan) for the activities will be developed during the implementation of the project

The climate change risk will be addressed by proposing technical agroforestry packages that will anticipate potential increases in average temperature. The key is to include plant materials (trees and companion crops) that will be the least affected by potential temperature changes over their lifecycles (a few years for crops, longer for fruit trees, very long for pine).

Reference: ProDoc, page 36

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

12/21/21:

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

2/28/22:

Cleared.

12/21/21:

- a) The LDCF/SCCF Council has expressed interest in age-disaggregated direct-beneficiary information. Would it be possible to track this, at least for broad categories of the young and the aged?
- b) If there are expected benefits for income, health, sustenance, etc., as a result of this project, please discuss.
- c) Please discuss any opportunities this project offers in terms of green recovery and building back better in the COVID-19 context.
- d) The discussion on sustainability includes mention of exploring communities' "willingness to pay". Please note this was not included/mentioned at PIF stage. We advise very strong caution where it comes to the criteria for making the vulnerable poor pay for access to water, especially through a project which should support easier water access for all, including the poorest. Please discuss how it will be ensured that such an approach will not impose greater pressure and vulnerability on communities.

Agency Response

01/25/22:

- a) This is well noted. Age-disaggregated beneficiary information has been added under section 10 of the CEO ER, according to available statistics.

Reference: CEO ER, page 97

b) Thank you. The health, income and food security benefits to the project's target beneficiaries has been clarified accordingly in the CEO ER.

Reference: CEO ER, page 97

c) This is well noted. Opportunities the proposed project offers in terms of green recovery and building back better in the COVID-19 context has been discussed under the 'Benefits' section in the CEO ER.

Reference: CEO ER, pages 99-100

An Approach of Payment for environmental services was considered at the PIF stage and is still being considered. A small fee will be set according to the decision among the local members of the SAEP. It is therefore necessary to ensure that the financial contribution for the proposed service can be borne by the subscribers according to their level of vulnerability and in compliance with the regulations (ethical sustainability). The community members contributions will be used to maintain the technical assets in good condition after the life of the project. It also allows for the maintenance and renewal of the assets to guarantee the operation of the service for present and future users.

Reference: ProDoc, page 59

CEO ER, page 61

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/28/22:

Please remove the highlighting of any text in the Portal entry as well as the uploaded Project Document. Both items will be submitted for four-week Council review and the highlight can sometimes make it difficult to read the text.

Agency Response

UNDP, 04/21/22:

Corrected in the documents and portal as well

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 12/21/21:

Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 5/2/22:

Cleared. Due to technical difficulties faced by the agency to include these in the Portal entry, the responses to Council comments have been provided in Annex 16 of the Project Document.

4/22/22:

Adjustments requested.

Please include as an Annex or section of the Project Document, as mentioned in below comment. The only version of the CEO Endorsement Request that will be circulated to Council is the Portal entry, not an additional Word doc titled "CEO Endorsement Request". Therefore, **all materials that are expected to be in the Portal entry but for any reason cannot be included there** should be included as a section or annex of the Project Document, with information on where it can be found (e.g., page or para number) specified in the agency response in this review sheet.

Please also remove all highlight from the Portal entry and Project Document. A dark color has been used that will hide the text when converted to a black and white pdf file.

3/28/22:

Not yet. What has been provided in the Annex is a repeat of the current (CEO endorsement stage) review sheet. This is not needed. What is needed is an explanation by the agency of how the comments provided at PIF stage, for consideration at CEO endorsement, were addressed. These are included at the bottom of the PIF-stage review, and for the agency's convenience are pasted below:

"By CEO Endorsement, please ensure that detailed information has been provided on:

- 1) climate change rationale;
- 2) proposed investments and activities;
- 3) project locations/sites and community vulnerability;
- 4) stakeholder engagement (undertaken and proposed), including with civil society, women's groups and youth;
- 5) please discuss how women will be engaged in project design and implementation, and discuss in detail measures the project will proactively take to reduce women's vulnerability;
- 6) how the private sector has been and will continue to be engaged; and
- 7) Measures taken to ensure sustainability of project investments and durability of project outcomes."

We understand that due to technical issues, the responses cannot be pasted into the Portal and have been included as an annex of the Project Document.

2/28/22:

Not yet cleared. Please paste the consolidated table of responses to PIF stage comments, including those provided by the GEF Sec, in the Annex B section of the online CER, as has been done for the other annexes. These should be available in the Portal entry and not just as an uploaded document.

12/21/21:

We are unable to locate responses to GEF Sec comments provided (during PIF review) for consideration during project preparation in the Portal entry. Please include.

Agency Response

UNDP, 04/27/22:

The following Annexes have been added to the ProDoc: 1) Annex 8 Stakeholder Engagement plan; 2) Annex 10 Gender Analysis and action Plan; 3) Annex 12a Site selection; 4) 13i Stakeholder Engagement Report; 5) Annex 16 Response to Project Reviews (Annex B from the CEO ER);
The issue with the text highlighting in the portal has been clarified with the IT Support Team

UNDP, 04/21/22:

Reference: CEO End. Page 128- 135

ProDoc, pp. 7?9

Explanation of how the comments provided at PIF stage, for consideration at CEO Endorsement stage, were addressed, are presented below.

1) climate change rationale;

During the PPG phase of the project, the contextually relevant climate change rationale was developed following extensive virtual consultations between the consulting team, the UNDP country office, and representatives of the Government of Haiti (GoH). The development of the climate change rationale was also strongly informed by the information obtained from field mission reports by the national consultant as well as from online resources. All latest climate risk information that was obtained and analysed, especially the trend analysis and historical evidence of losses and damages that climate variability induced in the target areas. This information was collated with a range of scenarios for probabilistic impact. Through a thorough baseline analysis critical adaptation deficiencies and gaps have been identified and the project solutions defined in broad consultation and engagement of stakeholders at all level. Barrier analysis finally informed the project TOC and framework as the proposed project hinges on a barrier removal strategy.

Reference: ProDoc, pp. 21?42

The climate rationale is outlined under the 'Development Challenge' section of the ProDoc (Section II). First, the baseline climatic conditions of Haiti are described (ProDoc, p. 7), followed by a description of projected climate changes and associated hazards (ProDoc, pp. 7?8). These descriptions are then followed by the problem statement (ProDoc, pp. 8?9), whereby it is shown how observed and projected impacts of CC are currently, and will further impact the availability of freshwater in rural communities and small urban centres in the South-East Department of Haiti. Finally, the impact pathways underlying the core climate change problem, compounded by non-climate drivers, are presented in the problem tree in Figure 9 (ProDoc, p. 159).

Reference: ProDoc, pp. 21-42

Site Selection Annex 12a page 139 in the ProDoc (Filename: [Annex 12a_Haiti PPG GEF_UNDP Site Selection_2 Sep 2021](#)).

2) proposed investments and activities;

During the PPG phase, following virtual consultations between the consulting team, the UNDP country office, and representatives of the Government of Haiti (GoH), the project interventions were designed to improve the resilience of the drinking water supply.

Component 1 focuses on capacity building (through the improvement of awareness, knowledge and information management systems) and the creation of an enabling environment (through preparation of communities to effectively plan responses to CC). Component 2 focuses on necessary strengthening of policies and institutional capacities at national, regional and local levels (by mainstreaming CC into existing regulatory and policy instruments, capacity building of priority institutional stakeholders and equipping communities with instruments and mechanisms that ensure sustainable management of water resources). Finally, output 3 will identify and promote practices for the conservation, management and supply of drinking water by ensuring reliable access to drinking water by local communities and households through the implementation of CC adaptation measures. The components complement each other to ensure CC resilience is sustainable over time. All the activities were designed to prevent any loss of livelihood as well as any physical displacement ? notably consultations with, and input from the environmental and social safeguards expert were essential to ensure the activities were designed with full consideration of any negative socio-economic implications to the target communities. Inputs from the gender expert further ensured that the activities were designed in a gender-responsive manner. Finally, outputs from consultations between the consulting team, the UNDP country office, and representatives from the GoH were used to ensure that the project interventions were contextually and situationally relevant, notably to the South-East Department of Haiti. The project interventions are detailed under the Results and Partnerships of the ProDoc (Section IV, p. 21).

3) project locations/sites and community vulnerability;

In December 2020, a series of meetings were convened between the consulting team and the relevant stakeholders from the Government of Haiti (GoH). The objectives of these meetings were to have a shared understanding of the project intervention logic and find consensus among stakeholders on the sites to be selected. In particular, the meetings focused on Component 3 of the project Logframe as site selection will be critical for the adequate implementation of the interventions listed under this component. During these meetings, it was decided that individual water sources (including their respective recharge zones) and drinking water supply systems (SAEP) should be regarded as the strategic targets for selecting project intervention sites, rather than a single watershed. The following methodology was accordingly adopted for the preselection of intervention sites.

1. Identify strategic SAEPs and sources within the department, according to their regional socioeconomic and environmental importance, in collaboration with the Regional Office for Drinking Water and Sanitation (OREPA-Sud), the National Directorate for Drinking Water and Sanitation (DINEPA), the Ministry of Environment (MoE), the Departmental Directorate of Environment for the South-East (DDE-SE) and the Departmental Directorate of Agriculture for the South-East (DDA-SE).

2. Gather data on each identified water source and SAEP, including: i) mapping the hydrographic territory of each source; ii) collecting socioeconomic information ? such as local water management practices ? through consultations with local communities, civil society and non-governmental organisations operating in the area, as well as local and district-level government representatives; and iii) recording data and observations on the physical baseline of each site, including on existing water distribution infrastructure, hydrological data and levels of degradation and deforestation.

Reference: ProDoc, p. 50

CEO EL, p. 70

Stakeholder Engagement Plan Annex 8 page 136 in the ProDoc (filename: Annex 8_Haiti PPG GEF_UNDP_ Stakeholder Engagement Plan_17 Jan 2022)

Stakeholder Engagement Report Annex 13i page 184 in the ProDoc (filename: Annex 13i_Haiti PPG GEF_UNDP_ Stakeholder Engagement Report_17 Jan 2022)

3. Prioritise the identified water sources and SAEPs based on the data collected in the field, according to a multi-criteria analysis (MCA) developed by the PPG Team, to rank the potential intervention sites within the South-East Department.

The final site selection for project interventions was made during roundtable discussions involving DINEPA, UNDP and the PPG Team. The following criteria were discussed to make the final selection:

- ? the number of beneficiaries within each pre-selected SAEP;
- ? the multi-criteria analysis (MCA) developed by the PPG team;
- ? the existence of similar initiatives in the pre-selected SAEPs;
- ? the presence of functional Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Committees (CAEPAs) or Technical Operations Centres (CTEs) within the pre-selected SAEPs; and
- ? the respective projected effects of the agroforestry and reforestation interventions obtained in the SWAT modelling exercise.

A more in-depth description of the site selection methodology, as well as more detailed description of the final sites selected for project intervention is presented in the Site Selection Annex (12a).

Reference: Gender Analysis & Action Plan Annex 10 page 153 in the ProDoc (filename: [Annex 10_Haiti PPG GEF_UNDP_Gender Analysis _ Action Plan_2 Sep 2021](#))

4) stakeholder engagement (undertaken and proposed), including with civil society, women's groups and youth;

During the PPG phase of the project, the national consultant and his team, as well as a delegation from the Ministry of Environment (MoE), carried out field missions (over the December 2020-January 2021 period) in the South-East department to meet relevant stakeholders in order to develop an inventory and summary diagnoses of the department's strategic water sources. The summary diagnoses included information relating to inter alia flow rate, water storage facilities, water distribution infrastructure, water treatment systems, management regimes, degradation levels of the infrastructure and of the surrounding environment, as well as community usage of the water sources. The information obtained from these field missions are reported in the Stakeholder Engagement Report (Annex 13i), which was prepared using the respective field missions reports of the MoE delegation and of Mr. Danes Toussaint and his team.

A detailed Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) was developed at PPG stage and is presented as Annex 8. The SEP was developed using a combination of the information reported in the Stakeholder Engagement Report (Annex 13i), information obtained from online resources, as well as the outcomes from virtual consultations convened between the consulting team the UNDP country office and representatives of the Government of Haiti (GoH). A list of stakeholders to be engaged during the implementation phase is presented in Table 1 on page 6 of the SEP. In addition, in Table 7 on page 50 of the ProDoc, details are presented on stakeholder engagement and South-South cooperation within the proposed project. Further, with regards to engagement of communities and local NGOs/CSOs during project implementation, information is presented in the SEP on page 5, under Section 3, 'Stakeholder engagement during project implementation?'. This information has also been reflected on page 70 of the CEO ER and Table 7 on page 50 of the ProDoc.

Reference: Stakeholder Engagement Plan Annex 8 page 136 in the ProDoc (filename: Annex 8_Haiti PPG GEF_UNDP_Stakeholder Engagement Plan_17 Jan 2022)

5) please discuss how women will be engaged in project design and implementation, and the specific measures the project is proactively taking to reduce women's vulnerability;

During the PPG phase of the project, following the various field missions by the national consultant and subsequent virtual consultations between the gender specialist and the national consultant, a gender analysis, and a gender action plan (GAP) were respectively conducted and developed (Annex 10). Activities with gender-specific indicators to be monitored during and beyond project implementation are presented in the GAP. In addition, the gender dimension has been mainstreamed within the project design, as well as within the activities to be implemented. It is important to note that there was insufficient baseline data available to introduce more granular gender-responsive indicators than those listed in the GAP. Consequently, at implementation stage, assessments, with gender-specific criteria, will be carried out at the national level to demonstrate the gender-specific implications of different climate change scenarios on the availability of water.

Reference: ProDoc, pp. 21?42
CEO ER, pp 59?62

6) how the private sector has been and will continue to be engaged; and
During the PPG phase, private sector actors did not play a major role in the financing or design of the project as private sector in water are too small in the project area. However, the private sector actors who are involved in the drinking water sector in Haiti ? including local small and medium-sized private enterprises such as Culligan and Aquafin ? will be consulted as stakeholders for the project?s activities (notably pertaining to water treatment) during the implementation phase of the project. More detail on private sector engagement during the implementation phase is presented in the SEP (Annex 8).

7) Measures taken to ensure sustainability of project investments and durability of project outcomes

The project was designed to ensure institutional, economic and social sustainability of interventions during and beyond the project lifespan ? in addition to maintaining and improving the environmental sustainability of the target watersheds in the context of climate change in the South-East Department. The sustainability of the project?s interventions is an important element that will be supported by community ownership as promoted by the stakeholder engagement process during the project design.

The proposed project comprises several interconnected outputs to address the limited technical and organisational capacities within Haiti?s governmental institutions present considerable barriers to improved climate resilience in Haiti ? these will ensure the institutional sustainability of its interventions. In terms of the economic sustainability of the project, a ?willingness-to-pay? assessment will be conducted during project implementation. Following this assessment, the project will develop and implement appropriate water consumption monitoring and tariffication systems in the target water distribution networks (SAEPs) to improve the efficiency of water use and distribution. The revenue from the tariffication system will be collected into a centralised fund and distributed between the relevant sub-national institutions managing the SAEPs to support the operations and maintenance (O&M) costs required for these SAEPs, ensuring efficient water supply across the networks. In addition, by emphasising stakeholder participation, the project will ensure adequate community buy-in and ownership of interventions, further ensuring the social sustainability of these interventions and their impact on the communities.

More details on the activities that will ensure the abovementioned institutional, economic and social sustainability attributes of the project is presented in detail under the Results and Partnerships of the ProDoc (Section IV, p. 21).

3/23/22:

We have made several attempts to include the matrix table to Annex B section of the GEF Portal. However, it seems that the table does not show when Reviewer reviews the submission. We have consulted the GEF Portal IT team and after a couple of days of trying to fix this from the IT team, got a confirmation via email, dated 11 Feb 2022, that this problem could not be fixed. We were advised to submit the responses as a document and make a reference to them (hence, we submitted the CEO ER document via RoadMap section).

01/25/22:

Included in the Annex B (CEO ER)

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 5/2/22:

Cleared. Due to technical difficulties faced by the agency to include these in the Portal entry, the responses to Council comments have been provided in Annex 16 of the Project Document.

4/22/22:

Adjustments requested.

Please include as an Annex or section of the Project Document, as mentioned in below comment. The only version of the CEO Endorsement Request that will be circulated to Council is the Portal entry, not an additional Word doc titled "CEO Endorsement Request". Therefore, **all materials that are expected to be in the Portal entry but for any reason cannot be included there** should be included as a section or annex of the Project Document, with information on where it can be found (e.g., page or paragraph number) specified in the agency response in this review sheet.

Please also remove all highlight from the Portal entry and Project Document. A dark color has been used that will hide the text when converted to a black and white pdf file.

3/28/22:

No. The agency has provided responses to Council comments for a different project. Please provide responses for the comments received for this project. (We understand that due to technical issues, the responses cannot be pasted into the Portal and have been included as an annex of the Project Document.)

2/28/22:

Not yet cleared. Please paste the consolidated table of responses to PIF stage comments, including those provided by the GEF Sec, in the Annex B section of the online CER, as has been done for the other annexes. These should be available in the Portal entry and not just as an uploaded document.

12/21/21:

We are unable to locate responses to Council comments (USA, Germany) in the Portal entry. Please include.

Agency Response

UNDP, 04/27/22:

The following Annexes have been added to the ProDoc: 1) Annex 8 Stakeholder Engagement plan; 2) Annex 10 Gender Analysis and action Plan; 3) Annex 12a Site selection; 4) 13i Stakeholder Engagement Report; 5) Annex 16 Response to Project Reviews (Annex B from the CEO ER);

The issue with the text highlighting in the portal has been clarified with the IT Support Team

UNDP, 04/21/22:

Comment	Response	Reference
----------------	-----------------	------------------

<p>Comment by Kordula Mehlhart, GEF Council Member, Head of Division on Climate Finance, BMZ, Council, Germany made on 6/18/2020</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>Germany welcomes the proposal, which aims to increase the resilience of communities to the effects of climate change in Haiti by improving access to drinking water in the South-Eastern part of the country. Furthermore, Germany appreciates that the proposed activities under the project are fully aligned with Haiti's National Action Plan for Adaptation and have been framed to align with and support other ongoing development activities in the water sector. Given the universally poor coverage and vulnerability of water supply in the country, Germany also sees opportunities for scalability, as the measures to be implemented under the project can be replicated in other parts of the country.</p> <p>Suggestions for improvements to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:</p> <p>? Regulatory and policy instruments: Germany appreciates the approach to strengthening the institutional capacities. However, regarding component 2, Germany suggests incorporating an analysis of illegal and unregulated water extraction practices and unregulated spring water usage in the area of intervention and formulating a strategy to tackle this issue.</p>	<p>Information obtained from the national consultant's field mission reports, relating to illegal and unregulated water extraction practices, as well as unregulated spring water usage in the areas targeted by the proposed project has been reported in the Site Selection Annex 12a (to the ProDoc) as well as in the CEO Endorsement Letter.</p> <p>It is important to note that there was insufficient baseline data available to introduce more granular detail regarding illegal and unregulated water usage in the targeted areas. Consequently, at implementation stage, more in-depth assessments will be carried out at to address the knowledge gaps.</p>	<p>CEO ER, pp. 65-68</p> <p>ProDoc, pp. 21-42</p>
--	--	---

<p>? Role of the local level: Germany appreciates the central role of the Ministry of Environment's (MdE) Direction for Climate Change. However, the MdE's limited capacities regarding production and use of information as well as operationalization of policies supported by projects should be considered. Existing experiences regarding watershed management, to which UNDP projects have contributed, and experience in natural resource management in general show that regulatory and policy instruments should not depend on active application by central government stakeholders but be closely connected to the local level.</p>	<p>The fact that experiences in natural resource management in general show that regulatory and policy instruments should not depend on active application by central government stakeholders but be closely connected to the local level has been considered when designing the project interventions. The interventions were designed in such way that they include stakeholders ranging from the national level to the community level. Details of the project interventions can be found in the ProDoc under the 'Results and Partnerships' section.</p>	<p>ProDoc, pp. 21-42</p>
<p>Duplication of work: Germany appreciates the several types of plans that will be produced at local level. However, the 'community-based strategic and operational plans' should not lead to duplications and increased workload for the local participants. Germany suggests improving the quality of existing plans e.g. Plan de Development Communal (Municipal Development plans, required by law) wherever possible. Regarding the investments to be included in those plans, Germany further suggests considering the lack investment capacity of most local stakeholders or local governments 'especially small communities.</p>	<p>The project interventions were designed in such a way to improve the quality of existing plans 'whenever possible' at a national, regional and local levels. For instance, an Outcome 2.1 of the proposed project is that key regulatory and policy instruments are adjusted 'rather than created or duplicated' to consider the implications of climate change for drinking water supply and promote adaptive community-based management, knowledge generation and dissemination.</p>	<p>ProDoc, pp. 21-42</p>

<p>Synergies with existing projects and knowledge sharing: Germany appreciates the exploration of synergies with other projects and suggests to further include the experience of CIAT (Comit? interministerial d?Amenagement du Territoire), which has been working on pilot projects in spatial planning (plans d?amenagement du territoire) and improvement of hydro-meteorological data collection, as well as the experience of DINEPA, which worked with local committees in the Southern Department (financed by IDB and World Bank, 2007-2011).</p>	<p>As recommended, CIAT and DINEPA have been included as key stakeholders during project implementation.</p>	<p>CEO ER, p. 82 Stakeholder Engagement Plan Annex 8 (filename: Annex 8_Haiti PPG GEF_UNDP_Stakeholder Engagement Plan_17 Jan 2022)</p>
<p>Financial sustainability of water supply systems: Germany appreciates that the financial sustainability of water supply systems is addressed in the proposal. However, Germany recommends considering the informality of the existing water supply especially in rural areas. Fees paid might not cover costs of meter systems and informality might limit the potential of policy and regulation efforts.</p>	<p>As recommended, the informality of the existing water supply especially in rural areas was considered during project design. Specifically, the project proposes to allocate LDCF funds for the development of an O&M framework based on lessons learned from existing efforts of HELVETAS as part of the REGLEAU project, specifically relating to rehabilitation of water distribution. In addition, willingness-to-pay (WTP) assessments will be conducted among the target communities. Moreover, Project Social Impact Assessments (PSIAs) will be conducted determine the social impacts that the implementation of water tariffication systems may have on the target communities of the project. More information on the abovementioned intervention is shown in the ?Results and Partnerships? section of the ProDoc.</p>	<p>ProDoc, p. 41</p>

<p>Gender: Germany welcomes that gender-sensitive approaches are explicitly considered and suggests including disaggregated numbers of direct beneficiaries by gender.</p>	<p>beneficiaries of the project have been presented in a gender-disaggregated manner, where required, throughout the CEO Endorsement Letter and the ProDoc.</p>	<p>ProDoc, p. 60; 64; 137?140 CEO EL, p. 9; 97; 131; 133; 135</p>
<p>Comment by Elizabeth Nichols, U.S. Department of State Bureau of Oceans, International Environmental and Scientific Affairs (OES), Office of Environmental Equality and Transboundary Issues (EQT), Council, United States made on 7/2/2020</p> <p>Comment:</p> <p>As UNDP prepares the draft final project document for CEO endorsement, we urge UNDP to:</p> <p>Clarify the geographic area the project is proposed to take place, understanding that different regions have different access to water. For example, most of the population in the South-East doesn't have access to underground water. There also seems to be a mix-up between the South and Southeast. For example, Macaya National Park is not located on Massif de LaSelle.</p>	<p>The geographic area for the interventions of the proposed project has been clarified in the CEO Endorsement Letter in the "1b. Project map and geo-coordinates" section (pp. 62?63), as well as in the "Local context: South-East Department of Haiti" section (pp. 22?26). More comprehensive details on the geographic scope of the proposed project are given in the Site Selection Annex 12a to the ProDoc. Further, the differential access to water depending on the different communities being targeted by the project is also detailed in the Site Selection Annex 12a, as well as in the CEO Endorsement Letter (pp. 65?68). Finally, the mix-up regarding the location of the Macaya National Park has been cleared.</p>	<p>CEO ER, pp. 22?26; pp. 62?63; pp. 65?68</p> <p>Site Selection Annex 12a (Filename: Annex 12a_Haiti PPG GEF_UNDP_Site Selection_2 Sep 2021).</p>

<p>Consider the greater impact of watershed degradation on water supply. By focusing on the degradation at the aquifer recharge zones, it underestimates the overall impact of watershed degradation on water infiltration and yield.</p>	<p>The greater impact of watershed degradation on water supply is shown under the description of Component 3 <i>“Promotion of practices for the conservation, management and supply of drinking water adapted to projected climate change scenarios?”</i>, in the CEO Endorsement Letter (p. 33).</p> <p>However, in December 2020, during a series of meetings were convened between the National Consultant (NC) and the relevant stakeholders from the GoH, it was decided during those meetings that individual water sources (including their respective recharge zones) and drinking water supply systems (SAEP) should be regarded as the strategic targets for selecting project intervention sites, rather than a single watershed ? given the scope of the project. The objectives of these meetings were to have a shared understanding of the project intervention logic and find consensus among stakeholders on the sites to be selected. In particular, the meetings focused on Component 3 of the project Logframe as site selection will be critical for the adequate implementation of the interventions listed under this component. More details on the site selection methodology in shown in the Site Selection Annex 13a to the ProDoc.</p>	<p>CEO ER p. 33</p> <p>Site Selection Annex 13a (Filename: Annex 13a_Haiti PPG GEF_UNDP_Site Selection_6 Aug 2021).</p>
---	--	---

<p>Explain the path to sustainability for the different components of the project as well as the financial sustainability for the community-based strategic plans that would be developed under the proposed interventions.</p>	<p>The path to sustainability for the different components of the project as well as the financial sustainability for the community-based strategic plans that would be developed under the proposed interventions is detailed under the <i>“Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up?”</i> section in the CEO Endorsement Letter.</p>	<p>CEO ER, p. 60-61</p>
<p>Identify the location of the watershed protection component and explain in greater detail how the funding would adequately cover the costs of such a measure.</p>	<p>Greater detail as to how the funding would adequately cover the costs of such implementations is given in the ProDoc under the <i>“Results and Partnerships?”</i> section (pp. 36-42).</p> <p>It is important to note that there was insufficient baseline data available to introduce more granular detail regarding the location of the watershed protection component. Consequently, at implementation stage, assessments will be carried out at the national and local levels, under Components 2 and 3, to identify high-priority and strategic locations, prior to the physical implementation of watershed protection interventions (pp. 28-42).</p>	<p>ProDoc, pp. 36-42; pp. 28-42</p>
<p>Include a comprehensive view of different risks that may impact the region and water sector.</p>	<p>A comprehensive view of different risks – including current and future climate change impacts – that may impact the region and water sector is outlined throughout the <i>“Development Challenge?”</i> and <i>“Strategy?”</i> sections of the ProDoc.</p>	<p>ProDoc, pp. 7-11; 12-20</p>

<p>Consider the coordination potential of working in tandem with all water and sanitation stakeholders (such as IDB, Spanish AID, Swiss AID, USAID, World Bank) currently working in Haiti, either in partnership or in parallel toward the sustainable delivery of safe drinking water amid recurrent severe climate events in rural and/or high density population zones. The proposal mentions a few of these actors but does not elucidate on any of their accomplishments since their 2012 commencement (USAID since 2018) or how each may be better leveraged in a coordinated effort to improve the resilience of drinking water access in Haiti to the effects of climate change.</p>	<p>The potential for partnerships between the proposed project and other water and sanitation stakeholders, notably the IDB, AECID, World Bank and the Swiss Red Cross was considered during the project design. Details on how the above stakeholders may be better leveraged in a coordinated effort to improve the resilience of drinking water access in Haiti to the effects of climate change is outlined in the 'Results and Partnerships' section of the ProDoc, as well as in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan Annex 8 (to the ProDoc).</p>	<p>ProDoc, pp. 42?59</p> <p>Stakeholder Engagement Plan Annex 8 (filename: Annex 8_Haiti PPG GEF_UNDP_Stakeholder Engagement Plan_17 Jan 2022)</p>
<p>Utilize past drinking water/water supply programs, especially those in rural Haiti, to gain a comprehensive understanding of their success or failure.</p>	<p>During project development, lessons learnt and best practices from past drinking water/water supply in rural Haiti were used ? in tandem in field mission reports from the national consultant ? to design adequate interventions to improve the resilience of drinking water access in Haiti to the effects of climate change.</p>	<p>ProDoc, pp. 21?59</p> <p>Site Selection Annex 13a (Filename: Annex 13a_Haiti PPG GEF_UNDP_Site Selection_6 Aug 2021).</p>
<p>Consider a multi-sector and stakeholder commitment approach that not only includes high-level donors and government entities, but also local stakeholders (CBOs, FBOs, NGOs, municipalities, CASECs, ASECS, etc.).</p>	<p>The proposed project?s interventions were designed so as to have active and equal participation of the local stakeholders ? such as the CAEPAs, CBOs, FBOs, NGOs etc ? at implementation. This is outlined under Component 2 in the 'Results and Partnerships' section of the ProDoc.</p>	<p>ProDoc, pp. 21?42</p>

<p>Consider urbanization currently rampant in Haiti, including demand for livable land and subsequent unenforced activities in ad hoc informal settlements and how this impacts watershed efficiency and water quality in aquifers and other water sources.</p>	<p>Demand for livable land and subsequent unenforced activities in ad hoc informal settlements, particular around the aquifer recharge zones has duly been taken into consideration during the project design phase.</p> <p>During the implementation phase of the project, the Environmental and Social Management Framework (Annex 10 to the ProDoc) ? developed during the project design phased ? will be applied to ensure that no physical and economic displacement occurs in the target communities because of these interventions, even beyond project closure.</p> <p>Furthermore, the project was designed to benefit all the communities dependent on the aquifers and water sources being targeted by the project, whether they are in formal or informal settlements. More details on how the project interventions (for e.g. reforestation activities and agroforestry) will benefit the communities is given in the ?Results and Partnerships? section of the ProDoc.</p>	<p>ProDoc, pp. 21?42</p>
---	---	--------------------------

<p>Consider local ownership and responsibility for the sustainable management and actions (governance, finance, water resource management) that will be needed both during and beyond this project. Expand on how this project will address issues that arise related to the human resources needed to localize the proposed projects.</p>	<p>The project was designed to ensure institutional, economic, and social sustainability of interventions during and beyond the project lifespan ? in addition to maintaining and improving the environmental sustainability of the target watersheds in the context of climate change in the South-East Department. The sustainability of the project?s interventions is an important element that will be supported by community ownership as promoted by the stakeholder engagement process during the project design. Comprehensive details on the activities that will ensure the institutional, economic, and social sustainability attributes of the project is presented in detail under the Results and Partnerships of the ProDoc (Section IV, pp. 21?42).</p>	<p>CEO ER, pp. 60?62 ProDoc, pp. 21?42</p>
<p>Consider other sectors that are dependent on water access and availability such as agriculture, livestock, stream ecosystems, and local industries and how this project will benefit them.</p>	<p>Other sectors that are dependent of water and availability were considered during project intervention design. The project interventions are outlined in the ?Results and Partnerships? section of the ProDoc.</p>	<p>ProDoc, pp. 21?42</p>

<p>Focus on a more regional, zone-specific perspective that describes the water management and water needs/challenges in the target zone of South-East.</p>	<p>As mentioned above, during a series of meetings that were convened between the National Consultant (NC) and the relevant stakeholders from the GoH, it was decided during those meetings that individual water sources (including their respective recharge zones) and drinking water supply systems (SAEP) should be regarded as the strategic targets for selecting project intervention sites. The related interventions that consider the water management and water needs/challenges in the target areas of the South-East Department are outlined under Component 2 of the project.</p>	<p>ProDoc, pp. 21?42</p>
<p>Provide more information regarding what fora or communication media the implementing agency and its partners will use to communicate results.</p>	<p>A Communication and Knowledge Management Plan annex (Annex 13g) was developed for the ?Strengthening the climatic resilience of the drinking water sector in the South of Haiti? project, as required for the development of a comprehensive Project Document (ProDoc) for the Global Environmental Facility (GEF). This annex (to the ProDoc) provides comprehensive details on how this information sharing and communication to project stakeholders will be conducted under the proposed project.</p>	<p>Communications Plans Annex 12g (Filename: Annex 12g_Haiti PPG GEF_UNDP_Communications Plan_2 Sep 2021)</p>

3/23/22:

We have made several attempts to include the matrix table to Annex B section of the GEF Portal. However, it seems that the table does not show when Reviewer reviews the submission. We have consulted the GEF Portal IT team and after a couple of days of trying to fix this from the IT team, got a confirmation via email, dated 11 Feb 2022, that this problem could not be fixed. We were advised to submit the responses as a document and make a reference to them (hence, we submit the CEO ER document via RoadMap section).

01/25/22:

Included in the Annex B (CEO ER)

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 5/2/22:

Cleared. Due to technical difficulties faced by the agency to include these in the Portal entry, the responses to Council comments have been provided in Annex 16 of the Project Document.

4/22/22:

Adjustments requested.

Please include as an Annex or section of the Project Document, as mentioned in below comment. The only version of the CEO Endorsement Request that will be circulated to Council is the Portal entry, not an additional Word doc titled "CEO Endorsement Request". Therefore, **all materials that are expected to be in the Portal entry but for any reason cannot be included there** should be included as a section or annex of the Project Document, with information on where it can be found (e.g., page or para number) specified in the agency response in this review sheet.

Please also remove all highlight from the Portal entry and Project Document. A dark color has been used that will hide the text when converted to a black and white pdf file.

3/28/22:

Cleared. We understand that due to technical issues, the responses cannot be pasted into the Portal and have been provided as an annex of the Project Document.

2/28/22:

Not yet cleared. Please paste the consolidated table of responses to PIF stage comments, including those provided by the GEF Sec, in the Annex B section of the online CER, as has been done for the other annexes. These should be available in the Portal entry and not just as an uploaded document.

12/21/21:

We are unable to locate responses to STAP comments in the Portal entry. Please include.

Agency Response

UNDP, 04/27/22:

The following Annexes have been added to the ProDoc: 1) Annex 8 Stakeholder Engagement plan; 2) Annex 10 Gender Analysis and action Plan; 3) Annex 12a Site selection; 4) 13i Stakeholder Engagement Report; 5) Annex 16 Response to Project Reviews (Annex B from the CEO ER);

The issue with the text highlighting in the portal has been clarified with the IT Support Team

3/23/22:

We have made several attempts to include the matrix table to Annex B section of the GEF Portal. However, it seems that the table does not show when Reviewer reviews the submission. We have consulted the GEF Portal IT team and after a couple of days of trying to fix this from the IT team, got a confirmation via email, dated 11 Feb 2022, that this problem could not be fixed. We were advised to submit the responses as a document and make a reference to them (hence, we submit the CEO ER document via RoadMap section).

01/25/22:

Included in the Annex B (CEO ER)

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 12/21/21:

Yes.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 2/28/22:

Cleared. Lat/long coordinates have been provided in addition to the map.

12/21/21:

A map of the locations and a table with lat/long coordinates have been submitted.
Is it possible to submit a geo-referenced map?

Agency Response
01/25/22:

A new georeferenced map with sources and watershed boundaries has been added to the Prodoc and CEO ER

Reference: CEO ER, page 64
ProDoc, Annexe 3, page 102

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

7/19/2022: Yes, it is now cleared

6/6/22:

Not yet. Please address the comments on the Budget, which may be found under Q.5 (Resource Availability) section of Part 1 of the review sheet.

4/22/22:

Not yet.

(i) Please ensure that all information that should be included in the Portal entry but for technical reasons cannot, is presented as a section or an annex of the Project Document, not in a Word file titled "CEO Endorsement Request". The only CEO Endorsement Request that will be circulated to Council is the Portal entry. Thus, responses to comments, budget, maps, risk tables, theory of change, etc., should all be either in the Portal main entry or as a section/annex of the Project Document.

(ii) As requested on 3/28, please remove **all** highlight over text in the Portal entry as well as the Project Document.

3/28/22:

Not yet. Please address review comments pertaining to Agency responses to GEF Sec and Council comments of PIF approval stage, and please remove highlighting of text in the Portal entry or ProDoc.

2/28/22:

Not yet. Please address the remaining review comments. Thank you.

12/21/21:

Not yet. The agency is requested to please address the comments for the review items.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/22/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/28/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/28/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/25/2022	

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

5/15/2022

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations