



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9750		
Country/Region:	Haiti		
Project Title:	Resilient Productive Landscapes		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	162908 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$182,648	Project Grant:	\$6,210,046
Co-financing:	\$20,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$26,392,694
PIF Approval:	March 16, 2017	Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2017
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Saliha Dobardzic	Agency Contact Person:	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	Yes, the project is aligned with LDCF/SCCF strategic objectives CCA-1 and CCA-2.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	While the project is consistent with Haiti's National Adaptation Program of Action, the project document would be strengthened by including a discussion of consistency with this as well as other plans, reports, assessments under UNFCCC, such as the NDC, or other relevant	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		conventions, in addition to the World Bank Group's Haiti Country Partnerships Framework (CPF) 2016-2019, which has been discussed.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Yes, for PIF stage. It would be important to develop this aspect of the project's theory of change more fully prior to CEO endorsement. Also, please note comment under Review Question #4 below.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>Overall, the project is sound and addresses a critical and pervasive development issue through interventions targeting Haiti's land and watersheds. However, it is not entirely clear how the interventions in this project will be tailored to focus on the challenges that are specifically resulting from the current and expected climate change affecting the area of intervention. Please strengthen the linkage between current and expected climate change effects and the interventions being proposed.</p> <p>In addition, this extends to the role of the LDCF financing in the establishment of the CBF for Haiti. Please explain what concrete adaptation benefits would be generated by participating in this initiative. Please also elaborate on all</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		the sources of support for this initiative, even if unconfirmed. Prior to CEO endorsement, please provide full details on the proposed initiative including sources of capitalization where this issue can be considered adequately.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Yes. However, please note the comment under Review Question #4.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes, for PIF stage. It is expected that this issue would need to be substantially elaborated on by CEO Endorsement/Appraisal stage.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes.	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	The PIF is ready to be recommended for Council review and approval.	
Review Date	Review	March 02, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	Adjustments have been made in response to STAP and GEF SEC comments made at the PCN stage.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>The structure appears appropriate to achieve the expected aims of the project, namely the national capacity building namely in the realm of regional or landscape management, establishment of an adaptation window under the CBF in order to ensure steady income to support adaptation activities in perpetuity, and on-the-ground investments in resilient agricultural production. However, there is a lack of clarity concerning the design given the apparent absence of information on PPG activities. It would be helpful to understand what kind of preparatory activities are being financed by the PPG and how those will be able to influence the design.</p> <p>Update 12/18/2017: Additional clarifications were provided, specifically on the PPG activities that will namely (i) contribute to readiness for</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		implementation (e.g. recruitment of and financing of operating costs of initial support staff ; development of the Project Implementation Manual ; development of ToR for all key staff and operators to be recruited and conduct of recruitment process) ; and (ii) fill some knowledge gaps required before implementation to inform project interventions (including analysis of value chains ; gender gaps ; participation in participatory planning processes in all sub-watersheds).	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	Yes. The balance between the capacity building (\$1.2M) and investments in resilient agricultural techniques and practices (\$2M) is appropriate. The endowment to the National Trust under the CBF for adaptation (\$3M) is adequate to generate annual income to cover operating costs and ensure continuity of project outcomes.	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Yes, the project identifies a number of relevant risks, many of which are rated "high" or "substantial", and describes risk response measures.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	The cofinancing for this project has been revised downwards substantially (from \$20M at PCN to \$11.5M at CEO	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		Endorsement.) Please clarify. Update 12/18/2017: The datasheet has been corrected, with full IDA contribution of \$15 M, and parallel financing of US\$5 M from J/P HRO, and a letter of commitment has been provided.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	Yes.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	n/a	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	Yes.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	Yes.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	There are references to knowledge management, which would be supported under the IDA-financed Component on Project Coordination and Monitoring and Evaluation (US\$ 3.5 M total – 100% IDA). The objective of this component is to support Project coordination and M&E as well as all aspects of management (including fiduciary matters, knowledge management, communication, gender grievance	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		redress mechanism, citizen engagement as well as monitoring mitigation measures related to safeguards)	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	Yes.	
	• STAP	Yes.	
	• GEF Council	n/a	
	• Convention Secretariat	n/a	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	The project is technically cleared for CEO Endorsement.	
Review Date	Review	November 22, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	December 18, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.