

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

Review PIF 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

8/14/2019

Review completed by PM

4/19/2020

Program Manager

Fareeha Iqbal

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 3/9/2020:

Cleared.

FI, 11/1/2019:

Thank you. Cleared.

FI, 9/30/2019:

Adjustment is requested. Table A only shows alignment with CCA-2 ("mainstream climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact"). However, in addition to mainstreaming climate resilience in water sector planning, the project will support investments in small water infrastructure and other measures to reduce the vulnerability of communities, which is aligned with CCA-1 ("reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation").

Therefore, please also include CCA-1 in Table A.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 1/13/20:

Cleared.

FI, 11/1/19:

Further adjustment is requested:

1) We have not received the metadata or core indicators excel files with the resubmission. Please submit these. (Please note that while the PIF makes reference to number of beneficiary "families", the core indicator table will require an estimate of the number of individuals, not families.)

2) We have not received the annex/supporting document containing a summary of changes (or, explanation of why there have not been changes) to the original project design, etc., given that the originally-cleared PIF is now two years old. The scope of this required supporting document has been outlined in the document, "GEF Sec Brief on Updating Technically Cleared PIFs in the LDCF Pipeline". Please submit the supporting document.

3) Thank you for reducing the emphasis on the NWP, especially since it can capitalize on the newly approved NAP-GCF project. However, it is not clear which regulatory measures have been included. The ones referred to in the review of 9/30/19 included examples such as the following from the technically-approved PIF:

- a) 2.1.1: Two regulatory instruments adjusted to take into account the evolving needs and conditions resulting from CC;
- b) 2.4.4: Water consumption metering systems developed and installed in order to improve water use efficiency and distribution, accompanied with awareness-raising programme

In addition, this previously-included activity (2.3.1 of earlier technically-cleared PIF) appears to remain useful for this project: "Community-level governance structures strengthened in 86 communities, effectively addressing problems of squatting and degradation around water sources and in recharge zones, and providing for collaboration in water management and distribution within and between communities."

If these activities still remain relevant, can you please re-include, especially since the NWP activities have been scaled back.

FI, 9/30/2019:

Further information requested.

a) The National Water Platform (NWP) is a new element that had not been included at PIF stage. Please discuss its relevance and need in the context of adaptation to climate change. We note that several highly relevant regulatory measures have been removed since the earlier (technically cleared) version of the PIF. Please discuss why these were dropped in favor of the NWP. Please also discuss the impact on effectiveness of the other project-supported water resilience measures now that the proposed regulatory measures have been removed from the PIF.

b) This section (and also review items in Part II below) cannot be fully assessed without the following missing documents:

i) The documentation required with resubmission of any pipelined PIF that explains the updates that have been made to make it current and relevant (this particular PIF was last technically cleared over two years ago). All aspects of the updates and submissions required of agencies are captured in the document "GEF Secretariat Brief on Updating Technically Cleared PIFs in the LDCF Pipeline", which was shared with all GEF agencies on February 14, 2018 (we can re-send upon request).

ii) The excel file with (i) CCA Core Indicators for GEF-7, and (ii) Metadata, neither of which has yet been submitted. These are required at time of PIF submission, and can be accessed at:

<https://www.thegef.org/documents/gef-climate-change-adaptation-results-framework-gef-7>

Agency Response

Co-financing

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, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 3/9/2020:

Cleared.

FI, 12/27/2019:

Further adjustment is requested:

- a) Table C: As flagged in the earlier review, co-finance cannot be categorized as both "grant" and "recurrent expenditure" as per GEF Co-finance Policy. Please correctly categorize the last two rows of Table C accordingly.
- b) Table C: In the first column ("Sources of Co-financing") please categorize IDB as "Donor Agency" instead of "Other".

FI, 11/1/2019:

Not yet.

- 1) While we appreciate the modest increase in grant co-finance, we urge UNDP to further strive to increase mobilized investment, and to explain how the proposed "in-kind" co-finance will provide meaningful support.
- 2) The second comment from the review 9/30, below, remains unaddressed, i.e., the last row of Table C still shows grant finance categorized as "recurrent expenditure". Please correct the categorization.

FI, 9/30/2019:

Not yet.

- 1) We note that the originally-proposed (two years ago) "grant" co-financing of \$24.9 million has been altered to nearly entirely "in-kind" co-finance, including a large drop in the already low grant support proposed by UNDP from \$600,000 (earlier version) to \$200,000 in the current version. While there is no minimum requirement for co-finance mobilized, we strongly encourage GEF agencies to contribute larger amounts of grant finance to demonstrate country commitment,

especially in highly vulnerable LDC SIDS. We appreciate that the situation on the ground has changed in the intervening two years; however, the proposed co-finance provides no real additional finance to Haiti and thus will be difficult for us to approve.

2) Regarding the line in Table C pertaining to the co-finance being provided by UNDP, please note that grant expenditure is considered "investment mobilized" in the GEF's cofinancing policy. Please adjust either the "grant" or "recurrent expenditure" categorization provided.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 9/30/2019:

Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 9/30/2019:

Yes. Haiti has yet to program the \$10 M available in LDCF resources under the current per-country cap for GEF-7.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 9/30/2019:

Yes, the requested PPG is within the permissible cap.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/19/20:

Cleared. The project is expected to have 90,000 direct beneficiaries.

FI, 4/15/2020:

Not yet.

a. The Core Indicators excel file specifies that the number of direct beneficiaries should be entered, whereas from UNDP's response of 4/1/20, the figure (338,738) includes both direct and indirect. Please enter only estimated direct beneficiaries in the excel sheet, bearing in mind that the number for direct beneficiaries initially

provided (30,350) is considered very low by the GEF in terms of impact.

b. Please correct the error in paragraph 43 (in 'Adaptation Benefits') of the online PIF, so that the number matches the number of direct beneficiaries in the excel sheet.

FI, 3/24/2020:

Further information is requested.

- 1) We appreciate the much higher number of proposed beneficiaries (338,738). Please provide an explanation for why this number has been provided; is the entire population of the Arrondissement Jacmel expected to benefit from the proposed adaptation measures? Please provide a brief explanation.
- 2) Please submit the excel file with revised CCA Core Indicator information (currently, the former number of proposed beneficiaries is still visible).

(Also, we would be grateful if a lighter colored highlighter could be used in the response; the purple effectively blocks out the underlying text -- thank you.)

FI, 3/9/2020:

Adjustment is requested. 30,350 individuals is a very low number of proposed beneficiaries for a project grant of this size. We expect much greater impact. The agency is kindly requested to significantly revise.

FI, 12/27/2019:

Not possible yet to assess proposed level of impact. Adjustments are requested:

- 1) In the 'Meta-information' sheet, please tick the box for fragile/conflict state. (Haiti is included in the World Bank's harmonized list of Fragile Situations.)
- 2) Top section on 'Core Indicators' of the excel sheet table: Only Column D (of which, only Rows 9-16) needs to be filled in at this stage. These values should display the end-of-project target totals (as identified at PIF stage) for each of the Core Indicators, i.e., values in Column D should reflect **total** number of anticipated beneficiaries/hectares/trainees, etc. Subsequent columns (E, F, G) are intended to be filled at later stages of project implementation, so for now please delete all values entered in those columns. Please change the zero values in the first column to reflect the total number of male and female people that will be trained; and clarify total number of policies/plans in which climate change adaptation will be mainstreamed; etc., etc.
- 3) The PIF states that there will be 30,350 beneficiary families, whereas the 'Core Indicators' excel sheet shows there will be 30,350 individual beneficiaries. Please address this discrepancy.
- 4) Please delete all values entered throughout the excel table (below Row 20) for "CEO Endorsement", "MTR" and "TE" stages (values in Columns C, E, F, G).

5) In Part 1's 'Project Information' section, please ensure the Rio Marker value is set to 2, not 1.

6) Please delete values entered for Indicator 11 of the Core Indicator table in the online PIF template. This table corresponds to GEF Trust Fund results only.

FI, 11/1/2019:

Comment of 9/30 remains unaddressed:

1) The indicators table in the online PIF template still shows values for Indicator 11.

2) We have not yet received the metadata excel file; and

3) We have not yet received the CCA Core Indicators excel file. (Please note that while the PIF makes reference to number of beneficiary "families", the core indicator table will require an estimate of the number of individuals, not families.)

Please address the above items.

FI, 9/30/2019:

Please delete any information entered in the online Core Indicators table, as it corresponds to results for the GEF Trust Fund. Instead, please submit the excel file with core indicator and metadata information for the LDCF for GEF-7. This is available at:

<https://www.thegef.org/documents/gef-climate-change-adaptation-results-framework-gef-7>

Agency Response

4/16/2020 (RTA Simone Bauch, PA Maria Lukina-Lebedeva)

a) the estimated number of direct beneficiaries is 90,000 individuals living in in the Arrondissement of Jacmel. The direct beneficiaries will include individuals that use the products of the project, participants to trainings, those who will be employed by the project on the field, provide raw materials, local labour, and other goods and services to the project. The estimated number of direct beneficiaries has been entered in the excel sheet

b) Error in paragraph 43 has been corrected.

4/01/2020 (RTA Simone Bauch, PA Maria Lukina-Lebedeva)

- 1) 338,728 is the number of estimated populations of the arrondissement from a census that has been published 5 years ago. We consider this number as total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries living in the arrondissement of Jacmel that will benefit from adaptation measures in the water sector on different levels such as: economic, social and environmental. The census source is http://www.ihsi.ht/pdf/projection/Estimat_PopTotal_18ans_Menag2015.pdf).
- 2) Updated Excel submitted via portal

3/12/2020 (RTA Simone Bauch, PA Maria Lukina-Lebedeva)

The number of beneficiaries has been revised in the PIF to 338,728 beneficiaries. (source national Census 2015 http://www.ihsi.ht/pdf/projection/Estimat_PopTotal_18ans_Menag2015.pdf). This is the population of Arrondissement Jacmel in the SouthEast region which is the targeted area.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 11/1/2019:

Cleared. The relevant keyword taxonomy is displayed in the Project Information section of the PIF.

FI, 9/30/2019:

Further information is requested: the taxonomy appears in the Project Information section of the PIF; however, please submit Table G.

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 3/9/2020:

Cleared.

FI, 1/13/20:

Thank you for submitting the summary of changes/updates that have been made to the PIF since it was first technically cleared some time ago. Please provide relevant information on how this project will coordinate with the GCF-funded UNDP support towards national adaptation planning, referred to in the document summarizing updates to the original PIF. This information (on coordination with GCF) may be included in the "Coordination" section of the PIF.

FI, 11/1/2019:

Same as comment of 9/30. Review comment is pending submission of the document, "GEF Sec Brief on Updating Technically Cleared PIFs in the LDCF Pipeline". This should contain a summary of the continued relevance of this project for Haiti, given that the PIF was originally technically-cleared two years ago. This has not yet been received.

FI, 9/30/2019:

Pending information on updates made to the PIF in the intervening two years to ensure continued relevance.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 1/13/20:

Cleared.

FI, 11/1/2019:

Thank you for the explanation on the baseline projects. This review item will be cleared after receiving the annex/supporting document outlined in the document, "GEF Sec Brief on Updating Technically Cleared PIFs in the LDCF Pipeline", which should include a summary of updates (or explanation for lack of changes) made to the baseline projects. This has not yet been received.

FI, 9/30/2019:

This item will be fully reviewed upon receipt of information on the updates made to the PIF to ensure continued relevance for Haiti.

However, please provide further information on the following:

- a) The proposed project will be implemented in the Southeast department of Haiti, whereas the baseline initiative, IDB/WASH is focused on Northern Haiti. Please discuss the relevance of this baseline project for the target sites of the proposed LDCF project; and
- b) Several WASH programs are already including climate change adaptation elements. Please discuss whether the IDB/WASH baseline initiative is already considering impacts of climate change and, if so, how the adaptation benefits of the LDCF will be clearly and measurably additional.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 1/13/20:

Cleared.

FI, 9/30/2019:

Review comment is pending submission of the supporting document/annex described in the document, "GEF Sec Brief on Updating Technically Cleared PIFs in the LDCF Pipeline". The supporting document should contain the summary of updates made to -- and explanation of continued relevance of -- the originally-cleared PIF two years ago. This has not yet been received.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 11/1/2019:

Cleared.

FI, 9/30/2019:

Yes; however, please see comment for review item 1 of Part I, above.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 9/30/2019:

Yes.

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/19/20:

Cleared.

FI, 4/15/20:

Please see comment of 4/15 for review item 6 of Part I of this review sheet, above.

FI, 3/24/2020:

Please see comment of 3/24 for review item 6 of Part I of this review sheet, above.

FI, 3/9/2020:

Please see comment for review item 6 of Part I of this review sheet, above.

FI, 1/13/20:

Please see comment for review item 6 of Part I of this review sheet, above.

FI, 11/1/2019:

Review comment is pending receipt of Core Indicator file for CCA.

FI, 9/30/2019:

Review of this item is pending receipt of the following:

- a) Information on updates made to the PIF in the intervening two years to ensure continued relevance;
- b) Core Indicators and Metadata for CCA for GEF-7.

Agency Response

Response 3/12/2020 (RTA Simone Bauch, PA Maria Lukina-Lebedeva)

Please refer to the response in the item 6 Part I

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 1/13/20:

Cleared.

FI, 11/1/2019:

Thank you for the explanation. It is fine for the scope of the project to remain unchanged, if it continues to be relevant and needed. However, this explanation needs to be included in a supporting document, as specified in the "GEF Sec Brief on Updating Technically Cleared PIFs in the LDCF Pipeline". The supporting document should contain the summary of updates made to -- and explanation of continued relevance of -- the originally-cleared PIF two years ago, including for baseline projects, proposed components, etc. It may also contain an explanation of why aspects remain unchanged from the originally-technically-cleared PIF, two years on. This supporting document is required for all PIFs that were pipelined in GEF-6, and has not yet been received.

Please submit the requested document.

FI, 9/30/2019:

Pending information on updates made to the PIF in the intervening two years to ensure continued relevance.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 1/13/20:

Cleared.

FI, 11/1/2019:|

Thank you. Cleared. Please mention in the PIF that consultations with stakeholders took place in 2019 and that youth will be engaged.

FI, 9/30/2019:

Please also discuss which stakeholders have already been consulted, and when (year). If the project will engage private sector actors (as indicated in the 'Private Sector Engagement' section, please tick the 'private sector entities' box in the stakeholders section accordingly. Is there information on which civil society organizations have or will be consulted, and will be involved in project design and implementation? If so, please include. Also please discuss whether youth will be engaged and if so, how.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/24/20:

Cleared for PIF stage.

PPO comment, 4/21/20:

Considering the objective and scope of this project, we would expect to see more information on important and relevant gender dimensions. UNDP is requested to please provide some additional information (e.g., gender based violence) and some indication of planned project activities/efforts to address gender (especially as related to the expected gender result areas).

FI, 9/30/2019:

Yes.

Agency Response

4/24/2020:

Thank you. Comments have been addressed, please refer to the highlighted changes in the PIF (Table B, pages 6, 10, 11, 17, 18)

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 10/3/2019:

Yes. Dialogue between government, civil society organizations and private sector actors will be promoted. A participatory analysis will be conducted of existing needs/gaps of the water sector that could be addressed through the participation of existing local small and medium sized private enterprises.

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 11/1/2019:

Thank you. Cleared.

FI, 10/4/2019:

Please consider including policy measures (e.g., incentives) to motivate communities to reduce likelihood of risks pertaining to "inadequate buy-in of local community members" and perhaps through careful tending, "low survival rates of trees" (both are included in the matrix).

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 1/13/20:

Cleared.

FI, 11/1/2019:

Thank you. This is cleared. However, please include some of this additional information in the PIF.

FI, 10/4/2019:

Please also discuss coordination with completed, ongoing or planned relevant initiatives supported by other (non-GEF) bilateral/multilateral sources of funding in Haiti. How will this project synergize, inform or be informed by them?

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 10/3/2019:

Yes. The proposed project is aligned with Haiti's NAPA, which identifies Water as one of the most vulnerable sectors to climate change in the country. The South-East, where the project will focus, has been identified as particularly high-risk region in terms of climate change impacts.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 1/13/20:

Cleared.

FI, 11/1/2019:

Thank you. This is cleared. However, please include some of this information in the PIF itself.

FI, 10/3/2019:

This section is unclear. Could you please make it more specific? The focus should not be wholly on scientific and technical studies but largely on sharing practical and usable know-how, lessons and best practice examples emerging from the project at various scales, as well as on how any challenges faced were overcome (or not). In addition, please consider including user-friendly and effective ways to share knowledge within the community and with other (non-beneficiary) communities.

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 9/30/2019:

Yes. A letter dated July 30, 2019 has been submitted, signed by the current OFP, Mr. Moise Jean-Pierre.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) 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 in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/24/20:

Yes.

4/21/20:

Not yet. The Agency is requested to please address PPO comment for section on Gender.

FI, 4/15/20:

Not yet. Please make the requested corrections for review item 6 of Part I of the review sheet.

FI, 3/24/2020:

Further information is requested for review item 6 of Part I and Part II.

Please also submit the excel file with revised CCA Core Indicator information (former number of proposed beneficiaries is still visible). (Please also use a lighter colored highlight over the Agency response text as the purple color blocks out the text beneath. Thank you.)

FI, 3/9/2020:

Not yet. Please address review item 6 of Part I and Part II. Please also enter Agency responses where needed, as these are not visible.

FI, 1/14/20:

Not yet. Please address the following:

Part I: review items 3 and 6; and

Part II: review item 1

FI, 11/1/2019:

Not yet. Please address all comments for Nov. 1, 2019.

FI, 10/4/2019:

Not yet. Please address review comments for the following:

a) PART I: items 1, 2, 3, 6 and 7;

b) PART II: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7; and also

c) sections on Stakeholders, Coordination, Risks, and Knowledge Management.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

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.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

CONTEXT and BACKGROUND

This LDCF PIF will support climate resilience in the drinking water sector of Haiti, a highly vulnerable LDC SIDS that experiences a range of climate and non-climate hazards, high poverty, and conflict and instability. Low sanitation coverage and inadequate availability and treatment of drinking water have contributed to widespread cases of cholera in Haiti. Climate change projections for the country include increasing temperatures, severe heat waves and prolonged flooding, all of which are likely to spur cholera and exacerbate health and social conditions of already vulnerable segments of the population.

COMPONENTS and RESULTS:

The project will be implemented in Haiti's South-East Department, and has three components:

Component 1 will support analyses of climate change implications for access to drinking water, calibrating climate change projections with local hydrogeological and hydrometeorological data. This will enable identification of springs and wells that are likely to dry up, and provide guidance regarding options for guaranteed quality water access. It will also help identify reliable water sources on which to base piped water systems, considering climate change conditions. These analyses will also feed into participatory community-based vulnerability assessments.

Component 2 will support inclusion of climate change considerations in Haiti's existing 'Water Platform', improve coordination of planning and investments across key institutions with responsibilities related to the management of drinking water and other natural resources, and invest in equipment required to effectively enforce adaptation practices, e.g., groundwater level monitoring, rainfall gauges, discharge measurements and other functions (to be identified during PPG) as essential for the effective planning and enforcement of adaptation measures to secure freshwater availability. This component will also strengthen local governance structures in order to improve the control of activities that negatively affect conditions of water sources and recharge zones (e.g., establishment of dwellings, tree felling, chemical pollution, road construction). The strengthening of Water Committees will also help them better oversee and control construction work, O&M, and user rights enforcement.

Component 3 will focus on concrete physical investments in drinking water access to improve community resilience, relating to protection and reforestation of water sources and aquifer recharge zones. Ecosystem-based adaptation measures will be applied to enhance infiltration of rainfall and runoff water, and consequent aquifer recharge, using local species and management models that are locally acceptable. In addition, the project will support physical measures to increase aquifer recharge, rooftop water capture and storage, recycling of grey water, and construction of small storage reservoirs.

The project will directly benefit 90,000 people, enhance the climate-resilient management of 700 ha of land, mainstream climate resilience in two policies or plans, and train 5,000 people.

INNOVATION, SUSTAINABILITY AND SCALE UP:

This project is innovative for Haiti as it will apply a multi-sector approach to promoting climate resilience in water supply. It will also add value to previous investments in the sector by ensuring that decision-making on water supply investments is sound, evidence-based and adaptive given changing climatic conditions, and takes into account multiple sources of information. Its support for diversification of potential water sources by the protection and mobilization of ground, surface, harvested rainwater and recycled household greywater will maximize local water availability.

Sustainability of the field-level resilience measures will be promoted by using low cost, locally-appropriate technologies that have been validated by engineers and target communities. Institutional sustainability will be promoted through the development of in-house capacities in key institutions for scenario analysis, monitoring and decision-making in accordance with principles of adaptive management, and by promoting inter-institutional collaboration. Options for financial sustainability to be explored will include the implementation of locally-negotiated and consensus-based systems for water charges to cover the costs of operation and maintenance of water supply systems,

The project's approach to improving drinking water access is expected to be highly replicable throughout Haiti, given the poor coverage and vulnerability of water supply in the country.