



**GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\*  
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS**

GEF ID:	<b>5531</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Haiti</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Ecosystem Approach to Haiti's Cote Sud</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Multi Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3; CCM-2; CCM-5; SFM/REDD+-1; SFM/REDD+-2; BD-1; LD-1;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$200,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$6,216,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$21,050,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$27,466,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>March 03, 2014</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Rawleston Moore</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Kristin McLaughlin</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Yes Haiti is eligible to receive resources from the LDCF. Aug 29 2013 RM	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	A letter from the operational focal point is on file. Aug 29 2013	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	29 Aug 2013 UA: LD (\$790,000) and BD (\$360,000) STAR funds are currently available for programming in Haiti.	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.  
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		29 Aug 2013 RM: CCM resources (US\$2million) are currently available for programming in Haiti.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	Resources are available for this project under the principle of equitable access.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	29 Aug 2013 UA: SFM/REDD+ incentive funding would be available in a ration of 1:3 to STAR funding. The minimum STAR funding required is \$2 million.	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>29 Aug 2013 UA: Yes for NR focal areas and SFM/REDD+. The link to Aichi targets needs to be provided in the PIF.</p> <p>29 Aug 2013 RM: The project is aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>29 Aug 2013 UA: Yes for NR focal areas.</p> <p>29 Aug 2013 RM: The project is consistent with the NAPA of Haiti. The contributes to the implementation of priorities 2: Strengthening and enforcement of the environment legal framework; 5: Preservation and strengthening of food security; 6: Valuation and conservation of natural resources; and 7. Coastal Zone</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		management,	
Project Design	6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b> , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>29 Aug 2013 UA: Yes for NR focal areas.</p> <p>29 Aug 2013 RM: Yes the baseline project is, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>29 Aug 2013 UA: Not fully. The focus on Mangroves is welcomed. However, the project framework needs to make a better case for the synergy that is created by combining climate change adaptation activities with sustainable forest management and biodiversity conservation.</p> <p>29 Aug 2013 RM: Not Clear. Recommended Action: Consideration should be given to restructuring some of the components and the proposed outputs. For example , perhaps output 2.1.3 should be linked to component outcome 1.2. Will there be any legal and/or regulatory aspects for consideration as it relates to output1.3.3, and overall as it relates to component 1. Please clarify.</p>	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>29 Aug 2013 UA: Yes for NR focal areas.</p> <p>On the carbon benefits: 1. Avoided deforestation - this assumes PAs are affected in the same way as the rest of the country which the PPG would</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>have to investigate, it also assumes full stocking, which doesn't fit 100% with 2) below which assumed some level of degrade - however that's for the PPG to sort out (but I'd err on the side of caution when pulling PIF CO2 estimates together)</p> <p>9,910 ha project area with a deforestation rate of 0.095/year = 941 ha/yr  IPCC standing biomass is 101 tC/ha =&gt;  avoided loss of C is 941 ha * 101tC/ha = 95,041 tC/yr  Assume success same every year =  95,041 tC * 5 years = 475,205 tC  Convert to CO2 = 475,205 * 3.66 = 1,739,250 t CO2</p> <p>2. Improved forest management - assuming the same 9910 ha  IPCC growth rate is 4tC/ha - you are using 3.32 (a good rule of thumb for natural tropical forest is about 2t/ha/yr,) Lets say bad management practices are removing 50% of the growth/yr - leaving <math>3.32/2 = 1.66</math> tC/ha/yr, and that the project can return this to its entirety <math>1.66</math> t/ha * 9910 ha = 16450 t C  Convert to CO2 <math>16,450 * 3.66 = 60,209</math> tCO2  However it would be unlikely to be able to claim all of this over all 5 years as it would take time for any actions to turn into results but it would be possible in the latter end of a 20 year lifecycle.</p> <p>3. Reforestation  460 ha of mangrove - 17 tC seem to high for mangrove better apply rule of thumb</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>of 2 tC/ha/yr  460 ha * 2 tC/ha = 920 tC/yr  Over 5 years = 920 tC * 5 = 4,600 tC  Convert to CO2 4,600 tC * 3.66 = 16,836  Again would be slow growth in initial years but you could also extrapolate to 20 years</p> <p>The fast growing species could easily grow at 6= tC/yr, but again startup would be slow in initial years  400 ha * 6t/ha/yr * 5 yr * 3.66 = 43,920 tCO2</p> <p>29 Aug 2013 RM:  Not clear. Recommended Action. Please provide the specific adaptation benefits for each component separately from the GEF alternative for each component under section A.1.4</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of:  a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and  b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>29 Aug 2013 RM:  Information is provided on the role of public participation including CSOs. Further information should be provided by CEO Endorsement.</p>	
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g.,</p>	<p>29 Aug 2013 RM:  Yes the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and describes sufficient risk mitigation</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	measures to enhance climate resilience)	measures.	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	29 Aug 2013 RM: Yes the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country. Please update the maps attached in attachment 1 to specifically identify and delineate the project areas of all of the other ongoing projects in Haiti identified in section A.4. By CEO endorsement please provide further information on the mechanisms which will be put in place to ensure coordination of all the related initiatives.	
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	29 Aug 2013 RM: The project proposes to use is a fully integrated multi-focal area approach at the community level and this approach is quite new and innovative for the GEF. The project is designed to improve the capacity of all of the participants, and create the long term conditions for sustainability and replication.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	29 Aug 2013 RM: The GEF funding and cofinancing is appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	29 Aug 2013 RM:  Please provide further information on the co-financing which is to be provided by UNDP for this project.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	29 Aug 2013 RM:  Please split the project management costs to show how much resources will come from the LDCF and the GEF trust fund.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	A PPG has been requested and is in line with standard request for a PPG.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of	N/A.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	reflows included?		
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>29 Aug 2013 RM: PIF clearance is not recommended. Please address comments in boxes, 7,8, 17 and 18.</p> <p>Update 10th December RM</p> <p>There have been several informal discussions and a conference call with UNEP on this project. The project is now recommended for clearance and inclusion in an upcoming work program. Please see box 25 for issues to be addressed at CEO endorsement.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>Update 10th December.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement the following need to be addressed:</p>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>1. The project will not limit itself to supporting a few cooperatives and their associated micro-financing systems. Instead it is expected that the project will be designed in such a way as to enable total coverage of the whole South Department with cooperatives and micro-financing systems for agro-forestry, forest carbon stocks protection/enhancement and low-carbon vetiver production.</p> <p>The CEO endorsement request is expected to detail how the project will set up and secure the means necessary for such large-scale deployment of cooperatives and micro-financing systems, especially concerning the financial means. The CEO endorsement request is expected to detail how the project will secure their continuation beyond project completion.</p> <p>2. The CEO endorsement request is also expected to clarify who will be the project partner for micro-financing. The micro-finance partner is expected to have sufficient experience in developing and sustaining micro-financing mechanisms at the scale required, and in attracting and securing funds for the expected large deployment of such financing schemes.</p>	
<b>Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval</b>	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	August 29, 2013	
<b>Review Date (s)</b>	Additional review (as necessary)		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Additional review (as necessary)		

**\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**