

Improving the flow of ecosystem services in biologically-rich watersheds of the Southern region of Haiti

Basic Information

GEF ID

10684

Countries

Haiti

Project Title

Improving the flow of ecosystem services in biologically-rich watersheds of the Southern region of Haiti

GEF Agency(ies)

UNDP

Agency ID

UNDP: 6314

GEF Focal Area(s)

Biodiversity

Program Manager

Sarah Wyatt

PIF

Part I – Project Informatics

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

10/27/2020

Yes.

10/13/2020

No, BD output 1-5 – This is only for the Inclusive Conservation Initiative itself. These activities would likely fall in to either 1-1 or 2-7.

Agency Response

10/22/2020

The BD output 1.5 has been removed from the table A and the text in the page 13.
Based on the project activities, we kept only 1.1

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

11/2/2020

Yes, thank you for the revisions.

10/27/2020

No, please address the following:

Component 2:

- The GEF does not support ex situ conservation. Please revise the arboretum work to be funded by co-financing. We could, however, support nurseries for threatened trees to support reforestation/restoration efforts that may be being undertaken by other groups (as well as this project) and the related work needed to establish this including how to make interventions sustainable.

Component 3:

- Financial gap of what?

During PPG:

- Please consider staff and people turn over when designing capacity building programs so that capacities are maintained after the life of the project.

10/13/2020

No, please address the following:

- Components:

- o 1.1 – How will the project work to actually get this passed not just written?
- o 1.3 – Where is the learning from other projects on this? Have we supported the development of similar things before?
- o Local capacity always needs to consider sustainability – how does that last given turnover?
- o 2 – While we appreciate the importance of use ES as a communication tool, the GEF reason for doing things is because of the BD value. Outcome 2 should be revised with this in mind.

- o 2.1 – Restoration needs a strong biodiversity benefits justification. There has been significant habitat loss so we understand that there is likely room, but a strong justification will be needed for site selection.
- o 2.3 – Voluntary farmers isn't a great English translation (we think that's the issue). Can you come up with a different word for this throughout the document?
- o 2.2 – Arboretums are generally not supported by the GEF – Why is this needed? What's special in this region? Is this also a nursery? Why do we need something specific to the south? How will they work with others?
- o 3 – Only 400 hectares seems quite small in terms of mainstreaming. Why is the number so low? Can greater benefits be achieved?
- o 3 – Certification –Is there evidence of value of certification in providing a price premium for farmers, particularly a Haiti domestic markets. STAP provided a guidance document on certifications that would be good to use here.
- § 3.1 – Has this worked in the past? Any models this is based on? This seems like throwing technology at a problem that may not be successful.
- § 3.6 – We appreciate the value addition component.
- § 3.7 – Looks like the sentence got cut off – tracking what?
- § 3.8 – These examples are so varied and substantially different from supply chain establishment. Is this reasonable to have all in one component?
- o 4.1 – This potentially seems overambitious for the resources available.

Agency Response

10/31/2020

Reference in the PIF: Page 3, Page 8, Page 23, Page 23 (#2.2), Page 26, Page 29 (stakeholder's table), Page 32, Page 35, Page 68, Page 71

Component 2:

Thank you for the comments. The project will support nurseries for threatened trees to support reforestation/restoration efforts that are being undertaken by other groups such as AYITIKA (as well as this project) and the related work needed to establish this including how to make interventions sustainable.

Parallel discussion is ongoing with Swiss Embassy to explore possible cofinancing. This discussion will be deepened during PPG. The text has been adjusted to take this change into consideration.

Reference in the PIF: Page 4

Component 3:

Has been replaced by the amount of financial support provided

Yes. Turnover will be considered when designing capacity building during PPG

10/22/2020

1.1: Increase the advocacy and dialogue with the support of the private sector which has gotten very involved lately on BD conservation

1.3. GEF has supported the 6th BD National report that has an important focus on spatial planning. But the government wants to deepen the experience that was done and strengthen the knowledge and the use of a well experimented tool.

We will also build on the lessons learned from the PMDN project (MARNDR, IDB) and the South Watershed Development Program / Phase 2 (UNDP, 2013)

- The anchoring will be at the local level with civil society organizations where there is no turnover per-se

2-Comment has been taken into account. The outcome 2 has been modified. Changes in PIF: Changes have been made in the outcome 2 in the table B and in the text (page 9)

2.1 Well noted. Criteria for site selection will be established during the PPG phase.

2.3 Rewording was made. Replaced by "targeted farmers". Changes in PIF: Changes have been made in the table B and in the text (page 9)

2.2 The arboretum is part of Haiti's national strategy and action plan for the protection of biodiversity 2019-2030. It is part of the national network of arboreta that the Haitian government aims to establish in the country by 2025. The government aims to establish one arboretum per department (total of 10 department), as a strategy for ex situ biodiversity conservation. The southern region of the country is an area rich in biodiversity and endemism. This biodiversity is prey to various factors of degradation. More recently, Cyclone Mathew caused significant damage in terms of loss of biodiversity, habitats and ecosystems. Endemic species have become increasingly vulnerable in natural habitats, and others are tending to disappear. The establishment of the arboretum in the South will help protect local and endemic species that are threatened and endangered throughout the regions, promote the multiplication of these species (many of them are difficult to multiply, since they are old and degenerate), contribute to raising awareness on issues related to biodiversity and to promote research in the country in the field of biodiversity. A synergy will be developed between the arboretum and the Plant nursery of Dosmond for the multiplication and reproduction of these species that will be used for restoration of 5,400 ha of forest and contribute to global environmental benefits.

Changes in PIF: Text on arboretum has been edited in page 11

3. It was a mistake the right number is 5,400 Ha. Changes in PIF: The numbers have been modified in the table B, Outcome 3

- 2000 hectares of coffee production landscape and 3400 hectares of cocoa production landscape sustainably and productively managed

More details have been added in Page 6 and 7

more details have been added in Page 6 and 7

3- Certification: . Fermented cocoa is dedicated to the international market, particularly niche markets (Fair Trade, organic) where there is a system of premiums and remunerative prices for producers. Precisely the FARMFORCE used by AYITIKA is a traceability tool that allows to set up a good internal control system that guarantees the obtaining of these advantages by the small producers. And this tool is also used by large international companies. The use of this traceability tool <https://farmforce.com/> is expected to be reinforced with the project. Positive experience that will be upscaled "Farmforce gives AYITIKA and the customers security and certainty in the sustainable origin of Haitian cocoa by ensuring traceability of individual certified farmers. With the Farmforce platform it is possible to digitally capture cocoa purchases from specific farmers in the Southern region to ensure that AYITIKA certified cocoa is grown to their high standards. This digital transparency allows AYITIKA to secure international partnerships." (Chesnel Jean, AYITIKA Director).

3.1. Geonova has used this and is still doing this technology for the vetiver and Mango value chains.

3.6- Okay.

3.7- The missing part has been added: "value chains". Changes in PIF: Changes have been made in the output 3.7 in the table B and in the text (page 12)

3.8- Ok. Examples have been deleted. Changes in PIF: Changes have been made in the table B and in the text (page 12)

4.1- the Environmental Information System is already being developed through other initiatives. The GEF7 project would contribute to add a component on Ecosystem services accounting.

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

10/27/202

Yes, cleared.

10/13/2020

No, The PITAG project looks like it will be done by the time this project starts implementation rather than it being investment mobilized. Will there be a continuation? Will this build on/expand their work?

Agency Response

10/22/2020

The project will build on the work being supported by the PITAG project. Ongoing discussion within Government for an extension approx.2023 and a continuation project. More information will be confirmed during PPG phase

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

10/13/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/13/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/13/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

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

10/13/2020

Yes.

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

10/13/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

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

10/13/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

art 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

10/13/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/27/2020

Yes. It will be important to expand on this during PPG.

10/13/2020

No, Relationship to GEF-6 – This project is similar to the GEF-6 project but in a different place. Please talk more about how the projects will work together to be more effective.

Agency Response

10/31/2020

Ok. It will be description of baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects will be appropriately expanded during PPG

10/22/2020

Experiences from the GEF6 project will be used to guide the implementation of some of the project's activities. In addition, certain studies and expertise on certain topics will be shared between the projects in order to create synergy. Studies on Cocoa value chain that will be developed in GEF6 will be used in GEF7

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/13/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/13/2020

Yes.

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

11/2/2020

Yes.

10/27/2020

No, the theory of change has not be included in the Portal.

10/13/2020

No, please provide a theory of change as required by STAP.

Agency Response

10/31/2020

The Theory of change (Annex D) posted in the portal

10/22/2020

Theory of change is in the Annex D of the PIF / page 26

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

10/28/2020

Yes, however we hope that during PPG the project can work to increase the impact.

10/13/2020

No, the numbers are quite low in terms of hectares. Is it possible to be more ambitious in the on-the-ground work?

Agency Response

10/31/2020

Yes. During PPG, the project will work to increase the impact.

10/22/2020

Changes in PIF: Changes have been made in page 8, page 13, page 15, page 20.

It was a mistake; the right number is 5,400 Ha

- 2000 hectares of coffee production landscape
 - 3400 hectares of cocoa production landscape sustainably and productively managed
- 250 hectares of BD-rich ecosystems (incl. Jardin garde-manger "market gardens" and uphill dry forests) will be restored

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/13/2020

Yes.

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

10/13/2020

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

10/13/2020

Yes.

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

10/13/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/13/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

1/2/2020

Yes.

10/28/2020

No, please note the requirements listed below.

10/13/2020

No, please see STAP guidance on climate risk screening ([link below](#)) and provide at least a basic climate risk screening at PIF stage. At a minimum, at PIF stage, the climate risks should be identified, listed and described. This can include:

a.) Outlining the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project location (or as close to it with data available), which

are relevant for the type of intervention being financed (e.g. changes in temperatures, rainfalls, increased flooding, sea level rise, saltwater acquirer contamination, increased soil erosion, etc).

b.) Time horizon if feasible/data available (e.g. up to 2050). Please refer to list of examples from STAP guidance.

c.) Listing key potential hazards for the project that are related to the aspects of the climate scenarios listed above (describe how the climate scenarios identified above are likely to affect the project, during 2020-2050).

d.) Describing plans for climate change risk assessment and mitigation measures during PPG.

Agency Response

10/31/2020

Reference in the PIF: Page 31 : Section 5) climate risk and its management measures included.

Climate risk screening has been included in the revised PIF, in line with STAP Guidance provided in "STAP guidance on climate risk screening, June 2019".

10/22/2020

Climate Risk is already considered in the Risk Matrix – please see page 18

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

10/13/2020

Yes.

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

10/13/2020

Yes.

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

10/13/2020

Yes

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/13/2020

Yes.

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

10/13/2020

Yes.

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

NA

Agency Response

EFSEC 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

11/5/2020

Yes, all the issues have been resolved. Thank you.

11/2/2020

No, please address the following:

1. PMC should be proportional from co-financing.
2. Please list the OFP not the PFP for the country endorsement.
3. For GEF Agency that is not the implementing Agency for the project (IDB), please use "donor Agency" as source.

10/28/2020

Not at this time. Please revise and resubmit.

10/13/2020

Not at this time, please revise and resubmit.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/13/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/28/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/2/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/15/2020	

Additional Review (as necessary) 11/5/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

Haiti as a large tropical island has much endemic biodiversity. Southern Haiti has the highest priority AZE site in the world. Haiti has less than 10% remaining natural forest cover with many poor farmers and people who depend on nature and natural resources to survive. This has led to significant pressure on Haiti's remaining forests for charcoal and conversion for agriculture. In addition to impacting highly biodiverse areas, this results in the loss of critical ecosystem services which can drive a vicious cycle of poverty and environmental destruction.

This project will work with policy, farmers, and systems in areas around the PAs in southern Haiti to mainstream biodiversity. This project will achieve this goal by: governance strengthening and capacity-building to mainstream biological diversity (BD) protection into watershed management; restoration of pilot farms and establishment of resources to support improved farming practices, such as threatened tree nurseries; market-based practices for commodity-related SMEs are strengthened to further increase the demonstrated value of BD-rich ecosystems; and information on the value of restored BD-rich ecosystems is compiled and disseminated, and constitutes an evidence base for awareness-raising and funding mobilization.

Innovation, Sustainability and Scaling-up: This project will work to both pilot approaches for restoration of diverse and productive market garden farming that includes tree crops as well as creating and strengthening the systems needed to support this approach. The project will support the development of nurseries for threatened tree species that can be included in these systems and increase and diversify the supply of trees for this and other restoration initiatives (with attention to maintaining intraspecies diversity). The project will also help scale up an initiative to track high value crops (coffee and cacao), ensure farmer compliance with improved practices, and deliver higher prices to these farmers to give returns for their improved practices.

This project will result in: restoration of 250 ha of diverse farmland; the improved management for biodiversity of 5,400 ha of productive lands; and reduced emissions of 23,944 metric tons of CO₂.