



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT(select decision sought)

PROJECT TYPE: FULL SIZE PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND:GEF/LDCF

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Ecosystem Approach to Haiti's Cote Sud			
Country(ies):	Haiti	GEF Project ID:	5531
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	01167
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Environment & UNEP PADI, ORE, AyitiKa,	Submission Date:	
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi-focal areas	Project Duration(Months)	60
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Project Agency Fee (\$):	\$590,520
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/> 			

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
CCA-1	<p>Outcome 1.2: Reduced vulnerability to climate change in development sectors</p> <p>Outcome 1.3: Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas</p>	<p>Output 1.2.1: Vulnerable physical, natural and social assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability</p> <p>Output 1.3.1: Targeted individual and community livelihood strategies strengthened in relation to climate change impacts, including variability</p>	LDCF	\$2,236,500	\$12,300,000
CCA-2	<p>Outcome 2.2: Strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses</p> <p>Outcome 2.3: Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at</p>	<p>Output 2.2.1: Adaptive capacity of national and regional centers and networks strengthened to rapidly respond to extreme weather events</p> <p>Output 2.3.1: Targeted population groups participating in adaptation and risk reduction awareness activities</p>	LDCF	\$409,500	\$4,300,000

	local level				
CCA-3	Outcome 3.1: Successful demonstration, deployment, and transfer of relevant adaptation technology in targeted areas	Output 3.1.1: Relevant adaptation technology transferred to targeted groups	LDCF	\$472,500	\$3,334,000
CCM-2	Outcome 2.1: Appropriate policy, legal and regulatory frameworks adopted and enforced	Output 2.2: Investment mobilized	GEFTF	\$1,207,500	\$3,060,000
CCM-5	Outcome 5.1: Good management practices in LULUCF adopted both within the forest land and in the wider landscape Outcome 5.2: Restoration and enhancement of carbon stocks in forests and non-forest lands, including peatland	Output 5.1: Carbon stock monitoring systems established Output 5.2: Forests and non-forest lands under good management practices	GEFTF	\$561,750	\$3,090,000
SFM/REDD+1	Outcome 1.2: Good management practices applied in existing forests. Outcome 1.3: Good management practices adopted by relevant economic actors.	Output 1.2: Forest area (hectares) under sustainable management, separated by forest type Output 1.3: Types of services generated through SFM	GEFTF	\$698,250	\$3,370,000
SFM/REDD+2	Outcome 2.2: New revenue for SFM created through engaging in the carbon market.	Output 2.3: Innovative financing mechanisms established (number).	GEFTF	\$52,500	\$3,780,000
BD-1	Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas.	Output 1.1. New protected areas (number) and coverage (hectares) of unprotected ecosystems.	GEFTF	\$320,250	\$5,765,000

LD-1	Outcome 1.2: Improved agricultural management	Output 1.2 Types of Innovative SL/WM practices introduced at field level Output 1.3 Suitable SL/WM interventions to increase vegetative cover in agro-ecosystems		\$257,250	\$3,670,700
Total project costs				\$6,216,000	42,669,700

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs ¹	Grant Amount LDCF/GEF	Confirmed Cofinancing LDCF/GEF
1. Extension and management of the PA system in the South	TA	Outcome 1. The national network of Protected Areas is augmented and under effective management	<p>Output 1.1 The national Protected Areas network is extended. Enhanced conservation and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity. Ecosystem services are protected and improved. Forest loss and degradation is reduced.</p> <p>Output 1.2 Capacity in place for sustainable management of Ile a Vache NP, Port Salut/Pointe Abacou Protected Landscape and the La Cahouane PA including climate-adapted management plans.</p> <p>Capacities of governments and local communities are strengthened. Communities have access to alternative</p>	\$173,550/ \$193,534	\$1,282,468/ \$2,584,247

¹ See Section A5 here for additional details on proposed activities and outputs, and Section 3 of the Project Document

			livelihoods. Increased resilience to climate change.		
2. Ecosystem sustainability and resilience in the identified Protected Areas of South Department in Haiti's Southwestern Peninsula	TA/INV	Outcome 2. Improved Land use and Forestry practices resulting in carbon savings	Output 2.1 400 ha of land reforested. Communities have increased access to forest ecosystem services. Increased resilience to climate change. Output 2.2 Improved technologies and increased efficiency in charcoal production and consumption. Improved charcoal woodlot value chain .conservation and enhancement of carbon stock.	\$141,478/ \$874,662	\$674,253/ \$6,420,033
3. Disaster Risk Reduction through an ecosystem management approach in the broader Southwest Peninsula landscape (Departments of Sud, Grande Anse and Nippes)	TA/INV	Outcome 3. Increased ecosystem and livelihood resilience through an EBA approach Outcome 4. Strengthened local capacity to anticipate and rapidly respond to extreme weather	Output 3.1. rehabilitated and resilient coastlines providing local communities with productive and protective coastal ecosystem services (including disaster risk reduction). Improved buffers for weather related catastrophes. Output 3.2 Resilient livelihoods promote good ecosystem use practices. Livelihood alternatives for vulnerable and impoverished. Food production techniques improve food security/ Output 4.1 Early warning and disaster preparedness is in place for 10 extremely vulnerable and heavily	\$2,445,111/ \$104,128	\$14,714,305/ \$10,321,040

		events	populated small islands and cays in the South Department . Emergency plans in place. Capacities for adaptive planning increased.		
4. Reducing Land degradation and climate change impact by introducing improvements in the vetiver value chain	TA	<p>Outcome 5. Improved Land use practices adopted in the Vetiver value-chain leading to significant carbon sequestration</p> <p>Outcome 6. GHG emission reduction benefits through vetiver supply chain efficiencies, inc new use of by-products</p>	<p>Output 5.1. Increased sustainability and productivity in the vetiver production value chain. Better access to markets. Micro finance support to assist cooperatives to diversify livelihoods. Improved land and water use, biomass and waste management</p> <p>Output 6.1. Private Sector engaged in emissions-responsible production of vetiver oil factories in the broader South West Peninsula. Increased use of renewable energy. Increased adoption of innovative technologies.</p>	\$27,081/ \$1,408,858	\$346,213/ \$764,301
5. Enforcement, Knowledge management and awareness	TA	Outcome 7. Environmental laws are known and enforced adequately	<p>Output 7.1 Environmental agents are deployed to enforce environmental laws, policies, codes and norms. Actions to reduce forest loss and degradation Importance of environmental laws is mainstreamed.</p> <p>Output 7.2 Knowledge generated from the project is disseminated to the public and shared with national structures.</p>	\$175,649/ \$305,962	\$1,238,184/ \$2,245,766

			Increase awareness of beneficiaries of proposed sites of increased resilience and alternative livelihood opportunities. Lessons are shared with other potential beneficiaries of knowledge.		
6. Evaluations (mid Term and Final)				\$13,553/ \$63,447	\$53,000/ \$25,000
Project management Cost (PMC) ²				142,078/ \$146,909	\$1,625,577/ \$375,313
Total project costs				\$3,118,500/ \$3,097,500	\$19,934,000/ \$22,735,700

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	Ministry of Environment	Grant	650,000
GEF Agency	UNEP (Norwegian funds)	Grant	10,585,000
GEF Agency	UNEP	In-kind	1,200,000
Multi-lateral Agency	UNDP	In-kind	3,234,700
Multi-lateral Agency	IADB	Grant	27,000,000
Total Co-financing			42,669,700

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total c=a+b
UNEP	LDCF	CCA	Haiti	3,118,500	296,258	3,414,758
UNEP	GEFTF	CC	Haiti	1,769,250	168,079	1,937,329
UNEP	GEF TF	SFM	Haiti	750,750	71,321	822,071
UNEP	GEF TF	BD	Haiti	320,250	30,423	350,673
UNEP	GEFTF	LD	Haiti	257,250	24,439	281,689
Total Grant Resources				6,216,000	590,520	6,806,520

² PMC costs disproportionately split between LDCF and GEFTF owing to larger co-financing proportions available from this co-financing.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	504,163	1,234,622	1,738,785
National/Local Consultants	1,028,574	2,049,696	3,078,270

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF³

While the objectives and the thrust of the project remain the same, the logical framework has been readjusted to reflect the knowledge gained during the PPG. The conceptual framework in the PIF provided a sound starting point to develop the project in detail, however, changes were made in the logframe to:

- take into account political and economic realities on the ground
- accommodate concerns of stakeholders and coordinating partners; and build on the comparative advantage of project partners
- ensure cost effectiveness
- identify better mechanisms to deliver activities

-clarify language for improved understanding among stakeholders.

Changes from the PIF	Justification
Addition of Component 1: “Extension and management of the PA system in the South”	This component was created to specifically focus on the Protected Areas system, given the opportunity (politically) and the urgency to establish management structures for these vulnerable areas and to declare a new protected area for important coral reef habitats in the Jérémie/Abricots area of Grand’Anse.
Addition of Component 5: “Enforcement, Knowledge management and Awareness”	During the course of the PPG, the need for enforcement was expressed strongly both by government officials and by local stakeholders. MDE requested that enforcement measures not be tucked in as a mere activity but form the core of a new component. Both government officials and local communities stated that without sufficient enforcement, project initiatives would remain ineffective. Moreover, it was emphasized that public awareness had to go hand in hand with enforcement and had to be mainstreamed into education initiatives, local government etc... For that reason, a new component has been added, which recognizes that for the project to be successful it must improve enforcement and conduct public awareness activities throughout the duration of the project and at various levels of the community.

³ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

<p>Outcome 1 used to be “Establishment and effective climate resilient management of Ile a Vache National Park and Port Salut Protected Landscape (20,253 hectares)” and is now: “The national network of Protected Areas is augmented and under effective management”</p>	<p>This change is due to two reasons (1) addition of new Component 1 and (2) this was seen more as an output. As a result the idea of the previous Outcome 1 is now reflected in output 1.2: Output 1.2 Capacity in place for sustainable management of the Ile a Vache NP, Port Salut/ Pointe Abacou Protected Landscape and the La Cahouane PA, including climate-adapted management plans.</p>
<p>Outcome 1.2 in the PIF was “1.2 Improved forest and land use climate resilient practices in five protected areas (9910 hectares) resulting in GHG emission reduction of 408,226 CO2 tons/year. Potential total carbon benefit of 2,041,128 CO2 over 5 years. Additional restoration of 460 hectares of woodlands, resulting in GHG emission reduction of 10,102 CO2 tons/year. Potential total carbon benefit of 508 tons CO2 over 5 years.”</p>	<p>This outcome has now been rephrased as Outcome 2: Improved Land use and forestry practices resulting in carbon savings. The numbers of hectares and emissions reductions are now reflected as targets (See project results table, Annex A).</p>
<p>Component 2: Disaster Risk Reduction through an ecosystem management approach in the broader Southwest Peninsula landscape (South Department)”</p> <p>Rephrased to 2. Ecosystem sustainability and resilience in the identified Protected Areas of South Department in Haiti’s Southwestern Peninsula</p>	<p>Previous Component 2 has merely shifted to Component 3 due to the new Component 1</p>
<p>Outcome 3 used to be: “2.1 Increased ecosystem and livelihood resilience through an Eco-DRR approach in 2,500 hectares along the southern coast landscape. Restoration of 350 hectares of mangrove will result in GHG emission reduction of 2,928 tons/year.</p> <p>Potential total carbon benefit of 14,640 tons CO2 over 5 years.” and is now: “Outcome 3. Increased ecosystem and livelihood resilience through an EBA approach”</p>	<p>This outcome has been rephrased for several reasons: (1) it was assessed that ECO-DRR is one part of a broader EBA approach, and the outcome should be rephrased to reflect EBA (ECO-DRR initiatives are reflected in Output “rehabilitated and resilient coastlines providing local communities with productive and protective coastal ecosystem services (including disaster risk reduction)” and through the indicator “number of people trained in ECO-DRR approaches); (2) the hectares and calculations of carbon emissions have been added as targets rather than within the outcome itself, and (3) the text of the outcome was broadened to account for livelihood resilience which is a core aspect of this project.</p>
<p>New Outcome 7: “Environmental laws are known and enforced adequately”</p>	<p>This new outcome 7 has been added under new Component 5 on enforcement, knowledge management and public awareness. There are two new outputs under this outcome:</p> <p>Output 7.1 Environmental agents are deployed to enforce environmental laws, policies, codes and norms” and</p>

	<p>“Output 7.2 Knowledge generated from the project is disseminated to the public and shared with national structures.”</p>
<p>Increase in co-financing and new co-financing Partner; decrease in UNEP co-financing</p>	<p>There has been an increase in co-financing and the addition of a new co-financier, the Inter-American Development who will contribute USD 27 million to the project, due to the synergies with their programming.</p> <p>In the PIF USD 13,050,000 was to be allocated from the MDE as part of UNEP funds. This amount has now changed to USD 10,585,000 as part of what is available from baseline programming.</p>

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e.S, NAPs national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

The project has been designed to adhere to national plans and priorities and support current institutions. President Martelly identified the environment as a priority focus and as such, recent legislation has increased the demarcations of protected areas and focus on protecting ecosystems. This was done through the assistance of UNEP and this project will further serve to put the management of such protected areas into practice and is in line with national policy.

The project arises from a thorough country-driven process and resonates with key national and sector strategies, such as:

- National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)*- The NBSAP was never completed due to the suspension of World Bank operations in Haiti as a result of the elections of May 2000. Haiti is now in the process of developing its NBSAP and is participating the UNEP led Global Project “Support to GEF Eligible Parties (LDC & SIDS) for the Revision of the NBSAPs and Development of Fifth National Report to the CBD-Phase II. The NBSAP profile prepared prior to the suspension articulates a vision that links the future of the Haitian nation with the way local population plans to use the diversity of biological resources. This future, as identified in the NBSAP profile, to become sustainable, needs to integrate a management approach that reconciles Haitian people with their environment and satisfies their present needs without compromising the well-being of the future generations. The NBSAP profile has retained five specific objectives: 1) to promote education awareness among the public and decision-makers on biodiversity issues, in order to increase their understanding on the interest to conserve Haitian biodiversity and recognize its contribution in the process of sustainable development; 2) to undertake immediate measures to stop biodiversity erosion in natural areas and ecosystems of Haiti; 3) to conserve biodiversity resources of the country; 4) to develop and implement ecological management approaches to preserve and use biodiversity on a sustainable manner; and 5) to implement institutional, legal and fiscal measures in support to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of components of biological diversity (UNCBD). The National Biodiversity strategy guidelines also refer to decentralization and encourage to “Promote a decentralizing approach to manage biodiversity by strengthening the Haitian civil society and territorial collectivities while building their capacities to take appropriate

actions to conserve biological diversity and to facilitate sustainable use of biodiversity components and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources” (UNCBD). The proposed project is in line with the objectives of the NBSAP profile as it will seek to protect vulnerable ecosystems and biodiversity; develop enforcement capacity in protected areas; establish a code of use of biodiversity; develop sustainability norms and standards; sensitize local populations on sustainable use and how this can improve community livelihoods; protect mangroves and provide alternative sources of fuel.

- *National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA)*- Haiti’s NAPA identifies climate related hazards (flooding, saltwater intrusion, changes in river morphology, drought and low flows, intense rainfall and cyclones) and the main human vulnerabilities and livelihood impacts (reduced agricultural production, water shortage or groundwater depletion, flooding, food security, water pollution, loss or degradation of land). Improved management in the department of l’Artibonite is one of the priority adaptation projects. The proposed project is in line with Haiti’s NAPA by developing environmental actions for the local level which will combat negative climate change impacts. In particular, the project will seek to develop climate-adapted management plans for Ile-a-Vache, Port Salut, La Cahouane, and Pointe Abacou protected areas. The project will also support a climate study on coastal forest species, promote the increase of carbon stocks, and foster eco-disaster risk reduction (ECO-DRR) measures. The project also supports four of the NAPA priorities which are:
 - Priority 2: coastal zone management
 - Priority 3: Enhancement and Conservation of Natural Resources
 - Priority 4: Preserving and Strengthening food security
 - Priority 8: Information, Education and Awareness
- *Haiti’s First National Communications on Climate Change*- The evaluation of the process of developing the national communications revealed that there is a lack of training in the climate change sector and that future focus has to be on the public sector and particularly on policy-makers.
- *National Action Plan (NAP)*- The NAP has led to many achievements in Haiti. However, Haiti’s National Capacity Self-Assessment identified several capacity building needs which remain. These include: the identification of areas at risk of imminent or possible degradation; the identification and analysis of the impacts of land degradation; the mapping of degraded areas; the integration of issues related to land degradation in policies, laws and programs in place; the mobilization of government and public awareness; the elaboration of NAPs themselves. This project will support the NAP’s by mitigating degradation, creating management plans for protected areas, enhancing local awareness of improved land management and cultivation practices particularly in the areas of vetiver production. The project will also promote good management practices in land use and land-use change and forestry.

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:

UNEP has a strong relationship and presence with the Haiti government and it has also been active in contributing to environmental findings, policy development and legislative changes. In developing the NAPA and National Communications with Haiti, UNEP has fostered positive working relationships with national teams and various stakeholders, and with other multilateral institutions. UNEP also has a country office which allows it to provide support to national entities and liaise with other project management in order to avoid duplication.

With its office in the Southern region, UNEP is directly implicated in regional matters and has strong relationships with NGOs, CBOs, local communities, researchers, universities and with regional government staff which UNEP seeks to strengthen.

The UNEP Haiti office also supported the information gathering and production of the GEO Haiti: State of the Environment 2010. UNEP contributed technical expertise, worked with a variety of stakeholders, assisted the gathering of baseline environmental information and worked with various institutional partners to generate this data set. Through assisting the government through various projects, UNEP has a good understanding of the politics and technical capacity of state actors to support successful implementation of the project. UNEP also has a sound understanding of the socioeconomic, political and cultural context which allows it to sensitively implement its programming. UNEP is also the co-financier of the project by which it will ensure the value added of resources invested, the lack of duplication and enhanced coordination with other projects and activities.

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

See Annex E for Baseline Context by Geographic Site and Focal Area

There are a number of international projects and initiatives underway within the country. This project will build upon these interventions to avoid duplication, and ensure value added, a use of lessons learned, and a complementary approach to other projects, and to ensure that resources invested by other projects and this one are maximized to the most possible extent. Moreover, this project will seek to build climate resilience into the baseline programming through the planned interventions.

In particular, co-financing will be mobilized through UNEP from the initiatives and donors under the ***Cote Sud Initiative (CSI)***, which is a UN coalition taking a coordinated approach towards promoting food security, access to basic services such as water, sanitation, health, and energy, as well as support for sustainable natural resource management, particularly in the food crop and livestock sub-sector. Its overarching goal is to improve the coordination, quality and targeting of international sustainable development investments in the South Department of Haiti. CSI includes 5 major programmes: CSI Mer Sud, CSI Terre Sud, CSI Route Sud, CSI Energie Sud, and CSI Gouvernance Sud. Together, these programmes provide a baseline of 10.5 million US\$ in programmes and projects implemented by UNEP. CSI is a programmatic coalition that was developed in 2011 with a long-term, 20-year vision. Phase two is currently ongoing with amounts of US\$ 10.5 million for the period of 2013-2015. Additional funding of 6.8 million US\$ has been recently signed between the Government of Norway and UNEP and procedures for internal UNEP approval and partnerships agreements are underway. The sub-projects and initiatives under the CSI, which form the baseline programming, include:

Mer Sud -

This project (USD 2.417 million budget), implemented by UNEP and falling under the UNEP Ecosystem Management Sub-programme, promotes marine ecosystems regeneration and the sustainable management of marine resources. The project focuses on three thematic areas in the South Department of Haiti (1) marine protected areas, (2) reinforced good fishery management and (3) eco-tourism development. The project supports rural coastal communities to move from entrenched poverty and unsustainable natural resource-based livelihoods to more economically productive and environmentally sustainable ecosystem-based livelihoods, with the goal of fully utilizing coastal ecosystem services and respecting ecosystem integrity.

The project has two components:

-Component 1 covers coastal and marine environmental governance and education, which includes:

- 1.1. The consolidation of marine environmental governance structures in the South with the establishment of decentralized Protected Area and Fisheries Units within government structures.
- 1.2. The establishment of a government-led, co-managed Marine Protected Areas Network with associated regulations in the framework of a planned long-term integrated coastal and marine zone management process.
- 1.3. Development of Government-owned database and monitoring systems of marine resources and resources users.
- 1.4. The organization of government sponsored flagship marine environment pride campaigns, dissemination of information on good fishing practices and the implementation of marine education and rehabilitation activities throughout the South Department.

- Component 2 covers community based ecosystem management for improved well-being of coastal communities and will take place under the authority of the relevant ministries and corresponding municipalities. This component includes:

- 2.1. The promotion of ecologically sustainable, economically viable and locally co-managed sustainable fisheries in four coastal municipalities.
- 2.2. The development and piloting of new sustainable ways to exploit the marine environment through crayfish fisheries and apiculture in mangroves.
- 2.3. The development of community based ecotourism initiatives based on the sustainable development of local nature and historical assets in four sites.

The baseline project's successes have included:

- Establishment of the first nine Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) created by presidential decree in August 2013.
- Improved marine and fisheries governance through establishment of a decentralized Fisheries & Aquaculture unit (Ministry of Agriculture) and an MPA unit (Ministry of Environment) in Southern Haiti.
- Enhancement of off-shore fishing through the rehabilitation of 72 boats by trained local artisans.
- Environmentally-friendly fishing materials made available through specialized fishing supply stores.
- Rehabilitation and modernization of the main fish market in Port Salut.
- Safety at sea training for fishermen and emergency plan developed in case of tropical storm, including identification of shelters.
- Establishment of the first native coastal nursery (pilot) to demonstrated role of natural protection barriers against storm surges, floods and tropical storms along the coast.
- Feasibility study to establish the first fish hatchery in the South Department to improve food security.

While the baseline project has been very successful with establishing the MPAs, the proposed GEF project can incrementally support the establishment of sound management, administration and community governance of these MPAs. Similarly, while some natural barriers have been piloted in coastal communities (bamboo plantations for example), the proposed project can enlarge the geographic scope of these interventions and link them to broader eco-disaster risk reduction interventions and training.

The project will seek to build climate resilience into this baseline project. While Mer Sud has been successful in establishing MPAs, the proposed GEF project will support the integration of climate-based planning in Mer Sud operations. This will also support communities to include adaptation measures as part of the governance of the MPAs.

Moreover, the proposed project will strengthen climate resilience by investing in Eco-DRR measures. The project seeks to invest in natural buffers (e.g. mangroves, climate-resilient tree species, strengthening riverbanks and coastal environments) to both use and protect ecosystems against the devastating impacts of climate change. Given, Haiti's particular vulnerability to tropical storms, winds and floods, the project promotes climate resilience through sustainable coastal zone management with ecosystem-based solutions that improve local livelihoods and reduce disaster risk.

Terre Sud -

This project (USD 1.205 million budget) seeks to establish sustainable revegetation through sound soil management for agriculture, agroforestry and forestry in 6 municipalities of the South Department of Haiti. This project is based on two components:

- Component 1 supports governance in agriculture and forestry through dissemination of best practices and environmental education. This component includes:
 - o Harmonization of natural resources management approaches using the Government led Planning mechanisms as platform for best practices and dissemination of locally tested and successful techniques, and
 - o Awareness raising and environmental education activities to promote sustainable practices and prevent destructive ones.
- Component 2 covers community-based ecosystem management for improved well-being of mountainous and rural communities and will take place under the authority of the relevant Ministries and target Municipalities. This component is broken down into a set of 3 interconnected groups of activities delivered as a technological package:
 - o Watershed rehabilitation through sustainable agro forestry practices aiming at (i) establishing forested buffer zones along the Macaya National Park; (ii) establishing wood lots associated to cash crops to promote rational use and survival of trees; (iii) stabilizing river banks through vegetation cover; (iv) implementing soil conservation techniques; (v) establishing commercial orchards combined with coffee plantations, and (vi) top-grafting trees to improve production. Seedlings produced in nearby nurseries by the project will feed this group of activities
 - o Sustainable agriculture activities aiming at (i) improving staple crops production through improved seeds and optimal intercropping systems; (ii) promoting horticultural production associated to innovative small-scale irrigation, as well as; (iii) enhancing soil fertility through environmentally sound and innovative measures such as cover crops and inoculated seeds
 - o Agricultural value chain development activities aiming at (i) improving grain storage systems through increase of storage capacity and business skills trainings targeting women groups, and (ii) providing technical assistance for commercialization

There are some strong areas of complementarities between this baseline project and the proposed GEF project. For instance, under component 2, whereby the baseline project is seeking new agroforestry interventions, activities under Outputs 2 and 3 will promote specific activities that can both reduce stresses on land degradation and promote resilient livelihoods. Similarly, while the baseline project seeks to strengthen value chain development activity, the proposed GEF project's pilot activities on sustainable charcoal will target specific value chains.

The GEF project will build on the baseline project by adding significant investments for climate change adaptation. The project will support the rehabilitation of lands and reforestation with climate-resilient species. Moreover, the energy alternatives that the project promotes will decrease GHG emissions and decrease the rate of deforestation, which will

in turn reduce vulnerability to climate change. Maintaining forest cover and coastal buffers will further insulate populations from vagaries of the climate and its negative impacts (e.g. as floods). Maintaining forest cover and coastal buffers will further insulate populations from vagaries of the climate and its negative impacts (e.g. as floods). Moreover a reduction in the rate of deforestation decreases contributions to global climate change and its impacts on the global carbon cycle.

Energie Sud –

The goal of this project (USD 8 million budget) is to significantly improve energy access in the South Department of Haiti. A secondary goal is to demonstrate and support the national scale rollout of innovative solutions to energy poverty, with an emphasis on the promotion of renewable energy technologies and a Green Economy approach to energy utilization. The project has four main components:

- Component 1 focuses on renewable energy education and governance, including building the capacity of the Government of Haiti and other key Haitian energy sector organizations in the field of renewable energy.
- Component 2 comprises household electricity in the South Department, developing retail energy product and rental sales of Level 1 and 2 solar powered lamps, lanterns and home systems.
- Component 3 is the Haiti Rural Electricity Cooperative, which is developing a modern rural electrical cooperative to upgrade and sustainably operate and manage multiple, town-scale, conventional-renewable energy (diesel PV) hybrid mini-grids.
- Component 4 includes the Grid Renewables South Department Project, which seeks to develop renewable energy power generation for the Les Cayes regional grid in the South Department, as well as assessments of river hydropower and the potential for wind, solar, biomass and pumped storage.

While Energie Sud examines the different aspects of energy, aspects of climate change and ecosystem services are lacking. The proposed project can serve as a link by relating energy sources back to broader ecosystems. The baseline project also does not take into account negative climate impacts on energy sources.

Route Sud -

This programme is coordinated by UNOPS and seeks to build and rehabilitate main roads to increase access to remote and isolated communities. The programme also rehabilitates docks and secondary roads to protect people from floods and increase access to services and markets. It is mainly implemented through the “Emergency Interventions and Infrastructure Reconstruction in the South Department” project (US\$ 3 million). While this project will increase communities’ access to services and markets, it may also allow other private interests to reach more remote areas of the country for charcoal and other natural resources. For that reason, it is important that the proposed GEF project link to the Route Sud programming, particularly on issues related to monitoring and enforcement of protected areas. The strengthening of natural buffers by the proposed project will also help to make the infrastructure investments, made by UNOPS, be more resilient to negative climate impacts.

As this project deals with the rehabilitation of existing damaged structures, no EIA has been conducted.

Gouvernance Sud -

The Grand Sud Development Cooperation Platform, coordinated by UNEP, (USD 0.689 million budget) seeks to support the Ministry of Planning and municipalities in coordinating their activities, monitoring development progress in the

South Department and establishing a platform for discussion on funding activities for donors. It is largely implemented through one project, the “Development Cooperation Platform Project”. This platform provides a useful avenue through which development partners regularly meet and discuss their ongoing and planned initiatives (US\$700,000).

The proposed project will build on these initiatives and utilize the structures in place to enhance cooperation, synergies and dialogue on project activities. In order to provide value-added, the project will utilize the existing Sectoral Table for Environment to discuss climate change, ecosystems-based approaches to development and management implications of the PAs.

The proposed project will also build on the Macaya Grand Sud project, which aims to support the Government of Haiti in promoting the use of ecosystem management approaches in the Southern region of the country (Départements du Sud, Grande Anse et Nippes) to maintain ecosystem services and sustainable productivity of terrestrial and aquatic systems. Macaya Grand Sud supports rural coastal and mountainous communities to switch from entrenched poverty and unsustainable natural resources based livelihoods to more economically productive and environmental sustainable ecosystem based livelihoods, fully utilizing coastal ecosystem services and respecting ecosystem integrity.

The project has many interlinkages particularly in Protected Areas and establishing sustainable resilient livelihoods, however, as is noted in its Macaya Grand Sud’s project document, aspects of building climate change resilience, and promoting Eco-DRR initiatives, will be carried out by the proposed GEF project. As both have UNEP as implementing agencies, it will be feasible to apply the additionality provided by the proposed GEF project to the Macaya Grand Sud project (USD 9 million budget). Specifically, the proposed project’s initiatives in establishing climate-resilient livelihoods, and climate-adapted management plans governing PAs will build on baseline initiatives.

The IADB projects **Sustainable Coastal Tourism Programme** and **Natural Disaster Mitigation Programme in Priority Watersheds** will also serve as baseline projects. The former includes two components: i) improved sustainability and development of fisheries in the southern coastal region of Haiti, and ii) increased productivity and sustainability of the tourism sector through improved governance, destination management, public services and facilities.

The proposed project will build climate change resilience into the baseline project and examine and propose adaptation measures to maintain sustainable fisheries and ecotourism (See Outcome 3).

Natural Disaster Mitigation Programme in Priority Watersheds project finances works to protect upper watersheds and payments for collective and individual incentives for anti-erosive measures in priority watersheds, while supporting the implementation of national policies that favor watershed management. It is focused in the Ravine du Sud and in the Cavaillon are in the South Department. The work on vetiver and SLM promoted by the proposed GEF project will support this initiative, while including adaptation considerations into the baseline project.

- A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

Outcome	Baseline (B)	GEF Alternative (A)	Increment (I) I=A-B
<p>Outcome 1. The national network of Protected Areas is augmented and under effective management</p>	<p>While protected areas have been identified and decreed through legislation, there is currently no management structure in place to monitor or protect these regions. The Ministry of Environment is going through a process of discussing management strategies with Cuba, but currently does not have sufficient human resources to monitor or enforce the areas. As for local communities, few people consulted know that they reside in a protected area, and of those that do, are not aware of what this entails. The protected areas suffer from many destructive practices: charcoal production, use of vulnerable species for food/sale, poor agricultural practices and overfishing. New infrastructure such as roads are also threatening protected areas; giving more access to large trucks involved with logging and resource extraction. There are no climate-resilient community guidelines in managing shared natural resources and land tenure laws are unclear. There are no climate considerations built into community planning. Most of the communities targeted by this project are coastal villages that are observing the “receding of the shoreline”, a decrease in coastal level fisheries, a substantive decrease in biodiversity</p>	<p>GEF financing will allow for the foundational work to take place to establish management plans of the protected areas. On the government capacity front, GEF financing will allow training of decentralized staff in MDE, MARNDR, and SEMANAH on monitoring, protection, enforcement and public awareness of protected areas. The project will also support these governmental entities with small equipment (such as binoculars, GPS, radars) and signage to support PA management and oversight.</p> <p>GEF financing will also support climate change vulnerability assessments for identified and planned National Parks, Protected Landscapes and MPAs in the southwestern Peninsula and provide recommendations on adaptive/resilient management. This will provide better insight of the climate realities and how best to adapt to oncoming circumstances.</p> <p>In addition, GEF financing will apply this information through climate-adapted management plans for Ile-a-Vache National Park, Port Salut/Pointe Abacou Protected Landscape and the La Cahouane PA through consultation with key stakeholders and local communities,</p>	<p>367,084 USD</p>

	<p>and an increase in invasive fish (colloquially “minustah”).</p> <p>While Haiti has initiated discussions with Cuba in regards to models for PAs, the fact remains that Cuba has a very different governance structure than Haiti. Haiti would benefit from other cross-Caribbean consultations on PAs as well, but has not done so yet.</p>	<p>including cross-site management plans.</p> <p>In particular, GEF financing will promote a participatory and cooperative management structure, which ensures long time sustainability, by avoiding power inequalities and conflicts in the long run. This will also promote country ownership of the project and support adherence to the maintenance of PAs ecosystems.</p> <p>In order to further enhance the successful management of PAs and their ecosystems, GEF financing will also support an awareness raising campaign through local media, schools and NGOs to sensitize communities about the rationale and significance of PAs/MMAs, their boundaries, as well as on the economic activities that can be sustainably undertaken within PA boundaries.</p> <p>Finally, in order to fully benefit from regional knowledge, GEF financing will support enforcement of protected areas through training, knowledge sharing, data coordination and south-south cooperation with Caribbean countries.</p>	
--	--	--	--

<p>Outcome 2. Improved land use and forestry practices resulting in carbon savings</p>	<p>Haiti is one of the most deforested countries in the world. Its primary forest cover is estimated between 1.5 percent (41,000 ha) and 3.7 percent (102,000 ha) of the country's area, whereas in 1927 it reached 25%, in 1960 20%, and in 1980/1990 less than 10%. The southern departments, which comprise the project area, are the only ones where a consistent vegetative cover remains, while departments more to the North possess almost no forests. 73 percent of Haiti's forests are naturally regenerated forests, and the 27 remaining percent is planted forest: the only primary forests left in Haiti are part of the Macaya Natural National Park. The biomass stock in Haiti's forests is estimated at 26 million tons with a growth rate of 3.8% (1 million tons produced per year). This means that the biomass taken is far more important than the biomass produced. Also, according to the 2013 Second National Communication to the UNFCCC, a total of 1,149 GHGs were emitted in 2000 from the forestry sector.</p> <p>Main causes of forest and land degradation in Haiti are deforestation because of the intensive cutting of trees for firewood and charcoal production. The intensive cutting of forest and mangrove trees for firewood and charcoal production leads also to the loss of marine life, especially in the South Department, and their destructive impacts the entire marine food chain. The lack of access to alternative and affordable clean technology is a barrier. At the same time, with increasing population pressure and lack of alternative</p>	<p>Without tackling reforestation and addressing some of the challenges of land degradation, the project will remain unsuccessful. For that reason, with GEF financing, the project will support reforestation initiatives. It is estimated that contributing to reforestation will lead to an increased amount of carbon sequestered within trees and limit the emission of GHG into the atmosphere. It is estimated that the project activities related to reforestation will enable the sequestration of 6,867,862 tons of CO2 by the end of project.</p> <p>These benefits will be sought by planting 400 ha of resilient, value-added fruit trees in deforested lands (La Cahouane, Port Salut/Pointe Abacou, Ile a Vache, Jérémie) so as to increase carbon stocks and improve livelihoods. It will also be supported by establishing community-managed woodlots, for sustainable charcoal production, by planting 500 ha hectares of fast-growing, climate-resilient native trees on deforested land. In addition, the 200 hectares of vetiver contour line plantation will add carbon sequestration.</p> <p>GEF financing will also support the undertaking of a study climate impacts on coastal forests species, and determine optimally resilient tree species for reforestation plans. This will limit any possible failures of planting mal-adaptive species which has been an experience of other projects in Haiti.</p> <p>Finally, in order to target loggers'</p>	<p>1,016,140 USD</p>
--	---	--	----------------------

	<p>opportunity, forest encroachment for forest products become the only source of rural income.</p> <p>The charcoal production and consumption is one of the main drivers of deforestation of Haiti's woods, woodlands and a large emissions source. Improvements in the conversion of biomass to charcoal and the efficient use of charcoal show a tremendous potential for reductions in the associated GHG emissions. This potential consists in both avoided consumption of non-sustainable biomass, mitigation of CH4 emissions during the production process, and avoided GHG emissions from the use of efficient charcoal kilns. In Haiti, over 4 Mt of firewood and 1,4 Mt of charcoal were estimated to be consumed in 2012. The growing demand for charcoal fuel remains an important cause of deforestation.</p> <p><i>Summary of available baseline data:</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="381 1138 945 1453"> <thead> <tr> <th>Type of data</th> <th>Value</th> <th>Unit</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Forest cover (Haiti)</td> <td>41 000 to 102 000</td> <td>ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Forest and woodlands cover (Project areas)</td> <td>64 943</td> <td>ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mangrove cover (Haiti)</td> <td>13 700</td> <td>ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mangrove cover (Project areas)</td> <td>2 500</td> <td>ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Deforestation rate (Haiti)</td> <td>12.9</td> <td>%/year</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Growth rate (Haiti)</td> <td>3.8</td> <td>%/year</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Deforestation rate (Haiti)</td> <td>5.4 millions</td> <td>t of wood/year</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Type of data	Value	Unit	Forest cover (Haiti)	41 000 to 102 000	ha	Forest and woodlands cover (Project areas)	64 943	ha	Mangrove cover (Haiti)	13 700	ha	Mangrove cover (Project areas)	2 500	ha	Deforestation rate (Haiti)	12.9	%/year	Growth rate (Haiti)	3.8	%/year	Deforestation rate (Haiti)	5.4 millions	t of wood/year	<p>behavior in the PAs, GEF financing will also support the development of a code of use, including sustainable planting schedules, management, cutting and replenishment of forested plots by local stakeholders, for community loggers.</p>	
Type of data	Value	Unit																									
Forest cover (Haiti)	41 000 to 102 000	ha																									
Forest and woodlands cover (Project areas)	64 943	ha																									
Mangrove cover (Haiti)	13 700	ha																									
Mangrove cover (Project areas)	2 500	ha																									
Deforestation rate (Haiti)	12.9	%/year																									
Growth rate (Haiti)	3.8	%/year																									
Deforestation rate (Haiti)	5.4 millions	t of wood/year																									
<p>Outcome 3. Increased ecosystem and livelihood resilience through an Eco-DRR approach</p>	<p>Haiti is one of the countries that is most ravaged by natural disasters in Caribbean. While early warning dissemination has improved drastically, particularly with the use of cellular technology and improved protocols by the DCP, people's lives and livelihoods are still at risk. Haiti still incurs the greatest losses of lives and property during hurricanes, and resilient</p>	<p>In taking note of the poverty that exists in the baseline, GEF financing will foremost address the need for establishing viable, alternative ecosystem-based livelihoods. This will include the promotion of the following livelihood activities: castor oil production, planting/cultivation of fruit trees, ecotourism, sustainable fisheries, mariculture, cacao,</p>	<p>2,126,478 USD</p>																								

	<p>planning to manage these has not yet commenced. The disaster management framework is based on response (evacuation), rather than prevention, adaptation or mitigation. Furthermore, disaster management is hampered by environmental problems, such as an excess of waste and pollution, which cause obstacles to evacuating teams and allow the spread of disease.</p> <p>While UNEP, through supporting the NGO PADI, has successfully built shelters for fishermen’s boat in the Port Salut area, there remain many more fisherfolk communities that lose their means to survive during climate disasters. Further, as most communities are situated at the shoreline, any storm threatens housing, agricultural and food production, exacerbating people’s poverty and reliance on immediate natural resources. Fisheries which is the main activity of most in the targeted sites are beginning to dry up, and with each climate catastrophe or hurricane season it becomes more and more difficult for fishers to go out in the higher seas to catch an ample supply.</p> <p>Survey results reveal that the majority of those in selected sites are at a subsistence level of poverty. Communities that were consulted do not have emergency stocks of food, water or seedlings for agricultural production. There is no livelihood planning with regards to disaster management at the community level.</p>	<p>cashews, vetiver and aquaculture. The sustainable and economical feasible way of engaging in these livelihood activities will be piloted in the four sites.</p> <p>GEF financing will also support piloting of improved food production techniques in coastal communities demonstrating SLM practices, including agro-forestry.</p> <p>In building toward climate resilience, GEF financing will also support the rehabilitation of 700 hectares of degraded mangrove in South Department Protected Areas and beyond, using a participatory approach. GEF financing will also conduct shoreline and riverbank stabilization (20 km) to strengthen buffer areas.</p> <p>As fisheries is the most common activity in all of these sites, GEF financing will provide training on sustainable fisheries to address current stock depletion and pollution, including no-take zones and periods, variety/size selection and the sustainable use of DCPs (linked to the PA management plans and supported by alternative livelihoods). There is also the anticipation that establishing no take-zones will allow certain fish to reach reproductive maturity so that fish can begin to replenish their currently degraded stocks.</p>	
--	---	---	--

<p>Outcome 4. Strengthened local capacity to anticipate and rapidly respond to extreme weather events</p>	<p>As mentioned under the previous outcome, the DCP has made great strides in establishing early warnings to most of the communities. However, the most vulnerable residing in remote isles around Ile-a-Vache do not have an established warning system and have no evacuation measures. These people are in particularly precarious situations as they are surrounded by the sea and live at sea level. Also, while the DCP and associated partners have established emergency contacts in communities, there are no real preventative measures to protect people’s fishing equipment or housing. There are no emergency shelters on the islands and all of the housing is made of thatched straw houses. There are no emergency water supplies or extra food savings. There is virtually no agricultural production other than the odd almond tree, which increases dependence on fisheries. This also means that during the hurricane season, populations are likely to have insufficient food resources.</p>	<p>In order to provide adequate policy recommendations, GEF financings will support undertaking a detailed, community based Coastal Climate/Disaster Vulnerability Assessment (using e.g. DIVA or CRISTAL) in coastal and small islands communities and provide policy recommendations on short, medium- and long-term adaptation measures, including Eco-DRR measures.</p> <p>GEF financing will also provide training to the Departement de Protection Civile (DPC), local authorities, coastal communities on specific challenges DRM and Eco-DRR specifically related to coastal communities and small isle dwellers. During consultations DPC expressed an interest in integrating climate resilience into their disaster management planning.</p> <p>GEF financing will also support dissemination of available early warning information by strengthening department and community institutional structures on Ile-a-Vache and surrounding islands.</p> <p>In order to address the safety of people and their livelihoods-related equipment, GEF financing will also support the rehabilitation or construction of emergency shelter structures on the 10 islands and cays.</p>	<p>422,761 USD</p>
<p>Outcome 5. Improved Land use practices adopted in the Vetiver value-</p>	<p>Vetiver production is a key industry of the Southern region. Given its hardiness in a steep and dry landscape, it is an optimal plant to grow in otherwise degraded lands. However,</p>	<p>GEF financing will introduce resilient and sustainable vetiver production practices related to land and water use, biomass management, waste management, emissions</p>	<p>390,804 USD</p>

<p>chain leading to significant carbon sequestration</p>	<p>the entire production cycle is fairly inefficient causing land degradation, creating waste, using fuel and also preventing it from being a crop that can provide economic security for farmers. Part of the inefficiencies lie with the lack of knowledge about planting, harvesting, and root cleaning techniques. Another issue is that the average farmer only cultivates on a small parcel of land. This creates disparities in prices obtained, relationships with the private sector, and differences in cultivation techniques. A handful of cooperatives are slowly emerging to establish an organizational body that can negotiate price, certify vetiver cultivation practices, ensure that proper harvesting methods are used and provide traceability. However, these are in the formative stages and have yet to include a large proportion of vetiver producers.</p>	<p>management in pilot agricultural sites located within Port Salut Protected Landscape (200 ha).</p> <p>GEF financing will also support vetiver producer cooperatives so as to increase the areas under soil conservation, promote sustainable vetiver harvesting techniques, and improve land and water use efficiency through water catchment basins land works (contour line hedgerows). The trainings received by cooperatives will be scaled up at a regional level so as to include vetiver producers throughout the Grand Sud.</p> <p>GEF financing will support a study and develop recommendations on the carbon balance of the vetiver production cycle, land conservation values of improved management practices, improved practices for traceability, and monitor emissions generated/avoided throughout the project.</p>	
<p>Outcome 6. GHG emission reduction benefits through vetiver supply chain efficiencies, including new use of by-products</p>	<p>There are currently two large vetiver distillers in the South and approximately twelve small distillers. As mentioned previously, vetiver factories process vetiver roots through a process of distillation, and require large amounts of fuel oil to run the boilers to produce vetiver oil. The expenses of fuel oil, is a large cost to the private sector and also adds to carbon emissions.</p>	<p>In relation to the previous output, under this this output seeks GEF financing seek to improve vetiver distillation practices in factories. This will be done by increasing energy efficiency and including the use of renewable energy. First, increasing the energy efficiency will help using fewer materials for combustion, resulting in a smaller amount of GHG emitted. Second, the use of renewable energy would consist in using the vetiver distillation wastes as a source of energy for combustion; that means fewer fuelwood would be necessary for distillation, therefore</p>	<p>1,045,135 USD</p>

		<p>the impact on forest will be positive.</p> <p>GEF financing will allow a review of vetiver production practices in factories and provide recommendations and methodology to improve production methods towards sustainability and resilience, such as energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy (biomass)</p> <p>With GEF financing the project will identify volunteer industrial vetiver producers according to a set of criteria and install low-emission vetiver production equipment (biomass generation, energy efficiency) in pilot sites and factories in order to demonstrate the cost-efficiency of reducing emissions.</p>	
Outcome 7. Environmental laws are known and enforced adequately	<p>In the baseline, environmental laws and policies are largely unknown or ignored. There are absolutely no enforcement mechanisms in place and people do not know what the risks or benefits are of improved ecosystem management. In cases where there are fines or punitive measures in place for particular actions that degrade the environment, this information is not mainstreamed at the local level.</p> <p>While there is a unit of environmental surveillance officers in MDE, these are not located in the southwestern peninsula. There is thus no monitoring of the remaining forests, coral reef or ebbing coastlines of the region. In the baseline, there are no plans or resources to deploy environmental agents to the region.</p>	<p>The project will promote an awareness campaign for the local communities residing in the targeted sites of the project. Details of existing laws and regulations will be shared in Creole in a comprehensible way (through orators, local leaders, posters, radio ads). Local leaders as well as schoolchildren will be addressed so as to cover a broad range of beneficiaries and to reinforce the value of ecosystems management at intergenerational levels.</p> <p>GEF financing will also allow for the building of enforcement capacity. Through trainings of environmental monitoring agents and provision of surveillance equipment, the project will build up the unit that is relatively new in MDE. These agents, in</p>	481,611 USD

	While there have been one-off campaigns, there is no sustained environmental engagement and awareness strategy on the protected areas and how to maintain them, while carrying out livelihood activities.	addition to monitoring laws, will also be trained as to the benefits of ecosystems management.	
--	---	--	--

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

Risks	Rating (High (H), Medium (M), Low (L))	Possible Mitigation Strategies
Corruption	High	Given the political turmoil, potential for political change, the risk of corruption is relatively high. However, the project implementation structure will be such to both empower and strengthen the government institutions involved, while providing the necessary oversight and accountability measures. As is elaborated in the Project Implementation description provided in the accompanying project document, the project management structure will include participation from UNEP to partner with the project manager and to provide the timely support as needed. The project will also include wide partnership of various ministries on the Steering Committee. This cross-government oversight will allow greater accountability among institutions, and avoid the problem of one institution not knowing what funds the other is receiving through international projects. UNEP through the co-execution model will also support MDE to foster improved management and accountability practices.
Lack of uptake of project interventions	Low	Project interventions have been devised following numerous consultations and surveys with local communities and other stakeholders. The final list of activities includes the priorities expressed, which are likely to promote government uptake. Moreover, alternative livelihoods are at the heart of this project, thereby providing a socio-economic incentive for participation.
Project interventions too long-term to meet short-term	Medium	Some of the project interventions designed to support vulnerable communities may only realize themselves in the longer term (e.g. sustainable woodlots for charcoal

needs of beneficiaries		production, agroforestry, mangrove rehabilitation). In order to sustain beneficiaries' interest and participation, beneficiaries must (i) be kept abreast of the various stages of the project; (ii) receive consistent public awareness messages about the various phases of the project; (iii) receive the training and capacity-building that will help manage their expectations. The project is also meticulously designed over the five years to provide results year after year in various areas.
Private sector interests possibly limit success of vetiver cooperatives	Medium	The vetiver industry is dominated by three factories (Agrisupply and UNIKODE in Les Cayes, Carribean Flavors & Fragrances in Port-au-Prince). Given the share of the global market these enterprises respond to, they have a great deal of political and financial clout. However, the project anticipates theirs and the small distillators support for the following reasons: improved efficiencies in the vetiver value chain will actually add to these companies' bottom line. It is thus beneficial for them to engage; global pressures are mounting to provide traceable, sustainably harvested vetiver—this provides an opportune climate for carrying out this project. It will also be demonstrated how organizing more producers (in cooperatives for instance) will increase availability and cleanliness of vetiver roots, as well as traceability which private companies are seeking.
Political changes and conflict limit project success	High	At the time of writing, it is unclear what will happen on the political landscape. Since the start of the PPG, the Minister of Environment has changed, elections have been called, but it is unclear when they will happen and who the reigning party will be. While it is anticipated that there will be disruptions, the project has been designed to support local level communities and influence the value chains that are some of the most significant in Haiti. It is anticipated that any government will have an interest in engaging in activities that impact these value chains. In the meantime, UNEP is maintaining positive relations with the various political actors on the environmental front.
Lack of coordination among donor interventions and international projects	Low	Having a UNEP office in the region where the project will be implemented has a great deal of value-added (i) there is a clear idea of what projects are being developed and rolled out; (ii) there is a great deal of collaboration with other international institutions to ensure that there is no

		duplication or overlap; (iii) UNEP has been supporting the regional departments to enhance coordination among partners, thereby playing a key role in enhancing partnerships. It is thus unlikely that duplicative activities take place in these sites. Numerous consultations have taken place with international partners to avoid any such risk.
Climate change risks	High	Haiti is subject to frequent droughts and floods. It is already subject to climate variability and extreme weather events as it lies in the middle of the hurricane belt and is subject to an average of seven hurricanes and other severe storms each year. With worsening and unpredictable climate events it is anticipated that the frequency and severity of climate-related events will increase. As the population is so dependent on small-scale subsistence farming, this makes them even more vulnerable to the damage from natural disasters. Given this level of vulnerability, it is imperative that development activities in the country also promote resilience and consider climate change risks in development planning. This project will incorporate resilience building in its activities, trainings, and in the community management plans for improved PA management. Project execution team will keep abreast of emerging research on climate resilient approaches relating to livelihood diversification activities, inclusive of selection of species, location etc. Moreover, the project will invest in public awareness and knowledge sharing activities to mainstream knowledge about climate resilience.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

- The GEF-UNDP funded project **“Increasing resilience of ecosystems and vulnerable communities to CC and anthropic threats through a ridge to reef approach to BD conservation and watershed management”** is closely related to the current project and will aim at delivering help to reduce the vulnerability of poor communities in Haiti to the effects of climate change, while at the same time conserving threatened coastal and marine biodiversity. Investments in climate-proofed and socially-sustainable BD conservation strategies, within the context of the National Protected Areas System (NPAS), will enable coastal and marine ecosystems to continue to generate Ecosystem-Based Adaptation (EBA) services; while additional investment of adaptation funds in the watersheds which drain into these ecosystems will serve to maximize BD benefits and ecosystem functions, as well as generating EBA benefits for the populations living in the watersheds themselves. There were numerous consultations with UNDP during the preparation of both projects to ensure that there is no overlap, duplication and that information is shared optimally. As a result, both projects are working in different geographic areas. Lessons learned will be shared throughout to ensure complementarity.
- MDE/IDB/GEF project **“Sustainable Land Management of the Upper Watersheds of Southwestern Haiti”** whose objective is to contain the rapid environmental degradation in the upper watershed of the Southern part of Haiti, particularly in the area of the biologically rich zone of the Macaya National park and its buffer

zones, through the integration of sustainable land and forest management practices, and the prevention of deforestation, soil erosion and natural disasters. Additional NORAD funding will support two main components of the project: 1) Strengthening and restoration of ecosystems services 2) Strengthening of local and institutional governance.

- The project will share lessons learned from the UNDP/LDCF/GEF “**Strengthening Adaptive Capacities to Address Climate Change Threats on Sustainable Development Strategies for Coastal Communities in Haiti**”. This project has focused on strengthening local governments and community-based organisations in relation to climate change resilience, and the raising of awareness among local populations regarding CCA, as well as tangible measures such as soil erosion control, gulley stabilization and the protection of water sources, which the proposed project can learn from.
- The project will also coordinate with the LDCF/FAO project “**Strengthening climate Resilience and Reducing Disaster Risk in Agriculture to Improve Food Security**”, which will yield lessons on climate-resilient agricultural practices, which are of particular relevance under Outcomes 3 and 4.
- UNEP is also supporting the implementation of UNEP/GEF “**Developing Core Capacity for MEA Implementation in Haiti (CCCD)**” which will allow synergies with this proposed project. In particular, the CCCD project will establish the institutional mechanisms that this project can reinforce, given the cross-cutting thematic approach to the proposed project.
- The project will coordinate and share lessons with the MDE/UNDP/GEF project “**Establishment of Financially Sustainable National Protected Areas System (SNAP)**”, which aims to establish a national protected areas system in Haiti. Its geographic scope includes all areas of the country. The objective of the project is to promote national investments in protected areas and to increase the efficiency, diversity and amount of funds available for this purpose.
- Project links and knowledge sharing will also be explored with two LDCF funded global projects: **Expanding the Ongoing Support to Least Developed Countries (LDCs) with country-driven processes to advance National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) and Building capacity for LDCs to participate effectively in intergovernmental climate change processes**, as well as the SCCF financed project: **China: Enhancing Capacity, Knowledge and Technology Support to Build Climate Resilience of Vulnerable Developing Countries**. While largely focused on Africa and Asia-Pacific, all LDC countries including Haiti stand to benefit from Component 2 of this project which will build Inter-regional online EBA knowledge support; and will include the development of EBA planning tools for decision-makers and project managers and providing inter-regional knowledge support through an interactive web-based platform, including documentaries, research funding guidance, policy briefs as well as access to information and planning tools.

Further to earlier GEF approved UNDP executed projects, coordination between agencies, including other GEF projects, will be vital to minimize or avoid duplication, to improve effectiveness of activities, and to scale up impacts. Linkages between agencies including UNEP, FAO, WFP, IFAD, DFID, World Bank, IDB, EU, GIZ and AECID will be promoted, in consultation with partners and the Government, through several exiting and structured coordination mechanisms:

- 1) The **Technical Group of Political Champions for Resilience in Haiti** (TG-PCR/Haiti), aiming at playing an ambassadorial and advocacy role in favor of causes and issues that relate to resilience and its relation to the development process across the country;
- 2) The **Permanent Working Group on Protected Areas** (GTAP), a consultation and harmonization mechanism promoted by the UNDP/SNAP Project and the Swiss Cooperation Development Division (DDC), that will play an advisory and coordination role to ANAP.

- 3) The "**Table de Coordination Sud**" is the South Department Regional Donor Cooperation Group, facilitated by UNEP. This Table de Coordination will serve as the coordinating body for cross relevant projects funded in the South Department.

In terms of coordination with the PPCR , the main agency responsible for the PPCR is CIAT (Comité Interministériel d'Aménagement du Territoire). While the PPCR will not have any activities in the South that will directly link with the GEF project (they will work only in the Central Plateau and in the North), best practices and lessons learned on climate resilience and adaptation from UNEP supported work in the South will be incorporated into their approach for the North, including for small islands located off of the coast. In addition, CIAT will be one of UNEP's main implementing partners for regional planning to address climate adaptation and resiliency in the co-financing project Macaya Grand Sud.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

Given the scope of this project, there will be the need of involvement of a variety of stakeholders. Stakeholders have been consulted from the onset of project development to identify:

- Local needs, socioeconomic factors
- Project partners- opportunities for coordination, synergies and maximization of resources; implementation partners
- Project risks
- Challenges
- Opportunities
- Current practices; baseline business-as-usual scenario

Overall, the following stakeholders will include:

- (1) Government partners- These will oversee, enforce, provide institutional support and receive capacity building training to support project implementation. They will also receive information on lessons learned during project implementation so that they may include this information in their own projects and activities. These include:
 - Ministère de l'Environnement (MDE)
 - Ministère de l'Agriculture des Ressources Naturelles et du Développement Rurale
 - ANAP (part of MDE)
 - Comité Interministériel d'aménagement du Territoire (CIAT)
 - Direction de la Protection Civile (DPC)

- Ministère du Tourisme et des Industries Creative
- Ministère de l'Intérieur et des Collectivités Territoriales
- Ministre des Affaires Sociales et du Travail
- Ministère des Travaux Publics, Transport, Communications et Énergie
- Service Maritime de la Navigation (SEMANAH)
- National Office of the Cadastre
- Département du Sud

(2) Local Stakeholders- these communities will be the beneficiaries of project interventions and contribute to the implementation of activities.

- Local communities in La Cahouane, Port Salut/Point Abacou, Ile-a-Vache and surrounding isles, Jeremie and surrounding areas.
- Vetiver producers, charcoal producers, castor oil producers in aforementioned regions.
- Women- the project will ensure that women are consulted and derive the expected benefits from project implementation. Project results will be disaggregated by gender so as to measure the impact on women.
- Cooperatives (in vetiver, coffee, cacao, sustainable charcoal production)

(3) Local NGOs

- Organization for the Rehabilitation of the Environment (ORE)
- PADI
- Sustainable charcoal producers (OREB)

(4) Private sector partners- these stakeholders will be involved in piloting some of the energy efficiency initiatives

- Vetiver factories and distillators-oil distillation and export (UNIKODE, Agri-supply and CFF and approximately 12 small distillators) these stakeholders will be involved in piloting some of the energy efficiency initiatives. The 12 distillators include: Georges Celcis, Marc Jeune, Saint Germain Berrel, Benoir Mickael, St Joie Nissage, Borga Gerson, Gilbert Moise, Mars Aurel Roger, Pere Laurent, France Phillip, Paloma Bruno.
- Ayitika SA

Stakeholders have participated in the PPG process in several ways and have helped shape project activities which will lead to most successful outcomes. Most notably, local stakeholders engaged in community

consultations, interviews, participated in surveys, and demonstrated cultivation techniques. As expected, the main expectations from this group is that the project enhance livelihoods, provide more opportunities for employment and revenue. There was some concern expressed that projects come and go but that the outcomes are not really visible. Some of the issues that emerged:

- . Fisherfolk communities: perceived the problems of overfishing as linked to fishing too heavily near the shore and wanting mechanized boats to go further into the sea.
- . Vetiver-producing communities; as vetiver can only be harvested during one period of the year, some loans or income stability is required during the rest of the year. Traditionally middlemen can provide some kind of pre-payment, but at a usurious price. Once well installed, cooperatives should be in a position to do pre-payment to their members.
- . Charcoal producers: viable alternatives are requested; an interest in fruit trees that can yield some revenue.
- . Women are mostly responsible for selling the produce or fish; they require greater support for storage, marketing and access to customers (particularly in remote regions).

These civil society stakeholders will support project implementation throughout the project duration. They will be part of implementing activities on the ground as they have already demonstrated accountability and partnership on other UNEP and UN interventions. They will also promote a learning-by-doing approach, provide trainings on the ground in local language. These actors will report back to the Project Management Team as well as to the Steering Committee and will play a significant role in downscaling knowledge and know-how. In particular, the sustainable charcoal producers will help establish woodlots in deforested areas, and train on management, technical, and accountability issues. Sustainable vetiver harvesters will provide on the ground training on how to cultivate vetiver in a sustainable manner without displacing the soil.

Private sector representatives in the vetiver value chains provided visits to factories and information on production practices. They also outlined how they would contribute to improved production practices and which interventions at the local level would be acceptable to their production. With this group, it is important to note that they are operating in a highly competitive environment; collaboration amongst the producers is not necessarily anticipated as there is the risk of losing the competitive edge. Given the clout of the key distillers and their market share of global vetiver production, their decisions and collaboration are necessary for desired outcomes. However, it is worth noting that the international companies involved in the vetiver value chains are more and more moving to buy oil which has better economic, social and environmental standards, according to their Environmental and Social Responsibility. This can be a strong driver toward more equity and sustainability in the value chain.

Departmental governments, municipalities interviewed in the preparation phase emphasized their support. Given the dearth of national resources that eventually trickle down to this level, they have limited capacity to contribute, but the project itself can support the awareness and training of these partners so that in the long-term they are better equipped to promote sustainable practices.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

Socioeconomic benefits are at the heart of this project. It was well understood during the PPG that interventions would not be successful unless they took into account the livelihoods of people as well as improvements to their socioeconomic situations. During the site visits it was apparent that for any intervention to be wholly successful, alternative and resilient EBA livelihoods would have to be on par economically with the production of charcoal, lime and fuelwood. Consequently it was determined that for suggested activities the opportunity cost of supporting ecosystem-based adaptation cannot be higher than communities' current economic activities.

As such, the activities that have been identified (Outcome 3) are sought to both increase livelihoods and support livelihoods. In particular the project will yield the following benefits:

- Increase in income (measured by indicators; baseline established by survey)
- Increase in agricultural uses: crops, agroforestry, livestock, aquaculture, mariculture,
- Improved future scenarios (sustainable fisheries, adaptive and resilient livelihoods, improved coastal buffers protecting lives and property from climate disaster)
- Improve economic circumstances for women

Gender issues in Haiti are complex and are closely tied to socioeconomic class. In the rural areas of the South Department, women are often visibly involved in economic activities, though they lack opportunities to grow their businesses or to expand their activities. Likewise, women do appear on decision-making bodies, though not always with the intention of representing the rights or perspectives of other women's groups. There are active women's groups in the South that can be included in analysis in order to identify the ways in which this project can avoid negative impacts and promote opportunities for greater equity. At the same time, men face declining prospects for employment in rural areas, which adds to social pressures. In particular, engagement of young men in the framework of this project should be sought in order to increase the longevity of project impacts and to address this often overlooked group.

Economic opportunities are limited for women in Haiti and tend to closely follow traditional roles. For example, in rural areas women typically do not have separate bank accounts from their husbands (if they have bank accounts) or any dedicated access to financing. As such, women face greater difficulty in accessing capital to purchase stock for selling at markets (women do the vast majority of marketing of vegetables and fruits, as well as selling small household good), or to acquire land with productive gardens and/or fruit trees. The money that is exchanged from selling small stocks of goods is used to purchase more or to pay for immediate household needs, creating great difficulty for women to accumulate enough savings to grow their businesses or to explore additional activities.

Women's dependency on marketing as their main economic activity can render them vulnerable to shortages of supply and makes them highly dependent on imported goods for sale. Integrating women in to the production of sustainable and climate resilient crops and products can help to prevent vulnerabilities to both climate and market fluxes. This in turn can help to stabilize women's economic realities and allow them to plan and invest their earnings more efficiently.

While there is limited baseline data related to gender for the south department of Haiti, recent surveys by UNEP in 2014 and in 2015 as part of the PPG have shown the following:

- Men and women tend to occupy specific roles within economic activities
- Women tend to be responsible for transformation and commercialization in the fisheries and charcoal value chains, often within their own associations

- Some value chains, such as castor oil and cashew, primarily engage women
- Within the vetiver value chain, women often work alongside men cleaning roots
- Some gender parity is found within the vetiver cooperatives; both managers of the vetiver cooperatives in Port Salut are women, while the presidents are men
- Access to credit and technical resources are limited in the South, but are often harder for women to attain
- In all value chains, women and men’s activities and contributions are inextricably linked (i.e., women often finance fishing trips for motor boats, buy charcoal from producers, clean vetiver roots)

On the gender front, the project will:

- Seek to promote gender parity in PA management structures at the community and departmental level
- Target technical support and resources for women-specific activities within the development of value chains
- Provide access to trainings and capacity development resources for management of businesses, associations and cooperatives
- Provide gender disaggregated targets to measure results
- Improve women’s access to bigger markets given their roles in commercialization

Women’s roles and dependency on marketing as a main economic activity makes them vulnerable to climate change in direct correlation with men in many of the sectors mentioned below. For instance, fewer fish and changing marine ecology reduced the variety and size of the products being sold, leading to lower revenues. However, some value chains largely implicating women, such as castor oil, rely on a highly climate resistant crop that can be relied upon to provide a steady and consistent revenue stream for the future. This is important as women typically have fewer financial resources to rely upon if catastrophes strike.

Within the value chains targeted for this project, fisheries, charcoal, castor oil, honey and vetiver, the baseline numbers are the following:

Fisheries:

Port Salut – the Association of Marchandes (women) is responsible for the transformation and commercialization of fresh fish, as well as the drying and salting of fish that is not sold fresh. The association has some structure (president, secretary, treasurer, etc.) and organizes to keep the new fish market in Port Salut clean, but otherwise has limited capacity both technically and financially to improve transformation practices, increase marketing and commercialization and provide benefits to its members.

This project will aim to increase women’s participation in the management of the fisheries within the Port Salut PA and also to improve the capacity of the women’s association to manage and develop transformation techniques for their catch. This is important women are highly dependent on fish catch for their livelihoods and the implementation of the management plans for the Port Salut MPA will address over-fishing. The baseline for transformation capacity will be determined in the first phase of the project, where the current transformation techniques will be assessed and targets for improvement will be identified (i.e., moving drying and salting practices from the ground to elevated platforms, improving storage capacity and providing training on organizational management for the association) for Port Salut and Pointe Abacou.

For all PAs targeted by this project, a goal of 50% will be set for the participation of women in the development of PA management plans and their implementation. Current baseline is 0.

Charcoal:

Generally, women are responsible for selling charcoal in small retail quantities for daily consumption. Women may also be heavily involved in the production and wholesale of charcoal, including trade to depots and coordination of sales amongst multiple producers in geographic zones. These women tend to rely heavily on charcoal as their main source of income. Through the establishment of wood lots and support for alternative livelihoods in the target areas, the project intends to improve their economic options and direct them towards alternative livelihoods where possible, as well as to provide a sustainable option for involvement in the charcoal supply chain.

The baseline for sustainable charcoal production from wood lots is currently 0.

During the implementation of the wood lots, 50% participation of women should be targeted during the nursery, planting, maintenance and harvesting phases. Baseline work should include women's access to land and assess any existing community-based organizations as potential entry points for implementation of the project.

Castor oil:

In the communities surrounding La Cahouane, there is significant production of castor oil that can be further developed as an alternative livelihood to encourage protection of the mangrove. Both men and women participate in the cultivation and harvesting of castor oil seeds and certain stages of transformation (i.e., men tend to be responsible for the more physically demanding aspects, such as grinding and crushing the seeds, while women are responsible for the cooking and rendering of the oil).

This is an important economic activity for women, who are responsible for the majority of the work as well as the marketing of the oil. In addition, castor trees are highly drought resistant and can provide a livelihood in changing climatic conditions.

There is a baseline of castor oil production from the UNEP Green Economy report that establishes the number of people involved in the sector, market supply and demand and technical needs for improvement of the value chain in the South Department. This information can then be further refined for the area around the La Cahouane PA during the baseline phase of the project.

From this baseline, targets of production levels can be set to improve the quality of the oil produced (through cold presses) the organizational capacity of the producers associations (management training) and the quantity of sales of castor oil sold through the associations.

Honey:

The current baseline for honey production in the PAs targeted by this project is 0. There is honey production in the mangrove area of Aquin in the South Department and a baseline of the market for honey in the south and nationally is available from the UNEP Green Economy report.

Targets for honey production can include 50% women and men producers. Additional work transforming or refining the honey can also target women as the eventual sellers of the finished product.

Vetiver:

The baseline for vetiver shows that women are involved in the management of cooperatives (both cooperative managers for the Port Salut PL are women) and are often involved in the cleaning of roots. Some women are also vetiver producers and cooperative members.

The baseline for membership by men and women is available from the cooperatives – approximately 20% according to UNEP surveys. Targets to increase the membership of women producers (double from current membership), ensure gender parity in the management structures, and include women in the active negotiations of sales by the cooperatives will be set after the first baseline phase of the project. In addition, the project should seek to place women in key positions as treasurers and accountants of the cooperatives.

The benefits of alternate EBA activities will have to be clearly demonstrated to local communities through public awareness activities to avoid distrust and skepticism of the project, which is a lesson learned from other partner project experiences. The long-term negative impacts of utilizing scarce resources must also be shared with local communities in a locally comprehensible way, and should be integrated into other types of training and activities that other multilateral partners are carrying out.

Project Outcomes	Local Benefits	Global Benefits
<p>Outcome 1. The national network of Protected Areas is augmented and under effective management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ecosystem services are protected and improved providing people with more food, medicinal, cultural and spiritual products. - biological resources are protected and monitored to prevent the destruction of people’s natural environment - communities have access to alternative livelihoods and can use improved ecosystem services for material, spiritual and cultural practices, sustainably. - capacities of governments and local communities is strengthened to maintain their natural environment - social cohesion is enhanced as community management plans are developed in a participatory manner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - conservation of globally significant biodiversity - sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity - mitigated GHG emissions - conservation and enhanced carbon stocks in agriculture forest and other land use - improved provision of agro-forestry and forest ecosystem goods and services - conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in productive landscapes - reduction in forest loss and forest degradation - maintenance of the range of environmental services derived from forests - enhanced sustainable livelihoods for local communities and forest-dependent peoples

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increased resilience to climate change
Outcome 2. Improved Land use and Forestry practices resulting in carbon savings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 400 hectares of land is reforested, decreasing people's risk to climate catastrophes and increasing access to forest ecosystem services - sustainable alternatives to charcoal provided to local communities, thereby increasing health and protection of forests for the production of other agro-forestry goods. - improvements in the charcoal value chain to preserve woodlots while continuing to provide people with livelihoods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sustainable use of the component of globally significant biodiversity - increased use of renewable energy and decreased use of fossil energy resources - increased adoption of innovative technologies and management practices for GHG emission reduction - conservation and enhanced carbon stocks in agriculture, forest and other land use - improved provision of agro-forest ecosystem goods and services - mitigated greenhouse gas emissions and and increased carbon sequestration in productive landscapes - reduction in forest loss and forest degradation - maintenance of the range of environmental services and products derived from forests - increased resilience to climate change
Outcome 3. Increased ecosystem and livelihood resilience through an EBA approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - alternative livelihoods for the most vulnerable and impoverished are provided particularly in the contexts of climate-related disasters - improved protections and buffers from floods and storms and weather catastrophes - food production techniques are improved increasing food security and awareness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - enhanced sustainable livelihoods for local communities and forest dependent peoples - maintenance of the range of environmental services and products derived from forests - sustainable use of the component of globally significant biodiversity

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improved land management allowing for more productive soils - Rehabilitated mangroves, stabilized shorelines and riverbanks, and rehabilitated coral reefs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reduction in forest loss and forest degradation - improved provision of agro-forest ecosystem goods and services - increased resilience to climate change
Outcome 4. Strengthened local capacity to anticipate and rapidly respond to extreme weather events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a decrease in the loss of life, property, and livelihoods-related equipment - communities have emergency plans in the face of climate catastrophes and can better plan for their security - the most vulnerable are included in disaster planning - government capacities are increased for adaptive planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - enhanced sustainable livelihoods from local communities - increased resilience to climate change
Outcome 5. Improved Land use practices adopted in the Vetiver value-chain leading to significant carbon sequestration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - farmers in the vetiver value chain are better organized, have improved access to markets, can negotiate prices - farmers in vetiver value chain plant and harvest plants more sustainably - improved land and water use, biomass and waste management in the vetiver value chain 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increased use of renewable energy and decreased use of fossil energy resources - increased adoption of innovative technologies and management practices for GHG emission reduction and carbon sequestration - mitigated greenhouse gas emissions and increased carbon sequestration in productive landscapes - enhanced sustainable livelihoods for local communities
Outcome 6. GHG emission reduction benefits through vetiver supply chain efficiencies, inc new use of by-	- vetiver distillators produce vetiver more efficiently and reduce emissions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increased adoption of innovative technologies and management practices for GHG emission reduction and carbon sequestration

products		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increased use of renewable energy and decreased use of fossil energy resources
Outcome 7. Environmental laws are known and enforced adequately	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the general public's awareness and knowledge is enhanced on environmental issues - the beneficiaries of proposed sites become aware of the role of ecosystems to support livelihoods and in turn support resilient ecosystems - the importance of environmental laws and policies are mainstreamed - lessons are shared with other actors on environmental issues through regular meetings to enhance synergies and coordination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in productive landscapes - reduction in forest loss and forest degradation - maintenance of the range of environmental services derived from forests - increased resilience to climate change

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

The project has been designed to achieve the greatest results with the most cost-effective use of invested resources. One of the ways it manages to achieve this is due to the presence of a UNEP country office, which through its collaborative partnerships and relationships is able to leverage strategic support for this project. The baseline programming on which this project builds (Cote Sud Initiative) is a multi-UN agency programming tool, which targets different areas of programming. This project is strategically designed to target those areas which CSI does not, and to target areas where there is the greatest value added, and which can utilize GEF expertise. It is for that reason, that this project targets the specifics of climate change adaptation & mitigation, land degradation and sustainable forest management, biodiversity protection and livelihoods generation.

The project will also be cost-effective in that project design and project implementation have and will be able to include a variety of stakeholders, each with their value added in supporting implementation. There will be stakeholders from environment, agriculture & fishing, coastguard protection, tourism both on the steering committee, and also as beneficiaries and implementers of the project.

NGOs and existing cooperatives will be able to bring their expertise to support project implementation. For instance, PADI will support the building of shelters for vulnerable isle populations, while sustainable woodlot cooperatives will be able to lead pilot woodlot developments in La Cahouane. Similarly Ayitika's material on sustainable planting and harvesting of vetiver can be used and disseminated by the project.

The project also has firm co-financing arrangements which will support the achievement of results.

Outcome	Baseline (B)	GEF Alternative (A)
<p>Outcome 1. The national network of Protected Areas is augmented and under effective management</p>	<p>While protected areas have been identified and decreed through legislation, there is currently no management structure in place to monitor or protect these regions. The Ministry of Environment is going through a process of discussing management strategies with Cuba, but currently does not house sufficient human resources to monitor or enforce the areas. As for local communities, few people consulted know that they reside in a protected area, and of those that do, are not aware of what this entails. The protected areas suffer from many destructive practices: charcoal production, use of vulnerable species for food/sale, poor agricultural practices and overfishing. New infrastructure such as roads are also threatening protected areas; giving more access to large trucks involved with logging and resource extraction. There are no climate-resilient community guidelines in managing shared natural resources and land tenure laws are unclear. There are no climate considerations built into community planning. Most of the communities targeted by this project are coastal villages that are observing the “receding of the shoreline”, a decrease in coastal level fisheries, a substantive decrease in biodiversity and an increase in invasive fish (colloquially “minustah”).</p> <p>While Haiti has initiated discussions with Cuba in regards to models for PAs, the fact remains that Cuba has a very different governance structure than Haiti. Haiti would benefit from other cross-Caribbean consultations on PAs as well, but has not done so yet.</p>	<p>GEF financing will allow for the foundational work to take place to establish management plans of the protected areas. On the government capacity front, GEF financing will allow training of decentralized staff in MDE, MARNDR, and SEMANAH on monitoring, protection, enforcement and public awareness of protected areas. The project will also support these governmental entities with small equipment (such as binoculars, GPS, radars) and signage to support PA management and oversight.</p> <p>GEF financing will also support climate change vulnerability assessments for identified and planned National Parks, Protected Landscapes and MPAs in the southwestern Peninsula and provide recommendations on adaptive/resilient management. This will provide better insight of the climate realities and how best to adapt to oncoming circumstances.</p> <p>In addition, GEF financing will apply this information through climate-adapted management plans for Ile-</p>

		<p>a-Vache National Park, Port Salut/Pointe Abacou Protected Landscape and the La Cahouane PA through consultation with key stakeholders and local communities, including cross-site management plans.</p> <p>In particular, GEF financing will promote a participatory and cooperative management structure, which ensures long time sustainability, by avoiding power inequalities and conflicts in the long run. This will also promote country ownership of the project and support adherence to the maintenance of PAs ecosystems.</p> <p>In order to further enhance the successful management of PAs and their ecosystems, GEF financing will also support an awareness raising campaign through local media, schools and NGOs to sensitize communities about the rationale and significance of PAs/MMAs, their boundaries, as well as on the economic activities that can be sustainably undertaken within PA boundaries.</p> <p>Finally, in order to fully benefit from regional</p>
--	--	---

		<p>knowledge, GEF financing will support enforcement of protected areas through training, knowledge sharing, data coordination and south-south cooperation with Caribbean countries.</p>
<p>Outcome 2. Improved land use and forestry practices resulting in carbon savings</p>	<p>Haiti is one of the most deforested countries in the world. Its primary forest cover is estimated between 1.5 percent (41,000 ha) and 3.7 percent (102,000 ha) of the country's area, whereas in 1927 it reached 25%, in 1960 20%, and in 1980/1990 less than 10%. The southern departments, which comprise the project area, are the only ones where a consistent vegetative cover remains, while departments more to the North possess almost no forests. 73 percent of Haiti's forests are naturally regenerated forests, and the 27 remaining percent is planted forest: the only primary forests left in Haiti is found within the Macaya Natural National Park. The biomass stock in Haiti's forests is estimated at 26 million tons with a growth rate of 3.8% (1 million tons produced per year). This means that the biomass taken is far more important than the biomass produced. Also, according to the 2013 Second National Communication to the UNFCCC, a total of 1,149 GHGs were emitted in 2000 from the forestry sector.</p> <p>Main causes of forest and land degradation in Haiti are deforestation because of the intensive cutting of trees for firewood and charcoal production. The intensive cutting of forest and mangrove trees for firewood and charcoal production leads also to the loss of marine life, especially in the South Department, and their destructive impacts the entire marine food chain. The lack of access to alternative and affordable clean technology is a barrier. At the</p>	<p>Without tackling reforestation and addressing some of the challenges of land degradation, the project will remain unsuccessful. For that reason, with GEF financing, the project will support reforestation initiatives. It is estimated that contributing to reforestation will lead to an increased amount of carbon sequestered within trees and limit the emission of GHG into the atmosphere. It is estimated that the project activities related to reforestation will enable the sequestration of 7,132,278 tons of CO2 over a period of 20 years.</p> <p>These benefits will be sought by planting 400 ha of resilient, value-added fruit trees in deforested lands (La Cahouane, Port Salut/Pointe Abacou) so as to increase carbon stocks and improve livelihoods. It will also be supported by</p>

	<p>same time, with increasing population pressure and lack of alternative opportunity, forest encroachment for forest products become the only source of rural income.</p> <p>The charcoal production and consumption is one of the main drivers of deforestation of Haiti’s woods, woodlands and a large emissions source. Improvements in the conversion of biomass to charcoal and the efficient use of charcoal show a tremendous potential for reductions in the associated GHG emissions. This potential consists in both avoided consumption of non-sustainable biomass, mitigation of CH4 emissions during the production process, and avoided GHG emissions from the use of efficient charcoal kilns. In Haiti, over 4 Mt of firewood and 1,4 Mt of charcoal were estimated to be consumed in 2012. The growing demand for charcoal fuel remains an important cause of deforestation.</p> <p><i>Summary of available baseline data:</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="337 1083 901 1398"> <thead> <tr> <th>Type of data</th> <th>Value</th> <th>Unit</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Forest cover (Haiti)</td> <td>41 000 to 102 000</td> <td>ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Forest and woodlands cover (Project areas)</td> <td>64 943</td> <td>ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mangrove cover (Haiti)</td> <td>13 700</td> <td>ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mangrove cover (Project areas)</td> <td>2 500</td> <td>ha</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Deforestation rate (Haiti)</td> <td>12.9</td> <td>%/year</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Growth rate (Haiti)</td> <td>3.8</td> <td>%/year</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Deforestation rate (Haiti)</td> <td>5.4 millions</td> <td>t of wood/year</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Type of data	Value	Unit	Forest cover (Haiti)	41 000 to 102 000	ha	Forest and woodlands cover (Project areas)	64 943	ha	Mangrove cover (Haiti)	13 700	ha	Mangrove cover (Project areas)	2 500	ha	Deforestation rate (Haiti)	12.9	%/year	Growth rate (Haiti)	3.8	%/year	Deforestation rate (Haiti)	5.4 millions	t of wood/year	<p>establishing community-managed woodlots, for sustainable charcoal production, by planting 400 ha hectares of fast-growing, climate-resilient native trees on deforested land. In addition, the 200 hectares of vetiver contour line plantation will add carbon sequestration.</p> <p>GEF financing will also support the undertaking of a study climate impacts on coastal forests species, and determine optimally resilient tree species for reforestation plans. This will limit any possible failures of planting mal-adaptive species which has been an experience of other projects in Haiti.</p> <p>Finally, in order to target loggers’ behavior in the PAs, GEF financing will also support the development of a code of use, including sustainable planting schedules, management, cutting and replenishment of forested plots by local stakeholders, for community loggers.</p>
Type of data	Value	Unit																								
Forest cover (Haiti)	41 000 to 102 000	ha																								
Forest and woodlands cover (Project areas)	64 943	ha																								
Mangrove cover (Haiti)	13 700	ha																								
Mangrove cover (Project areas)	2 500	ha																								
Deforestation rate (Haiti)	12.9	%/year																								
Growth rate (Haiti)	3.8	%/year																								
Deforestation rate (Haiti)	5.4 millions	t of wood/year																								
<p>Outcome 3. Increased ecosystem and livelihood</p>	<p>Haiti is one of the countries that is most ravaged by natural disasters in Caribbean. While early warning dissemination has improved drastically, particularly with the use of cellular technology</p>	<p>In taking note of the poverty that exists in the baseline, GEF financing will foremost address the need</p>																								

<p>resilience through an Eco-DRR approach</p>	<p>and improved protocols by the DCP, people’s lives and livelihoods are still at risk. Haiti still incurs the greatest losses of lives and property during hurricanes, and resilient planning to manage these has not yet commenced. The disaster management framework is based on response (evacuation), rather than prevention, adaptation or mitigation. Furthermore, disaster management is hampered by environmental problems, such as an excess of waste and pollution, which cause obstacles to evacuating teams and allow the spread of disease.</p> <p>While UNEP, through supporting the NGO PADI, has successfully built shelters for fishermen’s boat in the Port Salut area, there remain many more fisherfolk communities that lose their means to survive during climate disasters. Further, as most communities are situated at the shoreline, any storm threatens housing, agricultural and food production, exacerbating people’s poverty and reliance on immediate natural resources. Fisheries which is the main activity of most in the targeted sites are beginning to dry up, and with each climate catastrophe or hurricane season it becomes more and more difficult for fishers to go out in the higher seas to catch an ample supply.</p> <p>Survey results reveal that the majority of those in selected sites are at a subsistence level of poverty. Communities that were consulted do not have emergency stocks of food, water or seedlings for agricultural production. There is no livelihood planning with regards to disaster management at the community level.</p>	<p>for establishing viable, alternative ecosystem-based livelihoods. This will include the promotion of the following livelihood activities: castor oil production, planting/cultivation of fruit trees, ecotourism, sustainable fisheries, mariculture, cacao, cashews, vetiver and aquaculture. The sustainable and economical feasible way of engaging in these livelihood activities will be piloted in the four sites.</p> <p>GEF financing will also support piloting of improved food production techniques in coastal communities demonstrating SLM practices, including agro-forestry.</p> <p>In building toward climate resilience, GEF financing will also support the rehabilitation of 700 hectares of degraded mangrove in South Department Protected Areas and beyond, using a participatory approach. GEF financing will also conduct shoreline and riverbank stabilization (20 km) to strengthen buffer</p>
---	--	--

		<p>areas.</p> <p>As fisheries is the most common activity in all of these sites, GEF financing will provide training on sustainable fisheries to address current stock depletion and pollution, including no-take zones and periods, variety/size selection and the sustainable use of DCPs (linked to the PA management plans and supported by alternative livelihoods). There is also the anticipation that establishing no take-zones will allow certain fish to reach reproductive maturity so that fish can begin to replenish their currently degraded stocks.</p>
<p>Outcome 4. Strengthened local capacity to anticipate and rapidly respond to extreme weather events</p>	<p>As mentioned under the previous outcome, the DCP has made great strides in establishing early warnings to most of the communities. However, the most vulnerable residing in remote isles around Ile-a-Vache do not have an established warning system and have no evacuation measures. These people are in particularly precarious situations as they are surrounded by the sea and live at sea level. Also, while the DCP and associated partners have established emergency contacts in communities, there are no real preventative measures to protect people's fishing equipment or housing. There are no emergency shelters on the islands and all of the housing is made of thatched straw houses. There are no emergency water supplies</p>	<p>In order to provide adequate policy recommendations, GEF financings will support undertaking a detailed, community based Coastal Climate/Disaster Vulnerability Assessment (using e.g. DIVA or CRISTAL) in coastal and small islands communities and provide policy recommendations on short, medium- and long-term adaptation measures, including Eco-DRR</p>

	<p>or extra food savings. There is virtually no agricultural production other than the odd almond tree, which increases dependence on fisheries. This also means that during the hurricane season, populations are likely to have insufficient food resources.</p>	<p>measures.</p> <p>GEF financing will also provide training to the Département de Protection Civile (DPC), local authorities, coastal communities on specific challenges DRM and Eco-DRR specifically related to coastal communities and small isle dwellers. During consultations DPC expressed an interest in integrating climate resilience into their disaster management planning.</p> <p>GEF financing will also support dissemination of available early warning information by strengthening department and community institutional structures on Ile-a-Vache and surrounding islands.</p> <p>In order to address the safety of people and their livelihoods-related equipment, GEF financing will also support the rehabilitation or construction of emergency shelter structures on the 10 islands and cays.</p>
<p>Outcome 5. Improved Land use practices</p>	<p>Vetiver production is a key industry of the Southern region. Given its hardiness in a steep and dry landscape, it is an optimal plant to grow in otherwise degraded lands. However, the</p>	<p>GEF financing will introduce resilient and sustainable vetiver production practices</p>

<p>adopted in the Vetiver value-chain leading to significant carbon sequestration</p>	<p>entire production cycle is fairly inefficient causing land degradation, creating waste, using fuel and also preventing it from being a crop that can provide economic security for farmers. Part of the inefficiencies lie with the lack of knowledge about planting, harvesting, and root cleaning techniques. Another issue is that the average farmer only cultivates on a small parcel of land. This creates disparities in prices obtained, relationships with the private sector, and differences in cultivation techniques. A handful of cooperatives are slowly emerging to establish an organizational body that can negotiate price, certify vetiver cultivation practices, ensure that proper harvesting methods are used and provide traceability. However, these are in the formative stages and have yet to include a large proportion of vetiver producers.</p>	<p>related to land and water use, biomass management, waste management, emissions management in pilot agricultural sites located within Port Salut Protected Landscape (200 ha).</p> <p>GEF financing will also support vetiver producer cooperatives so as to increase the areas under soil conservation, promote sustainable vetiver harvesting techniques, and improve land and water use efficiency through water catchment basins land works (contour line hedgerows). The trainings received by cooperatives will be scaled up at a regional level so as to include vetiver producers throughout the Grand Sud.</p> <p>GEF financing will support a study and develop recommendations on the carbon balance of the vetiver production cycle, land conservation values of improved management practices, improved practices for traceability, and monitor emissions generated/avoided throughout the project.</p>
<p>Outcome 6. GHG emission reduction benefits</p>	<p>There are currently two large vetiver distillers in the South and approximately twelve small distillers. As mentioned previously, vetiver factories process vetiver roots through a process</p>	<p>In relation to the previous output, under this this output seeks GEF financing seek to improve vetiver</p>

<p>through vetiver supply chain efficiencies, including new use of by-products</p>	<p>of distillation, and require large amounts of fuel oil to run the boilers to produce vetiver oil. The expenses of fuel oil, is a large cost to the private sector and also adds to carbon emissions.</p>	<p>distillation practices in factories. This will be done by increasing energy efficiency and including the use of renewable energy. First, increasing the energy efficiency will help using fewer materials for combustion, resulting in a smaller amount of GHG emitted. Second, the use of renewable energy would consist in using the vetiver distillation wastes as a source of energy for combustion; that means fewer fuelwood would be necessary for distillation, therefore the impact on forest will be positive.</p> <p>GEF financing will allow a review of vetiver production practices in factories and provide recommendations and methodology to improve production methods towards sustainability and resilience, such as energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy (biomass).</p>
<p>Outcome 7. Environmental laws are known and enforced adequately</p>	<p>In the baseline, environmental laws and policies are largely unknown or ignored. There are absolutely no enforcement mechanisms in place and people do not know what the risks or benefits are of improved ecosystem management. In cases where there are fines or punitive measures in place for particular actions that degrade the environment, this information</p>	<p>The project will promote an awareness campaign for the local communities residing in the targeted sites of the project. Details of existing laws and regulations will be shared in Creole in a comprehensible way</p>

	<p>is not mainstreamed at the local level.</p> <p>While there is a unit of environmental surveillance officers in MDE, these are not located in the southwestern peninsula. There is thus no monitoring of the remaining forests, coral reef or ebbing coastlines of the region. In the baseline, there are no plans or resources to deploy environmental agents to the region.</p> <p>While there have been one-off campaigns, there is no sustained environmental engagement and awareness strategy on the protected areas and how to maintain them, while carrying out livelihood activities.</p>	<p>(through orators, local leaders, posters, radio ads). Local leaders as well as schoolchildren will be addressed so as to cover a broad range of beneficiaries and to reinforce the value of ecosystems management at intergenerational levels.</p> <p>GEF financing will also allow for the building of enforcement capacity. Through trainings of environmental monitoring agents and provision of surveillance equipment, the project will build up the unit that is relatively new in MDE. These agents, in addition to monitoring laws, will also be trained as to the benefits of ecosystems management.</p>
--	--	--

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

The project will follow UNEP standard monitoring, reporting and evaluation processes and procedures. Substantive and financial project reporting requirements are summarized in Appendix 8 of the accompanying project document. Reporting requirements and templates are an integral part of the UNEP legal instrument to be signed by the executing agency and UNEP.

The project M&E plan is consistent with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy. The Project Results Framework includes SMART indicators for each expected outcome as well as mid-term and end-of-project targets. These indicators along with the key deliverables and benchmarks included in the Results Framework will be the main tools for assessing project implementation progress and whether project results are being achieved. The means of verification and the costs associated with obtaining the information to track the indicators are summarized in Appendix 7 of the accompanying project document. Other M&E related costs are also presented in the Costed M&E Plan and are fully integrated in the overall project budget.

The M&E plan will be reviewed and revised as necessary during the project inception workshop to ensure project stakeholders understand their roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis project monitoring and evaluation. Indicators and their means of verification may also be fine-tuned at the inception workshop. Day-to-day project monitoring is the responsibility of the project management team but other project partners will have responsibilities to collect specific information to track the indicators. It is the responsibility of the Project Manager to inform UNEP of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that the appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely fashion.

The project Steering Committee (PSC) will receive periodic reports on progress and will make recommendations to UNEP concerning the need to revise any aspects of the Results Framework or the M&E plan. Project oversight to ensure that the project meets UNEP and GEF policies and procedures is the responsibility to the Task Manager in UNEP-GEF. The Task Manager will also review the quality of draft project outputs, provide feedback to the project partners, and establish peer review procedures to ensure adequate quality of scientific and technical outputs and publications.

At the time of project approval 100% percent of baseline data is available. Any possible baseline data gaps will be identified and addressed during the first year of project implementation. Project supervision will take an adaptive management approach. The Task Manager will develop a project supervision plan at the inception of the project, which will be communicated to the project partners during the inception workshop. The emphasis of the Task Manager supervision will be on outcome monitoring but without neglecting project financial management and implementation monitoring. Progress vis-à-vis delivering the agreed project global environmental benefits will be assessed with the PSC at agreed intervals. Project risks and assumptions will be regularly monitored both by project partners and UNEP. Risk assessment and rating is an integral part of the Project Implementation Review (PIR). The quality of project monitoring and evaluation will also be reviewed and rated as part of the PIR. Key financial parameters will be monitored quarterly to ensure cost-effective use of financial resources.

UNEP will be responsible for managing the mid-term review/evaluation and the terminal evaluation. The Project Manager and partners will participate actively in the process. The project will be reviewed or evaluated at mid-term (tentatively in PY 3 as indicated in the project milestones). The purpose of the Mid-Term Review (MTR) or Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is to provide an independent assessment of project performance at mid-term, to analyze whether the project is on track, what problems and challenges the project is encountering, and which corrective actions are required so that the project can achieve its intended outcomes by project completion in the most efficient and sustainable way. In addition, it will verify information gathered through the GEF tracking tools. The project Steering Committee will participate in the MTR or MTE and develop a management response to the evaluation recommendations along with an implementation plan. It is the responsibility of the UNEP Task Manager to monitor whether the agreed recommendations are being implemented. An MTR is managed by the UNEP Task Manager. An MTE is managed by the Evaluation Office (EO) of UNEP. The EO will determine whether an MTE is required or an MTR is sufficient.

An independent terminal evaluation (TE) will take place at the end of project implementation. The EO will be responsible for the TE and liaise with the UNEP Task Manager throughout the process. The TE will provide an independent assessment of project performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine the likelihood of impact and sustainability. It will have two primary purposes:

- i. to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and

ii. to promote learning, feedback, and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among UNEP and executing partners.

While a TE should review use of project funds against budget, it would be the role of a financial audit to assess probity (i.e. correctness, integrity etc.) of expenditure and transactions.

The TE report will be sent to project stakeholders for comments. Formal comments on the report will be shared by the EO in an open and transparent manner. The project performance will be assessed against standard evaluation criteria using a six point rating scheme. The final determination of project ratings will be made by the EO when the report is finalized. The evaluation report will be publically disclosed and will be followed by a recommendation compliance process.

The direct costs of reviews and evaluations will be charged against the project evaluation budget.

The GEF tracking tools are attached as Appendix 15 of the attached project document. These will be updated at mid-term and at the end of the project and will be made available to the GEF Secretariat along with the project PIR report. As mentioned above the mid-term and terminal evaluation will verify the information of the tracking tool.


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. **RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
DR. JEAN FRANCOIS THOMAS, MINISTER OF ENVIRONMENT	GEF OFP	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT	06/27/2013

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Brennan Van Dyke		25.11.15	Kristin Mclaughlin	202-974-1312	kristin.mclaughlin@unep.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Overall Goal: Rehabilitation of the environment and a reduction in poverty						
Project Objective: Increasing resilience to climate change and decreasing disaster risk using an ecosystems-based approach targeting protected areas and fragile ecosystems in the Southwestern peninsula of Haiti.						
Outcome/Outputs	Indicator	Baseline	Midterm Target⁴	End of project Target	Means of Verification	Risks (R) & Assumptions (A)
Component 1. Extension and management of the PA system in the South						
Outcome 1. The national network of Protected Areas is augmented and under effective management	<i>Improvement in METT Score for La Cahouane PA, Ile a Vache PA, Port Salut/pointe Abacou PL, Jérémie MMA</i>	<i>Port Salut/Pointe Abacou : 17 La Cahouane : 16 Île à Vache : 16 Jérémie : 11</i>	<i>La Cahouane: 18; Ile a Vache: 17, Port Salut/Pointe Abacou: 18</i>	<i>La Cahouane: 19; Ile a Vache: 19, Port Salut/Pointe Abacou: 20, Jérémie MMA: 13</i>	<i>Portfolio prepared for area to be declared (Jérémie MMA), PA Management plans (Port Salut/Pointe Abacou PL, Ile à Vache PA, La Cahouane PA)</i>	<i>R: political problems delay the declaration of the Jérémie-Abricots area A: The government is interested in protecting the Jérémie-Abricots area</i>

⁴ Midterm targets will be discussed and revised at project inception

<p>Output 1.1 The national Protected Areas network is extended</p>	<p>Number and area of protected areas designated by end of project</p>	<p>There are 8 Protected Areas already declared in the South: 1. Le Parc National Naturel de l'île à Vache (11,235 ha) 2. L'Aire Protégée de Gestion des Habitats/Espèces Grosse Cayes/Zone Humide d'Aquin (10,974 ha) 3. L'Aire Protégée de Gestion des Habitats/Espèces Olivier/Zanglais (7,553 ha) 4. L'Aire Protégée de Gestion des Habitats/Espèces de Fonds des Cayes (2365 ha) 5. L'Aire Protégée de Gestion des Habitats/Espèces de Pointe Abacou (1840 ha) 6. Port Salut Paysage Naturel Protégée Marin et Terrestre (10750 ha) 7. La Grotte Marie Jeanne Element Naturel Exceptional (31 ha) 8. La Plaine Cahouane Aire Protégée de Gestion des Habitats/Espèces (5940 ha)</p>	<p>Consultations with key government and regional representatives have taken place to share research, and provide the justification for protecting Jérémie</p>	<p>1 additional protected area: Jérémie MMA, 5835 ha</p>	<p>Portfolio prepared for area to be declared, delimiting new protected areas</p>	<p>R: political problems delay the declaration of the Jérémie-Abricots area A: The government is interested in protecting the Jérémie-Abricots area</p>
--	--	---	--	--	---	---

Output 1.2 Capacity in place for sustainable management of the Ile a Vache NP, Port Salut/Pointe Abacou Protected Landscape, La Cahouane PA and, Jérémie MMA, including climate-adapted management plans.	Number of people in decentralized offices trained on PA oversight Number of climate-adapted management plans approved by end of project	0 0	4 people of which 2 are women Criteria of what should be in the management plans have been agreed to by key stakeholders	9 people, of which 4 are women 3 (Ile à Vache NP, Port Salut/Pte Abacou PL, La Cahouane PA)	Training reports Management plans	R: a lack of participation from key stakeholders A: stakeholders will participate in making decisions that will impact their communities
Component 2: Ecosystem sustainability and resilience in the identified Protected Areas of South Department in Haiti's SouthWestern Peninsula						
Outcome 2. Improved land use and forestry practices resulting in carbon savings	<i>Lifetime GHG emissions avoided through increased energy efficiency and reduced deforestation</i>	0	Midpoint target: 919,290 TCO2	End of project target: 1,838,580 tCO2	<i>Tracking Tool</i>	<i>R: deforestation continues mitigating carbon savings A: Improved land use and forestry practices result in carbon savings</i>
Output 2.1 400 ha of land reforested	Number of hectares of new plantations by end of project	0	100 ha	4000 ha	project reports, direct observation	R: deforestation continues mitigating carbon savings

						A: reforestation is successful
Output 2.2 Improved technologies and increased efficiency in charcoal production and consumption	Number of hectares under sustainable charcoal production schemes by end of project	0	200 ha	500 ha	Project reports, direct observation	R: stakeholders do not buy into increased efficiencies in charcoal production and consumption A: communities are willing to participate in sustainable charcoal production despite the initiatives taking longer times

Component 3: Disaster Risk Reduction through an ecosystem management approach in the broader Southwest Peninsula landscape (South Department)

<p>Outcome 3. Increased ecosystem and livelihood resilience through an EBA approach</p>	<p>Population benefitting from diversified climate resilient livelihood options by end of project; type and extent of asset strengthened/better managed to withstand the effects of climate change</p>	<p>0 people benefitting from resilient livelihoods; 0 ha of coastal forests, 0 ha of agricultural land, 0 ha of mangrove, 0 ha of shoreline/riverbank</p>	<p>At least 150 people of which 50% are women</p> <p>Mangrove plantation preparation is underway (technicians have been hired)</p> <p>At least 10 km of shoreline and riverbank rehabilitation</p>	<p>at least 500 people, of which at least 50% are women; at least 300 hectares of coastal agricultural lands</p> <p>at least 700 hectares of rehabilitated mangrove</p> <p>at least 20 km of shoreline and riverbank rehabilitation</p>	<p>surveys; tracking tool</p>	<p>R: climate catastrophes create impediments and destroy ecosystems</p> <p>A: strengthened natural buffers diminish risks posed to people and ecosystems</p>
---	--	---	--	---	-------------------------------	---

<p>Output 3.1. rehabilitated and resilient coastlines providing local communities with productive and protective coastal ecosystem services (including disaster risk reduction)</p>	<p>Number of hectares of coastal land under improved agricultural management by end of project</p> <p>Number of hectares of rehabilitated mangrove by end of project</p> <p>Number of linear kms of shoreline/bank rehabilitated by end of project</p>	<p>0</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>100 ha</p> <p>300 ha</p> <p>10 km</p>	<p>300 ha</p> <p>700 ha</p> <p>20 km</p>	<p>Surveys, physical observation</p> <p>physical observation</p> <p>physical observation</p>	<p>R: Natural disasters and climate-catastrophes hamper output success</p> <p>A: disaster risk reduction can be demonstrated during project duration</p>
<p>Output 3.2 Resilient livelihoods promote good ecosystem use practices</p>	<p>Increase in income from sustainable livelihoods; Number of people that have adopted new sustainable livelihood options</p>	<p>Mean annual income: 770\$ per year, or 2,052 Htg per week</p>	<p>200 people have adopted new sustainable livelihood options of which 40% are women</p>	<p>25% increase in livelihoods of 450 men and women (disaggregated by gender) by the end of the project</p>	<p>Surveys</p>	<p>R: other factors impact people's livelihoods (political upheaval, climate-related disasters)</p> <p>A: Participation will be high to receive training and support on</p>

						resilient livelihood activities
Outcome 4. Strengthened local capacity to anticipate and rapidly respond to extreme weather events	<i>Number of people with capacity to receive and disseminate early warning messages</i> <i>number of people trained in Eco-DRR approaches</i>	<i>While all people in the south now receive improved early warnings through community structures and cell phone operators, residents of the Ile à Vache Islets still have low access. None of the population has had access to Eco-DRR technologies or approaches</i>	<i>Early warning content and dissemination techniques are discussed with 10 communities; Eco-DRR trainings are initialized</i>	<i>100% of local population in Ile-a-Vache Islets, of which 50% are women has access to improved EW by end of project, 10 island communities are trained in Eco-DRR approaches; 10 focal points that disseminate EWS on Ile-a-vache islands are established</i>	Training reports, direct observation, surveys	R: climate-related storms may be too severe and evacuation measures will not be followed A: small isle populations will receive early warnings sufficiently in advance to evacuate safely

<p>Output 4.1 Early warning and disaster preparedness is in place for 10 extremely vulnerable and heavily populated small islands and cays in the Departments of Sud and Grand'Anse</p>	<p>Number of risks and vulnerability assessments carried out or updated;</p> <p>Number of people trained by end of project on eco-disaster risk reduction approach</p> <p>Number of emergency shelter structures built</p> <p>Number of evacuation protocols in place</p>	<p>0;</p> <p>0 people trained in eco-disaster risk reduction approach</p> <p>0</p> <p>0</p>	<p>Risks and vulnerability assessment are initialized</p> <p>Eco-disaster risk reduction training has been initialized</p> <p>Sites for emergency shelters have been identified</p> <p>Evacuation protocols are in place for at least 5 islands</p>	<p>1;</p> <p>at least 250 people trained on eco-disaster risk reduction approach</p> <p>At least 10</p> <p>At least 10</p>	<p>Project reports, vulnerability assessments,</p> <p>Training reports surveys, physical observation</p> <p>Physical observation</p> <p>Documented evacuation procedures</p>	<p>R: climate-related storms may be too severe and evacuation measures will not be followed</p> <p>A: small isle populations will receive early warnings sufficiently in advance to evacuate safely</p>
---	---	---	---	--	--	---

Component 4: Reducing land degradation and climate change impacts by introducing improvements in the vetiver value chain

<p>Outcome 5. Improved land use practices adopted in the vetiver value-chain leading to significant carbon sequestration</p>	<p><i>Direct lifetime emissions avoided from sustainable land use practices; numbers of hectares under good management as per LULUCF guidelines</i></p>	<p>0; 0</p>	<p>At least 75 ha</p>	<p>No literature available; 200ha</p>	<p>Tracking Tool and emissions report</p>	<p>R: carbon sequestration is challenging to measure</p> <p>A: improved sustainable land use practices and management will result in carbon sequestration</p>
<p>Output 5.1. Increased sustainability and productivity in the vetiver production value chain</p>	<p>Number of hectares of land under improved vetiver production methods</p> <p>Number of women with improved alternative livelihoods due to micro-finance (as measured by increased mean annual income)</p> <p>Number of additional</p>	<p>7ha</p>	<p>At least 75 ha</p>	<p>200 ha</p>	<p>Surveys, project reports</p>	<p>R: some beneficiaries will distrust that new practices will increase sustainability and productivity</p> <p>A: the demand for vetiver will continue globally and key players are interested in discovering and</p>

	producers outside of coepratives trained in improved methods via Farmer Field Schools approach					supporting sustainability in the vetiver production value chain
Outcome 6. GHG emission reduction benefits through vetiver supply chain efficiencies, including new use of by-products	<i>Lifetime direct GHG emissions avoided due to improvements in the vetiver production value chain</i>	<i>Baseline emissions from current vetiver practices (direct, indirect)</i>	<i>61,230 tCO2</i>	<i>122,460 tCO2</i>	<i>Tracking Tool and emissions report</i>	<p><i>R: by-products are not as widely available as other sources of energy</i></p> <p><i>A: vetiver oil producers who have large amounts of by-product have an incentive to use this product for energy sources.</i></p>

Output 6.1. Private Sector engaged in emissions-responsible production of vetiver oil factories in the broader southwest peninsula	Number of private sector vetiver producers adopting energy efficiency practices by end of project	0	Energy efficient practices and trainings are underway with 2 large-scale producers	at least 2 large-scale vetiver producers have adopted energy efficient production practices by end of project	Training report and observation	R: adopting energy efficiency practices may take longer than anticipated A: private sector partners will be interested and engaged in taking part in energy efficient production
Component 5: Enforcement, knowledge management & awareness						
Outcome 7. Environmental laws are known and enforced adequately	<i>Number of reported environmental law infractions</i>	0	<i>Mechanisms are in place to record environmental law infractions</i>	<i>20 the first year, 15 the second year, 10 the third year, 5 the fourth year, 0 the last year</i>	<i>Environmental enforcement reports</i>	<i>R: monitoring of infractions is inadequate A: the knowledge of environmental laws and policies will lead to less infractions</i>

<p>Output 7.1 Environmental agents are deployed to enforce environmental laws, policies, codes and norms</p>	<p>Number of people trained in monitoring and enforcement of PAs</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>Training is initiated for environmental agents</p>	<p>50 across all sites, of which 50% are women; 15 people trained in marine ecological monitoring and enforcement</p>	<p>training reports</p>	<p>R: Environmental agents are unable to enforce environmental laws and policies</p> <p>A: Environmental agents are adequately trained to effectively enforce environmental laws and policies</p>
<p>Output 7.2 Knowledge generated from the project is disseminated to the public and shared with national structures</p>	<p>Number of information products distributed</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>At least 10 information products are developed</p>	<p>at least 20 distinct information products distributed by end of project.</p>	<p>Project reports</p>	<p>R: the majority of the population maintains business-as-usual approach and does not respond to awareness initiatives</p> <p>A: that information products that</p>

						are developed conscientiously with targeted beneficiaries in mind resonate with targeted communities
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Comments	How they have been addressed
STAP Comments	
<p>1. During the proposal development, STAP recommends for UNEP to strengthen the proposal's focus on the socio-economic, institutional and biophysical factors and determinants of (e.g. soil type may influence a farmers' ability to adapt) influencing communities' adaptive capacities to climate change. This will help understand further what factors influence vulnerability reduction and disaster risk reduction in the targeted communities. It also will be useful to include issues of scale (temporal and spatial) for each factor. This will help assess, and understand further, the influence of each factor on vulnerability reduction (and adaptive capacity) at different scales.</p>	<p>The proposed project has included a number of indicators to assess economic, institutional and biophysical factors. These include the following: increase in income; number of people trained, hectares of mangroves, trees, and natural buffers planted and level of carbon sequestered among others. Temporal and spatial specifications have been provided through end of year targets and size of hectares planted and monitored. Kindly see Results Framework in Appendix A of the CEO Endorsement.</p>
<p>2. The proposal describes the ecosystem management measures (terrestrial and coastal) that aim to address disaster risk reduction and climate risk management in component 1 and 2. The STAP recommends detailing further who is most vulnerable to climate risks, and how the interactions between humans and 1 ecosystems affect adaptation to climate change. This includes defining the following aspects: 1) identifying the population who is vulnerable; 2) defining what types of ecosystems the vulnerable populations are dependent on; and 3) how these ecosystems would help decrease their vulnerability, and how much the target population depends directly on the ecosystem.</p>	<p>The project document highlights the vulnerability of coastal and island communities. The survey results in Appendix 21 of the Project Document (henceforth Prodoc) (points 2-4) demonstrate the breakdown of men and women and which ecosystems they most depend on for their income (e.g marine ecosystems for fisheries, coastal mangroves for charcoal etc...)</p>
<p>3. In establishing a monitoring system, UNEP may wish to consider indicators that measure the ecosystem's health, and indicators that measure and track how ecosystem restoration/conservation has assisted in providing ecosystem services that help reduce the communities' vulnerability to climate change. The project proponents may wish to consider the GEF's "Operational Guidelines for Ecosystem-Based Adaptation", October 2012 (GEF/LDCF.SCCF.13/Inf.06) for developing the monitoring system and component 1 and 2. Within the context of coastal ecosystems (component 1), it also will be important to quantify the ecosystem services they provide within the adaptation planning process. The following source provides an overview of the steps that could be considered for adaptation strategies on coastal ecosystems: Spalding, M.D. et al., "The role of ecosystems in</p>	<p>The studies and climate-management plans put forth by the project (Outcomes 1,3,4) will include an aspect of valuation of ecosystem services which currently does not exist in the baseline.</p>

<p>coastal protection: Adapting to climate change and coastal hazards". Ocean & Coastal Management (2013). http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2013.097</p>	
<p>4. In component 1, the STAP recommends defining the methodology used to estimate carbon stock changes through forest management, reforestation and improved management of vetiver production. This information appears absent from the proposal, and the quoted rates of sequestration seem quite ambitious. Additionally, it would be useful to detail what type of extension services and information will be provided to farmers on agroforestry measures, such as planting and managing (fruit) trees and vetiver grass.</p>	<p>The project calculating emissions due to deforestation, by identifying the areas concerned by the deforestation, and to apply to these areas emission factors adapted to the ecosystem. The methodology to calculate GHG emissions reductions for Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF) projects is applied. The emissions factor for Haiti's forests is calculated as follows: Carbon ratio in forest biomass in Haiti: $B = 79 \text{ tC/ha}^4$ Biomass carbon to CO₂ conversion factor: $C = 3.67 \text{ tCO}_2/\text{tC}^5$ Overall emissions factor (F) in tCO₂/ha: $F = B * C = 289.93$</p> <p>The EX-ACT methodology is also utilized. Kindly refer to Appendix 18, which includes a more detailed report produced by Carbonium with regards to the methodology used to estimate carbon stock changes</p> <p>In regards to the extension services, as was noted during the project preparation phase and relayed in the project document, extension services in the South are extremely poor. Many of the communities visited were unaware who their extension officer even was. For that reason, the project will include training for departmental representatives of MDE and MARNDR to ensure that they can provide the relevant advice on agroforestry matters.</p>
<p>5. STAP welcomes the attention to improved charcoal manufacture. Detail of the production processes that will be promoted, and the mechanism to foster uptake, should be provided. Measures to address unsustainable coral mining should also be detailed. While alternatives are theoretically available, it will be important to identify affordable solutions, and measures to encourage adoption.</p>	<p>The project document acknowledges the particular challenge of charcoal use in Haiti and recognizes that there is ongoing demand. To counter this, the project will pilot the use of "forets energetiques" or sustainable forests made up of fast-growing tree species that will be harvested sustainably for charcoal use. Improved kilns will be used in conjunction to render the process more efficient and sustainable. Details of this are provide in Section 3.3. of the Prodoc.</p>
<p>6. In component 3, STAP recommends describing further farmers' land management practices, including land-users' socioeconomic and institutional characteristics that may</p>	<p>The project preparation took into account the various socioeconomic differences that exist along the value chain, as well as the challenges that have</p>

<p>influence their land management approaches. This information will put into context the potential barriers small-holders may face in adopting sustainable land management, and ways vetiver grass (and vetiver oil production) can contribute to addressing these constraints while reducing vulnerability to climate change and delivering global environmental benefits. The information also will be useful in understanding further the factors influencing farmers' decisions to engage in activities that bring about multiple benefits (example " using vetiver grass for soil health improvements and for income generation resulting from the vetiver oil production). The project proponents may wish to rely on the following document for detailing further farmers' land management practices, Bargout, R., and Raizada M. "Soil nutrient management in Haiti, pre-Columbus to the present day: lessons for future agricultural lessons". Agriculture & Food Security 2013, 2:11 http://www.agricultureandfoodsecurity.com/content/2/1/11 Additionally, STAP suggests detailing further the public-private partnership for vetiver oil production and whether it intends to conduct a market analysis for the commodity, and what extension services will the cooperatives receive to assist individual farmers with marketing purposes.</p>	<p>historically contributed to land degradation in the South. The narrative examines the challenges facing vetiver cooperatives, the opportunities, the needs of bigger vetiver oil producers. The subject is treated in several sections, but mostly in Sections 2.1.6, 2.6, and 3.3. of the Prodoc.</p>
<p>7. The STAP appreciates the project will build on UNEP's baseline efforts through its role in the Cote Sud Initiative, as well as compliment other GEF initiatives in the country. Thus, it will be useful to provide a more thorough description on how this project intends to tap into the knowledge and learning generated by the Cote Sud Initiative on vulnerability reduction.</p>	<p>In Section 2.6.3 of the Prodoc and in Section A.4 of the CEO Endorsement, the narrative describes how the project will build on the sub-projects of Cote Sud Initiative. In particular, this section highlights how the proposed GEF project will build climate resilience into the existing baseline project. It is to be noted that a new co-financier was added during the PPG (IADB).</p>
<p>8. During the project implementation, STAP suggests collecting disaggregated gender data as possible. Gender disaggregated data can assist the project target its interventions more appropriately by addressing the multiple needs and roles of women and men in enhancing adaptive capacity. The project proponents may wish to refer to the following publication on gender and adaptation to climate change http://www.unep.org/pdf/rra_gender_screen.pdf</p>	<p>During the project preparation phase, disaggregated gender data was collected so as to provide a baseline for project successes. Approximately 700 surveys were carried out; and were repeated to ensure that there was significant data from women. Information pertaining to gender can be found in Sections 2.1.6, 2.6.4, 3.3 and Appendix 21 of the Prodoc. The project results also provide gender disaggregated targets. Women in Haiti play different socio-economic roles which have been taken into consideration in crafting the livelihood improvement activities.</p>
<p>Germany's Comments</p>	
<p>It should be specified how the proposed project will complement and build on the Cote Sud Initiative (see STAP review, paragraph 7).</p>	<p>See response to question 7 above</p>
<p>In addition we would encourage identifying gender-specific</p>	<p>See response to question 8 above</p>

<p>potentials that may be used in the project context. In order to determine these potentials, as well as to further specify the vulnerabilities and the possibly gender-differentiated ways livelihoods are affected by climate change, we would recommend conducting a comprehensive target group and gender analysis. The analysis should then form a basis for an assessment on whether and how gender equality can best be promoted in the project context.</p>	
<p>From our perspective, the project should put stronger emphasis on the relevance of ecosystem services and biodiversity for development, particularly with regard to linkages and trade-offs with existing and planned development activities (e.g. energy, infrastructure, agriculture, etc.). It should put an emphasis on assessing ecosystem services and integrating them accordingly into development planning. It should consider “trade-offs” between different (economic) activities and their dependence and impact on ecosystem services.</p>	<p>The project document examines several economic activities and their current trade-offs with the environment. These currently include the fishing, vetiver cultivation, and charcoal production practices. Kindly see section 3.3 of the Prodoc for additional information.</p>
<p>The project should therefore consider applying (established) methods of vulnerability analysis with regard to climate change, ecosystem management and protected area</p>	<p>Vulnerability analysis has been added as an activity that will be carried out early in the project under Outcome 4. Number of vulnerability assessments have also been added as an indicator measuring project success.</p>
<p>There is currently a German-supported cooperation project being prepared to support the Haitian Ministry of Environment regarding the “La Selle” Biosphere reserve</p>	<p>Kindly refer to Section 2.7 of the Prodoc which provides information on this project. GIZ has actively participated in the validation mission and provided inputs into the logical framework.</p>
<p>GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW of PIF August 29, 2013</p>	
<p>7. 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>The project outputs now provide a greater case for synergy that is provided by combining adaptation, SFM and biodiversity conservation activities. Kindly refer to elaborations of Output 2.2 (page 82 of Prodoc) and Output 3.1 (page 90 of Prodoc) for these.</p>
<p>7. (b) 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.</p>	<p>The logical framework has changed from how it was proposed in the PIF. Kindly refer to Appendix 4 of the Prodoc or Annex A of the CEO Endorsement for the new logframe. There are legal and regulatory aspects that are anticipated in the project under Component 1, especially as the project seeks to establish a new marine managed area. While the project will provide the data, justification and information for decreeing this area as a protected entity, the ensuing legislation and decree will be an act of the government.</p>

<p>8. 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 have to investigate, it also assumes fullstocking, 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 => 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 3.32/2 = 1.66 tC/ha/yr, and that the project can return this to its entirety</p> <p>1.66 t/ha * 9910 ha = 16450 t C Convert to CO2 16,450 * 3.66 = 60,209 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 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 8 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 seperately from the GEF alternative for each component under section A.1.4</p>	<p>Kindly refer to the following sections for additional information on carbon benefits, and how carbon calculations were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 2.2.2 Climate Change Mitigation of the Prodoc - Table 2 on page 31 of the Prodoc on climate change mitigation and expected global benefits - Description of Output 2.2 (pages 83-88) and - Appendix 18 of the Prodoc for the GHG Analysis conducted for this project. <p>- Adaptation benefits are now provided by Outcome in Section 3.7 of the Pr0doc in Incremental Cost Reasoning, and in Section A.5 of the CEO Endorsement.</p>
<p>10. Information is provided on the role of public participation including CSOs. Further information should be provided by CEO Endorsement.</p>	<p>Information on how stakeholders, including CSOs/NGOs and private sector partners will participate in the project are now provided in Sections 2.5 and 5 of the Prodoc.</p>
<p>12. By CEO endorsement please provide further information on the mechanisms which will be put in place to ensure coordination of all the related initiatives.</p>	<p>Kindly refer to Section 2.7 of the Prodoc to see linkages with projects and how these will be managed. Also, please refer to Section 4 of the Prodoc on the implementation arrangements, to see which particular partners will be asked to sit on the steering committee of the project to ensure coordination and avoid duplication.</p>
<p>17. Please provide further information on the co-financing which is to be provided by UNDP for this project.</p>	<p>Kindly see the co-financing letter provided by UNDP which outlines the basis of their commitment;</p>

	Appendix 11 of the prodoc and Annex K-4 of the CEO Endorsement.
18. Please split the project management costs to show how much resources will come from the LDCF and the GEF trust fund.	Kindly refer to attached Activity-based budget which reflects how each focal area budget is allocated among each outcome of the project.
<p>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. 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>	<p>The project has been very vigilant in not disrupting power dynamics or giving undue support to one producing group over another. For that reason, the project will support the mainstreaming of best practices across cooperatives. Given the steep terrain many vetiver producers are also removed from one another and the project will seek to create linkages among them. For those that are not organized into cooperatives, there will be opportunities for knowledge exchange to demonstrate the benefits of cooperatives both in terms of sustainable cultivation techniques but also of leveraging improved prices, and better quality of vetiver. This will be done across the Southern region.</p> <p>There is no micro-financing allocated in this project per se. However, as cooperatives are strengthened, trained in SLM and best practices in vetiver harvesting, it is anticipated that they will have the resources to invest and lend within their own communities. As was noted during the inception mission, existing cooperatives have provided lending for social projects (water pump, school) but also to support individual producers to enhance livelihoods. In supporting cooperatives the project will encourage, however, that women beneficiaries are equal recipients of micro-financing initiatives by cooperatives.</p>

GEF Secretariat Review of CEO Endorsement Package – September 24, 2015

Remarks from the GEF	How remarks have been addressed
3. 11 Sept 2015 UA: For SFM funding, in Table D, please select "Haiti" and not "global" from the drop down menu.	Done- Table D now says "Haiti" and not "Global" for SFM.
<p>7. 11 Sept 2015 UA: Not fully for NR focal areas and SFM/REDD+. Please, a) correct 250 ha to 350 ha in output 2.1 b) provide more details on outputs by inserting the information provided in Table 3.1 of the project document, page 75f.</p> <p>FI/MO, 9/24/15: Not quite. Please: (1) Split grant amount as well as co- financing in Table B by type of GEF fund (i.e., specify amounts separately for GEF TF and for LDCF). (2) Include evaluation within the Table B components and</p>	<p>a) Output 2.1 has actually increased to 400 ha, see (4) below.</p> <p>b) Table B has now been reformulated to include more details on outputs as well as corrections to hectares.</p> <p>(1-3) Grant amounts have been split in Table B by GEFTF and LDCF.</p> <p>(4) At the time of the GEF review results of studies carried out during the PPG phase with co-financing,</p>

<p>provide separate (not combined) figures for LDCF and GEF TF. (3) Split the PMC (grant and corresponding co-financing) by LDCF and GEF TF as well. (4) Activities to produce briquettes from vetiver waste to replace conventional charcoals are described in outcome 2, 5 and 6, but their result and targets are not reflected in Annex A. Please revise table A.5 (page 17 - 23), Annex A and Annex I.</p> <p>FI, 11/6/15: Not yet. As requested on 9/24 comment (2) above. please include independent evaluations within Table B components 1-5 and not in a separate row of its own.</p>	<p>have come to light demonstrating that vetiver waste briquettes <u>will not serve</u> as a possible alternative to charcoal briquettes. The physical properties of vetiver by-products do not lend themselves well to the process which was tested. As a result, the project document and CEO Endorsement now no longer include reference to vetiver briquettes. Tracking tools and other documents have all been adjusted accordingly (Consultants to be Hired, Draft Procurement Plan, Work plan, etc.). Please note that vetiver briquettes were not part of the originally approved PIFs, although were felt to be worth pursuing as innovative at the beginning of the PPG phase. Budgeting has been reformulated to increase hectares planted under Output 2.1 which drew from the same sources of LDCF financing.</p> <p>UNEP, 11/20/15 Independent Evaluations have been presented as Component 6 in Table B for ease of posting in GEF systems.</p>
<p>8. 11 Sept 2015 UA: Yes for NR focal areas and SFM/REDD+.</p> <p>FI, 9/24/15: Please consider climate-resilience of the suggested (apiculture and agricultural) alternative livelihoods options (Output 2.2).</p> <p>MO, 9/24/2015: (1) Tracking tool picked "cook stoves" under objective 2, but this project target energy efficiency of vetiver production process. Also it does not have GHG emission avoided (Annex A shows 112.460 tCO₂ will be avoided from Outcome 6). Please revise tracking tool. (2) Tracking tool shows GHG emission avoided through renewable energy, but this amount is not available in the endorsement request document. Please explain. (3) Please explain how the amounts in objective 6 in tracking tool are calculated, and please explain difference from the endorsement request document.</p>	<p>Kindly refer to Section 3.3 in the Prodoc where activities are described under Output 3.2. The Section now includes reference to the links between beekeeping and climate change adaptation, as well as between other livelihood activities and adaptation.</p> <p>(1) Under Outcome 6, there will be significant reduction of GHG emissions due to increased energy efficiency in the vetiver supply chain. The amount of 112.460 tCO₂ avoided is due to the fact that at least 1 large-scale vetiver producer and at least 5 small-scale producers will adopted energy efficient production practices by end of project. It is expected that, at the industrial level, oil production factories will operate in an energy inefficient manner at the end of the project. Without the project, the industry produces a large amount of non-recovered organic waste after the oil has been extracted from the roots. In the baseline scenario, this major potential of biomass produced as a by-product of the industrial process goes mainly unrecognized.</p> <p>First, increasing the energy efficiency will help using fewer materials for combustion, resulting in a smaller amount of GHG emitted. Second, the use of renewable energy would consist in using the Vetiver distillation wastes as a source of energy for</p>

<p>FI, 11/5/15: FI comment of 9/24 has been adequately addressed. However we would like to underscore the fact that livelihood diversification options that seek to reduce vulnerability to climate change can be potentially vulnerable to adverse effects of climate change in and of themselves -- e.g., vetiver-growing, fish production, mangrove planting and beekeeping. We encourage the Agency to refer to emerging research on climate-resilient approaches to such actions when selecting species, location, etc. MO 11/5/15 The project document and tracking tool for CCM are not aligned. (1) Tracking tool Objective 2 Energy Efficiency - Please delete "cook stove" from tracking tool, because the project do not expect energy efficiency improvement</p>	<p>combustion; that means fewer fuelwood would be necessary for distillation, therefore the impact on forest will be positive.</p> <p>(2) This has been corrected.</p> <p>(3) GHG emissions reduction from the improvement of energy efficiency in vetiver oil factories was calculated by using methodologies and standards available for energy efficiency in the industry sector, among other the Ex-ACT and the GEF Tools (http://www.stagef.org/revised-methodology-for-calculating-greenhouse-gas-benefits-of-gef-energy-efficiency-projects-version-1-0/ and http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/313). These calculations enabled to preparation team to account for energy savings in the vetiver oil industry of Haiti, Cote Sud.</p> <p>Starting from the baseline scenario, improvements in energy efficiency in the vetiver oil industry have been considered with project implementation. Calculations were made taking into account available technologies targeting energy efficiency and related investments with project scenario (lighting, appliances, equipment, building, industrial process, etc.). The energy savings have been weighted by the emissions factor of the energy producing technology according to national or international references, with 24 492 tCO₂ avoided per year, and 122 460 tCO₂ avoided, totaled over the respective lifetime of the investments.</p> <p>UNEP, 11/20/15 UNEP acknowledges this advice. In the Climate Change Risk section of Risk Table, the following sentence has been added. "Project execution team will keep abreast of emerging research on climate resilient approaches relating to livelihood diversification activities, inclusive of selection of species, location etc. "</p> <p>The tracking tools for CCM and SFM have been amended. These are now fully consistent with documentation. In addition, a correction was made in the CCM tracking tool where "cookstoves" was mistakenly selected. The emissions figured were corrected and reflected consistently throughout the documents. The lifetime Direct GHG emissions</p>
--	---

<p>by cook stove.</p> <p>- Please indicate Lifetime Direct GHG emission avoided, Lifetime Post-GHG emissions avoided, and Lifetime indirect GHG emissions avoided (bottom-up and top down) in the tracking tool.</p> <p>(2) Tracking tool Objective 3 Renewable Energy</p> <p>- The amounts of the Lifetime direct GHG emissions avoided are different in Tracking tool as 159,198 tons, and 122,460 tons in Project document. Please correct them in either tracking tool or project document.</p>	<p>avoided figures are reflected in the tracking tool for project-relevant objectives (2 and 5). The project is no longer intervening in renewable energy.</p>
<p>9. FI, 9/24/15: Further information is requested. Quantitative targets have been presented, on p.71 of the ProDoc, for increasing women's participation in the production of charcoal, castor oil, honey, and vetiver. Please also provide some discussion on qualitative aspects. For example, is it harder for women to get access to support and resources relating to production? Are they more vulnerable to the impacts of climatic extremes? Etc. Please also discuss whether and how the project will address these issues.</p>	<p>Section B.2 in the CEO Endorsement and 2.6.4 now include additional information on the qualitative aspects of women's participation in livelihood activities. Access to resources, impacts from climate change are now included in these sections.</p>
<p>10. FI, 9/24/15: Further information is requested. CSOs, vetiver-growing and charcoal-producing community members were consulted during PPG. Please discuss how their continued engagement will be sought and taken into consideration during implementation.</p>	<p>Text has been added in the CEO Endorsement on the role of CSOs during project implementation (support in implementing activities, providing on-the-ground training and reporting back to the Project Management Unit) Please refer to the highlighted paragraph in Section B.1.</p>
<p>12. FI, 9/24/15: Please discuss coordination with Haiti's adaptation investments under the PPCR. Agency has provided info requested at PIF stage for CEO Endorsement (on coordination mechanisms).</p>	<p>We have added the following text on this matter: "In terms of coordination with the PPCR : The main agency responsible for the PPCR is CIAT (Comité Interministériel d'Aménagement du Territoire). While the PPCR will not have any activities in the South that will directly link with the GEF project (they will work only in the Central Plateau and in the North), best practices and lessons learned on climate resilience and adaptation from UNEP supported work in the South will be incorporated into their approach for the North, including for small islands located off of the coast. In addition, CIAT will be one of UNEP's main implementing partners for regional planning to address climate adaptation and resiliency in the co-financing project Macaya Grand Sud." in the CEO Endorsement (Section A.7) and Prodoc (Section 2.7.2).</p>

<p>15. FI, 9/24/15: Not quite. Text on cost-effectiveness is very general (p. 141 of ProDoc). Agency is requested to discuss cost-effectiveness of project design and activities relative to potential other measures that might have achieved similar outcomes.</p>	<p>Text on cost-effectiveness in the CEO Endorsement and prodoc has been strengthened by inserting a table which demonstrates the business as usual approach, compared to the cost-effective intervention through GEF financing.</p>
<p>17. FI, 9/24/15: Co-financing letters have been provided and, at \$42.67 M, co-financing appears adequate. However, Table C mistakenly specifies UNDP co-financing as "grant" whereas the letter states "in-kind". Table C also identifies IADB co-financing as "grant" whereas the letter does not specify. Please correct and/or confirm both. Also, please split co-financing in Table B by whether it corresponds to LDCF or GEF TF amounts.</p> <p>FI, 11/6/15: Further adjustment requested. GEF's online database requires numbers shown in Table B columns to add up exactly to the specified subtotals and totals, otherwise error messages are triggered. Currently there are two sets of numbers that are not adding up to the stated totals: (a) co-financing for LDCF actually adds up to 1 more than the shown subtotal (i.e., sum is \$18,235,424) and (b) sum of GEF TF relevant co-financing adds up to 1 less than the shown subtotal (i.e., it adds up to \$22,355,386). This is probably a result of rounding off. Since the numbers need to add up exactly, Agency is requested to address this issue.</p>	<p>UNDP is reflected as in kind throughout, IADB as grant throughout.</p> <p>Co-financing has been split in accordance with breakdown of LDCF and GEF TF amounts. Please note an in depth examination of programmed activities as they relate sources of co-financing have resulted in some adjustments.</p> <p>UNEP, 11/20/15 (a) The \$1 round up has been adjusted (b) The \$1 round down has been adjusted.</p>
<p>18. FI, 9/24/15: Please split the project management costs to show the amount of resources that will come from the LDCF and the GEF trust fund, as well as the corresponding co-financing.</p> <p>FI, 11/5/15: Revision or adequate explanation is requested. The GEF TF project grant amount has been reduced by \$25,088 since PIF stage, and the GEF TF component of PMC increased by the same amount, bringing it to 5.9 percent of the project cost. The explanation provided in the footnote, which refers to co-financing, is unclear. Further, PMC is expected to remain within 5% of the total project grant irrespective of the amount co-financing secured. Recommended action: Please either revise the GEF TF PMC to within 5% of the GEF TF project grant, or provide adequate explanation for why the threshold has been exceeded.</p>	<p>The Project management costs have been separated in the CEO Endorsement to demonstrate the sources form LDCF and GEF trust fund.</p> <p>UNEP, 11/20/2015 The respective LDCF and GEFTF budgets have been recalculated to ensure that respective PMC amounts for <u>each</u> fund remains within the 5% threshold.</p>

<p>21. 11 Sept 2015 UA: Not fully for NR focal areas and SFM/REDD+. Please a) check the BD TT - it seems that a draft version has been provided with comments included such as "I don't have the data"; b) please check SFM and LD tools for consistency with prodoc. There are different figures provided for reforestation/vegetation cover such as 200ha, 300ha, 350 ha. FI, 9/24/15: No. CCA Tracking Tool appears to be missing.</p>	<p>The SFM and LD tracking tools have been harmonized and are consistent with the prodoc..⁵</p> <p>Outcome 2.1 is 400 hectares (fruit trees) Outcome 2.2 is 500 hectares (woodlots) Outcome 3.1 is 700 hectares (mangroves) + 300 hectares (improved ag management). Outcome 5 is 200 hectares (non forest so in CCM Tracking tool only)</p> <p>The climate change adaptation tracking tool is part of the submission package.</p>
---	---

⁵ The data between the SFM and the CCM tools have been harmonized.

Conservation and enhancement of carbon in forests, including agroforestry	500,00 (accounted in SFM : line 75 & 77)	ha
Conservation and enhancement of carbon in non forest lands, including peat land	500,00	ha
Avoided deforestation and forest degradation	700,00 (accounted in SFM : line 76 & 78)	ha
Afforestation/reforestation	400,00 (accounted in SFM under : line 94)	ha

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁶

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$200,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Consultants	165,750	145,422	20,328
Travel	10,000	10,000	0
National Workshops	9,250	4,250	5,000
Local workshops and consultations	10,000	5,000	5,000
Communications	5,000	5,000	0
Total	200,000	169,672	30,328⁷

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

⁶ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

⁷ To be used for National and local Project Inception Workshops and Activity launching.